

1 [Opposing California State Senate Bill No. 50 (Wiener) - Housing Development: Incentives -
Unless Amended]

2

3 **Resolution opposing California State Senate Bill No. 50, authored by Senator Scott**
4 **Wiener, which would undermine community participation in planning for the well-being**
5 **of the environment and the public good, prevent the public from recapturing an**
6 **equitable portion of the economic benefits conferred to private interests, and**
7 **significantly restrict San Francisco’s ability to protect vulnerable communities from**
8 **displacement and gentrification, unless further amended.**

9

10 WHEREAS, The California State Legislature is currently considering passage of State
11 Senate Bill No. 50 (SB 50), which would entitle real estate developers to increase both
12 residential and mixed use development with significantly less public review and in excess of
13 many existing local plans developed often after extensive public participation and in concert
14 with our regional governing agencies and consistent with state planning mandates; and

15 WHEREAS, The City and County of San Francisco along with many other communities
16 is striving to address the social and environmental impacts of regional growth of private
17 industry which include displacement of low income seniors, working families, and communities
18 of color, and strained public transit and infrastructure; and

19 WHEREAS, SB 50 establishes an optional and only temporary exception from its
20 mandated development incentives for formulaically defined ‘Sensitive Communities’ with the
21 apparent purpose of controlling displacement while expanding growth; and

22 WHEREAS, SB 50 restricts the ability of the city to adopt long term zoning and land
23 use policies to assure equitable and affordable development in those neighborhoods; denies
24 the city the ability to adjust or expand the boundaries of those protected neighborhoods based
25 upon community testimony and additional research; and SB 50’s temporary ‘Sensitive

1 Communities' exemption fails to encompass many of the areas threatened by development
2 driven displacement and gentrification, including parts of the Mission, Chinatown, Western
3 South of Market, Portola, the Bayview, Castro, Inner Richmond and others; and

4 WHEREAS, The upzoning proposed by SB 50 confers significant value to properties
5 for increased development opportunity and yet is not tied to any increased affordability
6 requirements for San Francisco above and beyond the baseline Inclusionary standard already
7 required of development projects, which undermines sound public policy that requires any
8 substantial value created by density increases or other upzoning be used, at least in part, to
9 provide a meaningful net increase in affordable housing; and

10 WHEREAS, While SB 50's provisions standing alone may appear to preserve local
11 demolition controls and other local planning processes, without further clarifying amendments
12 the combination of SB 50's development incentives with other state laws undermine the ability
13 of local governments to protect existing housing and small businesses and otherwise advance
14 the public good; now, therefore, be it

15 RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco
16 joins with other local jurisdictions and a growing statewide coalition of housing advocates in
17 opposing SB 50 unless amended to cure these concerns; and, be it

18 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San
19 Francisco is committed to working with its State Legislative Delegation to craft the necessary
20 amendments to SB 50 in order to protect San Francisco's sovereign charter authority; and, be
21 it

22 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San
23 Francisco directs the Clerk of the Board to transmit copies of this resolution to the State
24 Legislature and the City Lobbyist upon passage.

25