

File No. 211300 Committee Item No. 5
Board Item No. 10

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Land Use and Transportation Committee Date June 6, 2022
Board of Supervisors Meeting Date June 28, 2022

Cmte Board

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Motion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Resolution |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Ordinance |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Legislative Digest |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Budget and Legislative Analyst Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Youth Commission Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Introduction Form |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | MOU |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Information Form |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Subcontract Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Contract/Agreement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Form 126 – Ethics Commission |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Award Letter |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Application |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Public Correspondence |

OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Referral PC 122321 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Referral CEQA 122321 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Referral FYI 122321 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | PC Transmittal 021522 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Hearing Notice 030722 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Hearing Notice 060622 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | PLN Group Housing Memo 060122 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |

Completed by: Erica Major Date June 2, 2022
Completed by: Erica Major Date June 8, 2022

1 [Planning Code, Zoning Map - Group Housing Special Use District]

2

3 **Ordinance amending the Planning Code to create the Group Housing Special Use**
4 **District; affirming the Planning Department’s determination under the California**
5 **Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan**
6 **and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1, and findings of public**
7 **necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302.**

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

12

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

14

15 Section 1. Environmental and Land Use Findings.

16 (a) The Planning Department has determined that the actions contemplated in this
17 ordinance comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources
18 Code Sections 21000 et seq.). Said determination is on file with the Clerk of the Board of
19 Supervisors in File No. 211300 and is incorporated herein by reference. The Board affirms
20 this determination.

21 (b) On February 10, 2022, the Planning Commission, in Resolution No. 21071,
22 adopted findings that the actions contemplated in this ordinance are consistent, on balance,
23 with the City’s General Plan and eight priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1. The
24 Board adopts these findings as its own. A copy of said Resolution is on file with the Clerk of
25 the Board of Supervisors in File No. 211300, and is incorporated herein by reference.

1 (c) Pursuant to Planning Code Section 302, the Board of Supervisors finds that the
2 Planning Code and Zoning Map amendments will serve the public necessity, convenience,
3 and welfare for the reasons set forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. 21071, and the
4 Board incorporates such reasons herein by reference.

5
6 Section 2. Other Specific Findings.

7 (a) The Group Housing Special Use District is generally comprised of overlapping
8 areas in whole or in part of the Chinatown Community Business District, the Chinatown Visitor
9 Retail District, the Chinatown Residential Neighborhood Commercial District, the Chinatown
10 Transit Station Special Use District, the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District, the
11 North Beach Special Use District, the Nob Hill Special Use District and the North of Market
12 Special Use District, which are described more fully in Planning Code sections 810, 811, 812,
13 722, 780.3, 249.66, 238 and 249.5 respectively, and the Uptown Tenderloin Historic District,
14 which is described more fully in the National Register of Historic Places as approved by the
15 State Historical Resources Commission (together, "Greater Chinatown and Greater
16 Tenderloin neighborhoods"). These districts all were designed with the intent of protecting and
17 preserving, to various degrees, the established communities, including the high concentration
18 of low-income residents of single-room occupancy (SRO) residential hotels, a type of group
19 housing as defined in the Planning Code.

20 (b) The Greater Chinatown and Greater Tenderloin neighborhoods continue to have
21 the highest concentration per census tract of low-income families in San Francisco, many of
22 whom reside in overcrowded group housing projects. This concentration of existing group
23 housing projects in the Group Housing Special Use District does not currently meet the
24 housing needs of the population, which lacks access to and choice of housing options that
25

1 provide adequate cooking, food preparation, and storage facilities appropriately sized for
2 families.

3 (c) The San Francisco Human Services Agency (HSA) has documented that both
4 the Greater Chinatown and Greater Tenderloin neighborhood residents are the most at risk for
5 food insecurity and the most reliant on government aid for food subsidies among San
6 Francisco residents; and that without a complete kitchen facility with adequate space to
7 prepare, store, and cook food, residents are more likely to rely on pre-prepared meals and
8 unhealthy snacks, furthering the income inequality and public health concerns in these
9 neighborhoods.

10 (d) Given the lack of adequate kitchens and adequate food storage areas within
11 new group housing projects, as well as Greater Tenderloin and Greater Chinatown residents'
12 limited access to affordable grocery stores, and an increase in documented assaults within
13 both neighborhoods, the Board of Supervisors finds that residents of new group housing
14 projects would need to purchase prepared food and would be unlikely to walk or take transit to
15 food establishments. Thus, residents are likely to rely heavily on Transportation Network
16 Company (TNC) food delivery vehicle services (e.g., DoorDash, GrubHub, and Uber Eats
17 deliveries) to obtain food, leading to additional congestion. As documented by the San
18 Francisco County Transportation Authority in its 2017 "TNC's Today" Congestion Study, an
19 increase in TNC use in turn creates more pedestrian/vehicle collisions and increased
20 pollution; the Greater Tenderloin and Greater Chinatown neighborhood already suffers high
21 levels of both.

22 (e) Group housing projects tend to have higher turnover of tenants given that the
23 typology specifically caters to transient and temporary residents, as interpreted by the Zoning
24 Administrator. Unlike family-sized dwelling units with full kitchens and storage space designed
25

1 for permanent residents, the transient nature of group housing residents contributes to
2 destabilization of the neighborhoods in which they are located.

3 (f) Existing group housing projects within the proposed Group Housing Special Use
4 District have been found to have a high number of vacancies as documented by the
5 Department of Building Inspection’s Annual Unit Usage Report (AUUR).

6 (g) The Board of Supervisors finds that because group housing is already
7 overwhelmingly saturated within the geographic boundaries of the Group Housing Special
8 Use District, and in the interest of promoting density and geographic equity, it is necessary
9 and appropriate to prohibit new group housing uses within the Group Housing Special Use
10 District to incentivize other needed housing typologies, namely affordable family-sized
11 housing, while concurrently increasing density in other areas of the City.

12
13 Section 3. Article 2 of the Planning Code is hereby amended by adding Section
14 249.92, to read as follows:

15 **SEC. 249.92. GROUP HOUSING SPECIAL USE DISTRICT.**

16 (a) Purpose. To incentivize the development of affordable family-sized housing over housing
17 without full kitchens or adequate space to prepare, store, and cook food, in areas of the City where
18 Group Housing is already saturated, a special use district entitled the “Group Housing Special Use
19 District” is hereby established.

20 (b) Boundaries. The boundaries of the Group Housing Special Use District are shown on
21 Special Use District Maps SU 01 and 02, and consist of the following areas:

22 (1) The area within a perimeter established by Bush Street, Stockton Street, Market
23 Street, and Polk Street.

24 (2) The area within a perimeter established by Union Street, Grant Avenue, Columbus
25 Avenue, Montgomery Street, California Street, and Powell Street.

1 (c) *Controls.* Except for an Affordable Housing Project, as defined in Planning Code
 2 section 315(b), and Single Room Occupancy residential hotel units required by section 41.13
 3 of the Hotel Conversion Ordinance, Administrative Code section 41.13, Group Housing, as
 4 defined in Section 102, shall not be permitted in the Special Use District. All other provisions of the
 5 Planning Code shall apply.

6
 7 Section 4. The Planning Code is hereby amended by revising Special Use District Map
 8 SU01 and SU02 of the Zoning Map of the City and County of San Francisco, as follows:

9

Description of Property	Special Use District Hereby Approved
The area within a perimeter established by Bush Street, Stockton Street, Market Street, and Polk Street.	Group Housing Special Use District
The area within a perimeter established by Union Street, Grant Avenue, Columbus Avenue, Montgomery Street, California Street, and Powell Street.	Group Housing Special Use District

18
 19 Section 5. Effective and Operative Dates.

20 (a) This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after enactment. Enactment
 21 occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the ordinance unsigned or
 22 does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board of Supervisors
 23 overrides the Mayor’s veto of the ordinance.

24 (b) This ordinance shall become operative on the later of (1) its effective date stated
 25 in subsection (a), or (2) on the effective date of either the ordinance in Board of Supervisors

REVISED LEGISLATIVE DIGEST
(Amended in Committee, 3/7/2022)

[Planning Code, Zoning Map - Group Housing Special Use District]

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to create the Group Housing Special Use District; affirming the Planning Department’s determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1, and findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302.

Existing Law

Currently, group housing is allowed in most districts that allow residential uses in San Francisco.

Amendments to Current Law

This ordinance would create a special use district that prohibited Group Housing in the areas bounded by Bush Street, Stockton Street, Market Street, and Polk Street (the greater Tenderloin neighborhood), and the area bounded by Union Street, Grant Avenue, Columbus Avenue, Montgomery Street, California Street, and Powell Street (the greater Chinatown neighborhood). Group Housing projects that are also Affordable Housing Projects, as defined in Planning Code section 315(b), or Single Room Occupancy residential hotel units required by section 41.13 of the Hotel Conversion Ordinance, Administrative Code section 41.13, would not be prohibited.

The ordinance would only be effective on the effective date of the ordinance in either Board of Supervisors File Nos. 210564 or 210866. Those ordinances allow additional units in RH-1 neighborhoods. When adopted together with one of these other ordinances, this ordinance would not reduce the residential capacity of the City.

Background Information

There are a number of group housing projects in the greater Chinatown and Tenderloin neighborhoods. Group housing units contain limited or no kitchen facilities or food storage areas.

This version of the ordinance includes amendments made at the Land Use and Transportation Committee of the Board of Supervisors on March 7, 2022, to exempt affordable housing and single room occupancy hotel units required by the Hotel Conversion Ordinance from the SUD.

FILE NO. 211300

n:\legana\as2021\2200120\01571418.docx



MEMO TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

June 1, 2022

Subject: SB330 Analysis of Group Housing Ordinance (Board File No. 211300) and Fourplex Ordinance (Board File No. 220446)

Staff Contact: Joshua Switzky, Land Use Program Manager (628.652.7464,
joshua.switzky@sfgov.org)

Background

California Government Code 66300, also known as the Senate Bill 330 Housing Crisis Act of 2019 (“SB330”), prohibits jurisdictions from making any regulatory changes that have the effect of reducing the housing development capacity of any parcels below what was allowed as of January 1, 2018, without concurrently adopting changes on other parcels within the jurisdiction to ensure that there is no net loss in residential capacity. (See Gov’t Code 666300(b) and (i).) This memorandum summarizes and analyzes two ordinances that might be considered by the Board of Supervisors concurrently under SB330: the Group Housing Special Use District ordinance (Board File No. 211300) and the “Fourplex” Ordinance (Board File 220446). The memorandum looks at the effects of the ordinances on residential capacity in terms of “soft-sites” – the realistic development potential of existing sites assuming typical market forces.

Group Housing Special Use District Ordinance (Board File No. 211300)

This proposed ordinance would prohibit new group housing units within two geographies defined in the ordinance, generally characterized as covering large portions of the Tenderloin and Chinatown neighborhoods. The ordinance does not reduce the capacity or allowed density of dwelling unit development or change the allowed square footage or envelope of housing that can be built on any parcel, but rather only limits one specialized sub-category of residential use within that envelope. Because the proposed ordinance does not reduce the amount of housing that could be built on a parcel, it would not trigger the provisions of SB330

Nevertheless, because group housing is presently permitted at higher densities of units per parcel area than other types of housing in most of the underlying zoning districts within the affected geographies, the Planning Department has conducted an analysis of the unit-count difference between group housing and dwelling units to produce the most conservative analysis of the proposed ordinance in light of the restrictions in SB 330. Of the potential “soft sites” for new development in the affected geographies, the



maximum reduction of unit “potential” is approximately 1,574 units across 43 parcels using a 40% softness threshold.¹

This analysis should be considered conservative for two reasons. First, Planning typically uses a maximum 30% softness threshold in estimating zoned capacity and likely development. Here, a 30% softness threshold would result in a potential reduction of fewer units (1408). Second,, though the Planning Code provides for a density allowance for group housing expressed in the form of “units”, neither the Planning Code nor the Planning Department has an equivalency or conversion factor from group housing “units” to regular dwelling units, as group housing does not necessarily always take the form of identifiable “units”. Since there is a nominal difference in the number of “units” that could be built as group housing compared to the number of regular housing units permitted, the analysis considered each group housing unit equivalent to a dwelling unit.²

“Fourplex Ordinance” (Board File No. 220446)

This proposed ordinance would rezone all RH-1 and RH-1(D) lots to RH-2 and RH-2-D respectively (thus allowing two units per lot), and create a density exception to allow up to four units per lot in all RH districts and up to six units on corner lots. The version of the ordinance currently being considered by the Land Use and Transportation Committee includes various conditions and requirements on utilizing the density exception for more than two units per parcel, including that the subject property be in the same ownership for at least five years prior to submitting an entitlement application, imposition of rent controls rules to “exception units” should they be rented, and limiting condominium subdivision of density exception projects to those where both the owner attests their intent to live in one of the units for at least three years post-construction and where there have been no tenants in any unit for the prior five years.

A development and buildout capacity analysis of a rezoning ordinance typically looks at likely development sites using traditional metrics indicating likely “softness”, or likelihood of development, which predominantly weights sites with little existing development relative to permitted zoning envelope and that typically contains no residential uses, given the strong policy and regulatory limits and discouragement of demolishing existing housing and displacement of tenants.³ Typical “soft sites”, as

¹ Softness is measured by existing built development, by square footage, as a ratio of the maximum allowed zoning envelope. Soft sites exclude properties with existing housing and those with significant historic structures.

² Note that for a number of soft sites within the affected areas, specifically within the C-3 districts, there are no density limits for either regular housing or group housing uses, and so there is no difference between the number of units currently allowed and the number of units allowed should the group housing ordinance be approved.

³ This analysis, as is typical of all buildout and capacity analyses conducted by the Planning Department, considers “residential capacity” based on a soft-site and probabilistic analysis of the practical effects of the two ordinances



evidenced by past patterns of development, thus tend to be sites with no existing housing and that are vacant or contain small non-residential buildings or no significant buildings at all (eg parking lots, gas stations). In the case of this proposed ordinance, the focus of the rezoning is districts where almost all lots have existing housing, though a very small percentage of lots are either vacant or have no housing and are developed with other uses. This analysis is therefore bifurcated into two sub-categories of lot conditions: (a) lots with no existing housing, including vacant lots and sites with not more than a 1-story non-residential structure; and (b) lots with a single dwelling unit. Lots with two or more dwelling units are not considered likely to be significant candidates for redevelopment under this ordinance. This analysis does not consider the incremental additional units added by adding one or two units to structures that already contain one or more residential units, as existing ADU laws already allow the addition of one unit to all lots in excess of density limits, and possibly more under some circumstances.

Capacity on Vacant Lots. There are approximately 735 vacant⁴ RH lots in the city. These 735 vacant lots would have a theoretical capacity under the proposed ordinance of approximately 3,000 units (i.e. 735×4). However, this assumes that all of these lots are actually developable and not otherwise encumbered by other factors unrelated to the specific amount of existing development on them, ranging from topography and natural conditions, deed restrictions, or other use or ownership characteristics that make them impossible or highly unlikely to redevelop. A more detailed and thorough individual analysis of these lots would reveal many of these conditions, though this information is not easily ascertained through high-level citywide data analysis.. Planning recommends a reasonable discount factor to account for these unknown factors of 50-75%, suggesting that the realistic housing capacity under the ordinance for vacant lots is possibly 750-1,500 units.

Capacity on Lots with One-Story structures. There are presently approximately 393 lots in RH districts that contain no residential uses and a non-residential structure that is one story in height. Lots in RH districts with non-residential structures of two or more stories are not considered soft sites as their existing structures are substantial relative to the building envelope allowed within the 40' height limit typical of these districts. The total maximum capacity of these parcels is approximately 1,600 net units (i.e. 393×4). As per the above discussion of the vacant lots, staff recommends applying a discount factor to these

and not of "raw" maximum zoning capacity which would count every net unit not currently built on each lot under the maximum zoning however unlikely those units would be to ever be constructed. Under a raw zoning capacity analysis, the fourplex ordinance would, at a minimum, increase the capacity of the City's RH lots by well over 100,000 net zoned theoretical units.

⁴ The Department's Land Use Database (LUDB) identifies more than 735 parcels as "Vacant." Two methods were used to refine this dataset. First, parcels were removed that were indicated in the Planning Department's Building Footprint 3D dataset as having any structures at all (ie. floors >0), despite the LUDB classification as "vacant". Secondly, Planning staff hand-culled the map by a simple visual check to remove "vacant" parcels that are clearly and objectively not developable because they are actually active street ROWs, parks, or similarly restricted lots that are miscellaneous artifacts of past or ongoing subdivisions or redevelopment projects and have not yet been appropriately categorized with their actual use in the LUDB or by the Assessor.



estimates to account for potential unknown constraints on development on a share of the lots. Given that these lots have existing structures on them, mostly single-story commercial structures, it is likely that a much smaller percentage have unknown factors rendering them undevelopable or highly unlikely to be developed in the long term (eg 30 years) than for the completely vacant lots. Planning recommends a reasonable discount factor to account for these unknown factors for the one-story lots of about 25%, resulting in a potential maximum capacity of about 1,200 units.

Capacity on Lots with a Single Residential Unit. Out of the 127,727 lots in the city currently zoned RH, 93,275 lots have a single residential unit on them. The major intent of the legislation and policy discussion around the Fourplex legislation is the allowance of incremental densification and redevelopment of existing single-family house lots. Even prior to considering the draft ordinance's potential additional restrictions on ownership and occupancy described above, the likelihood of any homeowner or buyer of a single family house pursuing a project to densify or redevelop their property more intensely than adding an ADU is low due to a variety of factors, including practical, financial as well as personal. The financial feasibility analyses conducted by economic consultants Century Urban, working with the Planning Department, concluded that the feasibility of demolishing a single family house and replacing it with a 3-4 unit building is very challenging given present economic conditions and cost factors, particularly the costs of construction and the high market value of single family houses. To supplement this analysis, the Planning Department conducted two data analyses of broader development patterns to look at analogous situations where single dwelling unit structures have been developed into 3-6 unit buildings over the past 10-15 years.

The first analysis looked at how many single-unit properties in the City's RTO and RTO-M districts added 2-3 net units since the RTO districts were established in 2008-2009 as part of the rezoning actions that accompanied adoption of the Market Octavia and Mission Area plans. The RTO districts have no lot-based density limits, thus allowing allow 4 or more units per parcel, consolidating and replacing the RH-2, RH-3, and RM-1 districts in significant swaths of those neighborhoods, though single-family homes are commonly mixed in with multi-unit buildings in these areas. Given that the RTO districts are largely residential-only, feature mostly small lots, and typically feature similar 40' height limits to the RH districts, that recent rezoning is a close approximation for comparison. Of the total 378 lots in the RTO and RTO-M districts that had one unit as of 2009 (i.e. at the time of rezoning to RTO/RTO-M), four (4) projects have been processed by the Planning Department that would build up to a total of 4 units per lot. In other words, in the RTO districts, 1.3% of the lots with one unit were densified or redeveloped up to 4 units since 2009. To extrapolate this pattern from the past 12 years for the 25-30 period that is considered the standard for long-term buildout capacity and CEQA analyses, it would be reasonable to multiply 1.3% by 2.1 (ie 25/12) to yield a potential of 2.73% of 1-unit lots being densified over a 25 year period, assuming the same pace of development activity from the past 12 years would continue over coming years. This means that, using this benchmark analogy, that of the 93,275 one-unit lots affected by the proposed



ordinance, this analysis would estimate that approximately 2,500 lots with one unit would add 3 units, or about 7,500 net new units, over the next 25-30 years.

The second methodology looked more broadly not at a specific zoning change that enabled more units per parcel, but simply at how many lots citywide with one unit within zoning districts that already allowed 3 or more units per parcel were redeveloped into buildings with 3-6 units over the recent 15-year period (2005-2020). Of the 2,895 lots with one dwelling unit in 2005 that are in zoning districts allowing three or more units per parcel, a total of 81 lots, or 2.8%, were redeveloped such that they had 3-6 units in 2020. Considering only lots that densified from one unit to 4-6 units, the number of lots drops to 25 lots, or 0.9% of lots over 15 years. This, like the prior methodology, would similarly suggest a range of 2-3% of the 93,275 one-unit lots affected by the proposed ordinance might be densified or redeveloped into 4-6 unit buildings over 25-30 years.

Total Capacity. Using typical buildout analysis metrics and recent past patterns of development described above, the sum total of these categories suggest a possible total buildout of around 9,500 net units over 25-30 years citywide as a result of this ordinance, of which approximately 2,000 would come from currently vacant lots and those with small non-residential structures, and the rest on existing one-unit residential properties.

There are three significant caveats to consider when looking at these analogies to estimate what might happen as a result of the proposed ordinance that must be layered on the above estimate to discount it further. *First*, the current economic and real estate conditions are not necessarily analogous to those that prevailed during the past 15 years. Construction costs have increased significantly, more than doubling during the past several years; similarly the market value of single family homes has also increased by similar or even larger margins. While these trends may change over the next two to three decades to more resemble the economics that prevailed in the late 2000s and early 2010s, the future is uncertain and current economics for such redevelopment are unfavorable for the median property. This factor alone suggests a substantial discount of the above percentages of likely redevelopment. *Second*, a key question for an analysis of this sort of zoning change is the likely maximum “saturation point” over a long period of time for existing single-family buildings to densify or redevelop given all of the factors involved. Somewhat similar to prior efforts to estimate the likely “capacity” or “buildout” of ADU ordinances, where theoretically *every* property can add one or more ADUs, there is the question of, economics notwithstanding, what share of the owners of all of the lots that would be enabled to add the full density allowance to existing lots with single family homes actually will, over time, seek to redevelop the property, add units, or subdivide the existing houses. *Finally*, the effects of the draft ordinance’s ownership, residency, and rent control requirements will substantially decrease both the number of eligible properties at any one time as well as limit the pool and types of parties that might be able to undertake such projects, particularly limiting the ability of professional developers with both experience and resources to undertake such projects. While long-term property owners may find ways to bring in development partners, the necessity of undertaking this sort of arrangement undoubtedly will serve to



limit the volume of projects using the ordinance. In contrast, development in the benchmark densification analogies from the past 15 years described above was not subject to such limitations on ownership, residency, and rent control.

Staff is not able as of the drafting of this analysis to develop a methodology for determining what discount factors ought to be applied to the buildout capacity based on the ordinance's ownership, residency and rent control requirements. However, for the sake of the present analysis we assume a substantial further reduction of 50-75% to the 9,500 unit estimate above to reflect the possible effects of these requirements and trends, resulting in buildout capacity estimate of 2,400 – 4,800 units.

SB 330 Findings

The estimated housing capacity increase of the proposed Fourplex ordinance (Board File No. 220446), with its wide potential range of 2,400-4,800 units would substantially exceed, even at its lowest end, the maximum reduction in housing capacity from the proposed Group Housing ordinance (Board File No. 211300) of 1,400-1,600 "units". Again, this is a conservative analysis and assumes that the Group Housing ordinance actually reduces capacity. As noted above, because group housing "units" are an alternative form of residential use not necessarily comparable to regular dwelling units, there would be no reduction in capacity as a result of the Group Housing ordinance.



February 15, 2022

Ms. Angela Calvillo, Clerk
Honorable Supervisor Peskin
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 Numbers 2022-000674PCA and 2021-011415PCAMAP
Group Housing Definition and Special Use District
Board File Nos. 211299 and 211300

Planning Commission Recommendation: Approval with Modification

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisor Peskin,

On February 10, 2022, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider the proposed Ordinance, introduced by Supervisor Peskin that would amend the Planning Code to revise the definition of Group Housing and to establish a Group Housing Special Use District. At the hearing the Planning Commission recommended approval with modification.

The Commission's proposed modifications were as follows:

Board File No. 211299

1. Increase the common space requirement to 0.5 square feet of common space for every square foot of private space, instead of the proposed 0.25.
2. Require at least one kitchen within 15% of the common space, instead of the proposed 50%
3. Revise the minimum number of kitchens to be at least one communal kitchen for every 15 Group Housing rooms, instead of the proposed 20.
4. In addition to Student Housing and 100% affordable housing, also exempt units protected under Section

41.3 of the Hotel Conversion Ordinance from the common space requirements

5. Exempt those organizations like Family House from the common space requirements.
6. Allow academic institutions to provide limited cooking facilities.
7. Define metrics for communal kitchens.
8. Exclude the single-room occupancy aspect from this specific legislation with the intent to continue discussions in the future.
9. For the Department to consider establishing a Working Group to further discuss Group Housing intent, best practices, and future legislation.

Board File No. 211300

1. Revise the proposed SUD to exempt Student Housing and 100% Affordable Housing projects.
2. Exclude the single-room occupancy aspect from this specific legislation with the intent to continue discussions in the future.

The proposed amendments are not defined as a project under CEQA Guidelines Section 15060(c) and 15378 because they do not result in a physical change in the environment.

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

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

Sincerely,



Aaron D. Starr
Manager of Legislative Affairs

cc: Audrey Pearson, Deputy City Attorney
Sunny Angulo, Aide to Supervisor Peskin
Erica Major, Office of the Clerk of the Board

Attachments :

Planning Commission Resolution
Planning Department Executive Summary



PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 21071

HEARING DATE: FEBRUARY 10, 2022

Project Name: Group Housing Definition
Case Number: 2022-000674PCA [Board File No. 211299]
Initiated by: Supervisor Peskin / Introduced December 14, 2021
Staff Contact: Veronica Flores, Legislative Affairs
Veronica.Flores@sfgov.org, 628-652-7525
Reviewed by: Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs
aaron.starr@sfgov.org, 628-652-7533

RESOLUTION APPROVING WITH MODIFICATION A PROPOSED ORDINANCE THAT WOULD AMEND THE PLANNING CODE TO REVISE THE DEFINITION OF GROUP HOUSING; AFFIRMING THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT'S DETERMINATION UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT; AND MAKING FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN, AND THE EIGHT PRIORITY POLICIES OF PLANNING CODE, SECTION 101.1, AND FINDINGS OF PUBLIC NECESSITY, CONVENIENCE, AND WELFARE UNDER PLANNING CODE, SECTION 302.

WHEREAS, on December 14, 2021 Supervisor Peskin introduced a proposed Ordinance under Board of Supervisors (hereinafter "Board") File Number 211299, which would amend the Planning Code to revise the definition of Group Housing;

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider the proposed Ordinance on February 10, 2022; and,

WHEREAS, the proposed Ordinance has been determined to be categorically exempt from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act Sections 15378 and 15060(c)(2); and

WHEREAS, the Planning 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 Planning Commission has reviewed the proposed Ordinance; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission finds from the facts presented that the public necessity, convenience, and general welfare require the proposed amendment; and

MOVED, that the Planning Commission hereby **approves with modifications** the proposed ordinance. The Commission's proposed recommendations are as follows:

1. Increase the common space requirement to 0.5 square feet of common space for every square foot of private space, instead of the proposed 0.25.
2. Require at least one kitchen within 15% of the common space, instead of the proposed 50%
3. Revise the minimum number of kitchens to be at least one communal kitchen for every 15 Group Housing rooms, instead of the proposed 20.
4. In addition to Student Housing and 100% affordable housing, also exempt units protected under Section 41.3 of the Hotel Conversion Ordinance from the common space requirements
5. Exempt those organizations like Family House from the common space requirements.
6. Allow academic institutions to provide limited cooking facilities.
7. Define metrics for communal kitchens.
8. Exclude the single-room occupancy aspect from this specific legislation with the intent to continue discussions in the future.
9. For the Department to consider establishing a Working Group to further discuss Group Housing intent, best practices, and future legislation.

Findings

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

The proposed Ordinance will support Group Housing, a much-needed housing typology to help alleviate the housing crisis in San Francisco.

General Plan Compliance

The proposed Ordinance and the Commission's recommended modifications are consistent with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan:

HOUSING ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 1

IDENTIFY AND MAKE AVAILABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT ADEQUATE SITES TO MEET THE CITY'S HOUSING NEEDS, ESPECIALLY PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

Policy 1.1

Plan for the full range of housing needs in the City and County of San Francisco, especially affordable housing.

OBJECTIVE 4

FOSTER A HOUSING STOCK THAT MEETS THE NEEDS OF ALL RESIDENTS ACROSS LIFECYCLES.

Policy 4.5

Encourage sufficient and suitable rental housing opportunities, emphasizing permanently affordable rental units wherever possible.

OBJECTIVE 5

ENSURE THAT ALL RESIDENTS HAVE EQUAL ACCESS TO AVAILABLE UNITS.

Policy 5.4

Provide a range of unit types for all segments of need, and work to move residents between unit types as their needs change.

The proposed Group Housing Definition Ordinance supports Group Housing, a housing typology that offers an alternative to traditional living arrangements. There is a wide spectrum of the different types of Group Housing projects, but they all focus on communal living. The proposed Ordinance seeks to ensure Group Housing provides adequate, usable common space for its residents. Further, the proposed Ordinance aligns with the draft Housing Element 2022 Update, which recently appeared in front of Planning Commission, to encourage co-housing. Additionally, the Housing Element 2022 Update noted the importance of minimum quality of life standards for all residences, such as having adequate cooking facilities and common spaces.

Planning Code Section 101 Findings

The proposed amendments to the Planning Code are consistent with the eight Priority Policies set forth in Section 101.1(b) of the Planning Code in that:

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 proposed Ordinance would not have a negative effect on neighborhood serving retail uses and will not have a negative effect on opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of neighborhood-serving retail.

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve

the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

The proposed Ordinance would not have a negative effect on housing or neighborhood character.

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

The proposed Ordinance would not have an adverse effect on the City's supply of affordable housing.

4. That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

The proposed Ordinance would not result in commuter traffic impeding MUNI transit service or overburdening the streets or neighborhood parking.

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 proposed Ordinance would not cause displacement of the industrial or service sectors due to office development, and future opportunities for resident employment or ownership in these sectors would not be impaired.

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

The proposed Ordinance would not have an adverse effect on City's preparedness against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.

7. That the landmarks and historic buildings be preserved;

The proposed Ordinance would not have an adverse effect on the City's Landmarks and historic buildings.

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development;

The proposed Ordinance would not have an adverse effect on the City's parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas.

Planning Code Section 302 Findings.

The Planning Commission finds from the facts presented that the public necessity, convenience and general welfare require the proposed amendments to the Planning Code as set forth in Section 302.

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

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Commission at its meeting on February 10, 2022.



Jonas P Ionin Digitally signed by Jonas P Ionin
Date: 2022.02.10 16:23:11 -0800

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES: Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ADOPTED: February 10, 2022

This page intentionally blank.



PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 21072

HEARING DATE: FEBRUARY 10, 2022

Project Name: Group Housing Special Use District
Case Number: 2021-011415PCAMAP [Board File No. 211300]
Initiated by: Supervisor Peskin / Introduced December 14, 2021
Staff Contact: Veronica Flores, Legislative Affairs
Veronica.Flores@sfgov.org, 628-652-7525
Reviewed by: Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs
aaron.starr@sfgov.org, 628-652-7533

RESOLUTION APPROVING WITH MODIFICATION A PROPOSED ORDINANCE THAT WOULD AMEND THE PLANNING CODE TO CREATE THE GROUP HOUSING SPECIAL USE DISTRICT; AFFIRMING THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT'S DETERMINATION UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT; AND MAKING FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN, AND THE EIGHT PRIORITY POLICIES OF PLANNING CODE, SECTION 101.1, AND FINDINGS OF PUBLIC NECESSITY, CONVENIENCE, AND WELFARE UNDER PLANNING CODE, SECTION 302.

WHEREAS, on December 14, 2021 Supervisor Peskin introduced a proposed Ordinance under Board of Supervisors (hereinafter "Board") File Number 211300, which would amend the Planning Code to create the Group Housing Special Use District;

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider the proposed Ordinance on February 10, 2022; and,

WHEREAS, the proposed Ordinance has been determined to be categorically exempt from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act Sections 15378 and 15060(c)(2); and

WHEREAS, the Planning 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 Planning Commission has reviewed the proposed Ordinance; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission finds from the facts presented that the public necessity, convenience, and general welfare require the proposed amendment; and

MOVED, that the Planning Commission hereby **approves with modifications** the proposed ordinance. The Commission's proposed recommendation is as follows:

1. Revise the proposed SUD to exempt Student Housing and 100% Affordable Housing projects.
2. Exclude the single-room occupancy aspect from this specific legislation with the intent to continue discussions in the future.

Findings

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

The proposed Ordinance responds to the overconcentration of Group Housing in the general Tenderloin and Chinatown neighborhoods.

The proposed Ordinance encourages more family-sized units within these neighborhoods.

General Plan Compliance

The proposed Ordinance and the Commission's recommended modification is consistent with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan:

HOUSING ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 1

IDENTIFY AND MAKE AVAILABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT ADEQUATE SITES TO MEET THE CITY'S HOUSING NEEDS, ESPECIALLY PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

Policy 1.1

Plan for the full range of housing needs in the City and County of San Francisco, especially affordable housing.

OBJECTIVE 5

ENSURE THAT ALL RESIDENTS HAVE EQUAL ACCESS TO AVAILABLE UNITS.

Policy 5.4

Provide a range of unit types for all segments of need, and work to move residents between unit types as their needs change.

The proposed SUD Ordinance responds to the overconcentration of Group Housing in the general Chinatown and Tenderloin neighborhoods. Additionally, there is a high vacancy rate within the existing Group Housing rooms within these neighborhoods suggesting the need for other housing typologies. The intent of the proposed Ordinance is to encourage more family-sized units in these neighborhoods.

Planning Code Section 101 Findings

The proposed amendments to the Planning Code are consistent with the eight Priority Policies set forth in Section 101.1(b) of the Planning Code in that:

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 proposed Ordinance would not have a negative effect on neighborhood serving retail uses and will not have a negative effect on opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of neighborhood-serving retail.

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

The proposed Ordinance would not have a negative effect on housing or neighborhood character.

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

The proposed Ordinance would not have an adverse effect on the City's supply of affordable housing.

4. That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

The proposed Ordinance would not result in commuter traffic impeding MUNI transit service or overburdening the streets or neighborhood parking.

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 proposed Ordinance would not cause displacement of the industrial or service sectors due to office development, and future opportunities for resident employment or ownership in these sectors would not be impaired.

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

The proposed Ordinance would not have an adverse effect on City's preparedness against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.

- 7. That the landmarks and historic buildings be preserved;

The proposed Ordinance would not have an adverse effect on the City's Landmarks and historic buildings.

- 8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development;

The proposed Ordinance would not have an adverse effect on the City's parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas.

Planning Code Section 302 Findings.

The Planning Commission finds from the facts presented that the public necessity, convenience and general welfare require the proposed amendments to the Planning Code as set forth in Section 302.

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

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Commission at its meeting on February 10, 2022.



Jonas P Ionin Digitally signed by Jonas P Ionin
Date: 2022.02.10 10:58:06 -0800

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES: Diamond, Fung, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ADOPTED: February 10, 2022



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PLANNING CODE TEXT & ZONING MAP AMENDMENT

HEARING DATE: February 10, 2022

90-Day Deadline: March 23, 2022

Project Name: Group Housing Definition and Group Housing Special Use District
Case Number: 2022-000674PCA and 2021-011415PCAMAP [Board File Nos. 211299 and 211300]
Initiated by: Supervisor Peskin / Introduced December 14, 2021
Staff Contact: Veronica Flores, Legislative Affairs
Veronica.Flores@sfgov.org, 628-652-7525
Reviewed by: Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs
aaron.starr@sfgov.org, 628-652-7533

Recommendation: Approval with Modification

Planning Code and Zoning Map Amendment

The Way It Is Now:	The Way It Would Be:
Board File 211299: Ordinance amending the Planning Code to revise the definition of Group Housing.	
Per Zoning Administrator interpretation, Group Housing rooms may have a limited cooking facility, which is defined as having a small counter space, a small under-counter refrigerator, a small sink, a microwave, and a small two-ring burner.	Group Housing rooms would not be allowed to have individual or limited cooking facilities.
Group Housing rooms need to be rented out for a minimum of seven days.	Group Housing rooms would need to be rented out for a minimum of 30 days.
Group Housing projects do not have a minimum square footage requirement for common space and amenities.	Group Housing projects would be required to provide 0.25 square feet of common space for every square foot of private space (including bedrooms and individual bathrooms). At least 50% of this common space would need to be devoted to a communal

	<p>kitchen, with a minimum of one kitchen for every 20 Group Housing rooms.</p> <p>The only exceptions would be for Student Housing or 100% Affordable Housing.</p>
On-site inclusionary Group Housing rooms can either be rental or ownership tenures.	On-site inclusionary Group Housing rooms would not be permitted as ownership.
Board File 211300: Ordinance amending the Planning Code to create the Group Housing Special Use District.	
Group Housing is Principally Permitted within the Chinatown and Tenderloin Neighborhoods.	The proposed Ordinance would establish a Group Housing Special Use District, generally comprised of the Chinatown and Tenderloin neighborhoods, which would prohibit new Group Housing rooms.

Background

There has been an increase in the number of market-rate Group Housing projects proposed in the last several years. Planning staff began work to ensure that Group Housing projects incorporated common spaces and cooking facilities to improve livability for the future residents of these developments. In early 2019, Planning Staff was awarded a Friends of City Planning (FOCP) grant to work with California College of the Arts (CCA) to better understand how the Group Housing typology is used worldwide, and to better inform policy recommendations and Planning Code amendments related to common areas. The culminating white paper and Informational Hearing are scheduled to appear in front of Planning Commission on the same day (see Case No. 2018-014048CWP). The results of this analysis are discussed further below.

Additionally, there was a [2005 Zoning Administrator interpretation](#) which allowed Group Housing rooms to have kitchens in the form of “limited cooking facilities”. A limited cooking facility is defined as a facility with a small counter space, a small under-counter refrigerator, a small sink, a microwave, and a small two-ring burner; however, if the kitchen had an oven, it would be considered a “full cooking facility”. This interpretation was originally intended to allow limited kitchen facilities in hotel rooms to provide guests the option of making their own meals during their stay. The same logic was applied to Group Housing to provide those residents with the option of preparing their own meals. The interpretation has since been applied to new construction Group Housing projects, which created a loophole for developers to construct higher density projects with fewer Planning Code requirements for unit mix, usable open space, and exposure. Implementing this interpretation made it difficult to determine what differentiated Group Housing from a regular Dwelling Unit. Further, this interpretation strayed from the “communal” aspect of the Group Housing definition, which excludes individual cooking facilities. The proposed Ordinance seeks to clearly define and differentiate Group Housing from a regular Dwelling Unit.

Issues and Considerations

Group Housing and State Density Bonus Interaction

Group Housing projects may elect to take advantage of the State Density Bonus per California Government Code Section 65915. The State Density Bonus Law provides a developer with incentives/concessions and waivers from development standards. Generally, Group Housing projects are allowed a higher density than Dwelling Unit projects in areas with numerical density, and Group Housing is also permitted in areas with form-based density. The Planning Code already requires lower standards for Group Housing projects; for example, Group Housing is only required to provide 1/3 of the required usable open space compared to regular Dwelling Units. Recent Group Housing projects that have elected the State Density Bonus have waived open space and exposure requirements, effectively increasing the density even further while having reduced open space, exposure, etc. The proposed Ordinance includes the common space requirements within the definition of Group Housing, rather than a Planning Code requirement so they cannot be waived. The intent is to make Group Housing a functional housing typology complete with common space and other basic items such as usable open space. As written, all new Group Housing projects (whether new construction or the conversion of existing buildings) would need to comply with the common space requirements. This ensures that future projects provide a true communal living situation and further distinguishes Group Housing from other Dwelling Units.

Definitions

The proposed Ordinances and staff report discuss different concepts which are sometimes interchanged for each other. This subsection clarifies the definitions and distinguishes between some of these concepts before describing other issues and considerations.

- Dwelling Unit is a type of Residential Use with a room or suite of rooms designed for a family to live in. Only one kitchen is allowed within each Dwelling Unit.
- Group Housing is a type of Residential Use focusing on shared amenities and communal spaces. These are distinct from regular Dwelling Units. Group Housing rooms currently may or may not include limited cooking facilities. If a unit is occupied by more than five unrelated individuals, then it would be considered a Group Housing use.
- Efficiency Dwelling Units with Reduced Square Footage (also known as “Efficiency Dwelling Unit”) is a Dwelling Unit with a living room of less than of 220 square feet. Every Efficiency Dwelling Unit is required to provide a separate closet, bathroom, kitchen sink, cooking facilities, and refrigeration. A maximum of 375 Efficiency Dwelling Units are permitted, with the numerical cap reassessed after the approval of 325 Efficiency Dwelling Units.
- Single-Resident Occupancy (SRO) is a residential use *characteristic*, meaning it could be either Group Housing or a Dwelling Unit. SROs are allowed a maximum occupied floor area of 350 square feet and need to meet the Housing Code's minimum floor area standards. The unit or room may have a private bathroom.

Group Housing: A Different Form of Housing

One of the key differences that distinguishes Group Housing from a Dwelling Unit is that Group Housing focuses on shared amenities and communal living. Group Housing usually does not involve a family, but rather individuals seeking a non-traditional form of housing. A person or household may be living in Group Housing for a wide variety of reasons. Some reasons may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- residents have created or joined existing co-living or co-housing communities based on shared values or goals such as a commune or nursery,
- individuals are seeking housing to establish social connections and fight isolation,
- for an opportunity for multiple households to pool and share resources and responsibilities,
- it may be the only affordable housing choice for some households, or
- as a temporary housing solution for newcomers, temporary workers, or as housing for institutions.

Regardless of the reason, Group Housing offers a viable housing option other than a traditional house or apartment.

Physical form

One of the primary challenges in implementing current Group Housing regulations is that Group Housing can occupy a wide variety of building types, ranging from a single-family home to a network of several buildings within a neighborhood.

Group Housing typically includes a private room and potentially private bathroom, with shared communal space in the building. This common space may include a kitchen, lounge, gym, or other gathering place. This allows individuals to have their own private space, while still having access to similar amenities found in traditional Dwelling Units. The Group Housing typology also inherently provides the opportunity for increased interaction and built-in community for its residents through the communal amenities, although the level of communal interaction also depends on the residents of the building.

Affordability

Due to the nature of their sizing, market-rate Group Housing is generally more affordable than a market-rate Dwelling Unit and provides a more affordable option in San Francisco's expensive housing market. SRO models of Group Housing provide an additional option for low- and single-income households. Group Housing also includes congregate living, which could contribute to housing affordability by providing shared resources, such as childcare, vehicles, or meals, further reducing living expenses for residents. Additionally, Group Housing might serve as an entrée into San Francisco as a new resident decides the best location to live in, without being financially tied to a year-long contract in a traditional apartment.

Affordability restrictions generally apply to Group Housing just as they would to Dwelling Units. The Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program applies to Group Housing projects that propose 10 rooms or more. The Rent Ordinance also applies to Group Housing, and existing buildings that were constructed prior to 1979 are generally subject to rent control.




Figure A: Example of Common Space vs. Private Space¹

¹ Source: Bhatia, Neeraj and Antje Steinmuller, “Learning from Collective Living: An Overview of How to Live Together”, White Paper (San Francisco: California College of the Arts / Urban Works Agency, 2022).

Common Space vs. Private Space

Group Housing projects generally provide smaller private “units” or rooms in exchange for more shared facilities and amenities. This is largely achieved by shifting the private amenities normally associated with regular Dwelling Units (such as kitchens and living rooms) to communal facilities shared by all residents. Common space generally includes all the interior areas that cater to communal living, including but not limited to kitchens, lounges, entertainment rooms, fitness rooms, laundry facilities, and shared bathrooms. Figure A, which features the StarCity: Mission project located at 2072 Mission, demonstrates common spaces (highlighted in blue) being spread throughout the building for all residents to access. Common space at the ground floor provides a communal kitchen, dining, living, and laundry areas, and there are shared bathrooms serving the two upper floors. This example provides an appropriate balance of common and private space.

Additionally, Planning Code Section 135 includes separate usable open space requirements that provide outdoor open space to the residents but are not calculated towards common space for the purposes of these Ordinances. Common space does not include circulation, storage, bicycle parking, mechanical space, and other “back of house” space necessary to the operation of the building. Private space is defined as the rentable area of the units or rooms, including the living space, closets, and private bathrooms, if provided.

Group Housing projects need to provide adequate common space for residents to use them. This is key in making sure this housing typology is successful.

Common spaces are integral for Group Housing to function. But it’s not just the mere presence of these amenities. Other critical factors that make common space usable and desirable may include how much common space is provided, what types of common spaces are available, proximity to such common space, and how many people have access to said common space. These variables influence how much time residents spend in their private rooms versus the common space. Further, inadequate common spaces may lead to residents spending less time in the common space with other residents and instead opt to leave the premises altogether.

Cooking Facilities

Currently, the primary physical difference between a Group Housing room and a studio Dwelling Unit are the cooking facilities. Group Housing rooms may have limited cooking facilities, while studio Dwelling Units require a full kitchen. Individual, limited cooking facilities are not a replacement for access to full kitchen facilities. Kitchens and cooking facilities are necessary for Group Housing residents to cook and prepare meals. Like common space, there are several factors which make a kitchen both usable and desirable, including the appliances provided, proximity to the kitchen, number of people served by the kitchen, and who is responsible for maintenance and cleanliness. The number of kitchens and distribution of kitchens depends on the size of the project and the configuration of the lot. Some projects may be better served with one or two large, primary kitchens while others may be better served with smaller, dispersed kitchens.

Special Use District

The proposed Special Use District (SUD) prohibits Group Housing in the general Chinatown and Tenderloin neighborhoods. The proposed SUD boundaries are highlighted in Figure B and enlarged in Exhibit D. These

neighborhoods already have a high concentration of Group Housing, and the intent of the Ordinance is to encourage other types of housing in these neighborhoods.




Figure B: Proposed Group Housing Special Use District (SUD) boundaries

The Department of Building Inspection conducts an [Annual Unit Usage Report \(AUUR\)](#), which includes information on Group Housing Residential Hotels administered under Chapter 41 of the Administrative Code. While the AUUR does not encompass all Group Housing rooms, it is still telling because Residential Hotels are one of the most prevalent types of Group Housing projects in San Francisco. Based on the DBI data, 7,037 (or 57%) of all Residential Hotels in San Francisco are located within the proposed SUD. This is an outstanding number considering the small geographic coverage of the proposed SUD. Of these Residential Hotels, approximately 2,102 (or 30%) are vacant. These high vacancy rates suggest that other forms of housing are preferred at this time. This is further echoed by feedback from community members on the desire for more traditional family-sized housing units.

The proposed amendments to the Group Housing definition exempt Student Housing and 100% Affordable Housing Projects from the common space and common kitchen requirements. The intent was to support these types of needed Group Housing projects by providing more flexibility. Based on conversations with Supervisor Peskin's office, the intent was also to exempt 100% Affordable Housing Projects from the SUD. However, the 100% Affordable Housing Project exemption was only included in the proposed Group Housing definition changes related to common space, but not the proposed SUD. Supervisor Peskin intends to introduce a substitute Ordinance or introduce an amendment at the Land Use and Transportation Committee hearing to this effect.

Next Steps

Group Housing has evolved since the inception of the type of housing. The Department will continue to monitor the number and type of Group Housing projects to ensure this typology of housing is a success. The Department's collaboration with CCA and future ongoing research will help inform what other potential changes should be considered for Group Housing, if any. This Ordinance and the CCA white paper only considered interior common spaces. Staff understands that many Group Housing projects also provide outdoor gathering spaces so this may be another aspect to research further in the future.

Currently, the definition of Group Housing and Family are inextricably linked.² The proposed legislation would ensure residential habitability and access to amenities for those seeking to live communally that do not meet the nuclear and heteronormative definition of "family". More than five people living together, unrelated by blood, marriage, or adoption, constitutes Group Housing. Group Housing offers a potential solution for non-nuclear families wanting to live together. Hence, in some ways Group Housing can be considered a "family" comprised of a group of individuals (though not related through blood or marriage) choosing to live in Group Housing functioning much like traditional families. Future amendments should consider if Dwelling Unit and Group Housing definitions should reference the inclusion or exclusion of "family". The Housing Element 2022 Update, which appeared in front of Planning Commission on January 27, 2022, suggested eliminating the definition of "Group Housing" and modifying "Dwelling Unit" to include more than one Family.

Separate from Group Housing projects, there is still the opportunity to build SRO buildings. The proposed changes to the Group Housing definition does not prohibit SROs in this SUD, only Group Housing. Future research should review SROs more closely to determine if these are desirable, appropriate housing typologies within the proposed SUD, or if they should also be prohibited.

Lastly, some of the Group Housing projects the Department reviews include SRO buildings with many small units. However, Group Housing and congregate living may require different layouts or floor plan configurations than SRO buildings. One potential idea that requires further research is revising the SRO definition to be a type of Residential Use, rather than a Residential Use *characteristic*. This would prohibit SROs within Group Housing projects and eliminate some of the confusion around SROs.

General Plan Compliance

The proposed Group Housing Definition Ordinance supports Group Housing, a housing typology that offers an alternative to traditional living arrangements. There is a wide spectrum of the different types of Group Housing projects, but they all focus on communal living. The proposed Ordinance seeks to ensure Group Housing provides adequate, usable common space for its residents. Further, the proposed Ordinance aligns with the draft Housing Element 2022 Update, which recently appeared in front of Planning Commission, to encourage co-housing. Additionally, the Housing Element 2022 Update noted the importance of minimum quality of life standards for all residences, such as having adequate cooking facilities and common spaces.

² Planning Code Section 102 defines "Family" as "consisting of either one person, or two or more persons related by blood, marriage or adoption or by legal guardianship pursuant to court order [...] or a group of not more than five persons unrelated by blood, marriage or adoption, or such legal guardianship unless the group has the attributes of a family [...]".

The proposed SUD Ordinance responds to the overconcentration of Group Housing in the general Chinatown and Tenderloin neighborhoods. Additionally, there is a high vacancy rate within the existing Group Housing rooms within these neighborhoods suggesting the need for other housing typologies. The intent of the proposed Ordinance is to encourage more family-sized units in these neighborhoods.

Racial and Social Equity Analysis

The Planning Code and Zoning Map amendments in the proposed Ordinances support the Group Housing as a different housing typology that is relevant in other parts of the country, but not yet fully realized in San Francisco. Group Housing residents tend to be people who are looking for non-traditional housing. These residents deserve fully functioning usable common space amenities and kitchens. The proposed Ordinance ensures that this housing typology works and is improved by having minimum requirements for common space. This is further needed because it is the communal aspect that distinguishes Group Housing from regular Dwelling Units. Without the common space amenities, the result is incredibly dense buildings without ample space for people. That extreme resembles a tenement, which is what this Ordinance hopes to avoid.

In its earlier days, Group Housing often provided housing for single or migrant workers, with buildings often segregated by sex. It was also a way for new immigrants to move to a city and find affordable housing until they could afford more permanent accommodations. Today, Group Housing offers more and different housing opportunities and caters to people who are unable or not interested in living in a traditional house or apartment. Newer Group Housing residents may include students or those starting a new job in San Francisco. Regardless the situation, the City still needs to accommodate for all types of residents and Group Housing is part of the solution.

The Department's early work on Tenderloin Community Action Plan also supports the proposed SUD. Community members in the Tenderloin neighborhood have emphasized the need for more family-sized units of two- or three-bedrooms. These sentiments are also echoed by the general Chinatown neighborhoods. The proposed SUD responds to their concerns that there is an abundance of Group Housing in these neighborhoods which did not meet their needs. Further, based on information from DBI, there is a high vacancy rate amongst the existing Group Housing rooms within the Chinatown and Tenderloin neighborhoods. The proposed SUD responds directly to this feedback.

Implementation

The Department has determined that these Ordinances will not impact our current implementation procedures.

Recommendation

The Department recommends that the Commission *approve with modifications* the proposed Ordinances and adopt the attached Draft Resolutions to that effect. The Department's proposed recommendations are as follows:

[Board File No. 211299](#)

1. Increase the common space requirement to 0.5 square feet of common space for every square foot of private space, instead of the proposed 0.25.
2. Decrease the communal kitchen requirement to be at least 15% of the common space, instead of the proposed 50%
3. Revise the minimum number of kitchens to be at least one communal kitchen for every 15 Group Housing rooms, instead of the proposed 20.

Board File No. 211300

4. Revise the proposed SUD to exempt Student Housing and 100% Affordable Housing projects.

Basis for Recommendation

The Department supports the overall goals of these Ordinances because they support Group Housing, and the related amendments make this a more successful housing typology. The goal is to improve livability in Group Housing projects and provide more space for residents. However, staff believes that the proposed Ordinances would benefit from the following recommended modifications:

Board File No. 211299

Recommendation 1: Increase the common space requirement to 0.5 square feet of common space for every square foot of private space, instead of the proposed 0.25.

Upon review of relevant case studies, CCA found that the average amount of common space was 0.67 square feet of common space for every square foot of private space, which translates to approximately 40% of the total combined square footage of common and private space. This number initially seems lofty; however, when considering that traditionally private amenities (i.e., kitchen) would be relocated to the communal areas instead, the requirement is more logical. This is possible because Group Housing rooms can be smaller since the space previously dedicated towards kitchens and limited cooking facilities would be reallocated to the communal kitchens in the common space.

As presented in the Informational Item for Case No. 2018-014048CWP, CCA has provided a quantitative analysis of various case studies, two-thirds of which are in the Bay Area, and which represent a variety of different building typologies currently used or proposed as Group Housing. CCA found that these projects provide common space at an average ratio of 0.67 square feet to every square foot of private space.

Staff analyzed numerous recent market rate group housing projects that proposed only SROs. The data shows that the 0.67 ratio CCA found through their case studies was not reflected in any of these projects. The ratio of common space provided by these projects ranged between 0.05 to 1.0 and 0.22 to 1.0. Based on this review of recent projects and considering the CCA case studies, staff recommends the common space requirement be increased to be 0.5 square feet of common space to every square foot of private space. This recommendation is in keeping the data that CCA has provided, but also provides a cushion for projects that may be more constrained.

Staff notes that the CCA case studies reviewed a wide range of types of Group Housing projects, with the majority local to the Bay Area and California. One of the white paper's findings also described that the ideal amount of common space is contingent on the type of Group Housing project. Specifically smaller Group Housing rooms (such as room without a private bathroom) rely more heavily on shared space, whereas bigger units (such as 1+ bedrooms) require less common space. As the Department continues to evaluate Group Housing projects, there could be an opportunity to create a tiered system of requirements for different types of cohousing and co-living models, and/or to separate Group Housing in congregate living from Efficiency Dwelling Units.

Recommendation 2: Decrease the communal kitchen requirement to be at least 15% of the common space, instead of the proposed 50%.

As written, the proposed Ordinance would also require a minimum of 50% of the common space be dedicated to the communal kitchen. Staff finds this number to be high considering there are other types of amenities that may be included in a Group Housing project, not just kitchens. This is especially important to retain as much flexibility for intentional communities in Group Housing, as common space may be dedicated to other uses that are more important or integral to the community. The 15% threshold would maintain flexibility for Group Housing projects to provide other types of programmed space, and for the overall program of the space to evolve over time.

The recommendation is to reduce the 50% requirement to 15%, and to clarify that the language is that 15% of common spaces should include at least one kitchen. This is further supported by CCA's case studies that found the Group Housing projects' communal kitchens were on average 17% of the common space.

The proposed Ordinance does not define how a communal kitchen is measured; however, Zoning Administrator recently defined a Dwelling Unit kitchen in a ["Zoning Administrator Rules, Regulations, and Interpretations" Memo to File](#) dated March 22, 2021. The interpretation defines a kitchen as a room containing the following:

- a full-size oven (gas or electric),
- a counter sink with each dimension greater than 15 inches, and
- a refrigerator/freezer of at least 12 cubic feet.

Staff notes this provision applies these kitchen measurements to Dwelling Units not Group Housing rooms. However, staff recommends using the same measurements because they have already been vetted as to what is required for a full kitchen to function. This approach also allows for consistency.

Recommendation 3: Revise the minimum number of kitchens to be at least one communal kitchen for every 15 Group Housing rooms instead of the proposed 20.

The proposed Ordinance would also require a minimum of one kitchen for every 20 Group Housing rooms. Considering that a kitchen has an oven, counter, and refrigerator/freezer, it would be difficult for approximately 20 people to be able to regularly use such kitchen.³ After noting the average number of residents per kitchen in CCA's white paper, staff recommends this requirement to be revised to be a minimum of one kitchen for every 15 Group Housing rooms instead. This recommendation is meant to ensure the kitchens are usable and that it is realistic for the residents to use the shared amenity.

³ Some Group Housing rooms may include more than one resident, but the Ordinances and this report assume just one resident per Group Housing room since the number of residents vary project to project.

This requirement does not preclude projects from placing communal kitchens side by side. For example, if a communal kitchen had two ovens, two counter sinks, and two refrigerator/freezers of the qualifying sizes, it would be counted as two communal kitchens. These combined communal kitchens could serve up to 30 Group Housing rooms under the recommended modification. However, staff encourages projects to still spread these communal kitchens throughout the different floors of the project, rather than having only one large communal kitchen.

Board File No. 211300

Recommendation 4: Revise the proposed SUD to exempt Student Housing and 100% Affordable Housing projects.

The proposed amendments to the Group Housing definition exempt Student Housing and 100% Affordable Housing Projects from the common space requirements. The intent was to support these types of needed Group Housing projects by providing more flexibility. Based on conversations with Supervisor Peskin's office, the intent was also to exempt 100% Affordable Housing Projects from the proposed SUD, but not Student Housing. Staff still recommends including Student Housing as part of the SUD exemption because of the unique needs these residents pose.

Required Commission Action

The proposed Ordinances are before the Commission so that it may approve it, reject it, or approve it with modifications.

Environmental Review

The proposed amendments are not defined as a project under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15378 and 15060(c)(2) because they do not result in a physical change in the environment.

Public Comment

As of the date of this report, the Planning Department has received one public comment with general questions about Group Housing and the proposed Ordinances.

Attachments:

- Exhibit A: Draft Planning Commission Resolutions
- Exhibit B: Board of Supervisors File No. 211299
- Exhibit C: Board of Supervisors File No. 211300
- Exhibit D: Proposed boundaries for Group Housing Special Use District
- Exhibit E: Public Comment



PLANNING COMMISSION DRAFT RESOLUTION

HEARING DATE: February 10, 2022

Project Name: Group Housing Definition
Case Number: 2022-000674PCA [Board File No. 211299]
Initiated by: Supervisor Peskin / Introduced December 14, 2021
Staff Contact: Veronica Flores, Legislative Affairs
Veronica.Flores@sfgov.org, 628-652-7525
Reviewed by: Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs
aaron.starr@sfgov.org, 628-652-7533

RESOLUTION APPROVING WITH MODIFICATION A PROPOSED ORDINANCE THAT WOULD AMEND THE PLANNING CODE TO REVISE THE DEFINITION OF GROUP HOUSING; AFFIRMING THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT’S DETERMINATION UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT; AND MAKING FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN, AND THE EIGHT PRIORITY POLICIES OF PLANNING CODE, SECTION 101.1, AND FINDINGS OF PUBLIC NECESSITY, CONVENIENCE, AND WELFARE UNDER PLANNING CODE, SECTION 302.

WHEREAS, on December 14, 2021 Supervisor Peskin introduced a proposed Ordinance under Board of Supervisors (hereinafter “Board”) File Number 211299, which would amend the Planning Code to revise the definition of Group Housing;

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission (hereinafter “Commission”) conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider the proposed Ordinance on February 10, 2022; and,

WHEREAS, the proposed Ordinance has been determined to be categorically exempt from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act Sections 15378 and 15060(c)(2); and

WHEREAS, the Planning 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 Planning Commission has reviewed the proposed Ordinance; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission finds from the facts presented that the public necessity, convenience, and general welfare require the proposed amendment; and

MOVED, that the Planning Commission hereby **approves with modifications** the proposed ordinance. The Commission's proposed recommendations are as follows:

1. Increase the common space requirement to 0.5 square feet of common space for every square foot of private space, instead of the proposed 0.25.
2. Decrease the communal kitchen requirement to be at least 15% of the common space, instead of the proposed 50%
3. Revise the minimum number of kitchens to be at least one communal kitchen for every 15 Group Housing rooms, instead of the proposed 20.

Findings

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

The proposed Ordinance will support Group Housing, a much-needed housing typology to help alleviate the housing crisis in San Francisco.

General Plan Compliance

The proposed Ordinance and the Commission's recommended modifications are consistent with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan:

HOUSING ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 1

IDENTIFY AND MAKE AVAILABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT ADEQUATE SITES TO MEET THE CITY'S HOUSING NEEDS, ESPECIALLY PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

Policy 1.1

Plan for the full range of housing needs in the City and County of San Francisco, especially affordable housing.

OBJECTIVE 4

FOSTER A HOUSING STOCK THAT MEETS THE NEEDS OF ALL RESIDENTS ACROSS LIFECYCLES.

Policy 4.5

Encourage sufficient and suitable rental housing opportunities, emphasizing permanently affordable rental units wherever possible.

OBJECTIVE 5

ENSURE THAT ALL RESIDENTS HAVE EQUAL ACCESS TO AVAILABLE UNITS.

Policy 5.4

Provide a range of unit types for all segments of need, and work to move residents between unit types as their needs change.

The proposed Group Housing Definition Ordinance supports Group Housing, a housing typology that offers an alternative to traditional living arrangements. There is a wide spectrum of the different types of Group Housing projects, but they all focus on communal living. The proposed Ordinance seeks to ensure Group Housing provides adequate, usable common space for its residents. Further, the proposed Ordinance aligns with the draft Housing Element 2022 Update, which recently appeared in front of Planning Commission, to encourage co-housing. Additionally, the Housing Element 2022 Update noted the importance of minimum quality of life standards for all residences, such as having adequate cooking facilities and common spaces.

Planning Code Section 101 Findings

The proposed amendments to the Planning Code are consistent with the eight Priority Policies set forth in Section 101.1(b) of the Planning Code in that:

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 proposed Ordinance would not have a negative effect on neighborhood serving retail uses and will not have a negative effect on opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of neighborhood-serving retail.

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

The proposed Ordinance would not have a negative effect on housing or neighborhood character.

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

The proposed Ordinance would not have an adverse effect on the City's supply of affordable housing.

4. That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

The proposed Ordinance would not result in commuter traffic impeding MUNI transit service or

overburdening the streets or neighborhood parking.

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 proposed Ordinance would not cause displacement of the industrial or service sectors due to office development, and future opportunities for resident employment or ownership in these sectors would not be impaired.

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

The proposed Ordinance would not have an adverse effect on City's preparedness against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.

7. That the landmarks and historic buildings be preserved;

The proposed Ordinance would not have an adverse effect on the City's Landmarks and historic buildings.

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development;

The proposed Ordinance would not have an adverse effect on the City's parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas.

Planning Code Section 302 Findings.

The Planning Commission finds from the facts presented that the public necessity, convenience and general welfare require the proposed amendments to the Planning Code as set forth in Section 302.

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

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Commission at its meeting on February 10, 2022.

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ADOPTED: February 10, 2022

This page intentionally blank.



PLANNING COMMISSION DRAFT RESOLUTION

HEARING DATE: February 10, 2022

Project Name: Group Housing Special Use District
Case Number: 2021-011415PCAMAP [Board File No. 211300]
Initiated by: Supervisor Peskin / Introduced December 14, 2021
Staff Contact: Veronica Flores, Legislative Affairs
Veronica.Flores@sfgov.org, 628-652-7525
Reviewed by: Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs
aaron.starr@sfgov.org, 628-652-7533

RESOLUTION APPROVING WITH MODIFICATION A PROPOSED ORDINANCE THAT WOULD AMEND THE PLANNING CODE TO CREATE THE GROUP HOUSING SPECIAL USE DISTRICT; AFFIRMING THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT’S DETERMINATION UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT; AND MAKING FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN, AND THE EIGHT PRIORITY POLICIES OF PLANNING CODE, SECTION 101.1, AND FINDINGS OF PUBLIC NECESSITY, CONVENIENCE, AND WELFARE UNDER PLANNING CODE, SECTION 302.

WHEREAS, on December 14, 2021 Supervisor Peskin introduced a proposed Ordinance under Board of Supervisors (hereinafter “Board”) File Number 211300, which would amend the Planning Code to create the Group Housing Special Use District;

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission (hereinafter “Commission”) conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider the proposed Ordinance on February 10, 2022; and,

WHEREAS, the proposed Ordinance has been determined to be categorically exempt from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act Sections 15378 and 15060(c)(2); and

WHEREAS, the Planning 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 Planning Commission has reviewed the proposed Ordinance; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission finds from the facts presented that the public necessity, convenience, and general welfare require the proposed amendment; and

MOVED, that the Planning Commission hereby **approves with modifications** the proposed ordinance. The Commission's proposed recommendation is as follows:

1. Revise the proposed SUD to exempt Student Housing and 100% Affordable Housing projects.

Findings

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

The proposed Ordinance responds to the overconcentration of Group Housing in the general Tenderloin and Chinatown neighborhoods.

The proposed Ordinance encourages more family-sized units within these neighborhoods.

General Plan Compliance

The proposed Ordinance and the Commission's recommended modification is consistent with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan:

HOUSING ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 1

IDENTIFY AND MAKE AVAILABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT ADEQUATE SITES TO MEET THE CITY'S HOUSING NEEDS, ESPECIALLY PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

Policy 1.1

Plan for the full range of housing needs in the City and County of San Francisco, especially affordable housing.

OBJECTIVE 5

ENSURE THAT ALL RESIDENTS HAVE EQUAL ACCESS TO AVAILABLE UNITS.

Policy 5.4

Provide a range of unit types for all segments of need, and work to move residents between unit types as their needs change.

The proposed SUD Ordinance responds to the overconcentration of Group Housing in the general Chinatown and Tenderloin neighborhoods. Additionally, there is a high vacancy rate within the existing Group Housing rooms within these neighborhoods suggesting the need for other housing typologies. The intent of the proposed Ordinance is to encourage more family-sized units in these neighborhoods.

Planning Code Section 101 Findings

The proposed amendments to the Planning Code are consistent with the eight Priority Policies set forth in Section 101.1(b) of the Planning Code in that:

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 proposed Ordinance would not have a negative effect on neighborhood serving retail uses and will not have a negative effect on opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of neighborhood-serving retail.

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

The proposed Ordinance would not have a negative effect on housing or neighborhood character.

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

The proposed Ordinance would not have an adverse effect on the City's supply of affordable housing.

4. That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

The proposed Ordinance would not result in commuter traffic impeding MUNI transit service or overburdening the streets or neighborhood parking.

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 proposed Ordinance would not cause displacement of the industrial or service sectors due to office development, and future opportunities for resident employment or ownership in these sectors would not be impaired.

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

The proposed Ordinance would not have an adverse effect on City's preparedness against injury and loss

of life in an earthquake.

7. That the landmarks and historic buildings be preserved;

The proposed Ordinance would not have an adverse effect on the City's Landmarks and historic buildings.

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development;

The proposed Ordinance would not have an adverse effect on the City's parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas.

Planning Code Section 302 Findings.

The Planning Commission finds from the facts presented that the public necessity, convenience and general welfare require the proposed amendments to the Planning Code as set forth in Section 302.

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

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Commission at its meeting on February 10, 2022.

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ADOPTED: February 10, 2022

1 [Planning Code - Group Housing Definition]

2

3 **Ordinance amending the Planning Code to revise the definition of Group Housing;**
 4 **affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental**
 5 **Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight**
 6 **priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1, and findings of public necessity,**
 7 **convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302.**

8

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

12

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

14

15 Section 1. Environmental and Land Use Findings.

16

(a) The Planning Department has determined that the actions contemplated in this
 17 ordinance comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources
 18 Code Sections 21000 et seq.). Said determination is on file with the Clerk of the Board of
 19 Supervisors in File No. _____ and is incorporated herein by reference. The Board affirms
 20 this determination.

21

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

1 (c) Pursuant to Planning Code Section 302, the Board of Supervisors finds that the
2 Planning Code amendments will serve the public necessity, convenience, and welfare for the
3 reasons set forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. _____, and the Board
4 incorporates such reasons herein by reference.

5
6 Section 2. Other Findings.

7 (a) In 2005, the Zoning Administrator issued an interpretation of the Planning Code
8 definition of Group Housing that allowed Group Housing to include limited kitchens, similar to
9 the Planning Code definition of Dwelling Unit, which made it more difficult to distinguish
10 between a residential Dwelling Unit and a Group Housing unit.

11 (b) The intent of a Group Housing development is to create successful communal
12 living arrangement for permanent residents, largely achieved by shifting the private amenities
13 required in standard Dwelling Units, such as kitchens, to communal facilities shared by all
14 project residents, thus encouraging shared social interactions and shared stewardship of the
15 facility.

16 (c) The Planning Department has partnered with California College of the Arts to study
17 current Group Housing developments and analyze best practices, and has prepared
18 recommendations on how to improve the definition of Group Housing in the Planning Code,
19 many of which are reflected in this ordinance.

20 (d) In 2002, San Francisco adopted its first Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, which
21 requires that projects with ten or more units designate a percentage of units on-site as
22 “affordable for purchase...and rent” by moderate, low, and very low-income households, with
23 the stated goal of addressing San Francisco’s affordable housing crisis. On-site affordable
24 units capture the social benefits of integrated below-market and market rate housing. The
25 Inclusionary Housing Ordinance was subsequently updated in 2016 and 2017.

1 (e) In 2002, the Planning Department reported that between 1992 and 2002 only
2 “3,1991 units of low and very low-income housing were built in San Francisco out of a total
3 need of 15,103 units for the same period.” This effort has not improved in the last two
4 decades. The Planning Department’s April 2021 Housing Balance Report shows that very-low
5 income units (including units for extremely low-income residents eligible for homeless
6 subsidies) and low-income units made up only 19% of net new units constructed between the
7 first quarter of 2011 through the fourth quarter of 2020. These numbers pale in comparison to
8 the need for such housing. The Association of Bay Area Governments’ 2023-2031 Draft
9 Regional Housing Needs Assessment identifies San Francisco’s need for 114,442 units of
10 very-low income housing, or 25.9% of total housing need, and 65,892 units of low-income
11 housing, or 14.9% of total housing need. Together, San Francisco’s Regional Housing Needs
12 Assessment HNA calls for over 40% of all units as below market rate units.

13 (f) Group Housing developments, while designed for permanent residents, are
14 nonetheless tailored to residents who are in a transitional stage in their lives, either as a
15 function of their employment situation or their student status. The smaller floor plans and
16 scaled-back private amenities of individual units are marketed to and designed for residents
17 who are primarily seeking to rent a unit, and not residents who seek to purchase a unit.

18 (g) Group Housing ownership units run the risk of becoming unregulated corporate
19 rentals or second and third homes for San Francisco or non-San Francisco residents, which
20 contravenes the intended social benefits and shared investment needed to ensure a
21 successful Group Housing project.

22 (h) In 2017, the Board of Supervisors updated the Hotel Conversion Ordinance,
23 Administrative Code Chapter 41, to clarify that residential hotels are intended for permanent
24 residents, and that any stay under 32 days would be considered a tourist or transient use and
25 not a residential use, and conformed the Hotel Conversion Ordinance to other sections of the

1 Administrative Code related to short-term rentals. The Hotel Conversion Ordinance updates
2 also reflect an updated definition of “protected tenants” in Chapter 37 of the Administrative
3 Code, the San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance. This
4 legislation conforms the definition of Group Housing with the term of stay for residential hotels,
5 a type of use included in the definition of Group Housing.

6
7 Section 3. The Planning Code is hereby amended by revising Sections 102 and 415.2,
8 to read as follows:

9
10 **SEC. 102 DEFINITIONS.**

11 * * * *

12 **Group Housing.** A Residential Use that provides lodging or both meals and lodging,
13 without individual or limited cooking facilities or kitchens, by prearrangement for 30 days a week
14 or more at a time and intended as Long-Term Housing, in a space not defined by this Code as a
15 Dwelling Unit ~~dwelling unit~~. Except for Group Housing that also qualifies as Student Housing as
16 defined in this Section 102 or 100% Affordable Housing as defined in Planning Code Section 315, the
17 residential square footage devoted to Group Housing shall include both common and private space in
18 the following amounts: for every gross square foot of private space (including bedrooms and individual
19 bathrooms), 0.25 gross square feet of common space shall be provided, with at least 50% of the
20 common space devoted to communal kitchens with a minimum of one kitchen for every 20 Group
21 Housing units. ~~Such group housing~~ Group Housing shall include, but not necessarily be limited to,
22 a Residential Hotel, boardinghouse, guesthouse, rooming house, lodging house, residence
23 club, commune, fraternity or sorority house, monastery, nunnery, convent, or ashram. It shall
24 also include group housing affiliated with and operated by a medical or educational institution,

25

1 when not located on the same lot as such institution, which shall meet the applicable
2 provisions of Section 304.5 of this Code concerning institutional master plans.

3 * * * *

4
5 **SEC. 415.2. DEFINITIONS.**

6 See Section 401 of this Article.

7 "Owned Unit" shall mean a dwelling unit that is a condominium, stock cooperative,
8 community apartment, or detached single family home. The owner or owners of an owned unit
9 must occupy the unit as their primary residence. An Owned Unit shall not be Group Housing, as
10 defined in Section 102.

11 * * * *

12
13 **Section 4. Effective Date.**

14 This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after enactment. Enactment occurs
15 when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the ordinance unsigned or does not
16 sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board of Supervisors overrides the
17 Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

18 //

19 //

20 //

21 //

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

1 Section 5. Scope of Ordinance. In enacting this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors
2 intends to amend only those words, phrases, paragraphs, subsections, sections, articles,
3 numbers, punctuation marks, charts, diagrams, or any other constituent parts of the Municipal
4 Code that are explicitly shown in this ordinance as additions, deletions, Board amendment
5 additions, and Board amendment deletions in accordance with the "Note" that appears under
6 the official title of the ordinance.

7
8 APPROVED AS TO FORM:
9 DAVID CHIU, City Attorney

10 By: /s/
11 **AUDREY WILLIAMS PEARSON**
12 Deputy City Attorney

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
n:\legana\as2021\2200120\01571301.docx

1 [Planning Code, Zoning Map - Group Housing Special Use District]

2

3 **Ordinance amending the Planning Code to create the Group Housing Special Use**
 4 **District; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California**
 5 **Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan,**
 6 **and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1, and findings of public**
 7 **necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302.**

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

12

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

14

15 Section 1. Environmental and Land Use Findings.

16 (a) The Planning Department has determined that the actions contemplated in this
 17 ordinance comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources
 18 Code Sections 21000 et seq.). Said determination is on file with the Clerk of the Board of
 19 Supervisors in File No. _____ and is incorporated herein by reference. The Board affirms
 20 this determination.

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

1 (c) Pursuant to Planning Code Section 302, the Board of Supervisors finds that the
2 Planning Code and Zoning Map amendments will serve the public necessity, convenience,
3 and welfare for the reasons set forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. _____,
4 and the Board incorporates such reasons herein by reference.

5
6 Section 2. Other Specific Findings.

7 (a) The Group Housing Special Use District is generally comprised of overlapping
8 areas in whole or in part of the Chinatown Community Business District, the Chinatown Visitor
9 Retail District, the Chinatown Residential Neighborhood Commercial District, the Chinatown
10 Transit Station Special Use District, the North Beach Neighborhood Commercial District, the
11 North Beach Special Use District, the Nob Hill Special Use District and the North of Market
12 Special Use District, which are described more fully in Planning Code sections 810, 811, 812,
13 722, 780.3, 249.66, 238 and 249.5 respectively, and the Uptown Tenderloin Historic District,
14 which is described more fully in the National Register of Historic Places as approved by the
15 State Historical Resources Commission (together, “Greater Chinatown and Greater
16 Tenderloin neighborhoods”). These districts all were designed with the intent of protecting and
17 preserving, to various degrees, the established communities, including the high concentration
18 of low-income residents of single-room occupancy (SRO) residential hotels, a type of group
19 housing as defined in the Planning Code.

20 (b) The Greater Chinatown and Greater Tenderloin neighborhoods continue to have
21 the highest concentration per census tract of low-income families in San Francisco, many of
22 whom reside in overcrowded group housing projects. This concentration of existing group
23 housing projects in the Group Housing Special Use District does not currently meet the
24 housing needs of the population, which lacks access to and choice of housing options that
25

1 provide adequate cooking, food preparation, and storage facilities appropriately sized for
2 families.

3 (c) The San Francisco Human Services Agency (HSA) has documented that both
4 the Greater Chinatown and Greater Tenderloin neighborhood residents are the most at risk for
5 food insecurity and the most reliant on government aid for food subsidies among San
6 Francisco residents; and that without a complete kitchen facility with adequate space to
7 prepare, store, and cook food, residents are more likely to rely on pre-prepared meals and
8 unhealthy snacks, furthering the income inequality and public health concerns in these
9 neighborhoods.

10 (d) Given the lack of adequate kitchens and adequate food storage areas within
11 new group housing projects, as well as Greater Tenderloin and Greater Chinatown residents'
12 limited access to affordable grocery stores, and an increase in documented assaults within
13 both neighborhoods, the Board of Supervisors finds that residents of new group housing
14 projects would need to purchase prepared food and would be unlikely to walk or take transit to
15 food establishments. Thus, residents are likely to rely heavily on Transportation Network
16 Company (TNC) food delivery vehicle services (e.g., DoorDash, GrubHub, and Uber Eats
17 deliveries) to obtain food, leading to additional congestion. As documented by the San
18 Francisco County Transportation Authority in its 2017 "TNC's Today" Congestion Study, an
19 increase in TNC use in turn creates more pedestrian/vehicle collisions and increased
20 pollution; the Greater Tenderloin and Greater Chinatown neighborhood already suffers high
21 levels of both.

22 (e) Group housing projects tend to have higher turnover of tenants given that the
23 typology specifically caters to transient and temporary residents, as interpreted by the Zoning
24 Administrator. Unlike family-sized dwelling units with full kitchens and storage space designed
25

1 for permanent residents, the transient nature of group housing residents contributes to
2 destabilization of the neighborhoods in which they are located.

3 (f) Existing group housing projects within the proposed Group Housing Special Use
4 District have been found to have a high number of vacancies as documented by the
5 Department of Building Inspection’s Annual Unit Usage Report (AUUR).

6 (g) The Board of Supervisors finds that because group housing is already
7 overwhelmingly saturated within the geographic boundaries of the Group Housing Special
8 Use District, and in the interest of promoting density and geographic equity, it is necessary
9 and appropriate to prohibit new group housing uses within the Group Housing Special Use
10 District to incentivize other needed housing typologies, namely affordable family-sized
11 housing, while concurrently increasing density in other areas of the City.

12
13 Section 3. Article 2 of the Planning Code is hereby amended by adding Section
14 249.92, to read as follows:

15 **SEC. 249.92. GROUP HOUSING SPECIAL USE DISTRICT.**

16 (a) Purpose. To incentivize the development of affordable family-sized housing over housing
17 without full kitchens or adequate space to prepare, store, and cook food, in areas of the City where
18 Group Housing is already saturated, a special use district entitled the “Group Housing Special Use
19 District” is hereby established.

20 (b) Boundaries. The boundaries of the Group Housing Special Use District are shown on
21 Special Use District Maps SU 01 and 02, and consist of the following areas:

22 (1) The area within a perimeter established by Bush Street, Stockton Street, Market
23 Street, and Polk Street.

24 (2) The area within a perimeter established by Union Street, Grant Avenue, Columbus
25 Avenue, Montgomery Street, California Street, and Powell Street.

1 (c) Controls. Group Housing, as defined in Section 102, shall not be permitted in the Special
2 Use District. All other provisions of the Planning Code shall apply.

3
4 Section 4. The Planning Code is hereby amended by revising Special Use District Map
5 SU01 and SU02 of the Zoning Map of the City and County of San Francisco, as follows:



Description of Property	Special Use District Hereby Approved
The area within a perimeter established by Bush Street, Stockton Street, Market Street, and Polk Street.	Group Housing Special Use District
The area within a perimeter established by Union Street, Grant Avenue, Columbus Avenue, Montgomery Street, California Street, and Powell Street.	Group Housing Special Use District

15
16 Section 5. Effective and Operative Dates.

17 (a) This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after enactment. Enactment
18 occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the ordinance unsigned or
19 does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board of Supervisors
20 overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

21 (b) This ordinance shall become operative on the later of (1) its effective date stated
22 in subsection (a), or (2) on the effective date of either the ordinance in Board of Supervisors
23 File No. 210564 or the ordinance in Board of Supervisors File No. 210866. The ordinances in
24 File Nos. 210564 and 210866 change the development standards, policies, and conditions
25 applicable to RH-1 districts, increasing the development capacity in those districts. This

Group Housing Special Use District - DRAFT



This page intentionally blank.

From: [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Kevin Stull](#); [Pratibha Tekkey](#)
Subject: FW: Group Housing Definition and Group Housing Special Use District
Date: Monday, March 7, 2022 1:38:37 PM

From: Kevin Stull [<mailto:kstull201281@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Monday, March 7, 2022 12:30 PM
To: MelgarStaff@sfgov.org; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>;
dean.preston@sfgov.org; Pratibha Tekkey <pratibha@thclinic.org>
Subject: Group Housing Definition and Group Housing Special Use District

Good afternoon Supervisors,

My name is Kevin Stull and I'm the Pedestrian Safety Organizer for the Central City SRO Collaborative. I'm writing to all of you today in support of agenda items #2-3 for the Land Use Committee. The Tenderloin and Chinatown are two neighborhoods which have historically contained housing units that were and are being used to house low income families of large sizes. This is due to the fact that there isn't enough buildings that have enough space in them for families and other diverse groups of individuals can come together and share a group kitchen or other common space areas.

As it stands right now, group housing is defined as lack of cooking and food storage amenities. If this City is serious about preserving families that currently still live here and for future families in San Francisco, making sure that they have the space in their current and future living spaces to store food, being able to cook and to socialize is key to the stability of communities like the Tenderloin and Chinatown. Hopefully with the success of the Special Use District for these two neighborhoods, it's quite possible to expand it to others in this city so that future generations of San Franciscans can benefit from it.

Thank you again Supervisors for your time and I hope that you will approve the Group Housing definition and the Special Use District for the Tenderloin and Chinatown. Have a safe and wonderful day today.

Kevin Stull
Pedestrian Safety Organizer
Central City SRO Collaborative

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This document is intended for the use of the party to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and protected from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the addressee, or a person authorized to accept documents on behalf of the addressee, you are hereby notified that any review, disclosure, dissemination, copying, or other action based on the content of this communication is not authorized. If you have received this document in error, please immediately reply to the sender and

delete or shred all copies.

ZACKS, FREEDMAN & PATTERSON

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

601 Montgomery Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, California 94111
Telephone (415) 956-8100
Facsimile (415) 288-9755
www.zfplaw.com

March 7, 2022

VIA EMAIL

Land Use and Transportation Committee
c/o Erica Major
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Agenda Items #2 & #3 – March 7, 2022 Hearing
BOS File No. 211299 [Planning Code – Group Housing Definition]
BOS File No. 211300 [Planning Code, Zoning Map – Group Housing Special Use Dist.]

Dear Chair Melgar and Honorable Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee:

Our office represents the San Francisco SRO Hotel Coalition and numerous individual owners of SROs, as well as developers of group housing (collectively, “Owners”). The Owners extend their previous objections¹ to the amended version of Board of Supervisors File No. 211299, as well as to File No. 211300.

We again respectfully request clarification of whether the proposed ordinances’ restrictions are intended to apply to *existing* group housing units or only to *newly proposed* group housing units.

We note that the amendment to File No. 211299 increasing the required common amenity space (p. 4, line 21) from 0.25 to 0.5 further lessens the intensity of residential use in violation of SB 330. (Government Code § 66300(b)(1)(A).) File No. 211300 would also clearly violate SB 330 by prohibiting an entire category of dense residential use. Neither of these is offset by a concurrent upzoning.

¹ Inter alia, available in your hearing packet at <https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=10572387&GUID=126F5A1B-1501-4A05-A16C-02121456D172>. OWNERS HAVE PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED FOR THE BOARD’S RECORD EVIDENCE AND ARGUMENTS, INCLUDING THE EXTENSIVE BRIEFING FROM THE TRIAL AND APPELLATE COURTS IN OPPOSITION TO THE PRIOR SRO AMENDMENTS (BOS FILE NOS. 161291, 190049, 190946, AND 191258; SUPERIOR COURT CASE NO. CPF-17-515656). WE REINCORPORATE THOSE MATERIALS AND ARGUMENTS HERE BY REFERENCE AND OFFER TO LODGE HARD COPIES UPON REQUEST.

Land Use and Transportation Committee

March 7, 2022

Page 2

Additionally, proper notice to particularly affected property owners, amortization, and CEQA review must all occur for both of these proposed ordinances, as previously discussed. These proposed ordinances also violate the holding of San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CPF-17-515656 under the doctrine of res judicata.

Very truly yours,

ZACKS, FREEDMAN & PATTERSON, PC

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Ryan Patterson". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Ryan J. Patterson

March 7, 2022

Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee,

As a resident potentially impacted by the matter pending before this committee, I am sending in my support for Supervisor Peskin's legislation to implement a Special Use District (SUD) for the Tenderloin and Chinatown.

The Tenderloin and Chinatown communities continue to have the highest concentration of low-income families in San Francisco, many of whom reside in SRO's. Additionally, these two neighborhoods contain most of the city's old and new SRO's and group housing projects that do not meet the current needs of the population. The purpose of the SUD is to encourage housing diversity and bring dwelling units to a community that has historically lacked adequate space and amenities.

Both the Tenderloin and Chinatown are in desperate need of stabilization and adequate housing to establish residents who want to invest in our communities. Families who currently live in overcrowded conditions in units without access to full kitchens in Chinatown and the Tenderloin struggle with food security because they can't prepare their own meals at home. Access to the kitchen amenities needed to store fresh food and prepare meals from scratch are essential keys to food security for low-income families. Group housing units - which are defined by their lack of complete cooking and food storage amenities - perpetuate the food insecurity that exists in neighborhoods like Chinatown and the Tenderloin where many housing units lack access to complete kitchens. Residents who don't have the ability to store fresh foods at home or to cook meals from scratch must subsist on more expensive prepared or restaurant meals or less healthy processed foods that don't need to be refrigerated, furthering the income inequality and public health concerns in these neighborhoods.

I personally have felt the backlash of the lack of kitchen facilities in SROs. As a Tenderloin resident living in cramped SROs without kitchen facilities I was diagnosed with diabetes 12 years ago at the age of 50 years old. Diabetes is not a genetic trait in my family. I am the only one to have contracted this disease and I can only attribute it to lack of good nutrition and lack of the kitchen facilities to make that so.

I urge you to support these planning code and zoning amendments to address inequities in access to adequate housing affordable to SRO inhabitants and working families and to remove the ambiguity around the definition of group housing for future development.

Respectfully submitted.

PETER F RAUCH

Tenderloin Resident of 20 years

From: [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Group Housing Definition and Group Housing Special Use District
Date: Monday, March 7, 2022 12:48:57 PM

From: Kevin Stull <kstull201281@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, March 7, 2022 12:30 PM
To: MelgarStaff (BOS) <melgarstaff@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Pratibha Tekkey <pratibha@thclinic.org>
Subject: Group Housing Definition and Group Housing Special Use District

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

Good afternoon Supervisors,

My name is Kevin Stull and I'm the Pedestrian Safety Organizer for the Central City SRO Collaborative. I'm writing to all of you today in support of agenda items #2-3 for the Land Use Committee. The Tenderloin and Chinatown are two neighborhoods which have historically contained housing units that were and are being used to house low income families of large sizes. This is due to the fact that there isn't enough buildings that have enough space in them for families and other diverse groups of individuals can come together and share a group kitchen or other common space areas.

As it stands right now, group housing is defined as lack of cooking and food storage amenities. If this City is serious about preserving families that currently still live here and for future families in San Francisco, making sure that they have the space in their current and future living spaces to store food, being able to cook and to socialize is key to the stability of communities like the Tenderloin and Chinatown. Hopefully with the success of the Special Use District for these two neighborhoods, it's quite possible to expand it to others in this city so that future generations of San Franciscans can benefit from it.

Thank you again Supervisors for your time and I hope that you will approve the Group Housing definition and the Special Use District for the Tenderloin and Chinatown. Have a safe and wonderful day today.

Kevin Stull
Pedestrian Safety Organizer
Central City SRO Collaborative

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

March 5, 2022

Members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee,

As a resident potentially impacted by the matter pending before this committee. I am sending in my support for Supervisor Peskin's legislation to implement a Special Use District (SUD) for the Tenderloin and Chinatown. The attempt to prohibit market rate group housing from being proposed in these two neighborhoods through a Special Use District (SUD) is rooted in years of resident advocacy to encourage the development of family-sized units. I respectfully ask for the land use committee's support.

The Tenderloin and Chinatown communities continue to have the highest concentration of low-income families in San Francisco, many of whom reside in SRO's. Additionally, these two neighborhoods contain most of the city's old and new SRO's and group housing projects that do not meet the current needs of the population. The purpose of the SUD is to encourage housing diversity and bring dwelling units to a community that has historically lacked adequate space and amenities.

While efforts to address the need for affordable family housing in Chinatown and the Tenderloin have been in place for some time, this work was accelerated after a large group housing proposal was introduced in the Tenderloin at 450 O'Farrell St. Resident voices were loud and clear that the need for one of the densest neighborhoods in the city was not more group housing, but affordable family units to address the issue of overcrowding and to create housing that would foster permanence and the opportunity to thrive. Through an intensive community process with the help of the Planning Department to understand the group housing type, we learned that these types of units, which cater to temporary residents, have the highest rate of turnover. Both the Tenderloin and Chinatown are in desperate need of stabilization and adequate housing to establish residents who want to invest in our communities.

Families who currently live in overcrowded conditions in units without access to full kitchens in Chinatown and the Tenderloin struggle with food security because they can't prepare their own meals at home. Access to the kitchen amenities needed to store fresh food and prepare meals from scratch are essential keys to food security for low-income families. Group housing units - which are defined by their lack of complete cooking and food storage amenities - perpetuate the food insecurity that exists in neighborhoods like Chinatown and the Tenderloin where many housing units lack access to complete kitchens. Residents who don't have the ability to store fresh foods at home or to cook meals from scratch must subsist on more expensive prepared or restaurant meals or less healthy processed foods that don't need to be refrigerated, furthering the income inequality and public health concerns in these neighborhoods.

In addition to the efforts during the 450 O'Farrell community process, the Planning Department staff recognized the glaring ambiguity in the group housing definition and worked alongside stakeholders to refine the definition to clarify the difference between group housing units and dwelling units. The Planning Department also worked with the California College of the Arts to study current

group housing best practices that influenced the recent legislation that proposes a revision of the current definition of group housing, which we are also supportive of.

We urge you to support these planning code and zoning amendments to address inequities in access to adequate housing affordable to working families and to remove the ambiguity around the definition of group housing for future development.

Respectfully submitted.

GREGGORY D JOHNSON
Building Tenant Organizer
Vincent Hotel
415-940-9193

LEVEL 5 INC

1390 Market Street #427238
San Francisco, CA 94102
530.539.4435

City & County of San Francisco
Land Use & Transportation Committees
San Francisco, CA 94102

March 5, 2022

Dear Chair Melgar & Members of the Land Use & Transportation Committees,

The signed stakeholders are sending in their **support for Supervisor Peskin's legislation to implement a Special Use District (SUD) for the Tenderloin and Chinatown**. The attempt to prohibit market rate group housing from being proposed in these two neighborhoods through a Special Use District (SUD) is rooted in years of resident advocacy to encourage the development of family-sized units. **We kindly ask for the Land Use committee's support.**

The Tenderloin and Chinatown communities continue to have the highest concentration of low-income families in San Francisco, many of whom reside in SRO's. Additionally, these two neighborhoods contain most of the city's old and new SRO's and group housing projects that do not meet the current needs of the population. The purpose of the SUD is to encourage housing diversity and bring dwelling units to a community that has historically lacked adequate space and amenities.

While efforts to address the need for affordable family housing in Chinatown and the Tenderloin have been in place for some time, this work was accelerated after a large group housing proposal was introduced in the Tenderloin at 450 O'Farrell St. Resident voices were loud and clear that the need for one of the densest neighborhoods in the city was not more group housing, but affordable family units to address the issue of overcrowding and to create housing that would foster permanence and the opportunity to thrive. Through an intensive community process with the help of the Planning Department to understand the group housing type, we learned that these types of units, which cater to temporary residents, have the highest rate of turnover. Both the Tenderloin and Chinatown are in desperate need of stabilization and adequate housing to establish residents who want to invest in our communities.

Families who currently live in overcrowded conditions in units without access to full kitchens in Chinatown and the Tenderloin struggle with food security because they can't prepare their own meals at home. Access to the kitchen amenities needed to store fresh food and prepare meals from scratch are essential keys to food security for low-income families. Group housing units - which are defined by their lack of complete cooking and food storage amenities - perpetuate the food insecurity that exists in neighborhoods like Chinatown and the Tenderloin where many housing units lack access to complete kitchens. Residents who don't have the ability to store fresh foods at home or to cook meals from scratch must subsist on more expensive prepared or restaurant meals or less healthy processed

foods that don't need to be refrigerated, furthering the income inequality and public health concerns in these neighborhoods.

In addition to the efforts during the 450 O'Farrell community process, the Planning Department staff recognized the glaring ambiguity in the group housing definition and worked alongside stakeholders to refine the definition to clarify the difference between group housing units and dwelling units. The Planning Department also worked with the California College of the Arts to study current group housing best practices that influenced the recent legislation that proposes a revision of the current definition of group housing, which we are also supportive of.

We urge you to support these planning code and zoning amendments to address inequities in access to adequate housing affordable to working families and to remove the ambiguity around the definition of group housing for future development.

In Support,



JAMAL A. CARRINGTON,
Chief Executive Officer
Board of Directors
Level 5, Incorporated



SARA J PAULEY
General Counsel
Vice Chairperson
Level 5 Incorporated

Tenderloin Housing Clinic
Tenderloin People's Congress
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation
Central City SRO Collaborative
Chinatown Community Development Center
Chinatown SRO Family Collaborative

www.level5.com | l5bsi.sf@gmx.com

From: [Gabriella Ruiz](#)
To: [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Low, Jen \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Smeallie, Kyle \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support Letter - Items #2 and #3
Date: Monday, March 7, 2022 9:26:11 AM
Attachments: [Support Letter - Group Housing Land Use.pdf](#)

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

Dear Chair Melgar and the Land Use and Transportation Committee,

Please see the attached letter from Tenderloin and Chinatown stakeholders supporting Supervisor Peskin's legislation to redefine group housing and create a group housing Special Use District for the Tenderloin and Chinatown.

Best,

Gabriella Ruiz (she/her)
Senior Planner
Chinatown Community Development Center
c: 415-912-0118

March 7, 2022

Dear Chair Melgar and members of the Land Use and Transportation Committee,

The signed stakeholders are sending in their **support for Supervisor Peskin's legislation to implement a Special Use District (SUD) for the Tenderloin and Chinatown**. The attempt to prohibit market rate group housing from being proposed in these two neighborhoods through a Special Use District (SUD) is rooted in years of resident advocacy to encourage the development of family-sized units. **We kindly ask for the land use committee's support.**

The Tenderloin and Chinatown communities continue to have the highest concentration of low-income families in San Francisco, many of whom reside in SRO's. Additionally, these two neighborhoods contain most of the city's old and new SRO's and group housing projects that do not meet the current needs of the population. The purpose of the SUD is to encourage housing diversity and bring dwelling units to a community that has historically lacked adequate space and amenities.

While efforts to address the need for affordable family housing in Chinatown and the Tenderloin have been in place for some time, this work was accelerated after a large group housing proposal was introduced in the Tenderloin at 450 O'Farrell St. Resident voices were loud and clear that the need for one of the densest neighborhoods in the city was not more group housing, but affordable family units to address the issue of overcrowding and to create housing that would foster permanence and the opportunity to thrive. Through an intensive community process with the help of the Planning Department to understand the group housing type, we learned that these types of units, which cater to temporary residents, have the highest rate of turnover. Both the Tenderloin and Chinatown are in desperate need of stabilization and adequate housing to establish residents who want to invest in our communities.

Families who currently live in overcrowded conditions in units without access to full kitchens in Chinatown and the Tenderloin struggle with food security because they can't prepare their own meals at home. Access to the kitchen amenities needed to store fresh food and prepare meals from scratch are essential keys to food security for low-income families. Group housing units – which are defined by their lack of complete cooking and food storage amenities - perpetuate the food insecurity that exists in neighborhoods like Chinatown and the Tenderloin where many housing units lack access to complete kitchens. Residents who don't have the ability to store fresh foods at home or to cook meals from scratch must subsist on more expensive prepared or restaurant meals or less healthy processed foods that don't need to be refrigerated, furthering the income inequality and public health concerns in these neighborhoods.

In addition to the efforts during the 450 O'Farrell community process, the Planning Department staff recognized the glaring ambiguity in the group housing definition and worked alongside stakeholders to refine the definition to clarify the difference between group housing units and dwelling units. The Planning Department also worked with the California College of the Arts to study current group housing best practices that influenced the recent legislation that proposes a revision of the current definition of group housing, which we are also supportive of.

We urge you to support these planning code and zoning amendments to address inequities in access to adequate housing affordable to working families and to remove the ambiguity around the definition of group housing for future development.

In Support,

Tenderloin Housing Clinic

Tenderloin People's Congress

Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation

Central City SRO Collaborative

Chinatown Community Development Center

Chinatown SRO Family Collaborative

From: [Yonathan](#)
To: [Flores, Veronica \(CPC\)](#)
Subject: Group Housing questions
Date: Tuesday, February 1, 2022 4:45:36 PM

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

Hi Veronica Flores.

Regarding Ordinance Case 2021-011415PCA-02, [Board File 211299](#), scheduled for Planning Commission [2/10/2022](#), I am curious about how this interacts with Efficiency Dwelling Units which were added as [Planning Code §318](#) in 2013 ([Ord. 242-12](#), [Board File 120996](#)) along with Building Code changes ([Ord. 235-12](#), [Board File 120996](#)).

Questions:

- Are there a lot of “Efficiency Dwelling Unit” applications? I understand that the Planning Department opposed adding a definition of Efficiency Dwelling Unit because they said as far as the Planning Code is concerned, it’s just a unit, so perhaps you don’t track them.
- Are there a lot of “Efficiency Dwelling Units with reduced square footage” applications, subject to or not subject to the 375-unit citywide limit (for non-group-housing, non-affordable units)?
- Are Efficiency Dwelling Units allowed in every use district that a regular unit is?
- Why don’t the market-rate Group Housing proposals just make Efficiency Dwelling Units? (I have a feeling I know the answer: [Planning Code §207](#) lower dwelling density limit which is less than the [§208](#) group housing limit, and [Planning Code §135](#) open space for group housing which is 1/3 the requirement for units)

Thanks.
Yonathan Randolph

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

December 23, 2021

File No. 211300

Lisa Gibson
Environmental Review Officer
Planning Department
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Ms. Gibson:

On December 14, 2021, Supervisor Peskin submitted the following legislation:

File No. 211300

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to create the Group Housing Special Use District; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1, and findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302.

This legislation is being transmitted to you for environmental review.

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Erica Major".

By: Erica Major, Assistant Clerk
Land Use and Transportation Committee

Attachment

c: Joy Navarrete, Environmental Planning
Don Lewis, Environmental Planning

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

December 23, 2021

Planning Commission
Attn: Jonas Ionin
49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Commissioners:

On December 14, 2021, Supervisor Peskin submitted the following legislation:

File No. 211300

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to create the Group Housing Special Use District; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1, and findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302.

The proposed ordinance is being transmitted for review. The ordinance is pending before the Land Use and Transportation Committee and will be scheduled for hearing upon receipt of your response.

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Erica Major".

By: Erica Major, Assistant Clerk
Land Use and Transportation Committee

c: Rich Hillis, Director
Scott Sanchez, Deputy Zoning Administrator
Corey Teague, Zoning Administrator
Lisa Gibson, Environmental Review Officer
Devyani Jain, Deputy Environmental Review Officer
AnMarie Rodgers, Legislative Affairs
Dan Sider, Director of Executive Programs
Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs
Joy Navarrete, Environmental Planning

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

TO: Trent Rhorer, Executive Director, Human Services Agency

FROM: Erica Major, Assistant Clerk, Land Use and Transportation Committee

DATE: December 23, 2021

SUBJECT: LEGISLATION INTRODUCED

The Board of Supervisors' Land Use and Transportation Committee has received the following proposed legislation, introduced by Supervisor Peskin on December 14, 2021:

File No. 211300

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to create the Group Housing Special Use District; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1, and findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302.

If you have comments or reports to be included with the file, please forward them to me at the Board of Supervisors, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102 or by email at: erica.major@sfgov.org.

cc: Elizabeth LaBarre, Human Services Agency

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 proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard, in-person or remotely:

Members of the public attending this hearing in-person may be required to wear masks and adhere to certain procedures, please visit https://sfbos.org/in_person_meeting_guidelines for the current guidelines.

Date: June 6, 2022

Time: 1:30 p.m.

Location: **IN-PERSON MEETING INFORMATION**
Legislative Chamber, Room 250, located at City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA

REMOTE ACCESS

Watch: www.sfgovtv.org

Watch: SF Cable Channel 26, 78, or 99 (*depending on your provider*) once the meeting starts, the telephone number and Meeting ID will be displayed on the screen.

Public Comment Call-In: <https://sfbos.org/remote-meeting-call>

Subject: **File No. 211300.** Ordinance amending the Planning Code to create the Group Housing Special Use District; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1, and findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302.

In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter 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 (board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org). Information relating to this matter is 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 this matter will be available for public review on Friday, June 3, 2022.

For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Land Use and Transportation Committee:

Erica Major (Erica.Major@sfgov.org) ~ (415) 554-4441)

Please Note: *The Department is open for business, but employees are working from home. Please allow 48 hours for us to return your call or email.*



Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco

em:ams

CALIFORNIA NEWSPAPER SERVICE BUREAU

DAILY JOURNAL CORPORATION

Mailing Address : 915 E FIRST ST, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
Telephone (800) 788-7840 / Fax (800) 464-2839
Visit us @ www.LegalAdstore.com

ERICA MAJOR
CCSF BD OF SUPERVISORS (OFFICIAL NOTICES)
1 DR CARLTON B GOODLETT PL #244
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

COPY OF NOTICE

Notice Type: GPN GOVT PUBLIC NOTICE

Ad Description

EDM 06.06.2022 Land Use - 211300 Zoning Map (Peskin)

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):

05/27/2022

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	\$354.37
Total	\$354.37

EXM# 3589402

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MONDAY, JUNE 6, 2022 - 1:30 PM

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard in person or remotely: File No. 211300. Ordinance amending the Planning Code to create the Group Housing Special Use District, affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1, and findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302. Members of the public attending this hearing in person may be required to wear masks and adhere to certain procedures, please visit

<https://sfbos.org/in-person-meeting-guidelines> for the current guidelines. IN-PERSON MEETING INFORMATION Legislative Chamber, Room 250, located at City Hall 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA REMOTE ACCESS

Watch: www.sfgovtv.org Watch: SF Cable Channel 26, 78, or 99 (depending on your provider) once the meeting starts, the telephone number and Meeting ID will be displayed on the screen. Public Comment Call-In: <https://sfbos.org/remotemeeting-call> In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter 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 (board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org). Information relating to this matter is 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 this matter will be available for public review on Friday, June 3, 2022. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Land Use and Transportation Committee: Erica Major (Erica.Major@sfgov.org - (415) 554-4441) Please Note: The Department is open for business, but employees are working from home. Please allow 48 hours for us to return your call or email. EXM-3589402#



* A 0 0 0 0 0 6 0 2 5 7 4 9 *

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 will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard, in-person or remotely:

Date: March 7, 2022

Time: 1:30 p.m.

Location: **IN-PERSON MEETING INFORMATION**
Legislative Chamber, Room 250, located at City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA

REMOTE MEETING INFORMATION

Watch: www.sfgovtv.org

Watch: SF Cable Channel 26, 78, or 99 (*depending on your provider*)
once the meeting starts, the telephone number and Meeting ID will be displayed on the screen.

Public Comment Call-In: <https://sfbos.org/remote-meeting-call>

Subject: **File No. 211300.** Ordinance amending the Planning Code to create the Group Housing Special Use District; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1, and findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302.


In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter 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 (board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org). Information relating to this matter is 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 this matter will be available for public review on Friday, March 18, 2022.

For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Land Use and Transportation Committee:

Erica Major (Erica.Major@sfgov.org) ~ (415) 554-4441)

Please Note: *The Department is open for business, but employees are working from home. Please allow 48 hours for us to return your call or email.*



Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco

em:bjj:ams

CALIFORNIA NEWSPAPER SERVICE BUREAU

DAILY JOURNAL CORPORATION

Mailing Address : 915 E FIRST ST, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
Telephone (800) 788-7840 / Fax (800) 464-2839
Visit us @ www.LegalAdstore.com

ERICA MAJOR
CCSF BD OF SUPERVISORS (OFFICIAL NOTICES)
1 DR CARLTON B GOODLETT PL #244
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

EXM# 3559448

COPY OF NOTICE

Notice Type: GPN GOVT PUBLIC NOTICE

Ad Description

EDM 03.07.2022 Land Use - 211300 Zoning Map

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):

02/25/2022

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	\$320.62
Total	\$320.62

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MONDAY, MARCH 7, 2022 - 1:30 PM

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard in-person or remotely: File No. 211300. Ordinance amending the Planning Code to create the Group Housing Special Use District, affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1, and findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302. IN-PERSON MEETING INFORMATION Legislative Chamber, Room 250, located at City Hall 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA REMOTE MEETING INFORMATION Watch: www.sfgovtv.org Watch: SF Cable Channel 26, 78, or 99 (depending on your provider) once the meeting starts; the telephone number and Meeting ID will be displayed on the screen. Public Comment Call-In: <https://sfbos.org/remotemeeting-call> In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter 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 (board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org). Information relating to this matter is available with the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (<https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-irc>). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for

public review on Friday, March 4, 2022. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Land Use and Transportation Committee: Erica Major (Erica.Major@sfgov.org - (415) 554-4441) Please Note: The Department is open for business, but employees are working from home. Please allow 48 hours for us to return your call or email.



* A 0 0 0 0 0 5 9 4 8 1 3 9 *

Introduction Form

By a Member of the Board of Supervisors or Mayor

Time stamp
or meeting date

I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one):

- 1. For reference to Committee. (An Ordinance, Resolution, Motion or Charter Amendment).
- 2. Request for next printed agenda Without Reference to Committee.
- 3. Request for hearing on a subject matter at Committee.
- 4. Request for letter beginning : "Supervisor inquiries"
- 5. City Attorney Request.
- 6. Call File No. from Committee.
- 7. Budget Analyst request (attached written motion).
- 8. Substitute Legislation File No.
- 9. Reactivate File No.
- 10. Topic submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the BOS on

Please check the appropriate boxes. The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following:

- Small Business Commission
- Youth Commission
- Ethics Commission
- Planning Commission
- Building Inspection Commission

Note: For the Imperative Agenda (a resolution not on the printed agenda), use the Imperative Form.

Sponsor(s):

Aaron Peskin

Subject:

Planning Code, Zoning Map - Group Housing Special Use District

The text is listed:

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to create the Group Housing Special Use District; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; and making findings of consistency with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1, and findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302.

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor: /a/