

**From:** [Sonja Trauss](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff](#)  
**Subject:** File # 201370; Interim Zoning Controls - Large Residential Projects in RC, RM and RTO Districts  
**Date:** Monday, January 11, 2021 10:25:26 AM  
**Attachments:** [Yimby Law Comment Interim Zoning Controls - Large Residential Projects in RC, RM and RTO Districts.pdf](#)

---

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

YIMBY Law  
1260 Mission Street  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
[Hello@yimbylaw.org](mailto:Hello@yimbylaw.org)

1/11/2021

San Francisco Board of Supervisors Land Use and Transportation Committee  
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

[Erica.Major@sfgov.org](mailto:Erica.Major@sfgov.org); [Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org](mailto:Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org); [prestonstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:prestonstaff@sfgov.org); [melgarstaff@sfgov.org](mailto:melgarstaff@sfgov.org);  
Via Email

Re: File # 201370; Interim Zoning Controls - Large Residential Projects in RC, RM and RTO Districts

Dear members of the Land Use Committee,

Vote no on the above captioned resolution. Allow this proposed zoning change to go through the ordinary process for zoning changes so that its effects and shortcomings can be accurately assessed.

### **Bad Process**

The City of San Francisco has an extensive process for making zoning changes, regarding this proposed policy change, the city should avail itself of that process and not institute a change without public hearings and feedback. If this policy proposal is a good idea, it, or a version of it, will be passed after the requisite public process. If upon further study it's a bad idea, you don't want to have had it in effect for any amount of time.

There is no way for this committee to have sufficient information, on this compressed timeline and without any of the normal public process, or even a staff report from Planning, to be able to make a decision on this proposed legislation. Vote no on the emergency legislation, and allow it to go through the ordinary process.

### **Redundant, state (and local) laws already achieve the the tenant protecting goals**

The most generous reading of the purpose of this legislation is that it is meant to protect rent controlled housing, or even non-rent controlled apartments, that are in small apartment buildings, from project sponsors who intend to merge the apartments into one big single family house.

To accomplish that end, this legislation is not necessary. In addition to the local legislation already requiring a CU hearing when demolishing (including merging) rent controlled apartments, there is an even stronger state law preventing almost all of these mergers. It covers both rent controlled and market rate apartments. This is Government

**From:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#)  
**Cc:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Hearing on upzoning communities of concern  
**Date:** Friday, January 8, 2021 1:29:38 PM

---

**From:** Hunter Oatman-Stanford <hoatmanstanford@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Friday, January 8, 2021 12:28 PM

**To:** Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; PrestonStaff (BOS) <prestonstaff@sfgov.org>; Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; Mahogany, Honey (BOS) <honey.mahogany@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (CPC) <myrna.melgar@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Stefani, Catherine (BOS) <catherine.stefani@sfgov.org>

**Subject:** Hearing on upzoning communities of concern

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

Supervisor Haney & Others:

As a longtime resident of D6, I'm shocked to hear that the Supervisors on the Land Use and Transportation Committee are attempting to increase/maximize growth in many of San Francisco's communities of concern in response to our state required zoning for housing growth (RHNA) while allowing our wealthiest and least dense western neighborhoods to remain unchanged. The notice of this emergency bill is found here:

[https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/lut011121\\_201370\\_Notice.pdf](https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/lut011121_201370_Notice.pdf)

Instead of focusing on equity by expanding/fast-tracking housing production in the neighborhoods south and west of the Mission, which have long maintained exclusionary neighborhoods of single-family homes as a way to prevent people of color and lower-income residents from moving there, city leaders now want to push more growth into the few neighborhoods, like most of D6, that have already built the vast majority of new housing over the last 3 decades. While the Sunset would remain virtually unchanged, this policy would target growth in the Tenderloin, Fillmore, Japantown, Mission, etc.

This is offensive and goes against every stated city policy on housing equity, and practically begs for the state to take more decisive action in removing control from local politics. Please DO NOT allow such a farce to continue—San Francisco deserves to see housing growth spread equitably among every neighborhood in the city, with particular protections for communities of concern and expanded growth in wealthy, job-rich neighborhoods that have built little to no new housing. I have no issue with fast-tracking housing development, particularly when it is providing affordable units of funds for future affordable housing; however, this bill seems to pretend it is promoting affordable-housing growth, while directing the zoning changes at neighborhoods facing wide scale displacement and does nothing to promote growth in the two-thirds of SF that currently ban

apartments.

Please let me know how you plan to fix this.

best,

Hunter Oatman-Stanford

855 Folsom Street, #502