

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
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

LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

TO: Supervisor Myrna Melgar, Chair
Land Use and Transportation Committee

FROM: John Carroll, Assistant Clerk

DATE: December 9, 2024

SUBJECT **COMMITTEE REPORT, BOARD MEETING**
Tuesday, December 10, 2024

The following file should be presented as COMMITTEE REPORT during the Board meeting on Tuesday, December 10, 2024. This ordinance was acted upon during the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting on Monday, December 9, 2024, at 1:30 p.m., by the votes indicated.

BOS Item No. 58

File No. 230596

[Planning Code - Minimum Densities for Residential Projects in RM, RC, and RTO Districts]

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to require minimum residential density, in Residential-Mixed (RM), Residential Commercial (RC), and Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) Districts except for Residential-Transit Oriented - Mission (RTO-M) Districts; affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1, and making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare pursuant to Planning Code, Section 302.

RECOMMENDED AS A COMMITTEE REPORT

Vote: Supervisor Myrna Melgar – Aye
Supervisor Dean Preston – Aye
Supervisor Aaron Peskin – Aye

Cc: Board of Supervisors
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Alisa Somera, Legislative Deputy
Brad Russi, Deputy City Attorney

File No. 230596

Committee Item No. 7

Board Item No. 58

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Land Use and Transportation

Date: Dec 9, 2024

Board of Supervisors Meeting:

Date: Dec 10, 2024

Cmte Board

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

OTHER

- Planning Code Transmittal – July 25, 2023
- CEQA Determination – June 7, 2023
- Referral CEQA and PC – May 30, 2023
- Committee Report Request Memo – December 4, 2024
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____

Prepared by: John Carroll

Date: December 5, 2024

Prepared by: John Carroll

Date: December 9, 2024

Prepared by: _____

Date: _____

1 [Planning Code - ~~Conditional Use~~ Minimum Densities for Residential Projects in RM, RC, and
2 RTO Districts]

3 **Ordinance amending the Planning Code to require ~~conditional use authorization for~~**
4 **~~residential housing developments that do not maximize~~ minimum residential density,**
5 **~~as defined,~~ in Residential-Mixed (RM), Residential Commercial (RC), and Residential**
6 **Transit Oriented (RTO) Districts except for Residential-Transit Oriented – ~~Mixed~~**
7 **Mission (RTO-M) Districts; affirming the Planning Department’s determination under**
8 **the California Environmental Quality Act; ~~and~~ making findings of consistency with the**
9 **General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1, and making**
10 **findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare pursuant to Planning Code,**
11 **Section 302.**

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

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

20 Section 1. Environmental and Planning Code Findings.

21 (a) The Planning Department has determined that the actions contemplated in this
22 ordinance comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources
23 Code Sections 21000 et seq.). Said determination is on file with the Clerk of the Board of
24 Supervisors in File No. 230596 and is incorporated herein by reference. The Board affirms
25 this determination.

1 (b) On July 20, 2023, the Planning Commission, in Resolution No. 21364, adopted
2 findings that the actions contemplated in this ordinance are consistent, on balance, with the
3 City’s General Plan and eight priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1. The Board
4 adopts these findings as its own. A copy of said Resolution is on file with the Clerk of the
5 Board of Supervisors in File No. 230596, and is incorporated herein by reference.

6 (c) Pursuant to Planning Code Section 302, the Board of Supervisors find that this
7 ordinance will serve the public necessity, convenience, and welfare for the reasons set forth in
8 Planning Commission Resolution No. 21364, and incorporates such reasons by this reference
9 thereto. A copy of said resolution is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File
10 No. 230596.

11
12 Section 2. General Findings.

13 (a) In recent decades, the rate of housing production in San Francisco has failed to
14 keep pace with the growing demand for housing in the City and in the broader Bay Area. As a
15 result, housing is unaffordable to many City residents, and there have been waves of evictions
16 and displacement, largely to the detriment of long-term residents and lower-income
17 communities.

18 (b) Policymakers at the City and state level have sought to increase housing density
19 both in San Francisco and across the state. For example, San Francisco’s Citywide
20 Accessory Dwelling Unit Program, which applies to existing structures and new construction,
21 allows for the increased densification of residential and mixed-use neighborhoods and zoning
22 districts. Section 207(c)(8) of the Planning Code, enacted in 2022, increased density to allow
23 four units, or six units on corner lots, in Residential-Housing (RH) zones in certain
24 circumstances. And California Government Code Sections 65852.21 and 664117 require
25

1 ministerial approval of two units in single-family zoning districts and lot splits in single-family
2 districts, respectively.

3 (c) While significant emphasis has been placed on increasing the capacity for
4 increased housing density in residential and mixed-use zoning districts, and to remove various
5 substantive and procedural restrictions on the construction of affordable housing in particular,
6 comparatively little emphasis has been placed on setting density minimums and prohibiting
7 the creating disincentives for construction of low-density projects in zoning districts that allow
8 for greater density.

9 (d) The construction of large residences and low-density buildings in areas that are
10 zoned for greater density and that tend to be characterized by higher density, more affordable,
11 and rent-stabilized housing, is indicative of a market preference for demonstrably unaffordable
12 housing.

13 (e) The construction of large residences and low-density buildings in zoning districts
14 that permit greater capacity for housing density, such as Residential-Commercial (RC),
15 Residential - Mixed (RM), and Residential - Transit Oriented (RTO) districts, is at the expense
16 of opportunities for more units, and more affordable housing, and frequently results in the loss
17 or conversion of housing protected by rent stabilization provisions of the San Francisco Rent
18 Ordinance.

19 (f) Objective 4B of San Francisco’s 2022 Housing Element is to “expand small and
20 mid-rise multi-family housing production to serve our workforce, prioritizing middle-income
21 households.”

22 (g) The ~~2020~~ October 2024 Housing Balance Report, produced by the Planning
23 Department pursuant to Section 103 of the Planning Code, indicates that for the period from
24 ~~2010 Quarter 1 to 2019 Quarter 4~~ 2013 Quarter 1 to 2024 Quarter 2, ~~7,084~~ 10,153 units of net
25

1 new affordable housing have been built in San Francisco while ~~3,954~~ 2,722 units have been
2 removed from protected status, a ratio of just ~~4.79~~ 3.73 units built for every 1 unit lost.

3 (h) The loss of affordable and rent controlled housing is driven in part by the
4 demolition, merger, and conversion of such housing, and its replacement with market rate
5 housing and large single-family homes in zoning districts that permit increased capacity for
6 housing density.

7 (i) To address the loss of affordable and rent controlled housing and the construction
8 of large single-family homes in zoning districts that allow greater density, in January 2021, the
9 Board of Supervisors adopted interim controls to require projects that did not maximize the
10 number of units on a lot to seek conditional use authorization. The Planning Department
11 issued a report studying the interim controls and recommended permanent legislation to
12 address the issues posed by large residential developments that do not maximize the
13 allowable density. The Board has reviewed and considered the Planning Department report,
14 and proposes the controls as set forth in this ordinance.

15 (j) This ordinance will facilitate and encourage the development of multi-family housing
16 in zoning RM, RC, and RTO districts. By ~~incentivizing~~ requiring the creation of ~~more~~ the
17 maximum number of units on a parcel, the cost per unit of housing will be reduced. Similarly,
18 the ordinance will preserve and facilitate the construction of housing for moderate- and lower-
19 income households by requiring the preservation of existing units unless the minimum number
20 of units on a subject lot will be constructed. ~~incentivizing the creation of additional units on a~~
21 ~~subject lot.~~ Units in multi-family housing are generally lower in price per square foot than units
22 in a comparably sized single-family home. Therefore, by creating more multi-family units,
23 rather than large single-family homes in areas where multi-family ~~units~~ buildings are allowed,
24 the price per square foot of each unit will be lower and more affordable to lower-and
25 moderate-income households.

(k) Likewise, as density increases, per capita water and energy use, stormwater runoff, and air pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions are reduced. In addition, multi-modal travel becomes more feasible, improving choices for non-drivers, as well as cost savings for households. Finally, dense residential development lowers per capita infrastructure capital and operating costs, and increases tax revenue per acre.

Section 3. Articles ~~2~~ and ~~3~~ of the Planning Code is ~~are~~ hereby amended by revising Sections 209.2, 209.3, and 209.4, ~~and 303~~, to read as follows:

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

* * * *

**Table 209.2
ZONING CONTROL TABLE FOR RM DISTRICTS**

Zoning Category	§ References	RM-1	RM-2	RM-3	RM-4
* * * *					
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES					
Residential Uses					
Residential Density, Dwelling Units (7)	§ 207	P if 3 units per lot or up to at least <u>P if 3 units per lot or up to at least</u> one unit per 800 <u>1067</u> square feet	P if 3 units per lot or up to at least <u>P if 3 units per lot or up to at least</u> one unit per 600 <u>800</u> square feet	P if 3 units per lot or up to at least <u>P if 3 units per lot or up to at least</u> one unit per 400 <u>533</u> square feet	P if 3 units per lot or up to at least <u>P if 3 units per lot or up to at least</u> one unit per 200 <u>267</u> square feet of lot area.

		of lot area, <i>whichever is greater.</i> <u>Total</u> <u>maximum</u> <u>permitted</u> <u>density is</u> <u>one unit per</u> <u>800 square</u> <u>feet of lot</u> <u>area. (11)</u>	of lot area, <i>whichever is greater.</i> <u>Total</u> <u>maximum</u> <u>permitted</u> <u>density is</u> <u>one unit per</u> <u>600 square</u> <u>feet of lot</u> <u>area. (11)</u>	of lot area, <i>whichever is greater.</i> <u>Total</u> <u>maximum</u> <u>permitted</u> <u>density is</u> <u>one unit per</u> <u>400 square</u> <u>feet of lot</u> <u>area (11)</u>	<i>whichever is greater.</i> <u>Total</u> <u>maximum</u> <u>permitted</u> <u>density is one</u> <u>unit per 200</u> <u>square feet of</u> <u>lot area. (8), (11)</u>
****	****	****	****	****	****

* * * *

(11) C per Section 303(cc) if the residential building does not maximize principally permitted density, while meeting minimum unit size requirements set forth in Section 415.6(f)(2), except as set forth in section 303(cc)(1). NP if less than minimum density as set forth in the table. Expansions of existing single-family residential buildings may not exceed more than 25% of Gross Floor Area over 10 years, or result in a building over 3,000 square feet. In new construction, no unit may be smaller than one-third the Gross Floor Area of the largest unit in the building.

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

* * * *

Table 209.3

ZONING CONTROL TABLE FOR RESIDENTIAL-COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Zoning Category	§ References	RC-3	RC-4
* * * *			
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES			
Development Standards			
Residential Density, Dwelling Units (7), (13)	§207	<u>P if 3 units per lot or up to at least one unit per 400-533 square feet of lot area, whichever is greater. Total maximum permitted density is one unit per 400 square feet of lot area. (13)</u>	<u>P if 3 units per lot or up to at least one unit per 200 267 square feet of lot area, whichever is greater. Total maximum permitted density is one unit per 200 square feet of lot area. No density limits in the Van Ness SUD (§243). (8), (13)</u>
* * * *			

* * * *

(13) C per Section 303(cc) if the residential building does not maximize principally permitted residential density, while meeting minimum unit size requirements set forth in Section 415.6(f)(2), except as set forth in section 303(cc)(1). NP if less than minimum density as set forth in the table. Expansions of existing single-family residential buildings may not exceed more than 25% of Gross Floor Area over 10 years, or result in a building over 3,000 square feet. In new construction, no unit may be smaller than one-third the Gross Floor Area of the largest unit in the building.

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

* * * *

Table 209.4

ZONING CONTROL TABLE FOR RTO DISTRICTS

Zoning Category	§ References	RTO	RTO-M
* * * *			
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND USES			
* * * *			
Residential Uses			
Residential Density, Dwelling Units (7)	§207	P if at least up to one unit per 600 <u>800</u> square feet of lot area (8); Maximum density as of right is one unit per 600 square feet of lot area. C above below <u>above</u> , per criteria of §207(a). (11)	No density limit. Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each parcel, along with Residential Design Guidelines.
* * * *			

1 ~~(11) C per Section 303(cc) if the residential building does not maximize principally~~
2 ~~permitted residential density, while meeting minimum unit size requirements set forth in~~
3 ~~Section 415.6(f)(2), except as set forth in section 303(cc)(1). NP if less than minimum density~~
4 ~~as set forth in the table. Expansions of existing single-family residential buildings may not~~
5 ~~exceed more than 25% of Gross Floor Area over 10 years, or result in a building over 3,000~~
6 ~~square feet. In new construction, no unit may be smaller than one-third the Gross Floor Area~~
7 ~~of the largest unit in the building.~~

8
9 **SECTION 303. CONDITIONAL USES.**

10 (a) General. The Planning Commission shall hear and make determinations regarding
11 applications for the authorization of Conditional Uses in the specific situations in which such
12 authorization is provided for elsewhere in this Code. The procedures for Conditional Uses
13 shall be as specified in this Section 303 and in Sections 306 through 306.6, except that
14 Planned Unit Developments shall in addition be subject to Section 304, Hospitals and Post-
15 Secondary Educational Institutions shall in addition be subject to the Institutional Master Plan
16 requirements of Section 304.5.

17 * * * *

18
19 (cc) Maximizing Density in RM, RC, and RTO Districts.

20 ~~(1) In order to promote, protect, and maintain the maximum number of~~
21 ~~residential units in RM, RC, and RTO Districts, except for RTO M Districts, new construction~~
22 ~~or alterations of existing buildings that do not meet the maximum principally permitted~~
23 ~~residential density as set forth in Tables 209.2, 209.3, and 209.4, respectively, while meeting~~
24 ~~the minimum unit size requirements set forth in Planning Code Section 415.6(f)(2), shall be~~
25 ~~permitted only as a Conditional Use. The maximum principally permitted residential density~~

1 shall not include any additional density permitted under state law or Planning Code sections
2 206 et seq. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, a project meeting one of the following
3 exceptions to this Section 303(cc) shall not require a Conditional Use:

4 (A) The project includes new construction or alteration of an existing
5 building and meets all of the following conditions:

6 (i) existing lot conditions or form-based restrictions on
7 development (e.g., height, bulk, rear yard requirements) are such that a proposed project
8 cannot maximize density without seeking a variance or subdividing existing units on the lot
9 because it is physically infeasible to do so; and

10 (ii) the proposed project will create more units on the subject lot;
11 and

12 (iii) the project does not include any single unit greater than 2,000
13 square feet in size; and

14 (iv) the project is not subject to Conditional Use Authorization
15 under any other provision of the Planning Code.

16 (B) The project is an expansion of an existing residential building that
17 would increase the total square footage of the residential building by no more than 25% of the
18 square footage of the existing residential building, and meets all of the following requirements:

19 (i) the expansion does not increase the size of any unit that is
20 already larger than 2,000 square feet; and

21 (ii) the expansion does not create any new unit that is greater than
22 2,000 square feet; and

23 (iii) the expansion would not cause an existing unit that is less than
24 2,000 square feet to be larger than 2,000 square feet.

1 (C) For a project consisting of an expansion to a building with two or
2 more units, no resulting individual unit would be greater than 3,000 square feet, and no
3 resulting individual unit would be less than 50% of the size of the largest unit in the building.

4 (D) For any project consisting of an expansion to an existing building of
5 600 square feet or less.

6 (E) For any project where maximizing density would be inconsistent with
7 the preservation of a historic resource or would preclude the issuance of a Certificate of
8 Appropriateness under Article 10 of this Code.

9 (2) In addition to the findings stated in Section 303(c), the Commission shall
10 make the following findings:

11 (A) The project proposes the maximum physically feasible density based
12 on existing lot conditions or form-based restrictions on development (e.g. height, bulk, rear
13 yard requirements); and

14 (B) The project proposes additional density equal to that of adjacent
15 buildings; and

16 (C) Maximizing density is financially or physically infeasible.

17
18 Section 4. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after
19 enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the
20 ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board
21 of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

22
23 Section 5. Scope of Ordinance. In enacting this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors
24 intends to amend only those words, phrases, paragraphs, subsections, sections, articles,
25 numbers, punctuation marks, charts, diagrams, or any other constituent parts of the Municipal

1 Code that are explicitly shown in this ordinance as additions, deletions, Board amendment
2 additions, and Board amendment deletions in accordance with the “Note” that appears under
3 the official title of the ordinance.

4

5 APPROVED AS TO FORM:
6 DAVID CHIU, City Attorney

7 By: /s/ Audrey Pearson
8 AUDREY PEARSON
9 Deputy City Attorney

10 n:\legana\as2023\2300223\01803203.docx

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

REVISED LEGISLATIVE DIGEST
(Amended in Committee – December 2, 2024)

[Planning Code – Minimum Densities for Residential Projects in RM, RC, and RTO Districts]

Ordinance amending the Planning Code to require minimum residential density in Residential-Mixed (RM), Residential Commercial (RC), and Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) Districts except for Residential-Transit Oriented – Mission (RTO-M) Districts; affirming the Planning Department’s determination under the California Environmental Quality Act; making findings of consistency with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1, and making findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare pursuant to Planning Code, Section 302.

Existing Law

Existing law limits the density of residential buildings in RC, RM, and RTO districts (but not RTO-M districts) to, generally, three units per lot, or one unit for every 200-800 square feet depending on the district. The Planning Code does not prescribe a minimum number of units that must be constructed on a lot. Residential projects that do not exceed the maximum number of units are principally permitted.

Amendments to Current Law

This ordinance would require minimum densities in residential development projects in RC, RM and RTO (but not RTO-M) districts. The minimum density would be at least 75% of the existing maximum density. Projects that are less than the minimum density are not permitted.

In addition, the ordinance prescribes that expansion of an existing single-family residential building may not exceed more than 25% of Gross Floor Area over 10 years, or result in a building over 3,000 square feet. In new construction, no unit may be smaller than one-third the Gross Floor Area of the largest unit in the building.

Background Information

This version of the ordinance includes amendments made at the Land Use and Transportation Committee meeting on December 2, 2024, and incorporates certain amendments recommended by the Planning Commission at its meeting on July 20, 2023.

The ordinance requires the construction of multi-family housing developments, rather than single-family “monster homes,” in zoning districts that allow multi-family housing developments. The Board of Supervisors adopted interim controls similar to the controls in this ordinance in January 2021, and renewed the interim controls in September 2022. The interim controls expired in January 2023.

n:\legana\as2023\2300223\01803246.docx



July 25, 2023

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 Number 2023-005238PCA:
Conditional Use for Residential Projects in RM, RC, and RTO Districts
Board File No. 230596

Planning Commission Recommendation: Approval with Modification

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisor Peskin,

On July 20, 2023, 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 require Conditional Use authorization for residential housing developments that do not maximize residential density in Residential-Mixed (RM), Residential Commercial (RC), and Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) Districts. At the hearing the Planning Commission recommended approval with modification.

The Commission's proposed modifications were as follows:

1. Modify the Ordinance to replace the Conditional Use authorization requirement with objective, minimum density standards for new construction projects in the RM, RC, and RTO (except RTO-M) districts as follows:
 - **RM-1:** *at least* 75% of the maximum density. Max density is 1 unit per 800sqft of lot area.
 - **RM-2:** 3 units per lot or *at least* 75% density of maximum density. Max density is 1 unit per 600sqft of lot area.
 - **RM-3 & RC-3:** 3 units per lot or *at least* 75% of the maximum density. Max density is 1 unit per 400sqft of lot area.

- **RM-4:** 3 units per lot or *at least* 75% of the maximum density. Max density is 1 unit per 200sqft of lot area.
 - **RC-4:** 3 units per lot or *at least* 75% of the maximum density. Max density is 1 unit per 200sqft of lot area. No density limit in Van Ness SUD.
 - **RTO:** *at least* 75% density of maximum density. Max density is 1 unit per 600sqft of lot area.
2. For new construction projects in the subject zoning districts, require that no unit be smaller than 1/3 the size of the largest unit in the building.
 3. Replace the Ordinance's proposed list of exceptions to minimum densities and unit sizes with a simplified, single exception to the Department's recommended objective standard for minimum densities and on minimum unit sizes as follows: Expansions of single-family homes may expand their Gross Floor Area by no more than 25% measured over 10 years, or to result in a home no more than 3,000sqft, whichever is greater.
 4. Incentivize projects in the subject zoning districts to build "ideal" projects by removing the Conditional Use authorization for demolition (Sec. 317), public-initiated Discretionary Review (DR), and only applying objective residential design standards for projects that:
 - a. Maximize allowable density (not including Accessory Dwelling Units);
 - b. Meet the 1/3-unit proportionality requirements;
 - c. Do not propose demolition of a previously identified (known) Historic Resource;
 - d. Do not propose demolition of a building subject to the Ellis Act within the previous 10 years;
 - e. Do not require any exceptions or waivers from Planning Code requirements (other than a CUA under Sec. 317);
 - f. Does not propose the demolition of more than two dwelling units that are subject to limits on rent increases under the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance;
 - g. Does not propose demolition of a Dwelling Unit occupied by a tenant within the last 5 years from the date of application, and;
 - h. Does not propose demolition of a Dwelling Unit where there was a registered buyout of the tenant within the last 5 years from the date of the application.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Aaron D. Starr". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

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. 21364

HEARING DATE: JULY 20, 2023

Project Name: Conditional Use for Residential Projects in RM, RC, and RTO Districts
Case Number: 2023-005238PCA [Board File No. 230596]
Initiated by: Supervisor Peskin / Introduced May 23, 2023
Staff Contact: Audrey Merlone, Legislative Affairs
Audrey.Merlone@sfgov.org, 628-652-7534
Reviewed by: Aaron D Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs
aaron.starr@sfgov.org, (628) 652-7533

RESOLUTION APPROVING A PROPOSED ORDINANCE THAT WOULD AMEND THE PLANNING CODE TO REQUIRE CONDITIONAL USE AUTHORIZATION FOR RESIDENTIAL HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS THAT DO NOT MAXIMIZE RESIDENTIAL DENSITY, AS DEFINED, IN RESIDENTIAL-MIXED (RM), RESIDENTIAL COMMERCIAL (RC), AND RESIDENTIAL TRANSIT ORIENTED (RTO) DISTRICTS EXCEPT FOR RESIDENTIAL-TRANSIT ORIENTED – MIXED (RTO-M) DISTRICTS; ADOPTING FINDINGS, INCLUDING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS, PLANNING CODE SECTION 302 FINDINGS, AND FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AND PLANNING CODE SECTION 101.1.

WHEREAS, on May 23, 2023, Supervisor Peskin introduced a proposed Ordinance under Board of Supervisors (hereinafter “Board”) File Number 230596, which would amend the Planning Code to require Conditional Use authorization for residential housing developments that do not maximize residential density, as defined, in Residential-Mixed (RM), Residential Commercial (RC), and Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) Districts except for Residential-Transit Oriented - Mixed (RTO-M) Districts;

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission (hereinafter “Commission”) conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider the proposed Ordinance on July 20, 2023; 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(s) is/are as follows:

1. Modify the Ordinance to replace the Conditional Use authorization requirement with objective, minimum density standards for new construction projects in the RM, RC, and RTO (except RTO-M) districts as follows:
 - **RM-1:** *at least 75%* of the maximum density. Max density is 1 unit per 800sqft of lot area.
 - **RM-2:** 3 units per lot or *at least 75%* density of maximum density. Max density is 1 unit per 600sqft of lot area.
 - **RM-3 & RC-3:** 3 units per lot or *at least 75%* of the maximum density. Max density is 1 unit per 400sqft of lot area.
 - **RM-4:** 3 units per lot or *at least 75%* of the maximum density. Max density is 1 unit per 200sqft of lot area.
 - **RC-4:** 3 units per lot or *at least 75%* of the maximum density. Max density is 1 unit per 200sqft of lot area. No density limit in Van Ness SUD.
 - **RTO:** *at least 75%* density of maximum density. Max density is 1 unit per 600sqft of lot area.
2. For new construction projects in the subject zoning districts, require that no unit be smaller than 1/3 the size of the largest unit in the building.
3. Replace the Ordinance's proposed list of exceptions to minimum densities and unit sizes with a simplified, single exception to the Department's recommended objective standard for minimum densities and on minimum unit sizes as follows: Expansions of single-family homes may expand their Gross Floor Area by no more than 25% measured over 10 years, or to result in a home no more than 3,000sqft, whichever is greater.
4. Incentivize projects in the subject zoning districts to build "ideal" projects by removing the Conditional Use authorization for demolition (Sec. 317), public-initiated Discretionary Review (DR), and only

applying objective residential design standards for projects that:

- a. Maximize allowable density (not including Accessory Dwelling Units);
- b. Meet the 1/3-unit proportionality requirements;
- c. Do not propose demolition of a previously identified (known) Historic Resource;
- d. Do not propose demolition of a building subject to the Ellis Act within the previous 10 years;
- e. Do not require any exceptions or waivers from Planning Code requirements (other than a CUA under Sec. 317);
- f. Does not propose the demolition of more than two dwelling units that are subject to limits on rent increases under the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance;
- g. Does not propose demolition of a Dwelling Unit occupied by a tenant within the last 5 years from the date of application, and;
- h. Does not propose demolition of a Dwelling Unit where there was a registered buyout of the tenant within the last 5 years from the date of the application.

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 Commission finds that on balance, the proposed Ordinance is consistent with the General Plan; specifically Housing Element Policy No. 31. Housing Element Policy No. 31 is to: *“Facilitate small and mid-rise multi-family buildings that private development can deliver to serve middle-income households without deed restriction, including through adding units in lower density areas or by adding Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs).”* The proposed Ordinance would create density minimums across Residential districts that were designed with greater density in mind. The proposed Ordinance, *with* all recommended modifications, additionally aligns with the Housing Element’s Policies 25 and 26, which focus on reducing governmental constraints to enable small and mid-rise multi-family buildings and simplifying permit processes to provide more equitable access to the application process. The Ordinance, with the Commission’s recommended modifications, accomplishes this by adopting *objective* density minimums across Residential zoning districts that were created with greater Residential density in mind, and by removing additional subjective processes for projects that the City considers ideal.

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 4.B

EXPAND SMALL AND MID-RISE MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING PRODUCTION TO SERVE OUR WORKFORCE, PRIORITIZING MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS.

Policy 25

Reduce governmental constraints on development in Well-resourced Neighborhoods to enable small and mid-rise multi-family buildings providing improved housing choice and affordability.

Policy 26

Streamline and simplify permit processes to provide more equitable access to the application process, improve certainty of outcomes, and ensure meeting State- and local-required timelines, especially for 100% affordable housing and shelter projects.

Policy 31

Facilitate small and mid-rise multi-family buildings that private development can deliver to serve middle-income households without deed restriction, including through adding units in lower density areas or by adding Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs).

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 July 20, 2023.



Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

Jonas P Ionin

Digitally signed by Jonas P Ionin
Date: 2023.07.20 18:56:39
-07'00'

AYES: Braun, Ruiz, Diamond, Imperial, Koppel, Tanner

NOES: None

ABSENT: Moore

ADOPTED: July 20, 2023



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PLANNING CODE TEXT AMENDMENT

HEARING DATE: July 20, 2023

90-Day Deadline: August 28, 2023

Project Name: Conditional Use for Residential Projects in RM, RC, and RTO Districts
Case Number: 2023-005238PCA Board File No. 230596
Initiated by: Supervisor Peskin / Introduced May 23, 2023
Staff Contact: Audrey Merlone, Legislative Affairs
 Audrey.Merlone@sfgov.org, 628-652-7534
Reviewed by: Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs
 aaron.starr@sfgov.org, 628-652-7533

Recommendation: Approval with Modifications

Planning Code Amendment

The proposed Ordinance would amend the Planning Code to require Conditional Use authorization for residential housing developments that do not maximize residential density, as defined, in Residential-Mixed (RM), Residential Commercial (RC), and Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) Districts except for Residential-Transit Oriented - Mixed (RTO-M) Districts.

The Way It Is Now:

1. In RC, RM, or RTO Districts, the Planning Code does not require Conditional Use authorization for projects that do not maximize the district’s underlying residential density limits.

The Way It Would Be:

- In all RC, RM, and RTO Districts (except RTO-M) the following controls would apply:
 - a) Proposed new construction of a residential building, or any proposed alteration that would result in the expansion of a residential building shall require a Conditional Use authorization if the residential building does not maximize the principally permitted residential density. For the

purposes of this requirement, “maximum density” shall not include any additional residential density permitted under state law or Planning Code, Section 206. Projects must also adhere to the minimum unit size requirements set forth in Planning Code Section 415.6(f)(2) *except* as set forth in a new section (Sec. 303(cc)(1)). Density minimums would be as follows:

- **RM-1:** 3 units per lot or *at least* 1 unit per 800sqft of lot area (*whichever is greater*)
 - **RM-2:** 3 units per lot or *at least* 1 unit per 600sqft of lot area (*whichever is greater*)
 - **RM-3 & RC-3:** 3 units per lot or *at least* 1 unit per 400sqft of lot area (*whichever is greater*)
 - **RM-4:** 3 units per lot or *at least* 1 unit per 200sqft of lot area (*whichever is greater*)
 - **RC-4:** 3 units per lot or *at least* 1 unit per 200sqft of lot area (*whichever is greater*). No density limit in Van Ness SUD.
 - **RTO:** *at least* 1 unit per 600sqft of lot area
- b) A newly created subsection would specify the conditions that must be present for a project to be exempt from either the minimum density, minimum/maximum unit size, or both. The conditions that must be present are as follows:
- If the project proposes new construction or alteration of an existing building:
 - Existing lot conditions or form-based restrictions on development (e.g., height, bulk, rear yard requirements) are such that a proposed project cannot maximize density without seeking a variance or subdividing existing units on the lot, (and while adhering to the minimum unit size requirements set forth in Planning Code), AND;
 - The project will create more units on the lot, AND;
 - The project does not include any single unit greater than 2,000 Gross Square Feet (gsf), AND;
 - The project is not subject to a Conditional Use authorization under any other Code section.
 - If the project proposes expansion of an existing residential building by less than 25%, it must additionally:
 - Not increase the size of any unit already over 2,000sqft, AND;
 - Not expand any unit currently under 2,000sqft to be over 2,000sqft, AND;
 - Not create any new unit greater than 2,000sqft.
 - If the project proposes an expansion of an existing building with two or more units:
 - No resulting unit may be greater than 3,000sqft, AND;
 - No individual unit may be less than 50% the size of the largest unit in the building.
 - The project is proposing an expansion to an existing building of 600sqft or less.
 - Projects where maximizing density would be inconsistent with the preservation of a

historic resource or would prevent the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

- c) For projects subject to the Conditional Use authorization (CUA), the Commission would be required to make the following findings (in addition to Sec. 303(c) findings):
- The project proposes the maximum physically feasible density based on existing lot conditions or form-based restrictions on development (e.g. height, bulk, rear yard requirements), AND;
 - The project proposes additional density equal to that of adjacent buildings, AND;
 - Maximizing density is financially or physically infeasible.

Background

On December 15, 2020, Supervisor Peskin introduced a resolution¹ imposing interim zoning controls for an 18-month period for parcels in RC, RM and RTO districts, requiring Conditional Use authorization for any residential development that does not maximize the number of units allowed by applicable density restrictions. On July 26, 2022, Supervisor Peskin introduced a resolution² that extended and modified the interim controls, setting a new expiration date of January 22, 2023. This resolution was enacted on September 29, 2022.

The final interim controls were like the proposed permanent controls that are the subject of this report, except that they did not require additional Commission findings beyond those required under Sec. 303(c). The effect of the interim controls is discussed later in this report.

Issues and Considerations

RM, RC, & RTO Districts

The RM, RC, and RTO districts differ from the City's Residential, House (RH) districts in that they are designed to accommodate greater density through a variety of unit types, including apartments, single-family homes, group housing, student housing, senior housing, and single-room occupancy units.

Residential, Mixed Districts (RM):

RM districts are intended to recognize, protect, conserve and enhance areas characterized by a mixture of houses and apartment buildings, covering a range of densities and building forms according to the individual district designations. Despite the range of densities and building sizes, most structures are of a scale that respects the traditional lot patterns, open spaces and articulation of façades typical of San Francisco neighborhoods. These Districts provide unit sizes and types suitable for a variety of households and contain supporting nonresidential uses.

¹ [201370 - Leg Ver2 \(legistar.com\)](#)


² [Final Leg Ver 4 \(legistar.com\) BF 201370](#)

Residential-Commercial Districts (RC):

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

Residential Transit Oriented Districts (RTO):

RTO Districts are intended to recognize, protect, conserve, and enhance areas characterized by a mixture of houses and apartment buildings, covering a range of densities and building forms. RTO and RTO-M Districts are composed of multi-family moderate-density areas, primarily areas formerly designated RM and RH-3, and are well served within short walking distance, generally less than one-quarter mile, of transit and neighborhood commercial areas. Transit available on nearby streets is frequent and/or provides multiple lines serving different parts of the City or region. Limited small-scale neighborhood-oriented retail and services is common and permitted throughout the neighborhood on Corner Lots only to provide goods and services to residents within walking distance, but the districts are otherwise residential. Only retail compatible with housing, generally those



permitted in NC-1 Districts, is permitted and auto-oriented uses are not permitted. Hours of operation are restricted and off-street parking is not permitted for these very locally oriented uses.

Interim Controls

Affected Projects:

The Planning Department monitored and produced reports on the interim controls during their tenure. Through that study, the Department identified six projects that were affected by the interim controls.

Two of the affected projects consisted of additions to existing single-family homes already over the 2,000sqft threshold that were not adding density. Both projects chose to not modify their project, but instead chose to wait until the interim controls expired to move forward (they are both still in progress). One of these two projects is proposing an addition of approximately 150sqft. The project would not require a CUA under the proposed Ordinance because the expansion is less than 600sqft. The other project is proposing to add an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) approximately 600sqft in size and add a vertical story to the main unit. The addition to the main unit would increase the home from approximately 4,000sqft to 4,700sqft. Under the proposed Ordinance, this project would require a Conditional Use authorization.

Only one of the seven projects proposed to increase the size of a single-family home that was under 2,000sqft. This project sought to expand an approximately 1,900sqft single-family home by 380sqft and add an Accessory Dwelling Unit. The Commission approved that project because adding additional density would have been infeasible without multiple variances (very little buildable area exists on the lot).

Why Interim Controls Applied	Number of Projects	Result
Expansion of Existing Single-Family Home already <2,000sqft	2	-Neither project was modified to comply with controls
Expansion of Existing Single-Family Home to be <2,000sqft	1	-Unmodified project approved by Commission
New Construction of a Single-Family Home <2,000sqft	1	-Project modified to add density due to controls
Expansion of Existing Multi-Unit Building resulting in at least 1 unit <2,000sqft	1	-Project was not modified to comply with controls
Expansion of Existing Multi-Unit Building expanding a unit already <2,000sqft	1	-Project was not modified to comply with controls and was approved by Commission & ZA

The most successful application of the interim controls was on a project at 1263 Clay Street. The original project proposed to demolish the adjacent garage of an existing 2-unit building, and construct a single-family home over 2,000sqft. Due to the presence of the interim controls, as well as a Discretionary Review application filed on the project, the sponsors amended the project to instead build a 2-unit condo building on the garage site and add an ADU to the ground floor of the existing 2-unit building.

Of the two multi-unit projects that were subject to the interim controls, one sought to expand at least one unit of a multi-unit building where at least one of the existing units was less than 2,000sqft, without maximizing density. This project sought to expand one unit of a two-unit flat building. Upon learning of the interim controls, the sponsor chose to wait to pursue the project, and as of the date of this report, has not moved forward with any project.

The second multi-unit project proposed a vertical addition of a mixed-use building which would increase the size of the existing dwelling unit that was already more than 2,000sqft. The project additionally would add a second dwelling unit. The project sponsors chose to wait until the interim controls expired before pursuing other entitlements needed for the project, as originally proposed. The project's CUA for a curb cut and rear yard variance were both approved unanimously.

This project described above illustrates how including expansion of existing, multi-unit buildings in minimum density controls can capture relatively minor and supportable projects. The project in question was in an RM-4 district, where the maximum residential density is 12 units. The site contained one office unit with a residential unit above. The project sought to expand the existing dwelling unit to accommodate a new bathroom and add a new dwelling unit through a vertical addition. The existing dwelling unit was approximately 2,300sqft (*the proposed vertical addition would make the unit approximately 4,000sqft*) and the proposed new dwelling unit would be 2,054 square feet. Both the expansion of the existing unit, and the proposal for a new dwelling unit over 2,000sqft triggered the interim controls. To avoid the Conditional Use process, the project would need to maximize density, which would require adding 10 units. Since the building is also a historic resource, the alteration of the building to add 10 additional dwelling units was not only difficult, but also prohibitively expensive. This project sought to expand the unit the current owners live in to accommodate their family, while also adding density. This project would likely require a demolition to accommodate the density required by the interim controls, which would force the family living in the residence, and the business operating on the ground floor, to be displaced.

Analysis of Interim Controls:

A finding in the interim control's adoption resolution indicates that one of the primary purposes of the controls was to create disincentives "for low-density projects in zoning districts that allow for greater density." Staff has found that the projects the interim controls most sought to dissuade (expansions of existing homes) have largely decided to move forward with the Conditional Use authorization, rather than maximize density or reduce their expansion.

The reasons for pursuing this route rather than altering the project to add density appears to be three-fold. The first reason is some of the projects proposed smaller additions (less than 500sqft) with no other proposed work. The second is that some of the projects would require either a Certificate of Appropriateness or Variance to maximize density and avoid a Conditional Use hearing. These additional processes would delay the application on their own, making avoiding a Conditional Use authorization to expedite their application moot. Finally, at

least two of the projects have found that maximizing density on their lot would either be financially or physically infeasible.

The interim controls appeared to be most successful at accomplishing their goal of incentivizing density for proposed new construction projects.

The interim controls appeared to be most successful at accomplishing their goal of incentivizing density for proposed new construction projects. New construction projects are better able to accommodate denser buildings, as they can be designed from the ground up, versus having to work within the existing building's physical constraints.

The interim controls did not include criteria for the Planning Commission to consider when evaluating Conditional Use applications; therefore, the standard, subjective criteria in Planning Code Section 303 were used by staff and the Commission to evaluate these projects. Subjective criteria are problematic because they don't provide an objective means to deny an otherwise code complying project. Objective criteria also identify what types of housing in a particular zoning district we want to encourage or discourage. Further, if objective criteria are developed, a Conditional Use hearing can be avoided entirely, removing a process barrier to building housing and reducing the burden on the Planning Commission's calendar.

Objective vs Subjective Standards

The Commission's discretion to deny Conditional Use authorizations for Code-compliant development projects is limited by state law. Additionally, Conditional Use authorizations for small-scale residential projects are a significant strain on both the Department's and Commission's time and resources; and prevent the City from accomplishing the Mayor's Objective Directive to streamline housing production.

The Department seeks to encourage projects to maximize density using objective criteria, while allowing for modest expansions of existing non-compliant housing units.

The goal of the interim controls and the proposed legislation is to encourage projects to maximize density in the affected districts, and to discourage projects that seek to build large single-family homes. The Department believes this goal is better served through an objective process, rather than the Conditional Use process, which is subjective and wherein the Commission's discretion is limited. The Department seeks to encourage projects to maximize density using objective criteria, while allowing for modest expansions of existing non-compliant housing units. It is also important to create an easier path for projects that the City considers "ideal" by creating a clear and direct process for their approval.

General Plan Compliance

The Department finds that on balance, the proposed Ordinance is consistent with the General Plan; specifically Housing Element Policy No. 31. Housing Element Policy No. 31 is to: *"Facilitate small and mid-rise multi-family*

buildings that private development can deliver to serve middle-income households without deed restriction, including through adding units in lower density areas or by adding Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)." The proposed Ordinance would create density minimums across Residential districts that were designed with greater density in mind. The proposed Ordinance, *with* all recommended modifications, additionally aligns with the Housing Element's Policies 25 and 26, which focus on reducing governmental constraints to enable small and mid-rise multi-family buildings and simplifying permit processes to provide more equitable access to the application process. The Ordinance, with staff's recommended modifications, accomplishes this by adopting *objective* density minimums across Residential zoning districts that were created with greater Residential density in mind, and by removing additional subjective processes for projects that the City considers ideal.

Racial and Social Equity Analysis

The proposed Ordinance is a positive step in furthering racial and social equity across our denser Residential districts by encouraging the production of multi-unit housing over the construction of new, and expansion of, existing single-family homes. The Housing Element's overarching goal is to build "housing for all". The objective standards proposed by the Department create simpler rules that affect housing approvals, which in turn reduces the specific or institutional knowledge needed by City staff, applicants, and members of the public; thereby increasing accessibility. The new minimum density requirements facilitate the building of small and mid-rise multi-family buildings that private development can deliver to serve middle-income households without deed restriction, including through adding units in lower density areas. Furthermore, many of the RM, RC, and RTO districts are in historically exclusive areas. The proposed minimum density requirements in the Ordinance will enable more people, especially marginalized communities, to access neighborhoods that were previously inaccessible to them.

Implementation

The Department has determined that this ordinance will not have a substantial impact on our current implementation procedures.

Recommendation

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

1. Modify the Ordinance to replace the Conditional Use authorization requirement with objective, minimum density standards for new construction projects in the RM, RC, and RTO (except RTO-M) districts as follows:
 - **RM-1:** *at least* 75% of the maximum density. Max density is 1 unit per 800sqft of lot area.
 - **RM-2:** 3 units per lot or *at least* 75% density of maximum density. Max density is 1 unit per 600sqft of lot area.
 - **RM-3 & RC-3:** 3 units per lot or *at least* 75% of the maximum density. Max density is 1 unit per 400sqft of lot area.

- **RM-4:** 3 units per lot or *at least* 75% of the maximum density. Max density is 1 unit per 200sqft of lot area.
 - **RC-4:** 3 units per lot or *at least* 75% of the maximum density. Max density is 1 unit per 200sqft of lot area. No density limit in Van Ness SUD.
 - **RTO:** *at least* 75% density of maximum density. Max density is 1 unit per 600sqft of lot area.
2. For new construction projects in the subject zoning districts, require that no unit be smaller than 1/3 the size of the largest unit in the building.
 3. Replace the Ordinance’s proposed list of exceptions to minimum densities and unit sizes with a simplified, single exception to the Department’s recommended objective standard for minimum densities and on minimum unit sizes as follows: Expansions of single-family homes may expand their Gross Floor Area by no more than 25% measured over 10 years, or to result in a home more than 3,000sqft, whichever is greater.
 4. Incentivize projects in the subject zoning districts to build “ideal” projects by removing the Conditional Use authorization for demolition (Sec. 317), public-initiated Discretionary Review (DR), and only applying objective residential design standards for projects that:
 - a. Maximize allowable density (not including Accessory Dwelling Units);
 - b. Meet the 1/3-unit proportionality requirements;
 - c. Do not propose demolition of a previously identified (known) Historic Resource;
 - d. Do not propose demolition of a building subject to the Ellis Act within the previous 10 years, and;
 - e. Do not require any exceptions or waivers from Planning Code requirements (other than a CUA under Sec. 317).

Basis for Recommendation

The Department supports the goals of the proposed Ordinance to facilitate and encourage the development of multi-family housing; however, staff believes this goal is better accomplished through a set of objective standards and simplified permit processes for the projects the City considers ideal. Objective minimum densities will curtail the expansion of single-family homes in zoning districts designed to accommodate denser housing typologies and make the City’s vision of moderate-density housing in these districts clear to developers. Removing additional subjective processes like Residential Design Guidelines and CUA’s for demolition for the most ideal projects will further encourage developers to build the maximum density, while keeping units at a more affordable size.

Recommendation 1: Modify the Ordinance to replace the Conditional Use authorization requirement with objective, minimum density standards for new construction projects in the RM, RC, and RTO (except RTO-M) districts. The creation of objective minimum densities not only removes processes wherein the Commission has little discretion, but also makes the City’s goals of added density clear.

Recommendation 2: For new construction projects in the subject zoning districts, require that no unit be smaller than 1/3 the size of the largest unit in the building. Requiring unit proportionality in addition to the proposed

Ordinance's minimum unit sizes ensures that the density that is added are real, livable units, rather than small, non-functional units that will be used as accessory to a larger unit on the property.

Recommendation 3: Replace the Ordinance's proposed list of exceptions to minimum densities and unit sizes with a simplified, single exception to the Department's recommended objective standard for minimum densities and on minimum unit sizes. The Department's analysis of the projects affected by the interim controls supports allowing for modest expansions to existing units. Modest additions do not dramatically affect the affordability of housing and are often to accommodate modern amenities, expanding families, or needed updates. Tracking expansions over the course of a 10-year period will also ensure that homes are not expanded over the allowable threshold through serial permitting.

Recommendation 4: Incentivize projects in the subject zoning districts to build "ideal" projects by removing the Conditional Use authorization for demolition (Sec. 317), public-initiated Discretionary Review (DR), and only applying objective residential design standards for said projects. The City is actively working to remove governmental constraints to buildings the types of housing projects that add modest density to lower density districts, especially those that have been considered historically exclusive. Removing the additional discretionary processes will add certainty, clarity, and time and cost savings to projects, further incentivizing their development.

Required Commission Action

The proposed Ordinance is 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 Section 15060(c) and 15378 because they do not result in a direct or indirect physical change in the environment.

Public Comment

As of the date of this report, the Planning Department has not received any public comment regarding the proposed Ordinance.

BOARD of SUPERVISORS




City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184
Fax No. (415) 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

Date: May 30, 2023
To: Planning Department / Commission
From: Erica Major, Clerk of the Land Use and Transportation Committee
Subject: Board of Supervisors Legislation Referral - File No. 230596
Planning Code - Conditional Use for Residential Projects in RM, RC, and RTO Districts

- California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Determination *(California Public Resources Code, Sections 21000 et seq.)*
 - Ordinance / Resolution
 - Ballot Measure

Not defined as a project under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15378 and 15060(c)(2) because it would not result in a direct or indirect physical change in the environment.
6/7/2023 
- Amendment to the Planning Code, including the following Findings:
(Planning Code, Section 302(b): 90 days for Planning Commission review)
 - General Plan
 - Planning Code, Section 101.1
 - Planning Code, Section 302
- Amendment to the Administrative Code, involving Land Use/Planning
(Board Rule 3.23: 30 days for possible Planning Department review)
- General Plan Referral for Non-Planning Code Amendments
(Charter, Section 4.105, and Administrative Code, Section 2A.53)
(Required for legislation concerning the acquisition, vacation, sale, or change in use of City property; subdivision of land; construction, improvement, extension, widening, narrowing, removal, or relocation of public ways, transportation routes, ground, open space, buildings, or structures; plans for public housing and publicly-assisted private housing; redevelopment plans; development agreements; the annual capital expenditure plan and six-year capital improvement program; and any capital improvement project or long-term financing proposal such as general obligation or revenue bonds.)
- Historic Preservation Commission
 - Landmark *(Planning Code, Section 1004.3)*
 - Cultural Districts *(Charter, Section 4.135 & Board Rule 3.23)*
 - Mills Act Contract *(Government Code, Section 50280)*
 - Designation for Significant/Contributory Buildings *(Planning Code, Article 11)*

Please send the Planning Department/Commission recommendation/determination to Erica Major at Erica.Major@sfgov.org.



MYRNA MELGAR

DATE: December 4, 2024

TO: Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: Supervisor Myrna Melgar, Chair, Land Use and Transportation Committee

RE: Land Use and Transportation Committee
COMMITTEE REPORTS

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "mm", located to the right of the "FROM:" line.

Pursuant to Board Rule 4.20, as Chair of the Land Use and Transportation Committee, I have deemed the following matters are of an urgent nature and request them be considered by the full Board on Tuesday, December 10, 2024.

- | | |
|------------------------|---|
| File No. 241055 | Building, Planning Codes - Code Corrections and Updates |
| File No. 241103 | Planning Code - Landmark Designation - Ladies' Protection and Relief Society (3400 Laguna Street)
Sponsor: Peskin |
| File No. 241141 | Endorsement of Key Terms - EQX Jackson SQ Holdco LLC - 425 Washington Street, 439-445 Washington Street, 447 Battery Street, and 530 Sansome Street
Sponsor: Peskin |
| File No. 230596 | Planning Code - Minimum Densities for Residential Projects in RM, RC, and RTO Districts
Sponsors: Peskin; Chan |

These matters will be heard in the Land Use and Transportation Committee at a Regular Meeting on Monday, December 9, 2024.

Introduction Form

(by a Member of the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor)



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

- 1. For reference to Committee (Ordinance, Resolution, Motion or Charter Amendment)
- 2. Request for next printed agenda (For Adoption Without Committee Reference)
(Routine, non-controversial and/or commendatory matters only)
- 3. Request for Hearing on a subject matter at Committee
- 4. Request for Letter beginning with "Supervisor inquires..."
- 5. City Attorney Request
- 6. Call File No. from Committee.
- 7. Budget and Legislative Analyst Request (attached written Motion)
- 8. Substitute Legislation File No.
- 9. Reactivate File No.
- 10. Topic submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the Board on

The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following (please check all appropriate boxes):

- Small Business Commission Youth Commission Ethics Commission
- Planning Commission Building Inspection Commission Human Resources Department

General Plan Referral sent to the Planning Department (proposed legislation subject to Charter 4.105 & Admin 2A.53):

- Yes No

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

Sponsor(s):

Subject:

Long Title or text listed:

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor: