2014 HOUSING ELEMENT

SAN FRANCISCO GENERAL PLAN

PART I: DATA AND NEEDS ANALYSIS

APRIL 2015 | ADOPTED APRIL 27, 2015

Cover photo courtesy of Flickr
http://www.flickr.com/photos/bookrep/2776433902

Contents

Tables, Figures, & Maps

Introduction: Data and Needs Analysis

San Francisco remains a highly desirable place to live and its housing market has a seemingly infinite demand. Housing costs in San Francisco, for both renters and owners, are second only to those of New York City. The continuing high cost of housing in San Francisco amplifies the need for providing affordable housing to all household income levels, especially low and very low income levels. The provision of adequate affordable housing remains a significant challenge for San Francisco.

This first part of the *Housing Element* contains a description and analysis of San Francisco's population and employment trends; existing housing characteristics; overall housing need, including special needs groups; and capacity for new housing based on land supply and site opportunities in compliance with Section 65583(a) of the state Housing Element law. Information is presented on trends since the *2009 Housing Element* was published and on expected development for the next five to 10 years, at which time the *Housing Element* will be updated again. An evaluation of the *2009 Housing Element* is included in this document as an appendix.

Primary data sources include the Census Bureau and California State Department of Finance for existing conditions, projections published by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), and independent analysis by the Planning Department.[1] The data used are the most reliable available for assessing existing conditions. These standard sources provide a basis for consistent comparison with older data and form the basis for the best possible forecasts. The data provide a general picture of economic trends and therefore do not necessarily reflect particular trends or cycles in the housing market and the wider economy.

1 San Francisco relies on information provided by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). ABAG projections are the official projections of growth for the Bay Area and are used by numerous local governing agencies to identify potential needs and problems, both locally and regionally. The California State Housing and Community Development Department also uses these figures for determining housing needs for the state. ABAG projects the number of jobs for each county in the Bay Area 20 to 25 years into the future. The assumptions that ABAG used in Projections 2013 are based on demographic and economic data. The demographic assumptions take into account fertility, births, deaths, migration, household sizes, and labor force participation rates. Economic assumptions include exports, the rate of GDP growth, energy prices, productivity, and interest rates.

I. Population, Employment and Income Trends

San Francisco continues to grow and has surpassed its population peak of the 1950s; by 2012, some 808,000 people called San Francisco home. A slight shift in the city's racial composition was noted in the U.S. Census Bureau's 2012 American Community Survey (ACS) estimate but San Francisco continues to be a culturally and racially diverse place. San Francisco households are generally better off and median incomes are rising; the 2012 ACS estimated San Francisco's median income at about $73,802. San Francisco is also growing older. The median age of San Francisco residents has been rising since 2000, especially as the baby boom generation ages. In 2012, the estimated median age was 38.5 years. Families with children constitute a small portion of San Francisco households. Under 12% of the city's total population is 14 years old and younger, giving San Francisco the distinction of having the fewest children per capita of all major U.S. cities.

A. POPULATION AND DEMOGRAPHICS

1. Population Change

San Francisco has seen an increase in population and jobs in recent years. The 2010 Census counted over 805,235 San Franciscans while the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) estimated some 568,720 jobs in the city.

The 2012 American Community Survey estimated San Francisco's population to be about 807,755. ABAG projects continued population growth to 981,800 by 2030 or an overall increase of about 174,045 people who will need to be housed over the next 18 years (Table I-1 and Figure I-1). Household growth, an approximation of the demand for housing, indicates a need for some 72,530 new units in the 18 years to 2030 just to accommodate projected population and household growth (Table I-1).

Table I-1
Population Trends and ABAG Projections, San Francisco, 2000–2040

	2000	2010	2020*	2030*	2040*
Total Population	776,733	805,235	890,400	981,800	1,085,700
Population Change	52,774	28,502	85,165	91,400	103,900
% Population Change	7.3%	3.7%	10.6%	10.3%	10.6%
Household Population	756,976	780,971	863,800	952,500	1,051,100
% HH Population Change	8.2%	3.2%	10.6%	10.3%	10.4%
Households	329,700	345,811	379,600	413,370	447,350
Households Change	24,116	16,111	33,789	33,770	33,980
% Households Change	7.9%	4.9%	9.8%	8.9%	8.2%

SOURCES: Census Bureau, ABAG, *Projections 2013*



Figure I-1
Population Trends and ABAG Projections, San Francisco, 1980–2040

SOURCES: Census Bureau, ABAG *Projections 2013*

2. Age

San Francisco's population, in line with national trends, is getting older as the baby boom generation ages. San Francisco also has the distinction of having the fewest number of children per capita of all major American cities. Table I-2 and Figure 1-2 show recent population trends and projections by age group. The median age for San Francisco was estimated to be 38.5 years old in 2012, an increase from 37.6 in 2010. ABAG's *Projections 2013* calculated the median age to increase steadily, reaching 40.9 years in 2030.

In 2010, San Franciscans 14 years and younger constituted about only 11% of the city's population, slightly decreasing from 2000. The number of young San Franciscans, however, is expected to increase by 56% to 140,600 in 2020 and make up 15.8% of the total population. Their numbers will taper off the following decades and eventually return to a smaller proportion of the population by 2040.

From 2000 to 2010, the 45-59 age group grew approximately 15%, the highest growth rate of any group in the population for that period. San Franciscans 45 years and older are also forecast to increase, making up 22.8% of the population by 2020 and 18.1% by 2040. The city's older residents – those 60 years and older – will grow the most over the coming years, accounting for 33.2% of the total population by 2040.

Table I-2
Population Trends and Projections by Age Groups, San Francisco, 2000–2040

Age Group	2000	2010	2020*	2030*	2040*
0 to 14	94,010	89,964	140,600	129,400	132,600
15 to 24	89,388	95,224	67,400	102,700	103,300
25 to 44	314,222	301,802	274,000	223,900	292,100
45 to 59	142,744	163,515	203,400	249,500	196,900
60 +	136,369	154,730	205,000	276,300	360,800
Total	776,733	805,235	890,400	981,800	1,085,700
Median Age	36.7	37.6	39.2	40.9	46.3

SOURCES: Census Bureau; ABAG, *Projections 2013*



Figure I-2
Population Trends and Projections by Age Groups, San Francisco, 2000–2040

SOURCES: Census Bureau; ABAG, *Projections 2013*

3. Ethnic Composition

San Francisco's population is ethnically diverse (Table 1-3 and Figure I-3) despite a slight shift since the 2010 Census. Since 2010, the percentage of San Franciscans claiming white racial affiliation increased, totaling nearly 51% of the city's population according to the 2012 American Community Survey (ACS). San Francisco's African-American population continues to decline, dropping from 6.1% in 2010 to 6% in 2012. San Franciscans of Chinese origin declined from 21.4% of the total population in 2010 to 21.2% by 2012. The proportion of San Franciscans identifying with Hispanic origins (of any race) has increased from 14.1% in 2010 to 15.1% in 2012. Household size and household incomes by ethnicity point to varied housing needs and abilities to pay for housing and will be discussed in later sections of this report.

Table I-3
Population Trends by Ethnicity, San Francisco, 1990–2012

Race	1990	2000	2010	2012
White	53.6%	49.7%	48.5%	50.7%
Black	10.9%	7.8%	6.1%	6.0%
American Indian	0.5%	0.4%	0.5%	0.5%
Japanese	1.6%	1.5%	1.3%	1.4%
Chinese	18.1%	19.6%	21.4%	21.2%
Filipino	5.7%	5.2%	4.5%	4.6%
Other Non-White	9.7%	15.8%	17.8%	15.7%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Hispanic Origin	13.3%	14.1%	14.1%	15.1%

SOURCE: Census Bureau

Figure I-3
Ethnic Composition, San Francisco, 2012



SOURCE: Census Bureau

As in most urban centers, there are concentrations of major ethnic groups in San Francisco neighborhoods. Many Latino households live in the Mission District, extending along Mission Street south to the Daly City border. A distinct Filipino community follows a similar residential pattern, with additional concentrations in the Excelsior area and, to a smaller degree, South of Market. Concentrations of several East Asian populations reside in the Richmond and Sunset Districts, in addition to a traditional presence in Chinatown. Residential concentrations of African Americans occur in the Western Addition, South Bayshore, and Ingleside Districts. Southeast Asian communities have a strong presence in the Tenderloin District north of Market Street and in neighborhoods throughout the Bayview and Visitacion Valley areas.

4. Household Characteristics

According to the 2010 Census, the number of San Francisco households grew from 329,700 in 2000 to 345,811, an increase of over 16,111 new households or about 5% growth (Table I-4). ABAG's *Projections 2013* estimates that the number of total households will continue to increase, growing to 379,600 by 2020 and to 413,370 by 2040 or an annual average of about 1,700 new San Francisco households over 20 years.

Table I-4
Household Growth Trends and Projections, San Francisco, 2000–2040

	2000	2010	2020 *	2030 *	2040 *
Number of Households	329,700	345,811	379,600	413,370	447,350
Growth	24,116	16,111	33,789	33,770	33,980
Average Annual Growth	2,412	1,611	3,379	3,377	3,398
Percent Change	7.9%	4.9%	9.8%	8.9%	8.2%
Average Household Size	2.30	2.26	2.28	2.30	2.35
Average Household Size (Bay Area)	2.69	2.69	2.69	2.71	2.75

SOURCES: Census Bureau; * ABAG, *Projections 2013*

As shown in Table I-4, the average household size in San Francisco has been relatively constant, hovering at 2.3 persons and tending to be smaller than the Bay Area average. ABAG also projects that the number of persons per Bay Area household will be increasing in the next 20 years.

San Francisco continues to have a comparatively small number of family households and this proportion is holding steady. According to the 2010 Census, family households comprised just 43.7% of all households in San Francisco (Table I-5), compared to over 44% in 2000. This decline does not necessarily indicate that families are leaving, as there were over 5,800 more family households in 2010; rather it indicates that non-family households are increasing at a much more rapid rate. The Census Bureau's definition of a family household – counting only those households with people related to the householder by birth, marriage, or adoption - also obscures the actual diversity of San Francisco's families and households. At the time of the American Community Survey in 2012, the estimated proportion of Census-defined family households in San Francisco remained steady about 45%. This is considerably less than the percentage for the entire Bay Area, where around 65% of all households are family households. Average family households are also likely to be larger than non-family households. The 2012 American Community Survey estimates these numbers to be 3.2 persons and 2.31 persons, respectively.

Table I-5
Family and Non-Family Households, San Francisco, 2000 and 2010

Household Characteristic	2000	2010
All Households	329,700	345,811
Family Households	145,186	151,029
As Percent of All Households	44.0%	43.7%
Bay Area Family Households as Percentage of All Households	64.7%	64.8%

SOURCES: Census Bureau; ABAG

In 2010, about 70% of all households in the city were comprised of one or two people and household sizes are expected to remain proportionally about the same as the previous decades (Table I-6). The recent ACS estimate shows that the proportion of one- and two-person households has grown slightly. In 2012, they both increased by a little less than 1%, compared to all other household types that either increased insignificantly or decreased slightly. The expected growth in households and the composition of these new households present specific housing needs.

Table I-6
Changes in Household Size, San Francisco, 2000–2010

Household Size	1990		2000		2010	
	No.	% of Total	No.	% of Total	No.	% of Total
1	123,915	41.4%	127,380	38.6%	133,366	38.6%
2	90,681	30.3%	101,781	30.9%	108,606	31.4%
3	36,554	12.2%	41,831	12.7%	45,939	13.3%
4	23,321	7.8%	28,563	8.7%	30,760	8.9%
5	12,335	4.1%	14,293	4.3%	12,849	3.7%
6+	12,150	4.1%	16,002	4.9%	14,291	4.1%
TOTAL	298,956	100.0%	329,850	100.0%	345,811	100.0%

SOURCE: Census Bureau

Average household size varies by ethnicity. Table I-7 below shows that households falling under the "Other Race" and the "Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander" categories tend to be larger, averaging 3.38 and 3.33 people per household, respectively. Hispanic or Latino households are similarly larger than the citywide average, with 2.94 people per household. There are, on average, 2.75 people in an Asian household, while the Black household average size is generally close to the citywide average. White households are smallest in size, averaging less than two persons per household.

Table I-7
Household Size by Ethnicity, San Francisco, 2010

Household	Average Household Size	No. of Households
White	1.95	199,332
Black	2.05	21,469
American Indian/Alaska Native	2.42	1,469
Asian	2.75	95,378
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	3.33	916
Other Race	3.38	14,930
Two or More Race	2.30	12,317
Hispanic / Latino	2.94	38,332
All Households	2.26	345,811

SOURCE: Census Bureau

Household size in San Francisco tends to reflect existing neighborhood housing stock (see Maps I-1 and I-2). Larger households of four or more persons are generally found in the south-eastern neighborhoods of the Mission, Bayview, Visitacion Valley, and the Excelsior where typical housing units have two or more bedrooms. Somewhat smaller households however are found in the western neighborhoods. The central and northeastern portions of the city generally have the smallest households—two or less than two persons—with the residential population tapering off near the commercial and industrial areas of the Financial District and South of Market.



Average Household Size by Census Tract
San Francisco, 2010

0 Miles 1

MAP 01

1.50 or less
1.51 - 2.00
2.01 - 2.50
2.51 - 3.00
Over 3.01

SOURCE: Census Bureau



Median Room Count by Census Tract
San Francisco, 2008-2012

0 Miles 1

MAP 02

- 2.50 or less
- 2.51 - 3.00
- 3.01 - 4.00
- 4.01 - 5.00
- Over 5.01

SOURCE: Census Bureau

B. EMPLOYMENT

1. Jobs

Employment growth in San Francisco and the region directly affects the demand for housing as new jobs attract new residents. As shown in Table I-8, total employment in San Francisco is recovering from the economic crisis of the late 2000s. The crash of dot-com ventures and the 2008 great recession show a net job loss in the years between 2000 and 2010 of approximately 65,700 (see Table I-8). ABAG forecasts a recovery in San Francisco, with employment steadily increasing to 759,000 by 2040. During the 2020 to 2030 period, the ABAG model shows 36,440 new jobs (5.4% increase) in San Francisco; from 2030-2040, 51,830 additional jobs are projected—a 7.3% gain.

Table I-8
San Francisco Employment Trends and Projections, 2000–2040

Year	Total No. of Jobs	Growth (Loss)	% Change
2000	634,430	55,250	9.5%
2010	568,720	(65,710)	-10.4%
2020 *	671,230	102,510	18.0%
2030 *	707,670	36,440	5.4%
2040 *	759,500	51,830	7.3%

SOURCES: Census Bureau; * ABAG, *Projections 2013*

From 2020 through 2040, the entire nine-county Bay Area is expected to add almost 518,080 jobs. Of that total, about 88,270 will be created in San Francisco and the city's share of regional employment will remain at about 17% (Table I-9). Maintaining this job share ensures San Francisco's continuing role as an employment hub, making full use of existing infrastructure. Future targeted infrastructure enhancements to core job centers such as San Francisco will support overall reduction in greenhouse gas emissions in the region.

Table I-9
San Francisco and Bay Area Regional Employment Projections, 2000–2040

Year	San Francisco	Bay Area Total	San Francisco as % of Bay Area
2000	634,430	3,753,460	16.9%
2010	568,720	3,385,300	16.8%
2020 *	671,230	3,987,150	16.8%
2030 *	707,670	4,196,580	15.9%
2040 *	759,500	4,505,230	16.9%

SOURCE: ABAG, *Projections 2013*

Job growth in the next 20 years is expected to be strongest in the "Professional and Managerial Services" industry (53,830 new jobs), followed by the "Health and Educational Services" category (23,800), and the "Arts, Recreation, and Other Services" segment (25,460) (see Table I-10). In terms of percentage growth for the 2020-2040 period, "Health and Educational Services" (25.7%) and "Professional and Managerial Services" (25%) industries lead the way. Almost all sectors of the local economy will have experienced net employment gains between the decennial censuses. Only the "Transportation and Utilities" (2,050 less jobs) sector will see job loss. By 2020, "Professional and Managerial Services" will have experienced the largest gain – some 35,840 or 25% of this sector's jobs. "Arts, Recreation, and Other Services" employment will have gained some 18,270 jobs during that time—a gain of 19%.

Table I-10
Employment Trends and Projections by Industry, San Francisco, 2010–2040

Industry	2010	2020*	2030*	2040*	2010 - 2040	
					Change	% Change
Agriculture & Natural Resources	420	440	400	350	(70)	-16.7%
Construction	14,860	22,030	23,530	25,620	10,760	72.4%
Manufacturing & Wholesale	21,960	23,230	20,980	19,210	(2,750)	-12.5%
Retail	44,970	49,030	49,470	50,700	5,730	12.7%
Transportation & Utilities	12,030	9,980	9,680	9,150	(2,880)	-23.9%
Information	20,800	26,520	27,020	28,060	7,260	34.9%
Financial & Leasing (F I R E)	54,660	70,310	71,160	73,590	18,930	34.6%
Professional & Managerial Services	129,800	165,640	183,630	207,060	77,260	59.5%
Health & Educational Services	64,660	79,590	88,460	100,020	35,360	54.7%
Arts, Recreation & Other Services	106,390	124,660	131,850	141,650	35,260	33.1%
Government	98,170	99,800	101,490	104,090	5,920	6.0%
TOTAL	568,720	671,230	748,100	759,500	190,780	33.5%

SOURCE: ABAG, *Projections 2013*

2. Employed Residents and Commuters

The number of employed residents in San Francisco is project to increase (Table I-11) A total of 480,800 employed residents is projected by 2015 and ABAG's *Projections 2013* also indicate that this trend will continue over the 20 years with the addition of over 83,600 employed residents between 2020 and 2040.

Table I-11
Employed Residents Trends and Projections, San Francisco, 2010–2040

Year	Employed Residents	No. of Change	% Change
2010	461,300	73,200	18.9%
2015	480,800	19,500	4.2%
2020	501,600	20,800	4.3%
2025	516,600	35,200	7.7%
2030	541,400	27,200	5.5%
2035	564,000	62,400	12.4%
2040	585,200	21,200	3.8%

SOURCE: ABAG, *Projections 2013*

The number of workers per household is also projected to increase between 2010 and 2015, from 1.22 to 1.27 (Table I-12). This number is expected to remain fairly constant until 2040 when it will increase to 1.28 workers per household. The Bay Area region will follow a similar trend with a slightly higher number of workers per household.

Table I-12
Workers per Household Trends and Projections, San Francisco and Bay Area, 2010–2040

Area	2010	2015*	2020*	2025*	2030*	2035*	2040*
San Francisco	1.22	1.27	1.32	1.30	1.28	1.28	1.28
Bay Area Region	1.25	1.30	1.36	1.34	1.32	1.32	1.31

SOURCE: Planning Department based on *ABAG Projections 2013*

As of 2010, commuters into San Francisco held 27.3% of the jobs in the city (Table I-13). According to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's *Plan Bay Area,* which includes the region's *Sustainable Communities Strategy* and *2040 Regional Transportation Plan*, over half of these workers commute into the city via the Bay Bridge corridor. By 2020, it is estimated that commuters will take up 43% of jobs in San Francisco.

As a regional job center, San Francisco will continue to have a larger share of commuters than other cities in the Bay Area. The regional transportation goal in the next ten years is to reduce commuting with a smaller share of new jobs created in San Francisco being taken by non-San Francisco residents. Table 1-13, however, is not a job forecast nor does it show distribution of jobs throughout the area. Rather, it assumes that more of the future jobs in San Francisco are expected to be taken by San Francisco residents than has occurred in the past.

Table I-13
Workers Commuting into San Francisco, 2010–2040

Category	2010	2020*	2030*	2040*
Commuters	162,455	283,622	281,580	314,862
San Francisco Residents	433,674	378,678	414,910	436,968
TOTAL JOBS	596,129	662,300	696,490	751,830
% of Commuters	27.3%	42.8%	40.4%	41.9%
Increase	8,829	66,171	34,190	55,340
Change in Commuters	-6,292	121,167	-2,042	33,282
Regional Goal of Percent Change of Commuters	-71.3%	183.1%	-6.0%	60.1%

SOURCE: Metropolitan Transportation Commission
(Note: Travel simulation results generated for the Plan Bay Area, SCS and Regional Transportation Plan)

C. INCOMES

1. Median Incomes

The 2010 Census noted San Francisco's median household income at $71,304. This represents an increase of about 29% in the 10 years between Census counts (Table I-14). Table I-14 also shows that median and mean family incomes tend to be higher than that of non-family households. The 2012 American Community Survey (ACS) estimates the median household income at just under $73,802 or about a 3.5% increase in the last twelve years. Table I-15, however, shows these same incomes adjusted for inflation, where median household and median family household incomes have decreased slightly, and median non-family household incomes have decreased by almost 29%.

Table I-14
Household and Family Income, San Francisco, 2000–2012

	2000	2010	2012 ACS
Median Household Income	$55,221	$71,304	$73,802
Mean Household Income		$102,267	$107,520
Median Family Household Income	$63,545	$85,778	$88,565
Mean Family Household Income		$122,087	$128,144
Median Non-Family Household Income	$46,457	$58,139	$60,285
Mean Non-Family Household Income		$83,647	$87,991

SOURCE: Census Bureau

Table I-15
Household and Family Income in Constant Dollars, San Francisco, 2000–2012

Income Category	2000 (2010 Dollars)	2010 (2010 Income)	2012 (2010 Dollars)
Median Household Income	$69,926	$71,304	$70,093
Median Family Income	$80,467	$85,778	$84,114
Median Non-Family Household Income	$58,828	$58,139	$41,242
Per Capita Income	$45,229	$45,478	$44,898

SOURCE: Census Bureau

Table I-16 below shows household incomes by household type, tenure and ethnicity. In addition to the difference between median family income and median non-family income, disparities exist between home-owning households and renters, and amongst ethnic groups. This array of income, as well as household type, affects housing demand and affordability. For example, the median household income is not enough to afford the average 2012 rent for a two-bedroom apartment at $1,799 a month. And while the median family income is somewhat higher than that of a non-family household, it is spread among more people in the household and would have to pay for larger housing to accommodate the larger average family household size. There is thus a need for larger units affordable to families and large households in San Francisco and an ongoing need for affordable housing for the population in general.

Table I-16
Household Income by Household Type, Tenure and Ethnicity, San Francisco, 2010

Characteristic	Median Income	% of San Francisco Median Household Income ($71,304)
HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Family Household	$85,778	120.3%
Non-Family Household	$58,139	81.5%
TENURE		
Owner Occupied Households Median Income	$106,870	149.9%
Renter Occupied Households Median Income	$53,716	75.3%
ETHNICITY		
White	$83,796	117.5%
African American	$30,840	43.3%
American Indian/Alaska Native	$51,087	71.6%
Asian	$60,648	85.1%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	$57,560	80.7%
Other Race	$52,599	73.8%
Two or More Race	$66,473	93.2%
Hispanic or Latino	$55,985	78.5%

* *People who identify themselves as Hispanic or Latino may also identify themselves as a particular race..*
SOURCE: Census Bureau

2. Employed Residents, Household Workers and Income

Generally, the overall number of employed persons in a city is probably not correlated with income. Rather, income levels relate more directly to general economic characteristics of an area, fluctuations in wages earned, inflation, and most directly, job mix. However, data suggest that some family incomes may rise as a result of increased employment. It is reasonable to expect that as employment increases, families would benefit from increased employment, thus increasing family income. This is evidenced in the higher median family income presented in Table I-15 above. Between 2000 and 2010, the number of families with no workers increased from 12.8% to 13.2% (Table I-17). Additionally, this table shows that the number of families with two or more workers decreased by about 2%, implying that those families earned less. However, one cannot be sure because, for instance, a family may have lost two jobs and replaced it with one higher-paying position.

Table I-17
Number of Workers in Family, San Francisco, 2000 and 2010

Workers	2000	2010
0	18,798	19,843
1	38,729	42,543
2+	89,659	87,792

SOURCE: Census Bureau

3. Income Disparities

Income disparity is even more significant when households' median incomes are compared by ethnicity. Table I-18 shows that across all types of households and per capita measures, white households have significantly higher earnings than other ethnicities. Only White households earn more than the 2010 Census citywide averages. African American households' median income of $30,840 is 43% of the city's median income, while White households' median income is $83,796 or 118% of the city's median income. "Two or More Race" households have a median income that is 93% of the city's overall median income, followed by Asian and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander households whose median incomes are about 85% and 81% of San Francisco's median income respectively. Median income of Hispanic or Latino households was pegged at $55,985 or about 79% of the citywide median.

Table I-18
Incomes by Ethnicity and Household Type, San Francisco, 2010

Ethnicity	Median Household Income	Median Family Income	Median Non-Family Income	Average Family Size	Per Capita Income
White	$83,796	$113,462	$68,652	2.74	$60,269
African American	$30,840	$42,108	$23,793	3.01	$25,325
American Indian / Alaska Native	$51,087	$59,350	$26,578	3.34	$28,325
Asian	$60,648	$70,360	$42,012	3.44	$31,449
Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	$57,560	$55,069	$58,452	4.37	$20,031
Other Race	$52,599	$53,750	$41,084	3.87	$23,554
Two or More Races	$66,473	$82,723	$54,292	3.14	$29,956
Hispanic or Latino	$55,985	$56,370	$49,457	3.6	$26,042
Citywide	$71,304	$85,778	$58,139	3.11	$45,478

SOURCE: Census Bureau

As noted earlier, ethnic households tend to be larger than the city's overall average household size (Table I-7). Thus a look at per capita income provides a starker reality of income disparity. The 2010 Census shows that per capita income of San Franciscan of Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander heritage is equivalent to only 44% of the city's overall, but for White San Franciscans, it is 133%. And while Asian households earn on average about 85% of the city's median income, per capita income of San Franciscans of Asian decent is $31,449 or 69%.

4. Employment Trends and Income

The housing needs of San Francisco are based on providing housing to support the city's workforce, which includes both San Francisco residents and commuters. While San Francisco serves as a regional center for employment, a substantial portion of its workforce lives within the city boundaries. San Francisco's share of the regional housing needs assessment reflect the continuing need to provide housing for its workforce. The average income for the San Francisco workforce demonstrates the lack of housing affordable to many San Francisco workers, both residents and commuters. Table I-19 below shows the average wage by sector and total jobs in each sector. The office sector was by far the largest employer with 231,908 jobs. The retail and industrial sectors had 106,305 and 75,637 jobs respectively. The cultural/institutional sector also had a large number of jobs with 132,851 employees as of 2012. With an average rent of $1,799 a month for a two-bedroom apartment in 2012, a household must have an annual income of at least $74,150 to afford such a unit.

Table I-19
Average Annual Wage and Employment by Sector, San Francisco, 2012

Industry	Average Annual Wages 2012	Average Employment 2012
TOTAL PRIVATE INDUSTRY	$83,876	491,107
Goods Producing	$80,340	24,140
Natural Resources and Mining	$66,404	186
Construction	$79,820	14,711
Manufacturing	$81,380	9,243
Service Producing	$84,084	466,967
Trade, Transportation and Utilities	$60,476	65,656
Information	$123,968	23,540
Financial Activities	$170,404	51,403
Professional and Business Services	$115,284	139,244
Education and Health Services	$56,472	60,082
Leisure and Hospitality	$33,748	83,473
Other Services	$29,536	41,833
TOTAL GOVERNMENT	$76,648	41,987

SOURCE: California Employment Development Division

Because each sector in Table I-19 contains a variety of occupations, it is useful to call out the fastest growing categories of jobs in San Francisco, as shown in Table I-20. Of these, only three job classifications – Lawyers, General and Operations Managers, and Computer Software Engineers and Developers, Registered Nurses, Management and Market Research Analysts, Marketing Specialists and Accountants and Auditors – have estimated annual wages around or above the $74,150 required to afford asking rents of an average two-bedroom apartment in San Francisco.

Occupational Title	Job Openings 2010–2020	Mean Hourly Wage, 2012	Estimated Annual Wage* 2012
Waiters and Waitresses	14,840	$10.58	$22,006
Cashiers	13,470	$11.87	$24,690
Retail Salespersons	13,120	$11.58	$24,086
Personal Care Aides	8,170	$12.11	$25,189
Janitors and Cleaners, Except Maids and Housekeeping Cleaners	7,090	$12.64	$26,291
Combined Food Preparation and Serving Workers, Including Fast Food	6,860	$10.83	$22,526
Counter Attendants, Cafeteria, Food Concession, and Coffee Shop	6,340	$10.42	$21,674
Market Research Analysts and Marketing Specialists	6,240	$39.36	$81,869
Software Developers, Applications	6,140	$52.64	$109,491
Accountants and Auditors	6,070	$37.67	$78,362
Registered Nurses	5,990	$54.23	$112,798
Customer Service Representatives	5,510	$20.15	$41,912
Office Clerks, General	5,470	$17.67	$36,754
Software Developers, Systems Software	5,130	$56.28	$117,062
General and Operations Managers	4,980	$65.00	$135,200
Food Preparation Workers	4,950	$10.64	$22,131
Management Analysts	4,410	$46.24	$96,179
Dishwashers	4,390	$10.44	$21,715
First-Line Supervisors of Office and Administrative Support Workers	4,370	$30.01	$62,421
Cooks, Restaurant	4,230	$13.67	$28,434
Laborers and Freight, Stock, and Material Movers, Hand	4,120	$13.77	$28,642
Lawyers	4,080	$79.36	$165,069
Maids and Housekeeping Cleaners	3,770	$15.65	$32,552
Executive Secretaries and Executive Administrative Assistants	3,640	$29.21	$60,757
First-Line Supervisors of Retail Sales Workers	3,600	$20.08	$41,766

Table I-20
Job Classifications with Most Job Openings 2010–2020 and Mean Hourly Wages, 2012

* Assumes 40-hour work week, 52-week year.
SOURCE: California Employment Development Department, *Occupational Employment Statistics Survey*

Much of the growth forecast to occur in the coming years will be in low- to medium-skilled jobs such as waitpersons, retail salespersons, personal care aids, janitors and cleaners, and food preparation workers, with approximate annual pay scales ranging from $22,006 to $26,291 (Table I-20). Some of this growth may be absorbed by San Francisco residents through the First Source Hiring Program. However, this is a limited program since it only applies to city contracts and commercial development that is over 25,000 square feet.[1]

1 San Francisco's First Source Hiring Program (Chapter 83 of the Administrative Code) was created to foster construction and permanent employment opportunities for qualified economically disadvantaged individuals. Participation in this program is required in City contracts and City property contracts. Between 2006 and 2011, the First Source Hiring Program has employed at least 1,310 people. These numbers represent minimums, because not all hires are recorded.

II. Housing Characteristics

This section provides background information on the physical and qualitative characteristics of San Francisco's housing stock. Totaling about 376,083 units by the end of 2013, the city's housing stock is roughly divided into low-, medium-, and higher-density structures. The city's housing stock is older than other West Coast cities, with almost 50% of the city's housing units constructed before World War II. San Francisco's housing tends to be smaller in size, with about 72% of all units containing two bedrooms or less. San Francisco, like most large cities, is a city of renters who live in 62.5% of occupied housing units in the city.

About 3,520 new housing units were added to the city's housing stock in the three years following the 2010 Census; of these, 95% were in structures with ten or more units. Since 2010, almost 35% of all new housing was constructed in the largely industrial areas of the South of Market planning district; an additional combined total of 11% were built in the residential-zoned Inner and Outer Sunset, the Richmond, and Central and South Central planning districts.

Housing affordability continues to be a major concern as San Francisco has one of the least affordable housing markets in the nation. In 2013, 36% of new housing built qualified as affordable to households making 120% or less of the area median income. Moreover, 93% of those affordable units were rentals affordable to very low- and low-income households. The housing market is heating up once more, and homeownership in San Francisco remains elusive for most residents. Only 16% of all San Francisco households could afford the $855,500 median housing price. Average asking rents stood at $3,300 in 2013.

A. EXISTING HOUSING STOCK

1. General Characteristics

Structure Type and Tenure: According to the 2010 Census, San Francisco's over 372,560 housing units consisted of roughly equal proportions of low-density single family units, two to nine unit medium density structures, and ten unit plus high-density buildings (Table I-21). This has not changed dramatically in the last 12 years. San Francisco is also city of renters: an estimated 63% of all households rent according to the latest American Community Survey estimates (2012). This latest Census survey, however, estimated that there has a decrease in the rate of homeownership, with 33% of all households owning their homes, down from 35% 12 years earlier. Table I-21 also shows that a vast majority of single-family units are owner-occupied (72%).

Table I-21
Housing Characteristics, San Francisco, 2010 and 2012

Characteristic	All Units		Occupied		Rent		Own	
	2010	2012	2010	2012	2010	2012	2010	2012
TENURE STATUS								
					65.0%	63.1%	35.0%	36.9%
STRUCTURE TYPE								
Single Family	32.1%	32.4%	32.7%	33.6%	11.7%	14.1%	71.6%	67.0%
2 - 4 Units	23.3%	21.9%	23.4%	21.7%	26.7%	24.6%	17.2%	16.8%
5 - 9 Units	11.3%	9.9%	11.3%	10.0%	15.9%	13.9%	2.8%	3.3%
10 - 19 Units	10.1%	10.2%	10.1%	10.2%	14.3%	14.7%	2.3%	2.4%
20+ Units	22.9%	25.4%	22.3%	24.3%	31.2%	32.5%	5.9%	10.3%
Other	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%
TOTAL	100.0%	100%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
UNIT SIZE								
No Bedroom	18.0%	13.8%	17.7%	12.4%	26.0%	18.8%	2.4%	1.4%
1 Bedroom	28.0%	27.1%	28.0%	27.1%	36.9%	37.1%	11.3%	9.8%
2 Bedrooms	29.8%	30.9%	29.7%	31.1%	25.0%	28.6%	38.5%	35.3%
3 Bedrooms	17.3%	19.1%	17.5%	19.7%	9.2%	10.8%	32.8%	34.8%
4 Bedroom	5.3%	6.6%	5.3%	7.0%	2.2%	3.0%	11.2%	13.8%
5 or more Bedrooms	1.7%	2.6%	1.8%	2.8%	0.7%	1.5%	3.8%	4.9%
TOTAL	100.0%	100%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
AGE OF HOUSING BY YEAR BUILT								
2010 or later		0.1%		0.1%		0.1%		0.2%
2000-2009		6.3%		6.1%		5.5%		7.1%
1980 - 1999	9.0%	9.6%	8.9%	9.6%	8.5%	9.6%	9.5%	9.5%
1960 - 1979	16.4%	15.2%	16.3%	15.3%	19.5%	18.5%	10.4%	9.9%
1940 - 1959	24.7%	20.0%	24.8%	20.5%	23.7%	18.5%	26.9%	23.9%
1939 or earlier	49.9%	48.8%	50.0%	48.3%	48.3%	47.7%	53.2%	49.4%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

SOURCE: Census Bureau

Structure Size:/Bedroom Counts Dwelling units in San Francisco are generally small in size. The 2010 Census showed that 72% of all units had two bedrooms or less. Only 9% of housing units had four or more bedrooms. These units were primarily in single-family homes and two unit residential flats. Renters, who make up two-thirds of all households in the city, tend to have smaller units. Almost of fifth (19%) of renting households live in units without a bedroom, compared to just 1.3% of home owning households.

Age of Housing Stock: Almost 50% of San Francisco's housing stock was built prior to 1940. New construction since 2010 accounts for just under 1% of the city's total housing stock. Unlike some jurisdictions where older housing stock is targeted for demolition or replacement, most of San Francisco's older housing stock is in sound condition. Indeed, the city's iconic Victorians are over 100 years old. (See page 58 for discussion on replacement of units.) Table I-21 details other differences in housing characteristics by household tenure status.

Location and Structure Type: Table I-22 in the following page shows the distribution of the city's housing inventory by planning district (see Map I-3) and by structure size. The Northeast planning district has the most housing units, followed by the Downtown, Richmond, Western Addition and South Central planning districts. The largely residential districts of Bernal Heights, South Bayshore, the industry-strewn Bayview and the Inner Sunset account for the fewest units. Single-family homes are concentrated in the residential-zoned districts of South Central, Outer Sunset, Ingleside and Bernal Heights. The Downtown planning district has the most high-density structures, followed by South of Market, Northeast and Western Addition.

Table I-22
Housing Stock by Planning District and Structure Size, San Francisco, 2013

Planning District	Single Family	2 to 4 Units	5 to 9 Units	10 + Units	District Total
1 Richmond	11,386	15,562	5,133	5,319	37,432
Percent	30%	42%	14%	14%	10.0%
2 Marina	3,467	5,638	3,817	13,238	26,175
Percent	13%	22%	15%	51%	7.0%
3 Northeast	2,081	7,643	6,154	24,619	40,561
Percent	5%	19%	15%	61%	10.8%
4 Downtown	547	728	495	28,146	30,077
Percent	2%	2%	2%	94%	8.0%
5 Western Addition	2,536	6,074	4,058	17,075	29,743
Percent	9%	20%	14%	57%	7.9%
6 Buena Vista	2,775	6,647	3,340	4,280	17,082
Percent	16%	39%	20%	25%	4.5%
7 Central	10,226	8,698	2,949	4,663	26,541
Percent	39%	33%	11%	18%	7.1%
8 Mission	6,298	7,057	3,815	7,792	24,984
Percent	25%	28%	15%	31%	6.6%
9 South of Market	2,382	2,949	1,207	16,708	23,290
Percent	10%	13%	5%	72%	6.2%
10 South Bayshore	7,614	1,580	688	1,578	11,532
Percent	66%	14%	6%	14%	3.1%
11 Bernal Heights	5,929	2,801	537	329	9,637
Percent	62%	29%	6%	3%	2.6%
12 South Central	21,593	3,000	863	1,407	26,875
Percent	80%	11%	3%	5%	7.1%
13 Ingleside	16,505	1,557	606	5,906	24,598
Percent	67%	6%	2%	24%	6.5%
14 Inner Sunset	10,451	4,535	1,555	2,414	18,959
Percent	55%	24%	8%	13%	5.0%
15 Outer Sunset	19,317	4,737	1,385	937	26,410
Percent	73%	18%	5%	4%	7.0%
CITYWIDE TOTAL	123,959	79,893	37,125	134,534	376,081
Percent	33%	21%	10%	36%	100%

SOURCE: SF Planning Department



Housing Stock by Planning District
San Francisco, 2013

0 Miles 1

MAP 03

Key:

Outer Sunset Planning District
26,410 Total Units

2. Changes to the Housing Stock, 2004–2013

Despite the economic downturn at the beginning of the new millennium, housing production in San Francisco seemed unaffected. Accounting for new production, demolitions, and alterations, the city has seen a net increase of over 19,316 housing units – an annual average of almost 1,932 units – in the last ten years. In comparison, a net total of 13,634 housing units were added between 1994 and 2003 or an annual rate of about 1,363 units per year. After the three-year spike in demolitions between 2003 and 2005, demolitions have been steady. San Francisco has a one-to-one replacement policy for demolitions and these units have since been replaced.

Table I-23
New Housing Construction, Demolitions and Alterations, San Francisco, 2004–2013

Year	Units Completed from New Construction	Units Demolished	Units Gained or Lost from Alterations	Net Change In Number of Units
2004	1,780	355	62	1,487
2005	1,872	174	157	1,855
2006	1,675	41	280	1,914
2007	2,197	81	451	2,567
2008	3,019	29	273	3,263
2009	3,366	29	117	3,454
2010	1,082	170	318	1,230
2011	348	84	5	269
2012	794	127	650	1,317
2013	2,330	429	59	1,960
TOTAL	18,463	1,519	2,372	19,316

SOURCE: SF Planning Department

a. Type and Location of New Construction, 2004–2013

Most of the new construction in the last ten years has occurred in larger structures, with 91% of the housing developed in buildings with more than ten units (Table I-24). South of Market absorbed most of the new housing development since 2010, accounting for about 1,230 new units or almost 35.3% of all new housing during that period; Downtown and the Western Addition follow with roughly 729 and 424 respectively, together accounting for about 33% of new housing (Table I-25 and Map I-4). The largely residential districts of the Outer and Inner Sunset, Bernal Heights, South Central, Marina and Richmond, combined, netted only 1.9% of the additional units to the city's housing stock.

Table I-24
Comparison of Existing Stock with New Construction by Building Type, San Francisco, 1990–2013

Building Type	Existing Stock			New Construction 2010-2013
	1990	2000	2010	
Single Family	32.0%	32.1%	33.3%	33.0%
Two Units	24.0%	10.9%	10.1%	10.0%
3 to 9 Units	11.3%	23.8%	21.3%	21.2%
10 + Units	34.3%	33.1%	35.2%	35.8%
TOTAL	100.0%	99.8%	100.0%	100.0%

SOURCES: Census Bureau; SF Planning Department

Table I-25
Net Change in the Housing Stock by Planning District, 2010–2013

Planning District	2010 Census	Net Additions April 2010–2013	Total Housing Stock, 2013	% of Net Addition
1 - Richmond	37,383	49	37,432	1.4%
2 - Marina	26,165	10	26,175	0.3%
3 - Northeast	40,462	99	40,561	2.8%
4 - Downtown	29,348	729	30,017	20.9%
5 - Western Addition	29,319	424	29,743	12.2%
6 - Buena Vista	16,950	132	17,082	3.8%
7 - Central	26,395	146	26,541	4.2%
8 - Mission	24,566	418	24,984	12.0%
9 - South of Market	22,061	1,229	23,290	35.3%
10 - South Bayshore	11,404	128	11,532	3.7%
11 - Bernal Heights	9,629	8	9,637	0.2%
12 - South Central	26,866	9	26,875	0.3%
13 - Ingleside	24,424	174	24,598	5.0%
14 - Inner Sunset	18,951	8	18,959	0.2%
15 - Outer Sunset	26,427	(17)	26,410	(0.5%)
San Francisco Totals	372,535	3,486	376,081	100.0%

SOURCE: SF Planning Department



Net Change to the Housing Stock by Planning District
San Francisco, April 2010 - December 2013

0 Miles 1

MAP 04

Less than 5% share
5% -15% share
Over 15% share

Outer Sunset Planning District
26,410, 3.7% Net Unit Change, Percent Change

b. Construction of Low and Moderate Income Housing, 2000–2013

Between 2000 and 2013, 6,370 new affordable housing units, including inclusionary affordable units, were added to San Francisco's housing stock. San Francisco, however, did not meet its fair share of the regional housing needs production targets, especially for low and moderate income housing. (See *Appendix A* for details of the city's housing production performance in the evaluation of the 2009 Housing Element.)

Since 2010, 33% of all new housing units built in the city have been affordable units. Nearly 65% of these qualified as affordable at very low-income levels and another 20% that was considered affordable for low income households (Table I-26). An affordable rental unit is defined as housing for which rent equals 30% of the income of a household earning 80% or less of the area median income (AMI).[1]

These totals represent construction of new units, including new units from alterations and conversion of commercial structures, but do not include permanently affordable units that result from the acquisition and rehabilitation of existing residential buildings by non-profit housing organizations. Of these affordable units, almost 660 units were specifically targeted for families and featured three- and four-bedroom units. Another 100 units were reserved for senior citizens and about 590 units were efficiency units or one-bedroom units to house the formerly homeless. About 115 units were for first-time homeownership. The Mayor's Office of Housing (MOH) noted that about 480 affordable units were acquired or rehabilitated since 2010. These numbers include both MOH and the Office of Community Infrastructure and Investment projects (formerly known as the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency).

Table I-26
Construction of New Affordable Housing Units, San Francisco, 2004–2013

Income Level	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Totals
Very Low	383	453	316	412	381	550	480	140	357	448	3,920
Low	2	236	17	120	81	140	21	21	52	220	910
Moderate	163	110	158	203	361	256	81	57	104	44	1,537
Total Newly Constructed Affordable Units	548	799	491	735	823	946	582	218	513	712	6,367
As % of Total New Construction	30.8%	42.7%	29.3%	33.5%	27.3%	28.1%	53.8%	62.6%	64.6%	30.6%	34.5%

SOURCE: Planning Department, Housing Inventory

1 Income and affordability guidelines are discussed on pp. 42-43.

c. Units Demolished

A total of 1,520 housing units were demolished between 2004 and 2013, or an annual average of over 150. This is higher than the number of units demolished in the nine years between 2000 and 2008 with an annual average of about 133 units. The city has a one-to-one unit replacement policy that requires units lost through demolition be replaced with the same number of units or more. As shown in Table I-27, 87% of all units demolished were in larger multi-unit structures. Single-family homes represented 13% of residential units demolished from between 2004 and 2013 (about 200 units).

Table I-27
Demolitions by Structure Type, 2004–2013

Structure Type	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	TOTAL
Units Demolished	355	174	41	81	29	29	170	84	127	429	1,519
Single Family	30	70	18	19	11	20	6	12	-	11	197
2 Unit Building	10	16	12	8	4	6	6	6	10	-	78
3-4 Unit Building	9	3	11	3	3	3	35	-	32	-	99
5+ Unit Building	306	85	-	51	11	-	123	66	85	418	1,145

d. Other Changes to the Housing Stock

In addition to changes resulting from new construction and demolition, the quantity of housing in the city can be altered by other factors including the subdivision of units, dwelling unit mergers, and building conversion (e.g. converting housing to commercial space).

a. Alterations: Since 2004, over 2,925 net units have been added to the city's housing stock by some type of alteration. The majority of alterations that produce additional housing usually result in a single new unit. Most losses through alterations result from removal of illegal units (over 210 units), although recent legislative efforts have a goal of curbing historically high trends by encouraging processes to legalize illegal units. A number of unit are also removed through unit mergers from the housing stock each year. About 210 housing units were removed in this fashion.

b. Conversions: A slowing trend in alterations is the conversion of commercial buildings to residential uses. Between 2004 and 2013, approximately 1,200 units were added through commercial to residential conversion. Moreover, the number of housing units lost by conversion to non-residential uses has decreased dramatically over the last three decades after controls that discourage conversion to commercial uses were set in place in the mid-1980s and 1990s. Approximately 25 units were lost to such conversion between 2004 to 2013, at a similar rate in the previous 10 years and far reduced from the over 165 units that were converted to non-residential uses in the decade from 1981-1990 (Table I-28). No information is available on the number of units illegally converted from residential use.

Table I-28
Housing Units Converted to Non-Residential Use, San Francisco, 1981–2013

Time Period	No. Units
1981 to 1990 *	165
1991 to 2000	42
2001 to 2010	71
2011 to 2013	4

NOTES
* SF Planning Department, *A Study of Conversion of Apartments to Non Residential Uses in Commercial and Industrial Areas*, 1981

SOURCE: SF Planning Department

3. Secondary Units

No information is available on the number of illegal secondary units that have been added to the city's housing stock. However, a total of 76 units have been legalized between 2004 and 2013 and another 226 illegal units were removed in the same period (Table I-29).

Table I-29
Legalization of Secondary Units, 2004–2013

Year	Units Legalized	Illegal Units Removed
2004	8	22
2005	16	38
2006	9	12
2007	11	10
2008	8	19
2009	10	8
2010	4	6
2011	6	39
2012	-	2
2013	4	70
TOTALS	76	226

SOURCE: SF Housing Authority

4. Federally-Assisted Units

Table I-30 describes units in San Francisco that receive support under the Federal Section 8 rent subsidy program or are managed by the San Francisco Housing Authority. In the Section 8 program, residents pay 30% of their monthly income in rent, and the government subsidizes the difference so that the property owner receives a HUD-determined fair market rent each month. Section 8 subsidies are associated either with a particular housing unit (project-based) or with a qualifying household (voucher/certificate program). Section 8 housing units and those managed by the Housing Authority total over 8,774 units, representing about 1% of the city's total housing stock.

Table I-30
Citywide Inventory of Public Assisted Housing, San Francisco, 2013

Type of Assistance	2013
	Total No. of Units
Project Based Section 8	1,300
Tenant Based Section 8	7,774
Moderate Rehabilitation	1,000
TOTALS	8,774

SOURCE: SF Housing Authority

5. Residential Hotel Stock

Residential hotel units (also called Single Room Occupancy or SROs) typically provide affordable rental housing for solo occupancy and generally rented to lower income persons. There are over 500 residential hotels in San Francisco containing about 19,380 rooms (Table I-31); most of these SRO units have shared bathroom and kitchen facilities. Since 1990, non-profit organizations have purchased residential hotels and now maintain nearly a quarter of the units with a guaranteed level of affordability and, in some cases, related supportive services to residents. Of the residential hotels operated by private entities, about 2,940 of the 13,900 rooms operate as tourist rooms and therefore do not contribute to the affordable housing stock..

Table I-31
Loss of Residential Hotel Rooms, San Francisco, 2000–2013

Year	For Profit Residential Hotels			Non-Profit Residential Hotels		Total	
	No. of Buildings	Residential Rooms	Tourist Rooms	No. of Buildings	Residential Rooms	No. of Buildings	Residential Rooms
2000	457	16,331	3,781	61	3,314	518	19,645
2005	435	15,106	3,345	71	4,217	506	19,323
2010	412	13,790	2,883	87	5,163	499	18,953
2013	414	13,903	2,942	87	5,479	501	19,382

SOURCE: SF Department of Building Inspection

With the adoption of the Residential Hotel Ordinance in 1980, and subsequent amendments to that ordinance strengthening its enforcement in 1990, conversion of residential hotel rooms has significantly decreased. Over 480 units were lost due to demolitions or fire from 2000 to 2007 (Table I-32). These units are slated to be replaced or have already been replaced by permanently affordable units.

Table I-32
Loss of Residential Hotel Rooms, San Francisco, 1980–2007

Reason for Loss	1980 - 1981	1981 - 1989	1990-1999	2000-2007
Demolitions/Fire		99	909	481
Conversions	1,188	109		
Earthquake Damage		202		
TOTAL	1,188	410	909	481

SOURCE: SF Department of Building Inspection

6. Live/Work

The Planning Department no longer tracks information on live/work units. As of 2008, over 4,570 live/work units have been completed since 1987. Most live/work development occurred in such areas where land was relatively cheaper and many industrial buildings were converted to residential lofts. As commercial development, live/work units were exempt from obligations and conditions typically required of residential development such as school fees, inclusionary affordable housing requirements and open space provisions. Displacement of viable businesses and land use conflicts also prompted the Planning Commission to adopt interim zoning con-

trols for southeastern portions of the city aimed at preserving industrially zoned lands from competing uses. These controls created Industrial Protection Zones where new housing and live/work units are not allowed, and accompanying Mixed Use Districts where housing would be encouraged. Concerned with distortions in the housing supply and with displacement of industrial space, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors also passed a six-month moratorium on the construction of new live/work units in February 2001. The temporary moratorium was intended to halt the approval of new projects while a study on the impact of live/work units on the city's housing market and industrial lands was being conducted. This moratorium was extended several times and eventually live/work loopholes were mended. Live/work units built after the moratorium were from development projects that were grandfathered in at the time of the legislation.

B. HOUSING TENURE AND AFFORDABILITY

1. Owner-Occupied Housing

The rate of homeownership estimated in 2012 (33%) has decreased since the 2000 Census (35%) and is still much lower than the national average (65.5%). Table I-33 below shows rates of home ownership by planning district. About 50% of homes owned are in the Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, South Central, and Bernal Heights planning districts. Home ownership rates are lowest in the Downtown, with only one percent of people owning their home.

San Francisco's housing prices are among the highest in the nation. And despite recent price declines, at year-end 2012, the median price for an average single family home in San Francisco exceeded $855,500 and was over 1.2 times the cost of similar housing in the Bay Area and four times the national average (Table I-34). It is estimated that only 16% of San Francisco's households can afford a median priced home in the city.

Table I-33
Rate of Homeownership, San Francisco, 2012

Planning District	Rate of Home Ownership
1 Richmond	38%
2 Marina	25%
3 Northeast	15%
4 Downtown	2%
5 Western Addition	19%
6 Buena Vista	26%
7 Central	41%
8 Mission	20%
9 South of Market	32%
10 South Bayshore	50%
11 Bernal Heights	53%
12 South Central	67%
13 Ingleside	59%
14 Inner Sunset	56%
15 Outer Sunset	59%
San Francisco Citywide	33%

SOURCE: US Census

Table I-34
Housing Affordability of Average Single Family Homes, San Francisco, 2013

Geographic Region	Median Price	% of Households Qualifying
San Francisco	$855,500	16%
SF Bay Area Region	$704,990	21%
Northern California (not including the SF Bay Area)	$721,140	21%
California	$433,940	32%
Nationwide	$207,300	56%

SOURCE: California Association of Realtors

Home sales prices in San Francisco has been steadily climbing since 2000 before peaking in 2005. With the global recession, prices dropped between 2005 and 2011 (Figure I-4). Since 2011, the price of housing in San Francisco continues to grow and based on the trend since 2000, the price of housing is projected to is to surpass the high prices seen in 2005. Compared to the Bay Area region, the housing prices trend follows a similar path as San Francisco. Still, the high cost of home ownership is still prohibitive for San Francisco's low and moderate-income households and homeownership for these households would require substantial subsidies. As stated earlier, only 16% of San Francisco households can qualify to purchase homes at these prices.

Figure I-4
Housing Price Trends, San Francisco, 2000–2013



SOURCE: California Association of Realtors, *(Figures in current dollars)

2. Rental Housing

The 2012 American Community Survey (ACS) estimated that about 63% of San Francisco households are renters; this is almost double the national average of 34.5%. San Francisco is nevertheless typical of other larger cities where renters outnumber homeowners. Average asking rents in San Francisco dropped slightly with the dot-com bust but remain high, climbing to $2,750 in 2007 and remaining constant until about 2011. After 2011, asking rents for a two-bedroom apartment skyrocketed to an average of $4,100 in 2014 (Figure I-5). To afford this level of rent in 2013, a household would need to earn about $170,000 a year.

Rental affordability continues to be a citywide problem. Traditionally, neighborhoods in the southeast portions of the city have been relatively affordable; however there is still a significant gap for low and very-low income households (Table I-35). The lowest median asking rent for a two bedroom by district ($2,525 in South Bayshore) has an affordability gap of $763 for low income households (i.e., those households with income from 51%-80% of the area median income).



SOURCE: Zillow.com, RentSF.com, Zilpy.com

Figure I-5
Average Monthly Rental Rates, San Francisco, 2000–2013

Planning District	Average Rent for a 2 Bedroom Apartment	Affordability Gap		% Over Rents Affordable by	
		Very Low Income	Low Income	Very Low Income	Low Income
1 Richmond	$3,195	$2,117	$1,433	296.38%	181.33%
2 Marina	$4,950	$3,872	$3,188	459.18%	280.93%
3 Northeast	$4,150	$3,072	$2,388	384.97%	235.53%
4 Downtown	$4,500	$3,422	$2,738	417.44%	255.39%
5 Western Addition	$3,822	$2,744	$2,060	354.55%	216.91%
6 Buena Vista	$3,972	$2,894	$2,210	368.46%	225.43%
7 Central	$3,918	$2,840	$2,156	363.40%	222.33%
8 Mission	$4,330	$3,252	$2,568	401.67%	245.74%
9 South of Market	$4,436	$3,358	$2,674	411.50%	251.76%
10 South Bayshore	$2,525	$1,447	$763	234.23%	143.30%
11 Bernal Heights	$3,650	$2,572	$1,888	338.59%	207.15%
12 South Central	$2,850	$1,772	$1,088	264.38%	161.75%
13 Ingleside	$2,793	$1,715	$1,031	259.09%	158.51%
14 Inner Sunset	$3,697	$2,619	$1,935	342.95%	209.82%
15 Outer Sunset	$2,700	$1,622	$938	250.46%	153.23%
Citywide Average	$4,100	$3,022	$2,338	380.33%	232.69%

SOURCE: Craigslist.com
Note: Average rents are average asking rents identified from listings between the period of November 2013 and March 2014

Table I-35
Rental Affordability for Lower Income Households by Planning District, San Francisco, 2014

C. VACANCY

The overall housing vacancy rate in San Francisco is indicative of an enduring tight market. In 2010, vacancy rates at 5.4% for rentals and 2.3% for homeownership inevitably led to intense bidding and rising housing costs. Just about 8% of the city's housing stock was vacant at the time of the Census in April 2010 (Table I-36). This is considered a healthy fractional rate in most housing markets in the United States. The 2012 American Community Survey shows units that are vacant and for sale stood at 1.4% and vacant units for rent at 4.3%. The unusually high total vacancy rate of 9.3% in 2012 may suggest an increase in time-shares and corporate homes used for employee housing. However, sampling error could also be a factor.

Table I-36
Vacancy Rates by Vacancy Status, 2000–2013

Vacancy Status	1990	2000	2010	2012
Vacant	6.97%	4.86%	8.3%	9.3%
For Rent Vacant	3.71%	2.50%	5.4%	4.3%
For Sale Vacant	0.56%	0.80%	2.3%	1.4%

SOURCE: Census Bureau

The vacancy data included in Table I-37 is calculated as part of the decennial census, supplemented by the 2012 American Community Survey. The Census Bureau also undertakes an

annual Housing Vacancy Survey which calculates vacancy rates for rental and homeowner properties in large metropolitan areas throughout the country. The methodology used to create this survey is different from that used for the decennial Census. Therefore, the results are not comparable. For example, the decennial census calculated a rental vacancy rate of 5.4% for 2010 while the Housing Vacancy Survey calculated a vacancy rate of 1.8%. Unlike in 2000 when it just accounted for San Francisco, the Housing Vacancy Survey now takes into account the whole metropolitan statistical area (San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont). The Housing Vacancy Survey data may not be as reliable as the decennial census because of sampling error, it nevertheless allows for yearly comparisons. Both data are provided here. Figure I-6 and I-7 below show vacancy rates for San Francisco from 2005-2010 based on this annual survey. This information can supplement Table I-36 to compare trends in vacancies.

Figure I-6
Rental Vacancy Rates, San Francisco, 2005–2010



SOURCE: Census Bureau, Housing Vacancy Survey

Figure I-7
Homeowner Vacancy Rates, San Francisco, 2005–2010



SOURCE: Census Bureau, Housing Vacancy Survey

D. COASTAL ZONE HOUSING

California state regulations require that the *Housing Element* detail new construction and demolition activity occurring within California Coastal Zone areas. The city's entire western shoreline is within California's coastal zone area. The coastal area zone boundary includes about 30 residential blocks that front the Pacific Ocean (Map I-5).

Two new units in two structures were added to the housing stock between 2007 and 2013, or an average of less than one new unit a year. In this same period, two buildings with two units were lost. The current development pipeline includes a 56-unit residential project within the coastal zone.

Within the larger census tract areas fronting the coastal shoreline (about 150 blocks), new construction in in-fill sites has generated no new units. This has been deepened by 16 units lost and six units added due to alteration projects. Some 14 new units are slated to be built in 9 structures in this larger area. In this larger area, about 957 units were built between 1982 and 2008.

Table I-37
New Construction, Alteration and Demolition Activity in Coastal Area, San Francisco, 2009–2013

Construction Type	Coastal Area		Larger Census Tracts	
	No. of Structures	No. of Units	No. of Structures	No. of Units
New Construction Completed	2	2	-	-
Addition through Alterations	-	-	6	6
Loss through Alterations	2	(2)	16	(16)
Demolition Completed	-	-	-	-
Net Change in Housing Stock	4	-	22	(10)
Development Pipeline (Q4 2013)	7	64	9	14

SOURCE: SF Planning Department

Residential development in the Coastal Zone must conform to City Planning Code density requirements. Development projects in the coastal zone also are required to apply for a coastal permit and are reviewed for consistency with Western Shoreline General Plan policies contained in the *Western Shoreline Plan* and Proposition M policies, one of which aims to preserve the City's supply of affordable housing.

In addition, new construction and demolition permits are reviewed for consistency with Article 10 of the California Government Code which requires that affordable lower income units converted or demolished in the Coastal Zone Area be replaced on a one-for-one basis, and that new housing developments, where feasible, provide housing units for persons and families of low or moderate income.



Coastal Zone Area
San Francisco, 2009 - 2013

0 Miles 1

MAP 05

- Coastal Zone
- Coastal Zone Census Tracts
- New Housing Development
- Proposed and Permitted New Housing Development

III. Housing Needs

This section examines the type, amount and affordability of new housing construction needed in San Francisco, as determined by the Association of Bay Area Governments, through June 2022. It is based, in part, on the data presented in the preceding Sections.

A. REGIONAL HOUSING NEED ASSESSMENT

The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), in coordination with the California State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), determine the Bay Area's regional housing need based on regional trends, projected job growth and existing needs. San Francisco's fair share of the regional housing need for January 2015 through June 2022 was calculated as 28,870 units, or about 3,850 units per year (Table I-38). This goal seeks to alleviate a tight housing market stemming from forecast household and employment growth as well as allocating regional household and employment growth to jurisdictions with established or planned transit infrastructures. More important, the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) determination includes production targets addressing housing needs of a range of household income categories. A total of about 16,333 units or 57% of the RHNA target must be affordable to households making 120% of the area median income (AMI) or less.

Table I-38
Regional Housing Needs Assessment for San Francisco, 2015–June 2022

Household Income Category	No. of Units	% of Total	Annual Production Goal
Very Low (0–50% AMI)	6,234	21.6%	831
Low (51–80% AMI)	4,639	16.1%	619
Moderate (81–120% AMI)	5,460	18.9%	728
Above Moderate (over 120% AMI)	12,536	43.4%	1,671
TOTAL UNITS	28,869	100.0%	3,849

SOURCE: ABAG, Planning Department

The Department of Housing and Urban Development determines the annual area median income (AMI) for the San Francisco Primary Metropolitan Statistical Area, which includes the counties of San Francisco, Marin and San Mateo. In 2014, the area median income for a single person household was almost $68,000 and $97,100 for a household of four people.

Table I-39
Household Income Standards by Household Size, 2014

Income Categories as percentage of Area Median Income (AMI)	Household Income by number of persons				
	1	2	3	4	5
Very Low (0–50% AMI)	$20,400	$23,300	$26,200	$29,150	$31,450
Low (51–80% AMI)	$48,225	$55,175	$62,075	$68,925	$74,450
Moderate (81–120% AMI)	$71,350	$81,575	$91,775	$101,950	$110,100
Above Moderate (over 120% AMI)	$98,550	$112,675	$126,725	$140,800	$152,050

SOURCE: Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)

The median income in San Francisco, however, is lower than the area median income. This is due in part to higher median incomes in San Mateo and Marin counties and the concentrations of lower-income families in the city. For example, in 2012, Marin County's median household income of $90,962 and San Mateo's $87,751 were quite higher than the city's median household income of $73,802.[1] Roughly 43% of all San Francisco households make less than 80% of the San Francisco PMSA area median income, and fall under the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)'s low and very low income categories (Table I-40).

Table I-40
Income Distribution, San Francisco, 2012

Characteristic	Very Low (<50% of median)	Low (50-80% of median)	Moderate (80-120% of median)	Above Moderate (>120% of median)
All SF Households	27.9%	14.8%	18.8%	38.5%
Median Income for SF, 2012	$73,802			

SOURCE: Census Bureau, 2012 American Community Survey

In order to account for this income variance, the Mayor's Office of Housing publishes a local AMI standard (Table I-41). San Francisco's Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program regulates housing assistance based on the San Francisco Area Median Income (SFAMI).

1 Figures cited are in 2012 inflation-adjusted dollars.

Household Income Categories	Household Size	Average Unit Size	Maximum Annual Income	Monthly Housing Expense	Maximum Purchase Price
Low Income *(70% of HUD Area Median Income)*	1	Studio	$47,550	$1,308	$162,631
	2	1 Bedroom	$54,400	$1,496	$188,062
	3	2 Bedroom	$61,200	$1,683	$213,721
	4	3 Bedroom	$67,950	$1,869	$239,380
	5	4 Bedroom	$73,400	$2,019	$258,449
Median Income *(90% of HUD Area Median Income)*	1	Studio	$61,150	$1,682	$226,943
	2	1 Bedroom	$69,950	$1,924	$261,692
	3	2 Bedroom	$78,650	$2,163	$296,669
	4	3 Bedroom	$87,400	$2,404	$331,418
	5	4 Bedroom	$94,350	$2,595	$357,758
Moderate Income *(110% of HUD Area Median Income)*	1	Studio	$74,750	$2,056	$291,483
	2	1 Bedroom	$85,450	$2,350	$335,322
	3	2 Bedroom	$96,150	$2,644	$379,389
	4	3 Bedroom	$106,800	$2,937	$423,228
	5	4 Bedroom	$115,350	$3,172	$457,295
Moderate Income *(120% of HUD Area Median Income)*	1	Studio	$81,550	$2,243	
	2	1 Bedroom	$93,250	$2,564	
	3	2 Bedroom	$104,900	$2,885	
	4	3 Bedroom	$116,500	$3,204	
	5	4 Bedroom	$125,800	$3,460	
Moderate Income *(150% of HUD Area Median Income)*	1	Studio	$101,950	$2,804	
	2	1 Bedroom	$116,550	$3,205	
	3	2 Bedroom	$131,100	$3,605	
	4	3 Bedroom	$145,650	$4,005	
	5	4 Bedroom	$157,300	$4,326	

Table I-41
Homeownership Affordable Housing Guidelines, San Francisco, 2014

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)

Note: Incomes are based on the 2012 Area Median Income (AMI) limits for the San Francisco HUD Metro FMR Area (HMFA). Monthly housing expenses are calculated based on 33% of gross monthly income. (FMR = Fair Market Rents). Maximum purchase price is the affordable price from San Francisco's Inclusionary Housing Program and incorporates monthly fees and taxes into sales price.

B. HOUSING AFFORDABILITY NEEDS

1. Affordability of New Housing Construction

State law requires that the city address the housing needs for all income levels. ABAG estimates housing need by income group to provide a basis for determining what income levels need to be most served by new construction. ABAG figures are based on income distribution of all existing households in the city and in the Bay Area. ABAG's estimates split the difference between the city and the regional figure in an effort to move the city closer to the regional income distribution. Table I-38 (see page 41) shows that the city must construct almost 28,870 new housing units to meet its fair share of the Bay Area region's estimated housing need. At least 38% of these new units must be affordable to very low and low-income households. Another 19% should be affordable to households with moderate incomes.

The high cost of housing leads to numerous troublesome effects including overwhelming rent burden (as more of a household's income is needed to go toward rent); overcrowding as more people squeeze into smaller affordable units to share costs; an increase in workers per household needed to pay mortgage or meet monthly rent; increased commuter traffic from San Francisco job holders who cannot afford to live in the city; and an increase in the homeless population.

2. Households Overpaying

Rising housing costs lead to overpayment as more of a household's income is spent on housing. The 2010 American Community Survey (ACS) estimated median monthly rent in San Francisco at $1,328 and median monthly housing costs for owner occupied units at $3,163. Overpayment comes about when 30% or more of a household's income goes to paying rent or 35 percent or more of household income for mortgage payments. A higher percentage of poorer households thus tend to overpay, as Table I-42 shows, almost 72% of low income renting households overpay, compared to 41% of all renting households. Table I-42 below also shows that about 38% of all San Francisco owner-occupied households spent more than 30% of its income on housing costs in 2010. The number and percentage of households overpaying has also grown since the 2000 Census. In 2000, housing costs for over two-thirds are very low income households represented 30% or more of their household income. Table I-42 also shows that a higher percentage of renting households tend to overpay. The marked increase in homeowning households overpaying by 2010 may be due in large part on the relaxation of criteria for mortgage financing.

Table I-42
Percentage of Very Low Income Households Overpaying Housing Costs, San Francisco, 2000 and 2010

Tenure Type	2000		2010	
	No. of Households	% of Households	No. of Households	% of Households
Renter Occupied *	76,600	80.8%	209,930	62%
Extremely Low/Very Low Income	36,790	38.8%	60,690	18.1%
Very Low/Low Income	16,012	16.9%	16,450	4.9%
Owner Occupied *	18,237	19.2%	126,030	37.5%
Extremely Low/Very Low Income	6,833	7.2%	22,945	6.8%
Very Low/Low Income	4,727	5.0%	9,605	2.9%
All Households	94,837	100.0%	335,960	100.0%

* Gross Rents or Monthly Housing Costs as 30% or more of household income; 2000/2010

SOURCE: Census Bureau, SCDS: CHAS Data 2010

3. Overcrowded Households

A household is considered overcrowded when there is more than one person per room in the dwelling unit. The 2012 Census reported that 20,520 or 6% of all San Francisco households were overcrowded (Table I-43). Of these households, 11,617 (3.4% of all San Francisco households) are severely overcrowded, with more than 1.5 occupants per room. Since 2000, the number of overcrowded households reduced by 50%, however. the number of severely overcrowded households increased by 23%. Renter households are also more likely to be overcrowded than home-owning households.

Table I-43
Overcrowded Households by Tenure, San Francisco, 2012

Tenure Type	Overcrowded		Severely Overcrowded	
Owner Occupied	5,110	4.1%	1,506	1.2%
Renter Occupied	15,410	7.2%	10,111	4.7%
All Households	20,520	6.0%	11,617	3.4%

SOURCE: Census Bureau

Asian-American and Hispanic/Latino households make up a disproportionate number of overcrowded households (14%) (Table I-44). This table also shows that a substantial percentage of Other Race and American Indian/Alaska Native households are also overcrowded. These households are likely to be larger (see Table I-7 on page 9) and have lower incomes (see Tables I-16 and I-18). Larger households have difficulty securing housing with three or more bedrooms, especially with the city's very limited stock of larger units. High housing costs also forces overcrowding. To afford the cost of housing, many low-income families crowd into smaller units.

Table I-44
Overcrowded Households by Household Ethnicity, San Francisco, 2012

Household Ethnicity	No of Households	% of Households
White	5,849	2.9%
African American	959	4.6%
American Indian / Alaska Native	151	10.4%
Asian	11,102	11.7%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	87	7.7%
Other Race	2,091	17.9%
Two or More Races	281	2.6%
Hispanic / Latino	5,313	14.0%
All Households	20,520	6.0%

SOURCE: Census Bureau

4. Expiration of Units at Risk of Conversion or Expiration

Government Code Section 65583(a)(8)(A-D) requires that the Housing Element update inventory assisted housing developments at risk of expiration or conversion to market rate during the next 10 years (2015-2025). Assisted housing developments include multifamily rental housing complexes that receive government assistance under any of the following federal, State, and/or local programs (or any combination of rental assistance, mortgage insurance, interest reductions, and/or direct loan programs) which are eligible to change to market-rate housing due to termination (opt-out) of a rent subsidy contract (e.g., Housing Choice Vouchers, Section 8) mortgage prepayment (e.g., FHA), or other state or local programs with expiring use restrictions. Entities that are qualified to manage assisted units in San Francisco are listed in Table I-45 below.

Some 3,434 units, funded through tax-credit and HUD are identified as at-risk with expirations between 2015 and June 2025. This is only to say that the contracts could expire and may have the possibility of converting to market-rate housing. In most cases (like in the case of non-profit owned projects) these units will not convert and will likely continue. According to the San Francisco Housing Authority, as of June 2014, Section 8 housing is the only housing type at risk of conversion to market rate in San Francisco. As many as 1,082 low-income units are at risk of losing their Federal Rental Section 8 subsidies by 2025. Separately, the SF Housing Authority manages contracts for about 10,074 Section 8 units. Section 8 units receive Federal subsidies that provide the owners of these units with the difference between 30% of the tenant's income, and a HUD established rent for the units.

Expiration of Section 8 subsidies in privately owned projects could force tenants to pay market rate rents for their unit, or face eviction. Expiration of Section 8 contracts in nonprofit owned projects will burden organizations that lack sufficient income to meet operating costs and mortgage payments. The existence of older buildings with Section 8 contracted units can pose as an additional financial burden. According to the Mayor's Office of Housing, during the 2013-2014 fiscal year, the total production and preservation of 1,759 units cost about $82.5 million. Assuming that all units were treated equally, that would mean that the approximate cost to produce and/or preserve one unit would be $47,000. This cost per units varies based on need and project size. Preservation costs for these units can run up to about $160 million.

Table I-45
Department of Housing and Community Development - Enities Qualified to Manange Assisted Units in San Francisco, 2013

Organization	Address	City	Zip Code	Phone No.
Affordable Housing Foundation	P.O. Box 26516	San Francisco	94126	(415) 387-7834
Asian, Incorporated	1167 Mission Street, 4th Floor	San Francisco	94103	(415) 928-5910
Asian Neighborhood Design	461 Bush Street., 4th Floor	San Francisco	94108	(415) 982-2959
Baker Places, Incorporated	600 Townsend, Suite 200E	San Francisco	94103	(415) 864-4655
Bernal Heights Neighborhood Center	515 Cortland Avenue	San Francisco	94110	(415) 206-2140
BRIDGE Housing Corporation	1 Hawthorne, Suite 400	San Francisco	94105	(415) 989-1111
BUILD Leadership Development, Inc.	1280 Bison, Suite B9-200	Newport Beach	92660	(949) 720-7044
Catholic Charities CYO	180 Howard Street, Suite 100	San Francisco	94105	(415) 405-2056
Chinatown Community Development Center	1525 Grant Avenue	San Francisco	94133	(415) 984-1450
Christian Church Homes of Northern California, Inc.	303 Hegenberger Road, Suite 201	Oakland	94621-1419	(510) 632-6714
Community Housing Partnership	20 Jones Street, Suite 200	San Francisco	94102	(415) 852-5300
Conrad House Supportive Housing Program	1385 Mission Street	San Francisco	94103	(415) 864-7359
Episcopal Community Services San Francisco	165 8th Street	San Francisco	94103	(415) 487-3300
Friendship House Assoc. of American Indians, Inc. of San Francisco	56 Julian Avenue	San Francisco	94103-3547	(415) 865-0964
Foundation of Affordable Housing, Inc.	2847 Story Road	San Francisco	95127	(408) 923-8260
Housing Corporation of America	31423 Pacific Coast Highway, Suite 7100	Laguna Beach	92677	(323) 726-9672
Indochinese Housing Development Corporation	340 Eddy Street, Suite 100	San Francisco	94102	(415) 441-2872
Mercy Housing	1360 Mission Street, Suite 300	San Francisco	94103	(415) 355-7100
Mission Housing Development Corporation	474 Valencia Street, Suite 280	San Francisco	94103	(415) 864-6432
Northern California Land Trust, Inc.	3126 Shattuck Avenue	Berkeley	94501	(510) 548-7878
Progress Foundation	368 Fell Street	San Francisco	94102	(415) 861-0828
San Francisco Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure	1 South Van Ness, 5th Floor	San Francisco	94103	(415) 749-2400
Satellite Affordable Housing Associates	1521 University Avenue	Berkeley	94703	(510) 647-0700
Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation	201 Eddy Street	San Francisco	94102	(415) 776-2151
TODCO Development Company	230 4th Street	San Francisco	94103	(415) 957-0227
West Bay Housing Corporation	120 Howard Street, 120	San Francisco	94105	(415) 618-0012

SOURCE: State Department of Housing and Community Development

Table I-46
Expiration of Project Based Section 8 Contracts, San Francisco, 2014

Project	Owner [1]	First Expire [2]	Units [3]	Assistance [4]	Risk Level [5]
Autumn Glow Alzheimer's Residential	NP	01/31/2015	15	PRAC/811	4-Low
San Lorenzo Ruiz Center	NP	01/31/2015	145	202/8 NC	1-Very High
St. Peter's Place	NP	02/28/2015	19	PRAC/811	4-Low
Britton Courts	NP	03/31/2015	46	PD/8 Existing	4-Low
MENORAH PARK	NP	04/30/2015	151	202/8 NC	4-Low
Edith Witt Senior Community	PM	06/30/2015	95	PRAC/202	4-Low
GOLDEN GATE APARTMENTS	PM	07/31/2015	24	LMSA	4-Low
On Lok House	NP	10/31/2015	54	202/8 NC	4-Low
Eastern Park Apts	NP	11/30/2015	201	202/8 NC	2-High.
HERITAGE HOMES	LD	12/31/2015	33	Pension Fund	4-Low
YWCA APARTMENTS, INC.	NP	12/31/2015	97	202/8 SR	4-Low
Bernal Gateway Apartments	PM	12/31/2015	18	Pension Fund	4-Low
Sutter Apartments	PM	01/31/2016	67	Sec 8 NC	2-High.
Buchanan Park Apartments	NP	03/31/2016	62	LMSA	4-Low
Eddy Street Apartments	NP	03/31/2017	20	PRAC/811	4-Low
Notre Dame Plaza	NP	07/31/2017	65	PRAC/202	4-Low
Casa De La Raza	NP	07/31/2017	51	Sec 8 NC	2-High.
Alcantara Court	NP	05/31/2018	49	PRAC/202	4-Low
Leland Apartments	NP	06/30/2018	24	PRAC/811	4-Low
Western Park Apartments	NP	12/31/2018	114	LMSA	4-Low
VISTA DEL MONTE	PM	01/31/2021	94	LMSA	4-Low
Page/Holloway Apartments	PM	02/03/2021	15	Sec 8 SR	3-Moderate
Thomas Paine Square	NP	05/31/2021	93	LMSA	3-Moderate
Fair Oaks Apartments	PM	07/20/2021	20	HFDA/8 SR	3-Moderate
Padre Apts	NP	07/30/2021	41	HFDA/8 SR	4-Low
Mission Capp Apartments (Leandro Soto Apts.)		8/16/2021	48	LIHTC	4-Low
Cambridge Hotel		12/31/2021	60	LIHTC	4-Low
Coleridge Park Homes		12/31/2021	49	LIHTC	4-Low
Padre Palou Apartments		6/30/2022	17	LIHTC	4-Low
Steamboat Point Apartments		8/27/2022	108	LIHTC	4-Low
Connecticut Street Court		9/30/2022	10	LIHTC	4-Low
JACKIE ROBINSON GARDENS	LD	12/31/2022	130	LMSA	4-Low
Del Carlo Court		1/28/2023	25	LIHTC	4-Low
111 Jones Street Apartments		4/30/2023	107	LIHTC	4-Low
Turk Street Apartments		12/15/2023	175	LIHTC	4-Low
Fell Street Apartments		9/2/2024	81	LIHTC	4-Low
Mariposa Gardens Apartments	LD	9/18/2024	62	Sec 8 NC	4-Low
Canon Kip Community House		9/19/2024	104	LIHTC	4-Low
Plaza del Sol		10/31/2024	57	LIHTC	4-Low
Larkin Pine Senior Housing		11/18/2024	62	LIHTC	4-Low
Minna Street Apartments		12/23/2024	23	LIHTC	4-Low

Project	Owner [1]	First Expire [2]	Units [3]	Assistance [4]	Risk Level [5]
The Knox SRO		12/27/2024	140	LIHTC	4-Low
1101 Howard Street		12/29/2024	34	LIHTC	4-Low
1028 Howard Street Apartments		12/31/2024	30	LIHTC	4-Low
555 Ellis Street Family Apartments		2/17/2025	37	LIHTC	4-Low
Bethany Center	NP	2/28/2025	123	LMSA	4-Low
Silvercrest Residence- San Francisco	LD	8/31/2025	103	LMSA	4-Low
Mission Plaza Apartments	PM	8/31/2025	132	Sec 8 NC	4-Low
International Hotel Sr Housing	NP	9/30/2025	104	PRAC/202	4-Low

NOTES
[1] LD = Limited Dividend, PM = Profit Motivated, NP = Non-Profit
[2] First expiration of Section 8 Contract, typically 30 years after origination.
[3] Units receiving rental assistance
[4] Rental assistance type/source
[5] Level of risk as defined by HUD:
1-Very High: Section 8 expiring within 1 year or mortgage maturing within 1 year owner status and plans unknown
2-High: Section 8 expiring in 2-5 years or mortgage maturing within 2-5 years owner status and plans unknown
3-Mod: Section 8 expiring in 5-10 years or mortgage maturing within 5-10 year owner status and plans unknown
4-Low: Section 8 not to expire for more than 10 years or large non-profit owner committed to affordability or a type of loan than requires longer term affordability
5-None: No Section 8 and mortgage type does not include affordability restrictions, owner is unknown so unable to evaluate

SOURCE: California Housing Partnership Corporation

C. HOUSING NEEDS OF SPECIAL POPULATION GROUPS

All San Francisco households require specific unit sizes and levels of affordability; various population groups have more specific housing requirements. Special housing needs are those associated with specific demographic or occupational groups which call for specific program responses, such as preservation of single-room occupancy hotels or the development of units with more bedrooms. Housing element law specifically requires analysis of the special housing needs of the elderly, the disabled, female-headed households, large families, and homeless persons and families, as well as the needs of any other group deemed appropriate by the city. These other groups include: the mentally ill; persons with HIV/AIDS; immigrants, refugees and undocumented workers; artists; and students. Most of special needs groups require some degree of affordable housing.

The permanent housing needs of specific population groups are summarized below with state required categories discussed first and locally determined groups following (Table I-47). It is important to note that these population groups are not mutually exclusive and needs may overlap. For example, a person can be both elderly and homeless. About 37% of the homeless suffer from mental illness and as many as 40% of the elderly have mobility or self-care limitations. Roughly between 50% to 80% of all homeless individuals may suffer from one or more physical disability, mental illness, or substance addiction.

Table I-47
Permanent Housing Needs of Special Population Groups, San Francisco, 2013

Population Group	Type of Housing Units Needed
Homeless	Shelters, Transitional Housing, SROs, Small and Large Family Units
Physically Disabled	Accessible Units of all Types
Mentally Ill	Board and Care, Institutional Facilities
Developmentally Disabled	Accessible Units of all Types, Large Family Units, Board and Care, Institutional Facilities, Modified Units for Medically Fragile, Affordable Rentals or Homeownership Units
Elderly	Senior Housing Projects, Studios, 1 Bedroom
Families with Children	2 or more Bedroom Family Housing
Female-Headed Households	2 or more Bedroom Family Housing
New Immigrants, Refugees and Undocumented Workers	Small and Large Families, various
Students	Dorms or Studios
Artists	Affordable Live/Work Space

SOURCE: SF Mayor's Office of Community Development, Developmental Disabilities Board Area 5

1. Homeless

The San Francisco Human Services Agency counted 7,350 persons on the streets and in homeless shelters in 2013 (Table I-48). Of these persons, about 59% were counted on the streets and some 33% were in shelters or transitional housing. Sixty-five percent of the homeless were single adults, 26% of the homeless with unaccompanied children or youth under the age of 25, and the remaining 9% counted in this survey were persons in families. Homeless households require affordable housing that is appropriately sized, with appropriate services.

Table I-48
Estimated Homeless Population, San Francisco, 2013

Location	Single Adults	Persons in Families	Unaccompanied Children and Youth Under 25	Total
Street	2,633	33	1,649	4,315
Shelter	1,187	374	65	1,626
Transitional Housing & Treatment Centers	355	272	186	813
Resource Centers & Stabilization	345	0	2	347
Jail	126	0	0	126
Hospitals	123	0	0	123
TOTAL	4,769	679	1,902	7,350

SOURCE: SF Human Services Agency, *San Francisco Homeless Count 2013*

2. Persons with Disabilities

San Francisco's housing stock and housing market present challenges to persons living with disabilities. This segment of the population, which includes individuals with mental, physical, and developmental disabilities, require a variety of living arrangements depending on the severity of their disability. Some can live at home in an independent environment with the help of other family members; others live independently with some assistance that includes special housing design features. Those who cannot work may require income support; and those with medical conditions would need in-home supportive services. Accessible housing can also be provided via senior housing developments.

The majority of persons with disabilities live on an income that is significantly lower than the non-disabled population. Many disabled individuals live on a small fixed income which severely limits their ability to pay for housing. The Task Force on Family Diversity estimates that at least one-third of all persons with disabilities in the United States live in poverty. Persons with disabilities have the highest rate of unemployment relative to other groups. For most, their only source of income is a small fixed pension afforded by Social Security Disability Insurance (SDI), Social Security Insurance (SSI), or Social Security Old Age and Survivor's Insurance (SSA), which will not adequately cover the cost of rent and living expenses even when shared with a roommate. In addition, persons with disabilities oftentimes experience discrimination in hiring and training. When they find work, it tends to be unstable and at low wages.

a. Physical Disabilities

The 2010 Census estimated almost 49,000 non-institutionalized adults having a physical disability, which is defined as a condition that substantially limits one or more basic physical activities, such as walking, climbing stairs, reaching, lifting or carrying. Well over half of disabled adults are over 65 and may require appropriate housing. There are over 19,600 people between 18 and 64 with a physical disability. If one in five of disabled non-seniors require affordable housing, this specific population group would have a need for roughly 3,920 subsidized units. Some physically disabled people require accessible housing with features such as: wheelchair accessible entrances, wide interior spaces for wheelchair circulation, accessible bathing facilities, adjustable heights for counters and cabinets, and other amenities. Since almost three-quarters of San Francisco's housing stock was built before 1950, much of the existing stock was not built with these accommodations in mind; some, but not most, can easily be converted to accessible standards. Most subsidized units developed by the Housing Authority, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (now called Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure), or otherwise supported by other public funds are accessible.

b. Mental Disabilities

According to the 2010 Census, almost 37,450 San Franciscans identify as having a mental illness; about 96% are over the age of 18. Not everyone with a mental illness has special housing needs. However, a substantial number of persons with severe psychiatric disabilities often have extremely low incomes and are consequently forced to live in substandard housing without the supportive services and assistance that would allow them to live independently.

De-institutionalization of the state's mental institutions in the late 1970s left the charge and housing of psychiatrically disabled residents to private board and care facilities. In 1977 there were 1,278 board and care beds. By 1995 this number shrank to 465.

In 1999, licensed board and care facilities in San Francisco managed 525 beds for San Francisco's mentally ill. However, the growing costs of patient care have reduced the modest gain in out-patient service. At current supplemental security subsidy levels, operators are finding the provision of board and care for the mentally ill financially unattractive.

A survey conducted by the San Francisco Mental Health Association indicated an overwhelming desire on the part of mentally disabled persons to live alone or with one to two friends in apartments with support services as needed. The absence of affordable housing linked to supportive services, however, sends many of the city's mentally ill to a cycle of short-term acute care and homelessness. While large scale supportive housing is a cost-effective way of meeting this group's housing needs, advocates working with special needs groups emphasize the need to balance large-scale development with small site development and rehabilitation of units within existing neighborhoods, to enable people to live within their neighborhood of origin wherever possible, and to avoid geographic concentration that often hinders the transition to independent living. The Department of Public Health's Division of Mental Health estimates a need for 3,000 supportive housing units for San Francisco's mentally ill.

c. Developmental Disabilities

Developmental disability is defined by the State of California as a lifelong disability caused by a mental and/or physical impairment manifested prior to the age of 18 and are expected to be lifelong. Conditions included under this definition include: mental retardation, epilepsy, autism, and/or cerebral palsy, and "other conditions needing services similar to a person with mental retardation."

Persons with developmental disability may also suffer multiple disabilities as the Developmental Disabilities Board Area 5 estimates below show:

- Mental Illness: a conservative estimate of 10% as the portion of people with a developmental disability who are also living with a mental disability.
- Mobility Impairment: Staff and service providers report that approximately 10 % of all people with a developmental disability also have a physical disability; their mobility impairment will call for housing that is ADA accessible, or certainly readily adaptable to their needs.
- Visual/Hearing Impairment: It is estimated from prior experience that 2% to 3% of the developmental disabled population are living with a visual and/or hearing impairment, and require reasonable accommodation to their disability.
- Medically Fragile: 2% of the developmental disabled population require 24/7 medical care, in housing specifically rehabilitated or constructed to include features like those in hospital settings, with space for care-givers and specialized equipment.

Many individuals with developmental disabilities are independent and can live in their own apartments or homes with very little support. Other individuals will have more severe disabilities, and may require 24-hour care and assistance in residences that are modified specifically to accommodate their individual needs.

The Developmental Disabilities Board Area 5 estimated that there are some 11,500 San Franciscans have a developmental disability. Its report also noted that seven out of 10 people with developmental disabilities are unable to earn substantial gainful income and must rely on Supplemental Security Income (SSI) to support themselves. With SSI capped at under $720, people with developmental disabilities are finding it increasingly difficult to find affordable, accessible, and appropriate housing that is inclusive in the local community. In the past, many people with developmental disabilities were institutionalized in large hospital-like settings, often for life. Current practice, made possible by the Lanterman Act and the Olmstead Decision, now calls for the "maximum possible integration into the general community." This is realized through the creation of housing, with affordable rents and appropriate supportive services, dedicated to the long-term needs and empowerment of this population.

Based on a survey of 2,640 developmentally disabled clients, the Developmental Disabilities Board Area 5 estimated a housing need of 850 units for the 2009-2014 period. According to the Board Area 5, types of housing opportunities appropriate for people living with a developmental disability include:

- Rent-subsidized affordable housing, with services, accessible, close to transit and community
- Licensed and unlicensed Single Family homes, modified, of 3-4 bedrooms
- Inclusionary within larger housing developments serving the general population
- SECTION 8 Apartment Housing Choice Voucher
- Home purchase through special programs (first time home buyers, Fannie Mae)
- HUD Section 811/ MHP-SHP developments for disabled populations
- Housing specially modified for the Medically Fragile (SB 962 Homes)

3. Elderly

The 2010 Census counted 154,730 or 19% of San Francisco's population as 60 years or older. San Francisco's elderly population is expected to grow to 205,000 by 2020 and to 360,800 by 2040; this growth is consistent with national trends. The recent Census also estimated that 30% of all San Francisco households have one or more persons over 65 years old. About 33,869 elderly householders, representing about 51% of all households in 2010, lived alone.

Senior citizens have different housing needs especially as they develop health problems or experience decreased mobility. The 2010 Census estimated that 40% of persons 65 and over have mobility or self-care limitations. Older and disabled adults who require long-term care have a need for a broad range of on-site and off-site services including central dining, transportation services, limited or complete medical care, recreational and other services. For seniors living

independently, there is a need for safe and easily maintained dwelling units. Table I-49 below shows that 40% of all elderly and one- to two-person households overpay; generally a larger proportion of lower income households have heavier housing burdens.

Table I-49
Elderly Households and Housing Burden, San Francisco, 2010

Household Type by Income	Renting Households		Homeowning Households		All Households
	Elderly, 1 & 2 member Household	Total Renting Households	Elderly, 1 & 2 member Household	Total Homeowning Households	
Very Low (0-50% AMI)	27,485	87,470	12,880	23,335	110,805
% Overpaying	65%	72%	52%	61%	70%
Low (51 - 80% AMI)	4,330	33,220	6,190	18,235	51,455
% Overpaying	34%	48%	33%	52%	49%
Moderate and Above (over 81% AMI)	6,015	92,175	17,230	83,935	176,110
% Overpaying	13%	9%	20%	28%	18%
Total Households	37,830	212,865	36,300	125,500	338,365
% Overpaying	53%	41%	34%	38%	40%

SOURCE: State of the Cities Data Systems CHAS Data 2010

4. Families with Children and Large Family Households

Approximately 56,940 or 37% of family households include children. Some 19% of San Francisco households include a person under 18 years of age. Many of these children are in low-income households in ethnic communities that tend to be larger and poorer (Tables 7 and 18 on pages 9 and 17, respectively). The high cost of housing and limited supply of larger units can result in overcrowding. These communities require that the existing affordable housing stock be adequately maintained and rehabilitated where necessary, and that new larger affordable units are constructed.

Virtually all large households, or those containing five or more persons, are family households. Family households as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau include only those households with persons related to the householder by birth, marriage or adoption, residing together. About 8% of all family households, or roughly 27,140, have five persons or more. Table I-50 below shows the number of suitable accommodations available for larger families and/or households. This mismatch is exacerbated as only a small portion of new construction consist of two bedrooms or more.

Based on the current waiting list managed by the San Francisco Housing Authority, there is an estimated unfilled need for over 17,000 affordable housing units for low-income families. Two-thirds of these families require a two or three-bedroom unit due to their larger family sizes.

Families with children generally earn less per capita than the average San Francisco household, yet require larger housing units. Table I-51 shows that larger family households tend to

overpay more than typical households. Like most groups, families also require public transit and neighborhood serving retail in close proximity. But they have specialized needs as well: accessible routes or transit connections to schools, nearby childcare (if it cannot be provided on-site), laundry and storage facilities on-site, recreational opportunities that are directly accessible from each unit on-site.

Even more important for families is their ability to access housing. Because many families are two-worker households, they have very little time to pursue affordable housing opportunities which can be listed in multiple locations under various agencies. They require a simple, easily accessible "one-stop" system to help them find housing opportunities, as well as significant support such as counseling agencies to move towards homeownership opportunities.

Table I-50
Household Size and Housing Unit Sizes, San Francisco, 2010

Household Size	No. of Households	% of Total	Unit Size	No. of Units	% of Total
1-person household	133,366	38.6%	Studio	43,245	12.8%
2-person household	108,606	31.4%	1-bedroom	90,898	26.9%
3-person household	45,939	13.3%	2-bedrooms	105,046	31.0%
4-person household	30,760	8.9%	3-bedrooms	66,916	19.8%
5-person household	12,849	3.7%	4-bedrooms	22,970	6.8%
6-person or more household	14,291	4.1%	5-bedrooms or more	9,291	2.7%
TOTALS	345,811	100%	TOTALS	338,366	100%

SOURCE: Census Bureau

Table I-51
Large Households and Housing Burden, San Francisco, 2010

Household Type by Income	Renting Households			Homeowning Households			All Households
	Small Related (2-4 people)	Large Related (5 or more)	Total Renting Households	Small Related (2-4 people)	Large Related (5 or more)	Total Home-owning Households	
Extremely Low (< 30% of AMI)	19,710	3,790	87,470	5,225	1,675	23,335	28,560
% Overpaying	74%	66%	72%	69%	75%	61%	70%
Very Low (up to 50% of AMI)	8,540	1,455	33,220	6,270	2,560	18,235	24,505
% Overpaying	39%	30%	48%	59%	59%	52%	49%
Low (up to 80% of AMI)	25,550	635	92,175	38,605	6,855	83,935	122,540
% Overpaying	6%	14%	9%	27%	20%	28%	18%
Total Households	53,800	5,880	212,865	50,100	11,090	125,500	175,600
% Overpaying	36%	51%	41%	35%	37%	38%	40%

SOURCE: State of the Cities Data Systems CHAS Data 2010

5. Female-Headed Households

Many families with a single parent are in households headed by women. Female-headed households in 2010 comprised about 8% of all households. Women still suffer from income disparities in the job market, forcing them to survive with less income than their male counterparts. At the time of the last Census, about 16% of female headed households were under poverty level, compared to about 7% of all families under poverty level (Table I-52). Two years later, the American Community Survey estimated that about 8% of families were under the poverty level while about 19% of female-headed households were under the poverty level. This increase in poverty exacerbates the need for affordable housing in order to avoid an increase in homeless families, especially female-headed households.

Table I-52
Characteristics of Female-Headed Households, San Francisco, 2010 and 2012

Household Type	2010		2012	
	No. of Households	% of Households	No. of Households	% of Households
Total Households	335,956	100.0%	340,839	100%
Total Female Headed Householders	27,411	8.2%	29,187	8.6%
Female Heads with Children under 18	11,387	41.5%	11,841	40.6%
Total Family Households	150,329	44.7%	153,345	45.0%
Total Families Under the Poverty Level	10,796	7.2%	12,346	8.1%
Female Headed Households Under the Poverty Level	4,421	16.1%	5,406	18.5%

SOURCE: Census Bureau

6. Persons with HIV/AIDS and Terminally Ill Patients

San Francisco has the third highest number of total AIDS cases in the United States, comprising almost one in five of California AIDS cases and about 3% of AIDS cases nationwide. As of December 2012, San Francisco accounted for 13% of California's HIV living cases and 2% of persons living with HIV reported nationally. The number of deaths from AIDS has decreased significantly from a high of over 14,700 in 2004 to fewer than 177 in 2012, in part because most deaths are listed under other causes given AIDS patients' compromised immune system. The number of people living with HIV/AIDS has decreased from about 15,757 in 2008 up to, according to the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH), over 15,705 in 2012.

Approximately 9% of people living with AIDS were homeless in 2012. The San Francisco Department of Public Health's Annual HIV/AIDS Epidemiology Report for 2007 noted that "Homeless persons suffer from high rates of substance abuse, mental illness, tuberculosis, infectious hepatitis, and insufficient health care. Among HIV-infected persons, unstable housing has been associated with poor utilization of health care services including greater reliance on emergency departments, more frequent hospitalizations, and fewer ambulatory care visits. Use of antiretroviral therapy and prophylaxis against opportunistic illnesses is less frequent among the homeless. Among homeless persons, prescribed antiretroviral therapy and adherence to these medications is suboptimal." The 2007 report continues on to note that "After taking into account those factors that are known to affect AIDS survival (such as age and use of

antiretroviral therapy), homelessness increased the risk of death by more than 20%."

The Housing Waiting List (HWL), created in 1995, is a centralized wait list that makes referrals to most housing programs designated for people living with HIV/AIDS except for hospices and emergency shelters. Most HOPWA funded (Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS) projects use this wait list. As of August 2006, approximately 7,500 people were active on the list. This list was closed to new applicants in November 2001 and the list's administration was transferred to DPH's Housing and Urban Health. According to the AIDS Housing Alliance, some 13,000 or 72% of people with HIV/AIDS have an unmet housing need. The Alliance also says that only 60% of people with HIV/AIDS in the city's REGGIE database have stable housing.

Compounding the barriers facing people living with HIV/AIDS in San Francisco is the highly competitive local housing market. People living with HIV/AIDS with very low incomes compete with high-income prospective tenants in a private, consumer driven rental market. For this reason, a tenant-based rental subsidy program is one of the largest HOPWA-funded programs in San Francisco. Unfortunately, due to increasing housing costs, and despite extensive cost-containment measures, this program is able to subsidize fewer people over time.

The San Francisco HIV Health Services Planning Council is a community planning group that oversees the prioritization and allocation of Ryan White CARE Act Title I and II funds for the Eligible Metropolitan Area of San Francisco, San Mateo and Marin Counties. The federal Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) administers these funds. The Planning Council conducted the 2008 Comprehensive Needs Assessment, which focused on underserved and populations in the most severe need of HIV/AIDS-related health and social services. Housing was consistently rated as one of the top ten most needed and most requested among these populations. Changes to CARE Act funds further limit the amount of CARE Act funds that can be spent on housing, which creates additional barriers to providing appropriate affordable housing for people living with HIV/AIDS in San Francisco.

In 2006, the Board of Supervisors requested that a new citywide HIV/AIDS Housing Plan be done. The Department of Public Health's Housing and Urban Health section led this process, which included assembling an HIV/AIDS Housing Work Group. The result of this process is the Comprehensive HIV/AIDS Housing Plan. This Plan estimates that 13,000 people living with HIV/AIDS in San Francisco have an unmet need for housing. Among these, up to 2,500 are estimated to be currently homeless.

7. Immigrants, Refugees and Undocumented Workers

San Francisco has long been a "port of entry" to the United States for immigrants and refugees. San Francisco also shelters a number of undocumented persons who are in the United States without legal status. Although data on the number of total number of immigrants, refugees, and undocumented workers is not available, the 2010 Census found that about 14% of all households, or about 105,570, are linguistically isolated. Many of these new arrivals need low cost housing and support services; a limited number of housing and immigrant agencies in San Francisco provide multicultural and multilingual assistance.

Shelter providers for the homeless also assist homeless persons who are undocumented. These persons have an urgent need for shelter because they are ineligible for public assistance programs such as General Assistance. Most immigrants and refugees, regardless of immigration status, also need housing services that are provided in a multicultural and multilingual context.

8. Artists/Artisans

Artists have special housing needs for affordable accommodations that provide large wall space, high ceilings, lofts, lighting, and the ability to work at all hours of the day or night. There is high demand for such flexible space in the city. Past efforts to secure housing for artist in San Francisco through the live/work program failed to meet the target housing market. While there are not official counts of artists, the cultural and economic value of artist to San Francisco is undisputable.

9. Students

Institutions of higher learning have not provided sufficient housing for their student populations. For example, the University of California, San Francisco has a student enrollment of 2,940 in degree programs, 1,620 residents, and 1,030 postdoctoral scholars but only have 920 units that can accommodates 1,454 persons available. San Francisco State University had a student enrollment of 29,905 in 2013 but only were able to provide about 2,700 student housing units. Students generally require smaller housing units near their school and job centers. Without dedicated housing, students often end up in overcrowded and/or costly accommodations.

D. HOUSING PRESERVATION NEEDS

San Francisco has an older housing stock, with 75% of all units over 50 years old. This is the largest concentration of older housing stock in the state. Seismic retrofitting requirements also create the greatest housing preservation need for San Francisco.

1. Private Housing Rehabilitation

Housing restoration, remodeling and maintenance is an ongoing activity throughout the City. Renovation projects completed between 2008 and 2013 totaled $1.57 billion, affecting some 356,770 units. Over 60% of these permits were for residential improvements in one and two unit buildings. Almost 50% of the total rehabilitation costs were for projects in single-family units where the average cost of improvements was just under $54,580 per unit.

2. Public Housing Rehabilitation

According to the San Francisco Housing Authority's (SFHA) 2013-2014 Agency Plan, there were 1,148 public housing units in five HOPE VI developments located throughout the City.

Recent programs have rehabilitated 1,149 units of new and affordable housing with 2,883 bedrooms. The 2009 Comprehensive Physical Needs Assessment performed by the SFHA indicated that there is a backlog of immediate physical rehabilitation needs that will cost $269 million. An additional $15 million a year is needed to forestall physical deterioration in SFHA housing. This trend has been significantly forestalled with a $17.9 million American Reinvestment and Recovery Act grant and $15.5 million in Capital Fund Recovery Act competitive grant funds. The SFHA has identified projects totaling $14 million to comprehensively address all of the physical problems that currently exist for the fiscal year 2014.[2]

3. Seismic Retrofitting

In the early 1990s, there were approximately 11,850 units in 399 unreinforced masonry residential hotels and apartment buildings (UMB), most of which are occupied by low-income households. As of May 2014, approximately 30 buildings, including about 90 units, have yet to comply with the City's retrofit requirements.[3] The San Francisco Department of Building Inspection and the City Attorney are working together to bring these remaining buildings into compliance. Rehabilitation and seismic upgrade costs vary depending on the type of building, the level of retrofit, and the availability of construction expertise. `

In addition to unreinforced masonry buildings, much of San Francisco's older housing stock is in need of some type of seismic upgrading such as foundation bolting and structural reinforcement. Soft-story, wood frame, multifamily housing -- typically wood-frame buildings with open fronts, usually large openings on the ground floor such as multiple garage doors or large storefront windows -- is particularly at risk. The City's *Community Action Plan for Seismic Safety* (CAPSS) looked at potential methods of instigating their retrofit, as well as other action steps to improve the City's earthquake resilience by addressing the performance of existing buildings during an earthquake and facilitating the repair of damaged buildings after an earthquake. Effective in September of 2013, the Mandatory Soft Story Retrofit Program was signed into law requiring the evaluation and retrofit for "multi-unit soft-story buildings," defined as: wood-frame structures, containing five or more residential units, having two or more stories over a "soft" or "weak" story, and permitted for construction prior to January 1, 1978. These types of building are found primarily in the Mission, Western Addition, Richmond, North Beach, and Marina Districts. As of May 28, 2014 there were 49 permits filed, 53 permits issued and eight projects completed.

2 PHA Plans – Annual Plan for Fiscal Year 2012-13, San Francisco Housing Authority
3 Information provided by Edward Greene of the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, May 13, 2014.

E. REPLACEMENT OF LOST UNITS

Demolitions, abatement enforcement, mergers and conversions, and fires all diminish the city's housing stock, and lost units need to be replaced. Table I-53 below anticipates losses based on historic trends since 2000.

Reason for Replacement	Units
Demolition and Replacement	1,170
Unit Mergers	180
Loss of Secondary Units	250
Conversion to Commercial Use	40
Owner Move-In	3,030
Ellis Act Evictions	1,570
TOTAL	6,230

Table I-53
Estimated Replacement Housing Needs, San Francisco, 2015–June 2022

SOURCE: Planning Department

1. Loss of Units through Building Demolition

Since 2010, building demolition has accounted for the loss of almost 810 units (Table I-27 on page 30), a rate 9% lower than the annual demolition average of 123 units between 2000 and 2009. The City has a one-to-one unit replacement policy and units lost through demolition are subsequently replaced with the same number of units or even more. Housing demolitions in this period included the demolition of the old Trinity Plaza apartments (418 units) in 2013, which coincided with the new construction of 418 units as Phase II of the new 1,900 unit Trinity Plaza; and the demolition in Hunter's View as a part of the revitalization and new construction of the 267-unit HOPE SF project. Similar housing renewal projects are foreseen in the near future.

2. Loss of Units through Mergers

Dwelling unit mergers result in fewer but larger units. Smaller units are generally considered more affordable. However larger units enable families to grow without leaving their communities. The City established legislation that aims to limit dwelling unit mergers that result in larger and more expensive units. A slight decline in dwelling unit mergers followed this legislation. Between 1995 and 1999, dwelling unit mergers resulted in the loss of some 233 units, an average of 47 a year. Trends slowed down even further, between 2000 through 2008, only 287 units were merged to make larger dwelling units, a loss of about 32 units a year. Trends continued to slow down between 2009 and 2013, yielding 147 merged units with a loss of about 26 units a year.

3. Loss of Illegal Secondary Units through Code Enforcement

A secondary unit is generally a smaller unit that does not have the same amenities as the primary unit or units on a lot. Often these units are built in basements, garages, attics, or in rear yard structures. While many illegal secondary units may not meet existing code requirements, they still constitute a major supply of affordable housing. Some illegal units create life safety hazards; other units require alternative standards for open space, parking, rear yard requirements, or density requirements to be legalized. In Spring 2014, the City and County of San Francisco passed legislation to allow the legalization process for secondary units built without a building permit. The legislation amends the Planning Code, the Building Code, and the Administrative Code to establish a legalization process for such units. The new law allows one authorized unit per lot and the applicants interested must go through a pre-screening process through the Department of Building Inspection. The Planning Department will maintain a master list of units authorized through this process.

Between 2004 and 2013, 226 illegal secondary units were removed and 76 units were legalized (Table I-54). Based on a projected average loss of 23 units per year, it is estimated that about 207 units will be needed between January 2015 and June 2022 to replace these typically affordable units.

Year	Units Legalized	Illegal Units Removed
2004	8	22
2005	16	38
2006	9	12
2007	11	10
2008	8	19
2009	10	8
2010	4	6
2011	6	39
2012	-	2
2013	4	70
TOTALS	76	226

Table I-54
Legalization of Secondary Units, San Francisco, 2004–2013

Source: Planning Department

4. Loss of Units from Conversions to Commercial Use

Seventy-five housing units were legally converted to commercial uses between 2000 and 2013 (Table I-28). This is comparable with the annual average of about five units removed between 1990 and 1999. While the conversion of residential use to commercial uses has declined significantly from the high rates experienced in the late 1970s, illegal conversions are still a concern in a number of areas. Unfortunately, no reliable data can detail the extent of illegal conversions, but based on trends in the previous decade, at least 50 new housing units will be needed to replace housing lost to legal conversion to commercial use expected during the period covering January 2015 and June 2022.

5. Loss of Units from Owner Move-In and Ellis Act Evictions

Changes in tenure status through Ellis Act evictions or owners move-in is seen to result in a loss of affordable units. These units are affordable through rent control, rental status or smaller unit size. Units held off the market through owner move-in and the Ellis Act and have decreased over the past 10 years by 49% and 34%, respectively (Table I-55). Based on the last 10 years, it can be projected that over the next 10 years there will be an annual average of 40 notices filed for both owner move-in and Ellis Act evictions. However, total eviction notices, including all other reasons for removal from the market have increased by 11% over the last 10 years.

Year	Owner Move-In	Ellis Act	Total Eviction Notices
FY 2003-04	363	177	1,587
FY 2004-05	322	282	1,446
FY 2005-06	259	276	1,621
FY 2006-07	220	246	1,476
FY 2007-08	183	252	1,665
FY 2008-09	259	192	1,430
FY 2009-10	116	43	1,269
FY 2010-11	130	61	1,370
FY 2010-12	127	64	1,395
FY 2012-13	185	116	1,757

SOURCE: SF Rent Board

Table I-55
Evictions from Ellis Act and Owner Move-Ins, San Francisco, 2004–2013

IV. Meeting Housing Needs

This section provides an analysis of the overall capacity for meeting the city's projected housing needs. The first part presents and inventory of the land use capacity for new housing based on the existing zoning, including an analysis of their suitability to a variety of affordable housing types. The second part discusses constraints to housing development in the city that could forestall the City's ability to meet San Francisco's RHNA allocation. The third part presents information on potential future projects and recent community plans. An estimate of housing development over the next five to ten years is also provided. This section shows that while San Francisco may have the land capacity to meet overall housing needs for the next planning period, the City must make programmatic and policy changes in order to meet targeted levels of affordability and achieve local and regional sustainability objectives.

San Francisco is already highly developed. It is also bounded on three sides by water, limiting its ability to expand outwards to meet the need for more housing. As San Francisco has relatively few large undeveloped sites and the following analysis is based on a cumulative examination of vacant and underdeveloped sites' potential development at less than the theoretical maximum capacity allowed under current zoning in acknowledgement of existing neighborhood characteristics. Nevertheless, some 47,020 new housing units could potentially be built on numerous in-fill development opportunity sites under current zoning allowances. In addition, some 22,870 can be accommodated in vacant or nearly vacant lands currently or previously zoned "Public" such as Mission Bay, Treasure Island and Hunter's Point Naval Shipyard.

A. NEW HOUSING DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL UNDER EXISTING ZONING

Residential development is allowed as-of-right in most of the city's zoning districts. All residential and residential-commercial (RH, RC and RM) districts permit dwelling units as of right. Housing is also permitted in most of the South of Market's mixed-use districts and all of the mixed-use districts in Chinatown; similarly, residential developments are allowed in downtown and commercial zoned districts. In the neighborhood commercial districts, housing is permitted but generally encouraged above the commercial ground floor in new construction projects. Housing development is a conditional use in industrial districts and the South of Market's Service and Secondary Office (SSO) district. The only zoning district wherein housing projects are not permitted unless they are affordable to low-income households is in the South of Market's Service-Light Industrial (SLI) district. New residential development is not allowed in the new Production, Distribution and Repair (PDR) districts.

Residential uses in San Francisco include single and multi-unit housing, residential care facilities, and group housing. Group housing in San Francisco include homeless shelters and transitional supportive housing. Group housing is not permitted in low density, single-family residential districts (RH-1, RH-2 and RH-3) and in the South of Market's residential enclave districts (RED). They are accommodated in the moderate density residential, downtown, commercial, and neighborhood commercial districts where other supportive amenities are more accessible. Group housing are also allowed on a conditional basis in low- to medium-density residential districts, the industrial districts and most South of Market districts. Emergency shelters, considered hotel use because these offer only short-term residency, are not permitted in low density, single-family residential districts but are allowed as conditional use in the moderate density residential districts, downtown commercial and neighborhood commercial districts. (*Attachment D-2* in *Appendix D* lists residential development types and standards for all zoning districts.)

1. Land Inventory

Housing Element law requires local governments to prepare an inventory of land suitable for residential development to help identify sites that can be developed for housing within the housing element planning period. It is a general estimate of the city's total housing capacity and is determined without specifying which sites may or may not be developed within the next five to seven years. This land inventory does not include sites that are under construction or are already slated for development in the next five to seven years, i.e. parcels with building permits already obtained and ready to start construction, or parcels that have received Planning Department entitlements and have applications for building permits filed.

The housing potential estimates shown in Tables I-56 and I-57 were derived using a computer model based on current zoning standards and an inventory of existing uses citywide. (*See Appendix D for additional details on methodology, terms used.*) The largely undeveloped Treasure Island and Hunter's Point Naval Shipyard are currently zoned "Public" and thus considered separately in this exercise. The number of units listed are currently proposed for these redevel-

opment areas. Similarly, parcels in Mission Bay are treated as distinct from the rest of the city's housing opportunity sites. Some 3,455 units out of the 6,000 proposed units have already been built in the Mission Bay redevelopment area. Construction for Phase I of the Hunter's Point Naval Shipyard is coming to a completion, in which 1,600 homes will be built. Phase II is projected to include an additional 10,500 units to be located on the Shipyard and Candlestick Point. Approximately 27% to 40% of units in these redevelopment areas are programmed to be affordable.

A database listing all parcels in the city, along with current land uses, zoning designation, and development or lot improvements forms the basis of this evaluation. Land use information collected included type of use, building square footage, number of stories, building height, lot area, floor area ratio, and other pertinent data.

Table I-56 categorizes the housing opportunity sites by zoning districts and lists the build-out capacities of potential housing sites according to permitted residential densities. Over half (55%) of the new housing can be accommodated in neighborhood commercial and mixed use districts; a little over a third (31%) can be expected to be built in traditional residential districts.

General Zoning Districts	Vacant or Near Vacant Sites			Underdeveloped Sites			No. of Parcels	Net Units	Total Acres
	No. of Parcels	Net Units	Acres	No. of Parcels	Net Units	Acres			
Residential	850	2,647	87	2,144	7,104	294	1,922	9,751	234
Neighborhood Commercial	293	4,418	58	1,987	15,648	234	2,280	20,066	292
Mixed Use Districts	146	2,446	28	459	7,423	93	605	9,869	121
Downtown Commercial	70	623	14	181	1,751	64	251	2,374	78
Downtown Residential	11	1,656	6	7	146	1	18	1,802	6
Industrial/PDR	373	1,890	241	701	1,267	448	1,074	3,157	690
Sub-Total	1,743	13,680	434	5,479	33,339	1,134	6,150	47,019	1,420
Programmed /Redevelopment Areas									
Mission Bay								4,373	
Treasure Island								8,000	
Hunter's Point Shipyard (Phase II)								10,500	
Sub-Total								22,873	
TOTALS								69,892	

Table I-56
Estimated New Housing Construction Potential in Vacant or Near Vacant and Underdeveloped Sites by Generalized Zoning Districts, San Francisco, Q4 2013

* Remaining units to be built

SOURCE: SF Planning Department

Table I-57

Estimated New Housing Construction Potential in Vacant or Near Vacant and Underdeveloped Sites by Zoning District, San Francisco, Q4 2013

Zoning Group	Zoning District	Current Utilization						Total Parcels	Total Sum of Net Units	Total Sum of Acres	Zoned Units/ Acre
		Vacant or Near Vacant Sites (Less than 5% of zoned capacity)			Underdeveloped or "Soft Sites" (From 5% - 30% of zoned capacity)						
		Parcels	Net Units	Acres	Parcels	Net Units	Acres				
Residential		**850**	**2,647**	**87**	**2,144**	**7,104**	**294**	**1,922**	**9,751**	**234**	
	RH-1	442	602	39	83	336	21	525	938	59	16
	RH-1(D)	105	105	14	3	8	0.2	108	113	15	8
	RH-1(S)	3	3	0.2	319		31	3	3	0	15
	RH-2	163	605	17	195	729	14	482	1,334	48	28
	RH-3	46	182	4	146	480	42	241	662	18	37
	RM-1	39	198	4	28	2,084	6	185	2,282	46	50
	RM-2	7	95	1	59	412	12	35	507	8	66
	RM-3	12	210	2	23	1,081	4	71	1,291	14	95
	RM-4	12	393	2	2	612	0.1	35	1,005	6	163
	RSD	3	65	1	214	15	18	5	80	1	111
	RTO	18	189	2	1,072	1,347	147	232	1,536	20	See note 1
Neighborhood Commercial / Neighborhood Commercial Transit		**293**	**4,418**	**58**	**1,987**	**15,648**	**234**	**2,280**	**20,066**	**292**	
	NCD	42	434	7	527	3,196	53	569	3,630	59	See note 1
	NC-1	28	135	3	250	910	21	278	1,045	24	43
	NC-2	56	914	17	397	1,686	38	453	2,600	56	47
	NC-3	84	1,157	16	460	3,647	54	544	4,804	69	69
	NC-S	11	58	1	32	1,148	26	43	1,206	27	45
	NCTD	38	634	6	231	3,005	26	269	3,639	32	See note 1
	NCT-2	2	167	2	3	106	1	5	273	3	See note 1
	NCT-3	29	910	6	69	1,839	14	98	2,749	20	141
	SoMa NCT	3	9	0.1	18	111	2	21	120	2	See note 1
Commercial/ Downtown Commercial		**70**	**623**	**14**	**181**	**1,751**	**64**	**251**	**2,374**	**78**	
	C-2	19	82	6	31	658	45	50	740	51	14
	C-3-G	26	444	5	61	735	9	87	1,179	14	84
	C-3-O	1	2	0.1	19	154	3	20	156	3	54
	C-3-O(SD)	10	57	1	28	91	3	38	148	4	39
	C-3-R	-	-	-	13	42	1	13	42	1	30
	C-3-S	13	34	1	23	62	3	36	96	4	24
	C-M	1	4	0.1	6	9	0.4	7	13	1	24

Zoning Group	Zoning District	Current Utilization						Total Parcels	Total Sum of Net Units	Total Sum of Acres	Zoned Units/ Acre
		Vacant or Near Vacant Sites (Less than 5% of zoned capacity)			Underdeveloped or "Soft Sites" (From 5% - 30% of zoned capacity)						
		Parcels	Net Units	Acres	Parcels	Net Units	Acres				
SUD / Downtown Residential		**11**	**1,656**	**6**	**7**	**146**	**1**	**18**	**1,802**	**6**	
	RH DTR	5	862	1	6	103	0.5	11	965	2	See note 1
	SB-DTR	4	100	1	-	-	-	4	100	1	See note 1
	TB DTR	2	694	3	1	43	0.2	3	737	3	See note 1
Mixed Use		**146**	**2,446**	**28**	**459**	**7,423**	**93**	**605**	**9,869**	**121**	
	CCB	1	8	0.05	6	97	1	7	105	1	180
	CRNC	3	51	0.3	10	143	0.8	13	194	1	178
	MUG	1	3	0.1	18	191	3	19	194	3	See note 1
	MUO	16	270	3	18	268	3	34	538	6	See note 1
	MUR	26	498	3	61	1,019	7	87	1,517	10	See note 1
	RC-3	6	86	3	22	381	14	28	467	17	27
	RC-4	24	641	3	88	2,717	14	112	3,358	17	199
	RED	18	167	2	55	279	3	73	446	5	88
	SLI	13	24	1	18	68	4	31	92	5	17
	SLR	-	-	-	6	33	1	6	33	1	41
	SPD	-	-	-	2	3	0.1	2	3	0 .1	30
	UMU	38	698	13	155	2,224	43	193	2,922	56	See note 1
Industrial / PDR		**373**	**1,890**	**242**	**701**	**1,267**	**449**	**1,074**	**3,157**	**690**	
	M-1	94	1,331	76	90	587	35	184	1,918	111	17
	M-2	26	441	27	9	394	24	35	835	51	17
	PDR-1	1	-	0 .4	-	-	-	1	-	0 .4	-
	PDR-1-B	3	-	0 .2	-	-	-	3	-	0 .2	-
	PDR-1-D	6	-	5	18	-	13	24	-	18	-
	PDR-1-G	43	2	21	187	24	102	230	26	123	0.2
	PDR-2	200	116	112	397	262	275	597	378	386	1
Sub-Totals		**1,743**	**13,680**	**434**	**5,479**	**33,339**	**1,134**	**6,150**	**47,019**	**1,420**	
Programmed / Redevelopment Areas									22,873		
Mission Bay									4,373		
Treasure Island									8,000		
Hunter's Point Shipyard (Phase I)									10,500		
TOTALS									**69,892**		

SOURCE: SF Planning Department

Notes:
1 These districts do not nominally restrict residential density, but regulates it based on factors such as lot cover, exposure, and unit mix requirements.



Generalized Permitted Housing Densities by Zoning Districts, San Francisco, 2013

0 Miles 1

MAP 06

Density (Average Units per Acre)

- Low (14)
- Moderately Low (36)
- Medium (54)
- Moderately High (91)
- High (283)

Tables I-56 and I-57 disaggregate this new housing potential according to the parcels' existing state of underutilization or lack of development. There are about 5,480 parcels totaling 1,134 acres that are classified as undeveloped where nearly 33,340 new housing units could potentially be constructed. Another 1,922 parcels are also seen as developable for residential uses, possibly yielding about 9,750 new units. As detailed in *Appendix D*, only parcels developed up to 30% of parcel potential are considered in this inventory. Due to high demand for housing, new construction have occurred in developed parcels, not just vacant or underdeveloped parcels. Hence, parcels with more than 50% of zoned capacity have been and are being redeveloped; rehabilitation and conversion of existing buildings are examples. Given San Francisco is largely built-up, parcels such as these would not have been considered in estimating the remaining zoned land capacity but were nevertheless redeveloped; the estimates in this section are thus conservative for considering only vacant and up to 30% developed parcels.

In addition, redevelopment of Mission Bay, Treasure Island and Hunter's Point Naval Shipyard will bring an additional 22,873 units. Undeveloped or underdeveloped parcels with proposed residential developments in the pipeline are not included in this assessment. About 230 of 800 acres of soft sites fall in areas with recently adopted area plans (Eastern Neighborhoods, Market & Octavia, Balboa Park, Rincon Hill, Visitacion Valley). The residential development pipeline, which accounts for some 47,020 units at the time of this report's writing, will be discussed at a later section of this report.

2. Suitability of In-Fill Housing Development Under Existing Zoning

Approximately one-half of San Francisco's developable land is devoted to residential use. Of the residentially zoned acreage, a majority of the area (76%) is zoned for single family and two unit housing, at a housing density of approximately 10 to 29 units per acre. Other residential areas with higher housing densities, such as the Van Ness corridor and neighborhoods north of Market Street, bring average housing density citywide to 15 net dwelling units per acre.[1] Table I-57 lists the City's zoning categories that permit residential development, grouping these by generalized housing density levels. Map I-6 provides a generalized illustration of housing densities citywide.

The location of San Francisco's housing stock is detailed in Table I-22 (page 24) and the geographic boundary used for this data is the Planning District (shown on Map I-3, page 25). The Northeast and Richmond districts have the most units. Over one-third (36%) of the city's units are located in buildings with ten or more units, while single family homes account for almost another third (33%).

All parcels considered in this estimate meet the minimum lot requirement for development. Sixty of these parcels are vacant or undeveloped, and cover half an acre or more. Most non-profit developers of affordable housing consider 0.5 acre as the minimum lot size necessary to meet economies of scale. Altogether, these parcels - about half of which are one acre or larger - can accommodate over 4,565 new housing units.

1 Not including right of way and streets.

Density Standards	Zoning District	Average Units per Acre	Estimated Population Density per Acre	General Characteristics and Locations
Low Density	RH-1	15	35	Mostly single-family housing located primarily in the southern and western parts of the city
	RH-1(D)			
Moderately Low Density	RH-2	33	75	Smaller multi-family housing such as duplexes, triplexes, and flats located around the City's central hills areas of Diamond Heights, Twin Peaks, and Potrero Hill; also around Golden Gate Park in the Richmond, and the northern part of the Sunset districts, the Marina and edges of Mission Bay bordering open space areas
	RH-3			
Medium Density	RM-1, RTO	58	134	Non-residential commercial and industrial districts; certain areas adjacent to commercial zones; also in the central areas of Mission Bay
	C-2			
	M-1, M-2			
	Eastern N'hoods Mixed-Use			
	NCs			
Moderately High Density	RM-2, RM-3	91	210	More intensively developed northeastern part of the city; along major transit corridors such as Van Ness Avenue, Upper Market Street and Columbus Avenue; in major redevelopment areas such as the Western Addition, Golden Gateway; in Nob Hill, Chinatown, North Beach, edges of Mission Bay bordering commercial and industrial areas
	RC-3			
	Chinatown, NCTs, RED			
High Density	RM-4	283	654	Downtown districts, Rincon Hill, Cathedral Hill, parts of the Western Addition; parts of Diamond Heights, parts of Parkmerced, Nob Hill, parts of the northeastern section of the city; heavy commercial districts.
	RC-4			
	DTR			
	C-M			

Table I-58
Generalized Existing Housing Densities by Zoning Districts, San Francisco, 2013

3. Locating New Housing Development in Existing Neighborhoods and Planned Areas

As Table I-57 on page 68 shows, residential and districts contain a substantial number of undeveloped lots. Locating new housing development in these districts makes sense, as housing should go where other housing already exists. These in-fill sites are scattered throughout all residential neighborhoods and construction of additional units will have very minimal cumulative effect on infrastructure needs. The build-out assumption for these districts also takes into account typical housing types (single-family homes in RH-1, for example); and there would be little impact on the neighborhoods' residential character.

Neighborhood commercial districts are also ideal for additional housing because of these neighborhoods' proximity to transit and services. Typically, the calculation assumes upper storey residential development over ground floor commercial uses, although height limits in some neighborhood commercial districts may have a dampening effect on residential development.

Downtown districts are similarly ideal for residential development given proximity to jobs and transit. The higher densities allowed under current zoning in these districts could bring almost 4,180 new units. Some industrial lands may be more suitable than other industrial sites for residential development based on its proximity to existing residential districts and transit. At least 3,160 units can be accommodated in these industrial lands.

The city's mixed-use districts in Chinatown and South of Market are generally built up and yielded smaller numbers of developable sites. However, with higher densities allowed in these areas, in-fill development could accommodate at least an additional 9,870 units.

The Mission Bay Plan, adopted and being carried out by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (now known as the Office of Community Investment and infrastructure), is envisioning a new neighborhood arising from one of the city's few vast and underused vacant industrial tracts. Projected land uses include a mix of housing and job opportunities. Mission Bay North will accommodate 3,000 units of housing while Mission Bay South will have 3,090 units. Over a quarter (28% or 1,700) of the units will be affordable to moderate, low and very low-income households. As of 2013, 3,455 units were built and the remaining 4,373 are expected to be completed by 2020.

Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, another redevelopment project, will involve re-use of the 500-acre former military base and 200-acre former Candlestick Point. The HPNS Redevelopment Plan sees the decommissioned shipyard transformed into a mini-city with housing, job opportunities and recreational uses. The residential component of the Redevelopment Plan will bring about some 10,500 new housing units. Construction on the Shipyard Phase 1 has begun and the first residents of the redeveloped sites have moved in early 2013; this phase will have a total of 1,600 new homes.

Redevelopment of Treasure Island, while not expected to commence during the 2015-2022 RHNA reporting period, has been included in the land inventory because of its long-term potential for housing. The current proposal includes up to 8,000 units.

a. Housing in Residential Areas

Housing development on remaining vacant, residentially zoned sites will occur as market pressure intensifies to build on available residential sites throughout the city. These sites generally have low or moderately low density residential-house zoning designations (RH-1, RH-2 or RH-3), which permit only one, two or three units per lot in most cases. Most housing – especially family housing – is already located in these residential districts. It is estimated that there is an in-fill housing potential of approximately 2,388 units on vacant and underutilized RH-1 and RH-2 parcels, which allow for single-family and duplexes, respectively. Typical densities range from a maximum of 16 units per acre for RH-1 districts and 28 units per acre for RH-2. An additional 662 units can also be accommodated in RH-3 parcels that allow for development of triplexes at about 37 units per acre density.

Residential mixed districts (RM) and residential commercial combined districts (RC) permit non-residential uses but remain predominantly residential in character. These areas are generally adjacent to commercial zones and can have intense, compact development. Medium density residential districts typically contain a mixture of dwelling types found in RH districts but have a significant number of apartment buildings. About 2,280 new units can be developed in low-density residential mixed districts (RM-1). This zoning category allows for a maximum of 50 units per acre. About 507 and 1,290 additional new units can be in the RM-2 and RM-3 districts respectively. Almost 1,800 new units can be in-fill development in the downtown residential districts ringing the city's downtown core, where higher densities are permitted. All told, there is the potential for almost 5,880 new units on vacant or underutilized parcels in these medium- and high-density residential zones.

b. Housing in Neighborhood Commercial Districts

Both Planning Code regulations and General Plan policies encourage housing over commercial spaces in districts throughout the city. More recently, regional and national interest in transit-oriented development has grown considerably. The close proximity of neighborhood commercial districts to transit preferential streets makes in-fill sites in these districts particularly suitable for development. There is also a proven strong market for mixed-use development. Mixed-use projects, with commercial and residential components, accounted for a significant amount of the new building construction in the last decade. Opportunity sites in neighborhood commercial districts cover over 290 acres of land in the city. This represents the potential for roughly 20,070 new housing units over ground floor commercial spaces.

c. Better Neighborhoods Program

The Better Neighborhoods Program was initiated by the Planning Department to address the city's related housing and transportation challenges. It seeks to do so by strengthening the linkages between land use and transportation planning, so that each one effectively supports the other. Market and Octavia, Balboa Park, and the Central Waterfront were chosen as three pilot neighborhoods and selected to serve as a model for other areas in the city. Glen Park and Japantown were later added as compact versions of the Better Neighborhood planning process. These neighborhoods' proximity to transit and essential services are ideal for additional housing, including units in upper stories above commercial uses. The Market Octavia Plan, promising an additional 5,900 units, was adopted in mid-2008. The Central Waterfront Plan was adopted, along with three other Eastern Neighborhoods, at the end of 2008. Balboa Park was also adopted in December 2008. The Central Waterfront Neighborhood Plan allows for the potential development of about 1,100 to 1,500 new units while Balboa Park could mean some 800 to 3,150 additional units.

Development opportunities in the Better Neighborhood areas vary. About 1,600 units can be built in vacant or near parcels in the Market and Octavia area while underdeveloped parcels can accommodate about 2,730 units. The demolition of the Central Freeway and its replacement with Octavia Boulevard in the Market and Octavia Plan Area freed up about seven acres for redevelopment. All told, these publicly owned parcels have the zoned capacity to accom-

modate over 1,000 units and have been included in the overall estimate for the area. In Central Waterfront, vacant or near vacant parcels have the zoned capacity to accommodate 290 units. Underdeveloped sites, mostly industrial uses such as warehouses, can be redeveloped and yield about 1,020 units. Balboa Park, on the other hand, can see about 310 units in vacant or near vacant properties. Another 660 units can be built in underdeveloped parcels that have existing uses such as single-storey commercial buildings or gasoline stations.

d. Housing in Industrial Areas and the Eastern Neighborhoods

A significant portion of new housing construction (over 40%) in the last decade occurred in the areas south of Market Street. These industrially zoned parts of the city provided a ready supply of flexible and inexpensive industrial space well suited for conversion to office space required by dot-com start-ups. At the same time, these same areas became highly desirable residential locations, especially for live/work or loft-style housing. Many traditional occupants of industrial space — notably production, distribution and repair businesses (PDR) — were displaced by rising rents brought on by new office and residential uses. Conflicts between new residents and remaining businesses, especially over noise and smells associated with many PDR activities made it difficult for businesses to operate. Some businesses found space elsewhere in San Francisco; many others left the city altogether, and a number went out of business.

Interim zoning controls and Planning Commission policies underscored the importance of retaining PDR activities and encouraging these uses on certain industrially zoned parcels while permitting housing and mixed-use activities on other industrially zoned parcels. Recently approved community planning in the Eastern Neighborhoods, where most industrially zoned lands are located, proposed new zoning controls that define uses permitted on these parcels. An additional potential of 7,400 new housing units in industrial lands came about with the passage of new zoning standards. As of now, 1,890 units can be built in vacant or near vacant parcels while 1,270 units can be built in underdeveloped parcels.

The mostly industrial Bayview neighborhood can see an additional 743 new units with the development of vacant or mostly vacant parcels. Redevelopment of underdeveloped sites in the area could mean an additional 1,255 units. Vacant or near vacant parcels in SoMa have the zoned capacity to accommodate about 256 units. Underdeveloped parcels in East SoMa are largely mostly low industrial buildings and can potentially be redeveloped to 1,370 units. Development of vacant or near vacant parcels in the Mission can add 730 to the area's housing stock. Underdeveloped sites in the Mission – largely commercial and some industrial buildings – have the potential to be redeveloped into some 4,690 units. In Showplace Square/Potrero Hill, about 340 units can be built in vacant parcels and another 1,080 units in underdeveloped sites. With rezoning of the largely residential Visitacion Valley, development of vacant or near vacant sites can result in 250 units and 290 units in underdeveloped sites. Vacant or near vacant sites in West SoMa have the potential to be developed into 165 units while underdeveloped sites can accommodate almost 270 units.

4. Suitability of Potential Affordable Housing Sites

Affordable housing in San Francisco includes subsidized multi-family units, single room occupancy units (SRO), emergency shelters, transitional housing, and other types of group housing. As noted earlier, such housing types are generally permitted in as of right or as conditional use in all zoning districts in San Francisco except in the low-density, single-family residential districts, the South of Market's residential enclave districts, and the industrial/PDR districts. In other municipalities, affordable housing includes housing for agricultural workers and low cost manufactured housing. San Francisco is highly urbanized and generally a distance from agricultural employment. Some manufactured single-family housing have been erected in San Francisco but prefabricated units may not be appropriate for high density, affordable housing in San Francisco, especially given seismic safety concerns.

Affordable housing projects with on-site services require a minimum of 90 units per site to gain economies of scale for construction and operations. Of all potential in-fill sites, over 750 parcels – with a total capacity of 16,480 units – would permit this type of development.

Construction of affordable multi-family units generally require a minimum lot size of 0.3 acre or roughly 40 units per project to meet economies of scale. There are around 945 such potential sites that are vacant or undeveloped. Altogether, these larger parcels, which average 0.7 acres each, could accommodate up to 19,540 new housing units.

5. Accommodating Housing Suitable for Persons With Disabilities

San Francisco building code ensures that new housing developments comply with California building standards (Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations) and federal requirements for accessibility. The San Francisco building code incorporates the 2012 International Building Code. It provides reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities in the enforcement of building codes and the issuance of building permits through its flexible approaches to retrofitting or converting existing buildings and construction of new buildings that meet the shelter needs of persons with disabilities.

a. Procedures for Ensuring Reasonable Accommodations

While single-family and duplex or 2-family dwellings are generally not required to be accessible except when they are part of a condominium or planned-use development, multi-family building accessibility requirements are contained in the California Building Code Chapter 11A, Chapter 10, Chapter 30, and section 101.17.9.1. Commercial building access requirements are contained in the California Building Code Chapter 11B, Chapter 10, Chapter 30, and section 101.17.11. The Planning Code additionally requires parking spaces be specifically designated for persons with physical or mental disabilities.

b. Information Regarding Accommodation for Zoning, Permit Processing, and Building Codes

The City provides information to all interested parties regarding accommodations in zoning, permit processes, and application of building codes for housing for persons with disabilities.

c. Zoning and Other Land Use Regulations

There are no zoning or other land-use regulatory practices in San Francisco that could discriminate against persons with disabilities and impede the availability of such housing for these individuals. The City permits group homes of all sizes in most residential districts; as noted above, group housing is allowed on a conditional basis in low density, single-family residential districts (RH-1, RH-2 and RH-3), as well as the industrial districts and most South of Market districts. All of the City's commercial zones also allow group homes: they are permitted as of right in the moderate density residential, downtown, commercial, and neighborhood commercial districts where other supportive amenities are more accessible. In addition, San Francisco does not restrict occupancy of unrelated individuals in group homes and does not define family or enforce a definition in its zoning ordinance. The Planning Department has developed a legislative ordinance that will enable persons with disabilities who require reasonable accommodation as exceptions to the City's Planning Code to bypass the currently required variance process, and to access a streamlined procedure permitting special structures or appurtenances such as access ramps of lifts and other non-physical accommodations and was implemented in the Fall of 2014.

d. Efforts to Remove Regulatory Constraints for Persons with Disabilities

The State has removed any City discretion for review of small group homes for persons with disabilities (six or fewer residents). The City does not impose additional zoning, building code, or permitting procedures other than those allowed by State law. The City has also made zoning accommodations to encourage housing for persons with physical and mental handicaps. Planning Code Section 207.4 and 209.1 set the dwelling unit density for dwellings specifically designed for and occupied by senior citizens or physically or mentally handicapped persons at twice the density ratio established by any residential or neighborhood commercial district. Planning Code Section 135 reduces the minimum amount of usable open space to be provided for use by each dwelling unit to increase development feasibility.

e. Permits and Processing

The City does not impose special permit procedures or requirements that could impede the retrofitting of homes for accessibility. The City's requirements for building permits and inspections are the same as for other residential projects and are straightforward and not burdensome. City officials are not aware of any instances in which an applicant experienced delays or rejection of a retrofitting proposal for accessibility to persons with disabilities.

B. CONSTRAINTS TO HOUSING ACCESS, PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION

Housing development in California is a complex and lengthy process. San Francisco in particular is one of the more challenging environments to build housing. Factors including high land and construction costs, protracted entitlement and permitting processes, and organized opposition pose real obstacles to developing housing in San Francisco.

One result of this difficult landscape has been the development of new housing in areas not fully appropriate for residential development, such as in predominantly industrial areas without the sufficient services and social infrastructure to support a pleasant and vital neighborhood. In meeting the City's housing goals, it is important to focus on areas that can absorb new development in the context of creating viable neighborhoods. The first part of Section IV, "Meeting Housing Needs," discussed suitable locations for potential new housing. This second part will discuss the challenges to new housing production and conservation.

1. Equal Housing Opportunity

All residents have the right to housing that is available without discrimination – that is, without limitations based on race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status, or national origin. The federal Fair Housing Act of 1968, and California's Fair Employment and Housing Act, as well as other non-discrimination acts, were enacted to prohibit discrimination; and San Francisco has adopted a number of local anti-discrimination ordinances addressing housing and public accommodations (Administrative Code Sections 12 A & 12 B, Police Code Sections 33, 38, and 1.2). These federal, state and local provisions are enforced by the City's Human Rights Commission (HRC), which offers mediation services for filed complaints, technical assistance with referrals to nonprofit organizations and City agencies, and fair housing training for housing providers.

However, with all of these protections, discrimination still occurs. Some of the major impediments to fair housing include discrimination in access to housing, condition, evictions and even lending practices.

- **Discrimination:** The most common forms of housing discrimination in San Francisco occur in rental housing, when tenants – who may be facing racial discrimination, poverty, mental and physical handicaps, or have alternative sexual orientation or gender identity – are denied housing, discriminated against in the terms or conditions otherwise available to other tenants, or harassed by a landlord or fellow tenant. Section 8 tenants in particular have difficulty accessing market rentals, as many landlords choose to not rent to Section 8 tenants.

- **Poor conditions:** Many available housing units are maintained in poor condition, at the expense of the quality of life for their tenants. The need to make physical improvements is critical to improve living conditions in low-income housing. Also, given the city's high percentage of renters with disability, it is particularly critical for persons with special needs, to provide improved accessibility to existing housing units.

- **Formal and informal evictions:** Even with state and local regulations against formal evictions, abuses occur as many residents are unaware of their protections. "Buyouts" (where the landlord pays the tenant an agreed upon dollar amount to vacate the property and therefore avoid any eviction processes) are also prevalent throughout the city.

- **Lending practices:** Predatory lending, often directed towards low-income and minority communities, has arisen as a facet of housing discrimination. The current foreclosure crisis is affecting those communities disproportionately, and is also affecting renters of those foreclosed units, who are without traditional eviction rights

Connecting all of these issues is a lack of education about fair housing issues and a lack of information connecting people to resources. Often, fair housing issues pit landlords with access to capital, legal advice and time, against renters who may not be aware of their rights and who may face other impediments in the system such as a language barrier. While San Francisco is fortunate to have a number of nonprofit organizations in addition to the City's Human Rights Commission (HRC) that provide public education, access to legal services and counseling, and even funding, they often lack resources to reach the majority of the population in need.

2. Non-Governmental Constraints

Government Code Section 65583(a)(5) requires that the Housing Element update include an assessment of non-governmental constraints to housing development. Such constraints include the price of land, the cost of construction, and availability of financing.

a. Land Availability and Costs

Much of San Francisco exhibits an established, relatively dense development pattern and is considered by many to be substantially built-out. While there are parcels of land still potentially available for development (see Tables I-56 and I-57 on pages 67-69), San Francisco's tight land market increases pressures on land values. Both market-rate and affordable housing developers report that acquiring land for housing in the city is a challenge. The heightened values of land make some of the land identified as a potential housing site infeasible for actual housing development, especially housing affordable to lower income households.

The city's finite supply of land, coupled with strong development pressure, means that landowners can expect high prices for parcels they own, if they choose to sell for housing development at all. Sites identified as potential housing sites may not be sold to residential developers as some property owners are satisfied with the state of their properties' development. Institutions, for example, may keep surface parking uses to support other adjacent properties' more intense uses. Similarly, building owners may keep smaller but profitable commercial buildings instead of fully developing their properties. Furthermore, except in purely residential zoning districts, housing developers must compete with other potential users. If it is more profitable for a landowner to hold or sell land for a commercial project, the land will not be available for housing. Private vacant or underdeveloped lands identified as housing opportunity sites will only see development if landowners decide to sell, and the prices they demand from housing developers will allow for profitable development.

Average land values vary greatly by zoning district as development potential varies greatly. Table I-59 below details the average sales price per square foot of vacant lands sold between 2008 and 2013. It shows that vacant lands in the industrial zoning districts were the least expensive and sold, on average, at just over $78 per square foot.

Table I-59
Average Price per Square Foot of Vacant Lands Sold, San Francisco, 2008–2013

Zoning Districts	No. of Transactions	Average Price per Sq. Ft.
Residential Districts	88	$204
Downtown Residential Districts	4	$738
Downtown Commercial Districts	5	$323
Neighborhood Commercial Districts	26	$369
Mixed Use Districts	18	$398
Industrial Districts	16	$78

SOURCE: SF Assessor-Recorder's Office; SF Planning Department

Vacant land in single-family zoned districts, where typically one unit is permitted per lot, cost on average $108 a square foot. Vacant parcels in moderately low density residential zones (where duplexes and triplexes are permitted) and the neighborhood commercial districts, averaged $549 and $369 per square foot respectively. Vacant land in the downtown and high density residential zoning districts was the costliest, averaging above $738 per square foot. Vacant lots in the densely built mixed use districts had sold, on average, just under $400 per square foot.

Though specific land costs varied greatly depending on an area's location and underlying zoning, the price of land is a major component of a developer's overall cost of producing housing (see Table I-60 below).

b. Housing Development Costs

In addition to high land costs, other direct costs of building new housing – the cost of labor, of construction materials and contractor fees – continued to escalate. Steep construction costs are generally seen as a major constraint on housing development and especially impacts affordability. In 2013, total development cost for an average two-bedroom condominium totaling 800 sq. ft. was about $469,800 a unit or $587 per square foot. Table I-60 below breaks down these costs.

In this estimate, planning, entitlement, and other permitting fees – discussed in the section above – totaled less than 4% of development costs. Specific site conditions may also add to the cost of new housing construction. For example, building demolition may be required with the re-use of a site; toxic waste clean-up needed to mitigate chemical contamination in some former industrial sites; or increased foundation costs in potentially seismically unstable soils.

Table I-60
Estimated Multi-Family Housing Development Costs Per Unit, San Francisco, 2013

Cost Categories	Costs	% of Total Costs
Land Cost	$120,000	25.5%
Building Construction at $300 per sq. ft.	$240,000	51.1%
Permits, city fees and professional service fees at 20% of construction costs	$48,000	10.2%
Subsidy to build below-market rate units (12% of total units) based on a $200,000 per unit subsidy for a year, divided by the remaining 88 market-rate units	$27,000	5.7%
Selling expenses	$34,800	7.4%
TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COST	$469,800	100.0%
"Total Cost per Square Foot (Average Net Unit Size: 800 sq. ft.)"	$587.25	

SOURCE: San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association (SPUR)
Note: San Francisco Housing Cost Calculation Per Unit for a 100-Unit Building. This is very simplified and does not include construction financing expenses, contingencies or developer's profit, among other things. Calculations are based on a 100 unit building assuming 800 square feet per unit, which is approximately 640 square feet of usable space based on typical building efficiency.

c. Availability of Open Space

Most of the potential housing sites identified – some 5,049 (out of 5,487) parcels – are within walking distance (1/4 mile) of open space amenities. Many of the remaining sites are located in new plan areas that include plans for more open space. For example, the Mission Bay project includes new public open spaces to serve the residents of its 6,000 new units and those of surrounding areas. The Rincon Point-South Beach Redevelopment area includes two new shoreline parks while Guy Place Park is currently being implemented per the Rincon Hill plan, due to open late 2016. The *Recreation and Open Space Element* 2013 update prioritizes new open space in underserved areas. As new areas are planned for housing, additional open space will need to be provided and should be included as part of future redevelopment plans, area plans, rezoning provisions, and subdivision projects.

d. Access to Commercial and Other Services

Many of the areas where new housing is likely to occur offer a rich mixture of uses that can readily serve new residents. About – 91% or 5,001 out of 5,487 parcels – of potential housing development sites are within a five-minute walk (1/4 mile) from a neighborhood commercial district. Additionally, much of the future housing development will be in mixed use projects that will likely include local serving commercial activities. If these new, larger scale developments are well planned and designed, the additional residents and businesses will enrich existing neighborhoods nearby. Major new housing developments that are isolated from requisite services do not create livable neighborhoods, and can contribute to citywide transportation problems. Plans for new neighborhoods, and specific plans for improving existing areas, must respond to the commercial and service needs of new residents.

e. Transportation

San Francisco's transportation system has been strained by the availability of free and relatively inexpensive parking in many parts of the city, which promotes driving. Coupled with job and population growth, this has increased congestion while decreasing the efficiency of public transit services. Recent planning efforts seek to address this issue and continue to closely examine the interaction of land use and transportation to assure that current and future residents are able to travel conveniently and efficiently to jobs, services, and recreational opportunities. Also, planners at the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) are currently preparing the Countywide Transportation Plan that will prioritize numerous improvements to the city's transportation system.

f. Infrastructure Standards

The City imposes fees on sponsors of new development for various on- and off-site infrastructure improvements when necessary. Various standards for street widths, curb requirements, and circulation improvements have been developed over time and are not believed to be excessive or to impose undue burdens on development. They apply citywide and conform to the developed pattern of the city. More specific infrastructure improvements, such as particular streetscape design treatments, may be required of major new developments in the city's project areas. Given the densities at which residential land is developed in San Francisco, these infrastructure costs, even when borne partially by the developer, represent a relatively small cost per unit.

San Francisco's current housing stock is approximately 376,080 units. The housing production goal set by HCD/ABAG for San Francisco is 28,869 units by 2022. This represents an increase of about 7.7%. The capacity of the city's infrastructure including water, sewage treatment, and utility services is generally not a constraint to meeting San Francisco's housing goals. Many potential development sites are in areas that are well-served by the existing infrastructure. Some proposed area or neighborhood plans and very large development projects may require additional local infrastructure improvements.

The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission's (SFPUC) *2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) for the City and County of San Francisco* (SFPUC, June 2011) projects water demand from residential and commercial customers. While the SFPUC does project an increase in total demand, it also expects residential water use to decline, even as population increases, because of increased conservation measures and efficiency. The 2010 Plan also relies on greater use of groundwater supplies and recycled water. The UWMP projects sufficient water supply in normal years, though during drought years demand will exceed supply. During drought years, plans are in place to institute varying degrees of water rationing depending on the severity of the drought. The SFPUC has begun the implementation of a 13-year Water Supply Improvement Program (WSIP) approved by the voters of San Francisco in the November 2002 General Election as Proposition A. The $4.3 billion WSIP will ensure that safe and reliable drinking water service will be provided to meet projected San Francisco retail customer demand anticipated in the UWMP through 2018.

The WSIP will maintain compliance with state and federal drinking water standards while ensuring that the system will be functional in the event of a natural disaster, and will attempt to provide adequate water supplies during drought conditions. The SFPUC also has an ongoing program to repair and replace outmoded and aging components of the city's water delivery and distribution infrastructure.

The SFPUC has committed to a number of programs to reduce water demand, which are described in greater detail in the UWMP. The SFPUC is also implementing a Recycled Water Program to produce recycled water for non-potable irrigation purposes. As of June 30, 2013, construction was underway on 14 regional projects valued at $2.6 billion, while construction had been completed on 29 other regional projects valued at $634 mission.

In 1997, the City completed a 20-year program to upgrade its wastewater treatment system to bring it into full compliance with federal and state clean water regulations. Because San Francisco has a combined sanitary and stormwater system, the largest volume of wastewater occurs during wet weather.

In 2005, the SFPUC launched a citywide $150 million, Five-Year Wastewater Capital Improvement Program (WWCIP) to improve the reliability and efficiency of San Francisco's combined wastewater and storm water system. Over the next few years, the program helped address the most critical needs of the aging wastewater system, improve the capacity of sewer mains, and upgrade treatment facilities.

The Water Pollution Control Division of the SFPUC reports that treatment capacity is available to serve expected growth. However, there are areas where local sewers, which transport waste to the treatment system, might be undersized and will need to be examined on a case by case basis. In 2012, the SFPUC began a public process to update the completed Clean Water Master Plan to identify the future course of the city's wastewater and storm water collection and treatment system, including repair or replacement of structurally-inadequate sewers to address localized flooding problems. Some proposed area plans or very large development projects may need local infrastructure improvements to connect to the city's system.

In 2006, pursuant to SB 1087 and Government Code Section 65589.7, the SFPUC approved Resolution 06-0185 adopting a written policy to provide water and sewer service to new developments on an income-neutral basis. The SFPUC will also give priority to applicants for developments that include the sale or rental of housing that is affordable to lower-income households during any period when supply, treatment, or distribution capacity is limited.

San Francisco's solid waste is transferred to the Altamont Landfill, in Alameda County. In 1988, the City signed a long-term disposal agreement that provides for the disposition of up to 15 million tons of solid waste at Altamont. As of March 2013, San Francisco's remaining landfill capacity at Altamont Landfill was about 1 million tons out of the original 15 million ton capacity. At current disposal rates, San Francisco's available landfill space under the existing contract will run out in January 2016.

In 2002 the City's Board of Supervisors adopted a goal for San Francisco of 75% landfill diversion by the year 2010, and authorized the Commission on the Environment to adopt a long term goal of zero waste when the 50% diversion goal is met. In 2003 the Commission adopted a date of 2020 for the City to achieve a goal of zero waste to landfill and directed the Department of the Environment to develop policies and programs to increase producer and consumer responsibility to achieve the goal. Currently, the City's 3 bin system, policies, financial incentives, and extensive outreach to residents and businesses, has helped San Francisco achieve the highest diversion rate of any major city in North America. San Francisco exceeded its goal of 75% in 2010 and diverted 80% (1,593,830 tons) of its discards from the landfill.

Despite recent supply problems, future gas and electricity supply should meet projected needs. Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) has filed a "Load Forecast" for San Francisco through 2022 with the California Energy Commission. This forecast is the basis for capital and operating plans, and covers both residential and commercial demand. In addition, the City and County of San Francisco in 2004 commenced the San Francisco Electric Reliability Project that calls for a new City-owned power plant to operate during periods of peak demand. In December of 2010 the project's license, however, was terminated.

g. Environmental Features

San Francisco is a built-up city. The sites inventory in the previous section identified parcels that are suitable for infill development. Unlike other jurisdictions, development in San Francisco is not constrained by environmental features such as protected wetlands or oak tree preserves. However, major programmed redevelopment efforts are proposed in areas that have been identified in the 2010 Floodplain Management Ordinance as potentially flood-prone. This list includes Mission Bay, Treasure Island, Candlestick Point, Bayview Hunters Point Area C, and the Hunters Point Shipyard. Floodplain management requirements are incorporated into redevelopment plans in these areas to ensure that any land at risk of flooding will be raised above the floodplain prior to redevelopment.

San Francisco has several brownfield designations that have been identified under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). San Francisco has initiated planning efforts in each of these areas to facilitate the clean-up process. Full clean up of the sites to residential standards has been required under the EIR's for each plan area:

- Mission Bay: The Mission Bay redevelopment area has been the subject of extensive clean-up since the mid 1980s, when the Santa Fe Pacific Realty Corporation began to remediate and redevelop the former railyard at Mission Bay in California. New housing construction in Mission Bay is now more than 50% complete.

- Hunter's Point Shipyard: The Hunters Point U.S. naval shipyard, a federally designated Superfund site contaminated by toxic waste, has been the subject of redevelopment plans for 20 years. In July 2010, the Environmental Impact Report for a redevelopment plan which would clean up the site and add 10,500 homes (32% affordable), as well as 320 acres of parkland and open space was certified. Clean up on the site was initiated in 2008.

- Eastern Neighborhoods: The industrial character of many sites in these neighborhoods meant that individual clean up efforts may be necessary. Recently, several sites have been fully cleaned and converted to residential activities, most recently the Deres Lofts, where a former paint manufacturing plant converted into 500 units.

- Schlage Lock Site: The former Schlage Lock factory operations polluted the groundwater at their site and on adjacent parcels. In 2009, the Board of Supervisors adopted the Visitacion Valley/Schlage Lock Redevelopment Plan, including a remedial action plan. Since then, the entire site has undergone remediation. When California eliminated its redevelopment agencies in 2012, the City of San Francisco initiated a new effort to develop the site with reduced public funding. The plan to develop 1,679 units on the site was adopted and approved in July 2014.

San Francisco's Maher Ordinance (San Francisco Public Works Municipal Code, article 20) also mandates soil analysis for hazardous waste by the Department of Public Health. This regulation requires site history and soil analysis reports for all building permit applicants in areas where dumping may have occurred in the past. Affected areas have been mapped by staff, and cover the majority of the city's Downtown area and its eastern shoreline. The Hazardous Waste Program staff continues to review and process the reports required in the Analyzing the Soil for Hazardous Waste Ordinance (Maher) and oversee activities in the city.

Like most coastal cities, San Francisco is vulnerable to sea level rise. However, recent plans for shoreline development include measures to protect development from rising sea levels. The Treasure Island Master Plan concentrate development at the island's center, elevates the building pad for the island's proposed developed area, and protects the buildings with a levee and a wide setback. Hunters Point Shipyard also elevates the total building pad for development, and also designed a flexible management strategy including incremental strategies on how to deal with shoreline based on actual rise levels. San Francisco staff continues to collaborate with the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) on overall adaptation strategies for the city.

Finally, San Francisco has taken seriously the impacts of greenhouse gas emissions. In 2001, the City adopted Resolution No. 010-01, which mandated local efforts to curb global warming, included adoption of a greenhouse gas emissions reductions goals for the City and County of San Francisco and continued actions towards achieving these goals. A primary component of meeting these goals is directing development towards transit-served areas to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from transportation. The City's area plans serve to direct development to transit served areas. Numerous policies in Part II of the City's Housing Element also support this aim.

h. Community Acceptance

San Francisco has a strong tradition of public involvement in policy discussions and possesses a very engaged citizenry on development issues. This activism often takes the shape of organized opposition to housing projects across the city, especially affordable housing for low-income residents and even towards well planned and designed developments. Such vocal opposition poses very real impediments to project sponsors and can lead to significant time delays, additional cost, or a reduction in the number of residential units produced. The City is

committed to the involvement of citizens in the planning process and to the need to expound on the importance of working towards citywide housing objectives. Two recently approved planning initiatives – the Market/Octavia plan and the Eastern Neighborhoods Community Planning plan and re-zoning – have engaged residents, property owners, workers, and other stakeholders and sought broad public community backing through participatory programs of education, public dialogue and input, and consensus building.

3. Governmental Constraints

Housing production in San Francisco is affected by a number of governmental regulations, from local policies and codes to state and federal land use regulations and state environmental laws. This section will examine the impacts of local governmental regulations on residential development as these can be addressed by local housing policy. These regulatory controls have been carefully crafted over time to balance citywide needs and address public concerns. These regulations were established to be consistent with the City's General Plan priorities to conserve and protect existing housing and neighborhood character. They also regulate new development to be compatible with and not detrimental to the area with respect to size, shape, traffic and its generated noise, open space and urban design requirements. The time required to administer and approve projects can add to the cost of housing production. But without these standards, an even greater check on new housing construction could result from public opposition to new development.

Addressing these constraints must be balanced against other citywide needs and will also be tempered by public concerns. Most of San Francisco's existing regulations were established to be consistent with the City's General Plan priorities to conserve and protect existing housing and neighborhood character, regulating development to be compatible with neighborhood character, and not detrimental to the area with respect to size, shape, traffic and its generated noise, open space and urban design requirements.

To address these issues, the City has made a number of improvements to remove hurdles in the City's General Plan and Planning Code, including:

- Using community planning processes to adopt streamlined regulations around discretionary process and reducing Conditional Uses;
- Using community planning processes to increase development capacity, including height, density and required lot sizes;
- Reduction of parking and open space requirements.
- Through Mayor Ed Lee's Executive Directive 13-01, the City has prioritized the permitting process for 100% affordable housing projects, and market rate projects with at least 20% on-site BMRs or 30% off-site BMRs.
- Through the Mayor's Housing Working Group, the City is working to identify streamlined regulations.

- Elimination of neighborhood notification (Section 311) for the addition on new dwelling units that do not expand the building envelope (Legislative Board File 13-1148)

- Exemptions from Planning Code requirements, such as open space, rear yard, exposure and parking, when legalizing certain dwelling units. (Legislative Board. File 13-1148)

a. Entitlements

Proposed developments that deviate from or exceed permitted development standards, or that bring up other planning concerns, are subject to additional assessment and would require conditional use approvals, variances, Downtown Project Authorizations, Large Project Authorizations and discretionary reviews. These take longer to process as they require greater study and analysis, public notifications and hearings, and approvals from the Planning Commission or the Zoning Administrator.

1) Land Use Regulations and Community Plans. The Planning Code, in particular, can present constraints to housing development. Height and density limits, exposure, parking and open space requirements, for example, can constrain housing form and increase production costs; discretionary processes such as Conditional Use authorizations can extend both the timeline for and the cost of housing construction.

The San Francisco Planning Department has prepared a number of community plans intended to shape growth in our urban neighborhoods, by encouraging housing where it makes sense and by using that housing growth to strengthen neighborhoods. The community planning process provides a neighborhood-based forum to grapple with issues such as appropriate height and density. It also provides the opportunity to shape new regulations for development which streamline the housing approval process yet make sure appropriate development still is designed according to the neighborhood character.

In the last five years, the Planning Department has completed several plans for the Downtown area (Rincon Hill and Transbay), a series of "Better Neighborhoods Plans" (Market & Octavia, Balboa Park and the Central Waterfront), and the Eastern Neighborhoods Plans (East SoMa, Showplace Square/Potrero Hill, and Mission). Adoption of these plans into the City's General Plan enabled clearly stated housing development policies. Each new neighborhood plan is also accompanied by a set of new regulations, including amendments to the General Plan, Planning Code, and other required documents. The goal of these amendments is to establish parameters for new development that give residents and developers a clear sense of what is and is not allowed in these neighborhoods. Amendments reduce discretionary processes such as Conditional Use authorizations as much as possible while still ensuring adequate community review (in the Better Neighborhoods and Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans, most housing is permitted as-of-right, and conditional use requirements for design aspects such as height have been eliminated). In many cases, the amendments also include a public review and approval process that reduces permitting time and hearings.

Planning Code amendments adopted with each new neighborhood plan also served to expand potential development capacity in each of these areas, using tools such as height increases,

removal of maximum densities, and removal of minimum required lot sizes. This increases flexibility for development on all sites in the project areas, and has resulted in an expanded development capacity which is detailed in Appendix D.

2) Parking Requirements: Providing parking represents a significant cost to developers and can affect housing prices, adding as much as $100,000 to the price of a new unit. Surface level parking also takes up valuable real estate that could be devoted to housing or other uses. As such, parking requirements can act as a constraint to housing development.

Parking requirements vary throughout the city's zoning districts, based on factors like density and transit access. For example, in the city's low density districts (one-, two- or three-family housing districts), one parking space is required for each dwelling unit. The City's high-density residential districts, including RC-4, RSD, and other mixed use areas, require one parking space for every four units. In downtown districts such as the DTR, NCT, RTO or C-3 Districts, no parking is required. Provision of guest parking is not required by the City for any housing development; it is only required for temporary stay uses such as hotel, motel or medical institution. Parking is not required for housing designed for and occupied by senior citizens, for group housing or for single-room occupancy dwellings; parking requirements for 100% affordable housing projects can be modified as a "variance" to reduce the 1:1 parking ratio requirement.

Recent amendments to the Planning Code removed parking requirements altogether in a number of zoning districts; instead, a maximum number of parking spaces serves as a cap. Newly adopted zoning districts such as Downtown Residential (DTR), Neighborhood Commercial Transit (NCT), and Residential Transit Oriented (RTO) Districts, have been established in several parts of the city do not require parking; where the provision of parking space is capped at one car for every four dwelling units (or less without the need for a conditional use).

To address the cost parking adds to the development price tag, the "unbundling" of parking spaces has also been institutionalized through the Planning Code. The adopted Section 167 of the Planning Code requires that parking costs be separated from housing costs in housing developments of 10 or more units. Off-street parking spaces that are accessory to residential uses can be leased or sold separately from the rental or purchase fees for dwelling units for the life of the dwelling units, so potential renters or buyers have the option of renting or buying a residential unit at a price lower than would be the case if there were a single price for both the residential unit and the parking space.

3) Open Space Requirements: The City's Planning Code currently requires that all new multi-family residential development provide outdoor open space, ranging from 36 to 125 square feet per unit, based on density, available public open space, and other factors. This open space may be provided on the ground, or in spaces such as balconies, terraces or rooftops.
To reduce the burden of open space requirements, as well as to gain the benefits that common space provides (collective place for residents to gather; residents get to know their neighbors well; space can foster a sense of community; etc.), the Planning Department has reduced open space requirements for developments in certain zoning districts which provide usable open space as publicly accessible.

4) Redevelopment Project Areas: The San Francisco Redevelopment Agency used the state tool of redevelopment to revitalize local neighborhoods where appropriate. Redevelopment provided several tools that aid with the preservation of, rehabilitation of and production of affordable housing for low-and moderate-income families. San Francisco's local redevelopment ordinance specifically required that 50% of redevelopment tax increment funds be committed to housing programs.

The San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, along with all 400 redevelopment agencies in California, was dissolved on February 1, 2012 by order of the California Supreme Court in a decision issued on December 29, 2011 (California Redevelopment Association et al. v. Ana Matosantos). On June 27, 2012, the California Legislature passed and the Governor signed AB 1484, a bill making technical and substantive changes to AB 26, the dissolution bill that was found largely constitutional by the Supreme Court on December 29, 2011.

In response to the requirements of AB 26 and AB 1484, San Francisco has created the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (formerly known as the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency). Under AB 26 and AB 1484, the Successor Agency is only authorized to continue to implement three major redevelopment projects that were previously administered by the former Redevelopment Agency: 1) the Mission Bay North and South Redevelopment Project Areas, 2) the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area and Zone 1 of the Bayview Redevelopment Project Area, and 3) the Transbay Redevelopment Project Area (collectively, the "Major Approved Development Projects"). In addition, the Successor Agency continues to manage Yerba Buena Gardens and other assets within the former Yerba Buena Center Redevelopment Project Area ("YBC").

5) California Environmental Quality Act review procedures: Like all projects in California, proposed residential projects in San Francisco are subject to environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). CEQA can act as a constraint to housing development because it can increase both the costs and the time associated with development review. Environmental analysis can take upwards of 18-24 months to complete. In San Francisco, environmental review fees are calculated based on a project's calculated construction costs and can easily exceed $100,000; independent consultants are often involved, also at a substantial cost. Moreover, under state law CEQA determinations may be appealed directly to the Board of Supervisors, an appeal body that is available to very few other types of land use decisions in San Francisco. It is not uncommon for the Planning Department's CEQA documents of any type to undergo lengthy appeals processes, further increasing the time and costs associated with environmental analysis.

The Department is implementing a variety of initiatives to increase the efficiency of the environmental review process and thereby reduce the time and costs associated with this effort. CEQA itself affords a variety of opportunities to streamline environmental review for urban infill and/or affordable housing projects, particularly in locations under an adopted area plan. The Planning Department takes advantage of these opportunities as available; however, when a project could result in significant environmental impacts (such as impacts to historical resources) the ability to streamline environmental review is substantially reduced.

Some common environmental impacts and their mitigations are relatively standard and could be addressed on a legislative level by ordinance and thereby incorporated into the building permit process. The benefit of this approach is that it would make more projects eligible for exemption from environmental review, because the necessary measures to avoid significant environmental impacts would be required for compliance with relevant code provisions. The Board of Supervisors has enacted such legislation such as adoption of the Environment Code, the Green Building Ordinance, and the establishment of the Department of the Environment, and others with regard to several air quality-related concerns; other such ordinances could be pursued in the future to address other areas of environmental impact.

With regard to the time and fees required for environmental review, sponsors of 100% affordable housing projects and market rate housing projects that include at least 20% on-site or 30% off-site BMRs are granted priority permit processing status and are also eligible for deferred payment of environmental evaluation fees. These measures reduce the amount of time that a project is in the environmental review process and facilitate the initiation of applications for environmental review.

6) Discretionary Review: The Discretionary Review process can result in a significant cost to developers. The costs are typically the result of architectural fees, holding costs associated with extended time delays, and compensation that is sometimes requested by the Discretionary Review requestor in order to mitigate concerns or withdraw the Discretionary Review Application. Due to the ambiguous outcome and undefined timeline associated with the filing of a Discretionary Review Application, many project sponsors forgo projects altogether because of the additional time and financial burdens caused by this process. The additional time and costs caused by Discretionary Review Applications are absorbed into the price of new or renovated dwelling-units, and therefore, the Discretionary Review process acts as a constraint to housing development and increases the overall cost of housing particularly in the city's lower density neighborhoods.

The City's Discretionary Review process is the Planning Commission's authority to review Code-complying projects and take action if the Commission finds that the case demonstrates "exceptional and extraordinary" circumstances. Conceptually, Discretionary Review is a second look at building permit applications that have already been determined to comply with the minimum Planning Code standards and applicable design guidelines. The idea is that additional scrutiny might be necessary in some cases to judge whether the design guidelines were applied appropriately or if there are circumstances unique to a case that warrant further modifications to the project. The problem with the Discretionary Review process is that because there are no guidelines for this process, it eliminates a developer's sense of predictability and certainty in the entitlement process. There are no barriers to file a Discretionary Review Application – other than a nominal fee of $535 – and there are no limitations as to the amount of time the process can take.

The Discretionary Review process is most frequently used as a response to development in the city's low density districts, (RH – one-, two-, or three-family housing districts) and high income areas, like Supervisorial Districts 2 and 7. The costs associated with Discretionary

Review in lower density districts have a greater impact to the affordability of housing, as there are fewer dwelling units associated with each project to absorb the additional costs of the process. Furthermore, the minimal filing cost of $535 for a Discretionary Review Application does not nearly reflect the actual cost of processing the Application, which is about $3,680. The Department recovers the difference by adding a Board of Appeal surcharge fee of $25 to the cost of every building permit application. This too adds to the overall cost of construction in the city, which increases the cost and acts as a constraint of housing development.

As part of the Department's Action Plan, the Department is working on a reform the Discretionary Review process. The Department is working on to improve the design review process to help minimize the number of Discretionary Reviews filed.

b. Permit Processing

A typical timeline for a medium-density, multi-family residential project (50 to 100 units) is about one year to 2½ years from the initial conceptual project review with the Planning Department to commencement of construction. This schedule assumes concurrent procedures for review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and entitlements requiring Planning Commission review and approval. If an environmental impact report is required, it can take up to 2 years for all necessary studies and analyses to be conducted and the EIR heard before the Planning Commission. Applications can be filed at the same time or filed and heard upon completion of the environmental review. Both procedures are subject to public comment and appeals periods. The conditional use permit can be appealed before the Board of Supervisors within 30 days following the Planning Commission's approval. Once planning entitlements are secured, the project sponsor can prepare detailed building plans to be reviewed and approved by the Department of Building Inspection. Depending on the proposed project's complexity, the plan preparations, review and approval process can take from four to six months before building permits are issued. If no building permit appeals are filed against this project after the 15-day period following permit issuance, building construction can begin. But if this typical project has received a conditional use, then the Bureau of Permit Appeals has no jurisdiction.

Minor alterations and new housing projects of up to three single-family dwelling units or up to six units in a single structure may not require substantial environmental review. Projects proposing principally permitted uses (or "as of right") meeting all applicable Planning Code requirements and not triggering mandatory discretionary review will involve less permit processing time. Construction of these kinds of projects can typically begin within nine months of initial project review.

As the City's permitting and review agencies, the Planning Department, the Department of Building Inspection, and other related agencies have a significant effect on the efficiency of the housing construction process. To address this, the Planning Department initiated in 2008 an Action Plan containing procedural and operational reforms to improve the professionalism and efficiency of the City's planning process. Improvements to the Planning Code and its effect on permit processing are already underway. Mayor Ed Lee convened an interagency working

group in early 2014 which focused on actualizing the production of 30,000 housing units by 2020. Every agency has committed to further process improvements to expedite housing production, including prioritized review procedures, and reduced process time for housing projects.

1) Planning Code Improvements: The Planning Code itself could be considered a de-facto constraint on housing production, because of its complexities. Many projects, particularly larger projects, might require a Conditional Use authorization for aspects such as dwelling unit density. Variances are required to deviate (even slightly) from dwelling unit exposure requirements and parking minimums, and a Discretionary Review in order to demolish an existing dilapidated building.

Acknowledging this, and as an effort to establish a single and more straightforward entitlement path, the Department has adopted a 'one-stop' review path in the fairly recent rezoned eastern portions of San Francisco. Housed in Planning Code Section 329, this authorization process is an effort to provide greater certainty and expediency for those development applications which meet the fundamental requirements of the Planning Code, regardless of minor deviations so long as they are in keeping with the intent of the Code and neighborhood character. Section 329 approval is available to projects of moderate scale (small projects have largely been made as-of-right) and requires a single public hearing and entitlement by the Planning Commission based mainly on the physicality of the proposal rather than the land use and density characteristics.

2) Application Processing: Processing time for projects can be a constraint to housing development, especially during economic boom times when multiple applications are submitted simultaneously. Staffing levels, staff workloads and level of review required can all affect the Planning Department's processing time, staffing levels, applications that were filed consecutively may have different processing times. Planning, entitlement and other permitting fees – to be discussed in a separate section below– totaled less than 2% of development costs.

The San Francisco Planning Department adheres to a set of Application Processing Guidelines, to ensure that all project applicants receive equitable treatment as the Planning Department reviews applications in the order received. However, under those guidelines, the Planning Department has established priority criteria to ensure that housing projects that help meet the City's identified Housing Element or other General Plan goals are prioritized. Affordable Housing Projects, "green" housing construction projects (i.e. those that meet or exceed a Gold Rating using the LEED Building Rating System® or that achieve high sustainability standards under another "green building" rating systems approved by the Director); and other applications which are needed to secure the health or safety of users, promote disabled access, etc, receive prioritized review by staff.

The overwhelming majority of projects which seek to create additional housing are subject to some level of neighborhood notification. Such notice can stem either from a required discretionary entitlement, such as a Conditional Use authorization, or from Planning Code provisions which apply to as-of-right projects and are seek to inform and solicit input from the

broader community. Required notification periods generally span 10 to 30-days and include notices mailed to property owners and/or occupants, notices posted at a project site, notices appearing in local newspapers, and all combinations thereof.

3) Permit Tracking: The Planning Department is also pursuing the development of an integrated permit tracking system to coordinate and streamline planning and building permitting processes. This system will establish a single intake application system for all Planning and Building cases to provide early and comprehensive information to applicants, and should have a significant effect on processing time. The new Permit & Project Tracking System (PPTS) was launched in Fall 2014.

c. Permit Application and Development Impact Fees

The Planning Department and the Department of Building Inspection require fees for entitlements and building permits based on a project's estimated construction costs. Projects of much smaller scale – such as interior rehabilitation, minor alterations or upgrading – generally require over-the-counter Planning Department approval and a building permit. Projects that are broader in scope, however, may require additional permits, or may require other actions such as a variance, a zoning re-classification, a subdivision, or a more in-depth environmental evaluation. Payment of an application fee may be required for these additional permits. The application fee for most of these additional permits is also based on the total estimated cost of construction of the project. Other new housing construction fees include water and sewer hook-up and school fees. Table I-61 on the following page provides an example of various fees imposed on new construction.

New housing development in the City of San Francisco is subject both processing fees, which support staff review of development proposals, and development impact fees which support additional infrastructure needed to support new residents, such as transit, open space, community centers, schools, affordable housing, and water capacity. According to the state Department of Housing and Community Development's 1999 *Pay to Play* survey, residential development fees in San Francisco were lower than Bay Area and California average development fees (including entitlement and permitting fees). According to this report, for example, development fees for an in-fill house in San Francisco totals $15,476 while the Bay Area average is $25,859 and California, $20,327.

Table I-61
Fees for Various Development Permits by Construction Costs, San Francisco, 2014

Estimated New Construction Cost	Building Permit (DBI) Fee	If Required			
		Conditional Use Fees	Variance Fees	Coastal Zone Fees	Environmental Evaluation Fee
$100,000	$2,378	$2,053	$4,019	$417	$8,466
$500,000	$13,054	$4,549	$4,019	$917	$17,373
$1,000,000	$17,314	$7,789	$4,019	$1,569	$27,881
$10,000,000	$30,672	$69,964	$4,019	$13,857	$184,746
$25,000,000	$31,422	$103,117	$4,019	$20,624	$263,646
$50,000,000	$32,672	$103,117	$4,019	$20,624	$332,625
$100,000,000	$35,548	$103,117	$4,019	$20,624	$356,710

SOURCE: SF Planning Department; SF Department of Building Inspection

Table I-61 summarizes current processing fees for new development by cost of construction. Larger projects generally require more review from environmental planners, land use planners, and building inspectors; however economies of scale generally result in a lower per unit cost for processing. Projects that are consistent with the planning code and general plan and do not require variances or conditional use authorization, have lower processing costs. The City generally updates fees annually based on inflation. Periodically processing fees are evaluated to insure accurate cost recovery for staff time, materials, and overhead.

Development impact fees fund public infrastructure to support new residents. There are a number of citywide fees to fund affordable housing, water and sewer hook-up and school fees. Recently planned areas of the city (Rincon Hill, South of Market, Visitacion Valley, Market & Octavia, Eastern Neighborhoods and Balboa Park) include additional localized impact fees which have been imposed to fund the infrastructure needed to support growth, including transportation infrastructure, open space, childcare, and other community facilities. These community based planning processes enabled the City to more closely evaluate localized infrastructure needs, especially in areas where zoning was adjusted to accommodate additional growth. New impact fees were determined through a needs assessment, nexus study and a financial feasibility analysis before their adoption to ensure they to not constrain new housing production. To further ensure feasibility, development impact fees may be deferred until the project receives certificate of occupancy. Table I-62 depicts what fees would look like for a 1,000 square foot housing unit in San Francisco.

Table I-62
Average Development Impact Fees for a 1,000 sq. ft. Housing Unit, San Francisco, 2014

Average Development Impact Fees for a 1,000 square foot Housing Unit in San Francisco	
	Citywide
Affordable Housing	$46,230.00
Transit, Open Space and Community Facilities	$10,540.00
Water and Wastewater	$2,543.00
Schools	$2,910.00
Total Average Impact Fee per new 1,000 SF unit	$62,223.00
Average Processing Fees per 1,000 SF unit	$ 6,000

SOURCE: SF Planning Department; SF Department of Building Inspection

Processing and impact fees are critical to the City's ability to ensure that new housing is safe, sustainable, consistent with current policies and supported by the infrastructure necessary for maintaining the service levels. Table I-60 (page 81) shows entitlement fees are an insubstantial proportion of development costs and are not seen as a significant constraint on housing development. Development projects by non-profit housing organizations are eligible for reduced or deferred City Planning permit fees pursuant to City Planning Code Section 351(a), (e), (g), (h), and (i).

d. Building Code Standards

San Francisco's Building Code is based on the 2012 California Building Code. San Francisco made certain amendments to the California Building Code, which local governments are permitted by the State to do if these amendments are proven and justified by local topography, geology or climate. The Building Code is intended to assure health and safety. Some San Francisco amendments to the State code, while maintaining health and safety standards, ease the production of housing by recognizing the particular local conditions. For example, the San Francisco Building Code permits fire escapes for certain required exits in existing buildings, whereas the State Code does not. Local amendments to the Building Code do not make housing more difficult or expensive than housing elsewhere in California.

Federal and state laws require that commercial and public use buildings, and new housing, be designed and constructed to be accessible to persons with disabilities. Local agencies do not enforce the federal American with Disabilities Act (ADA) prohibiting discrimination against persons with disabilities. The San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, implementing the San Francisco Building Code, requires all new construction and rehabilitation projects to comply with the Code's disability access requirements. (San Francisco does not make any amendments to the California Code's disabled access provisions.) Generally, one and two-family dwellings are not required to be accessible. Existing privately funded multi-family dwellings can generally undergo alterations with little or no accessibility upgrade. All new buildings of three or more units must meet the accessibility standards of the Code. Exceptions may be granted if compliance would result in an unreasonable hardship, in which case any

reasonable accessible features will still be required.
In addition, San Francisco's *2013 Electrical Code* consists of the *2013 California Electrical Code* with local amendments. Similarly, the *2013 San Francisco Mechanical Code* and the *2013 San Francisco Plumbing Code* consist of the *2013 California Mechanical Code* and the *2013 Plumbing Code*, respectively, with local amendments. The *2013 San Francisco Energy Code* is essentially the same as the *2013 California Energy Code*, as it does not include local amendments.

4. Financing

This section is a discussion of the availability of financing as a non-governmental constraint to housing development as required by Government Code Section 65583(a)(5). The Planning Department's regulatory capacity can encourage housing – especially affordable housing – development and conservation but, actual housing production or rehabilitation can only be realized with adequate financing. Some of the costs of providing housing occur at one time (capital expenditures such as land acquisition, construction or rehabilitation costs). Conservation of affordable housing, however, requires recurring annual funding for rental subsidies, operating subsidies and supportive services. Assembling the necessary funding to produce and maintain adequate affordable housing for the city's low- and moderate-income residents remains an enormous challenge.

a. Private Financing Sources

Private lenders offer construction loans on a conservative loan to appraised value ratios and pay particular attention to a project's costs. This limits the lenders' risk but may also reduce availability of financing for new housing construction. Larger, multi-unit condominium projects can be especially difficult to finance as lenders assume that construction costs tend to be higher as developers provide more amenities and that units may take longer to sell, stretching the period to recover construction costs.

Private financial institutions provide financing to affordable housing projects – often as construction loans – to comply with the Community Reinvestment Act requirements. Private lenders also participate in first-time homeownership programs that enable moderate-income households.

b. Public Financing Sources

Affordable housing development and conservation depends largely on the availability of public funding sources. Table I-63 lists the various federal, state and local funding available for affordable housing production for fiscal year 2013-2014. The total allocation is also inclusive of rollover from years prior to the fiscal year. Clearly, these funds will not cover the tremendous affordable housing need described in previous sections.

Public financing covers capital funding for the acquisition, rehabilitation, construction, and preservation of affordable housing. Other public financial programs also provide for supportive services, rental assistance, and assistance to first-time home buyers, and administrative costs to city agencies and non-profit corporations that provide affordable housing and other com-

munity development and human services.

Some of the funding programs below – such as CDBG, HOME – are expected to be stable sources of affordable housing funds. However, these are also subject to budgetary constraints. Similarly state funding sources are vulnerable to the budgeting process. Most local sources such as the Hotel Tax Fund and the Jobs-Housing Linkage Fund are even more dependent on economic trends.

Table I-63
Federal, State and Local Funding for Housing Programs, San Francisco, 2013–2014

Allowable Uses	Funding Sources	Rollover from Prior Years	Estimated New Funds	Estimated Total Available
Rehab & New Construction	Housing Trust Fund (including debt), CPMC, Low-Mod Income Housing Asset Fund, HOME	$51,752,709	$54,349,927	$106,102,636
Rehab Only	CDBG, Tax-exempt bonds	$12,531,344	$11,102,736	$23,634,080
New Construction Only	Inclusionary, Jobs/Housing, CPMC Replacement Housing	$61,013,415	$40,500,000	$101,513,415
Small Sites Only	Inclusionary Set-aside, Housing Trust Fund	$5,131,080	$3,050,000	$8,181,080
HOPE SF Only	General Fund, General Fund-supported debt	$616,067	$16,859,198	$17,475,265
Market-Octavia Only	Market-Octavia Impact Fee	$2,896,687	$0	$2,896,687
OCII housing obligations	OCII	$91,685,084	$46,895,843	$138,580,927
TOTAL				$398,384,090

SOURCE: Mayor's Office of Housing
CDBG: Community Development Block Grant
HOME: Home Investment Partnership Program
CPMC: California Pacific Medical Center
OCII: Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure

Some public funds are restricted to particular housing types and/or population groups; for example the elderly housing program (Section 202, Hotel Tax Fund), the disabled housing program (Section 811, Hotel and Tax Fund), and HOPWA (Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS). Administrative costs are also not covered by most public funding sources. Federal grants often carry a number of restrictions and regulations that can make the funds difficult to use. For example, some federal programs require matching grants while others are impossible to combine with other funds. Most affordable housing programs require three or more sources of funding to become feasible. Different funding sources may have to be tapped for pre-development, construction, and permanent financing costs – leading to considerable transaction and legal costs and delays in the development process.

C. QUANTIFIED HOUSING GOAL

The state Department of Housing and Community Development, with the Association of Bay Area Governments, determined San Francisco's fair share of the regional housing need for the period covering January 2007 through June 2014 at 31,193 units. Even with very aggressive policies and programs, given that San Francisco is a mature, built-up city with limited large tracts of undeveloped land and the previous decades' housing production record, the "fair share" of affordable housing units was not achieved. Table I-64 below shows that 58% of the state mandated production targets and 31% of the affordable housing production for the period covered by the 2009 *Housing Element* were achieved; this statistic is a result of the overproduction of market rate units. Appendix A provides details of the City's housing production performance in the evaluation of the 2009 *Housing Element*.

Table I-64
Annual Production Targets and Average Annual Production, San Francisco, 2007–Q1 2014

Household Affordability	Housing Goals 2007-2014	Actual Production 2007-Q1 2014	% of Production Target Achieved 2007-Q1 2014	Production Deficit as of Q1 2014
	Total	Total		
Low Income (under 80% AMI)	12,124	4,978	41%	7,146
Moderate Income (80% - 120% AMI)	6,754	1,107	16%	5,647
Above Moderate (over 120% AMI)	12,315	11,993	97%	322
TOTALS	31,193	18,078	58%	13,115

SOURCE: SF Planning Department; ABAG

More than the performance in the production of low-income housing, the deficit of 12,793 units affordable to low and moderate income households has been seen as critical in turning the city's housing problem into a crisis of affordability. Table I-65 below shows the new RHNA targets to be completed in the 2015-2022 planning cycle.

Table I-65
RHNA Housing Production Targets, San Francisco, 2015–2022

Household Income Category	2015-2022 RHNA Targets	% of RHNA Targets
Very Low (< 50% AMI)†	6,234	22%
Low (50-79% AMI)	4,639	16%
Moderate (80-120% AMI)	5,460	19%
Above Moderate (over 120% AMI)	12,536	43%
Total Pipeline	28,869	100%

SOURCE: SF Planning Department; ABAG

D. REALIZATION OF HOUSING POTENTIAL

1. Projects in the Pipeline

Housing in the production pipeline is an important indicator of future development. For the purposes of this report, the Planning Department defines the pipeline as those projects under construction, projects that have been approved by the Building Department within the past three years or filed within the past five years. It should be noted that project applications and permitting activities in the near future could increase the number of new housing production in the next five years.

Housing projects move through a multi-tiered approval process. A development proposal is first reviewed by the Planning Department for compliance with the Planning Code and consistency with the General Plan. The project then goes through review by the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) for approval and issuance of a building permit. Once construction is finished and the project passes inspection by DBI, it is issued a certificate of final completion. Only when a project receives a certificate of final completion can the housing units be officially counted as part of San Francisco's housing stock.

During the time of this report, the 2015-2022 planning period has not begun and therefore the housing pipeline is being used to provide an estimate of the future quantity of housing and how it fares against the RHNA targets. As of June 31, 2014, there were 10,959 residential units in the pipeline (Table I-66). According to the Mayor's Office of Housing, as of September 2014, 485 units are to be rehabilitated and 4,519 units are to be conserved or preserved through to 2021. The total estimated shortfall in meeting the RHNA targets is estimated to be about 12,900 units. It is possible that some of these projects, especially those in the early stages of development such as Planning review, may not go forward due to shifts in economic and legislative conditions. Production trends over the last decade, however, show that as much as 85% to 90% of pipeline projects units are completed within five to seven years.

Household Income Category	Q2 2014 Pipeline Entitled Units*	Rehabilitation (Non-Public Housing)	Conservation/ Preservation (Public Housing)	Total Estimated Housing Production	RHNA Targets	Estimated Shortfall
Very Low (< 50% AMI)†	1,425			1,425	6,234	4,809
Low (50-79% AMI)	1,017	344	4,519	5,880	4,639	-1,241
Moderate (80-120% AMI)	554	141		695	5,460	4,765
Above Moderate (over 120% AMI)	12,170			12,170	12,536	366
Total Pipeline	15,166	485	4,519	20,170	28,869	8,699

*Does not include three major development projects with a net total of 23,700 units: Hunters Point, Treasure Island and Parkmerced, including up to 5,400 net affordable units.

Table I-66
New Housing Construction Pipeline, San Francisco, Q2 2014

SOURCE: SF Planning Department; Mayor's Office of Housing

2. Housing Potential Under New Zoning

Through multi-year community planning efforts, the City of San Francisco had updated zoning controls for over 1/3 of the city. These planning efforts developed appropriate zoning, heights, bulks, and densities in balance with infrastructure and funding strategies to support new growth.

Table I-67 below details the estimated additional potential capacity with rezoning in planning initiatives currently underway.

Table I-67
Estimated New Housing Construction Potential with Rezoning of Select Neighborhoods, San Francisco, 2014

Area	Under Previous Zoning			With Rezoning *	
	Undeveloped	Soft Sites	Total Estimate	Total New Estimate	Additional Potential Units with Rezoning
Executive Park	114	97	211	1,600	1,389
Transbay Terminal	44	78	122	1,200	1,078
Visitacion Valley *	885	460	1,345	1,200	
India Basin				1,200	1,200
Hunters Point Shipyard			1,500	10,500	2,500
Candlestick Point				7,500	7,500
Treasure Island				8,000	7,000
TOTALS	1,043	635	3,178	31,200	20,667

* Rezoning of the Schlage Lock site tentatively effective August 2014

SOURCE: SF Planning Department

3. Plans for Future Affordable Housing Construction

Stable government support in the last few years covered almost all of the affordable housing production. Public subsidies tend to fund very low and low-income housing, with very limited grants allocated for moderate-income home buyers. The revised and expanded inclusionary affordable housing requirement is expected to improve the provision of new housing for households earning moderate incomes. For example, 1,045 inclusionary units were built from 2004 to 2008, or an annual average of 209 units. However, the trend has slowed. An annual average of 88 inclusionary affordable units were built in the five years from 2009 to 2013 as a result of this change.

Tables I-56 and I-57 indicated that there are more than enough in-fill housing opportunity sites to meet the projected housing needs. Yet historic housing production trends, together with recent public financing flows, could mean only some of these sites would be developed. Capital subsidies needed to bridge this estimated shortfall can be enormous (Table I-67). Funds available for new affordable housing construction, rehabilitation and supportive service provision in the 2013-2014 fiscal year totals just about $40 million. The estimated additional capital subsidies needed to meet the City's regional housing share would require over $7.3 billion in funding.

Table I-68
Estimated Capital Subsidies Required to Meet Production Goals, San Francisco, 2015–June 2022

Income Category	Estimated Annual Shortfall in Production	Estimated Affordability Gap	Estimated Capital Subsidies Required to Meet Production Goals
Low Income (80% and below AMI)	3,568	$727,000	$2,593,936,000
Moderate Income (81% - 120% AMI)	4,765	$566,000	$2,696,990,000
Above Moderate Income (121% to 150% AMI)	4,573	$445,000	$2,034,985,000
Total	12,906		$7,325,911,000

SOURCE: SF Planning, Mayor's Office of Housing, Federal Reserve Bank, San Francisco County Assessor's Office, California HCD, Zillow, Seifel Consulting Inc.

With the availability of future public subsidies impossible to predict at best, an optimistic assumption would anticipate funding that would sustain the last decade's affordable housing production. Achieving the housing production and affordability targets set by HCD-ABAG is clearly very difficult. But setting the goals to be more "realistic" and "achievable" could only weaken efforts at seeking and obtaining resources necessary to meet the city's urgent housing needs.

A practical solution would be to uphold these long-term targets and annually assessing priorities against the reality of available resources. The City, therefore, will take the production targets set by HCD-ABAG for its quantified housing production objectives. Each year, as resources are known to be, or reasonably expected to become available, shortfalls in achieving goals can be assessed, program targets shifted appropriately, and resources allocated efficiently and effectively.

4. Opportunity Sites on Public Land

Most San Francisco city agencies do not own large tracts of land that do not serve as part of their stated mission. There are occasional exceptions; for example, when new technology results in operational changes or when departmental objectives change over time. A few city agencies, notably the SF Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA, formerly Muni) and the San Francisco Unified School District, have found over time that some of their parcels can be disposed of or can be utilized for a mixture of other uses (see summary, Table I-69).

- **San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency**: The SFMTA, in particular, has been exploring new uses for its surplus sites where future housing development might be possible.

  - **Phelan Loop and Balboa Park Station area** — Alternative use options are being explored for Muni property near Balboa Park as part of the Better Neighborhoods program. The 1.4-acre Phelan Loop (Ocean and Phelan Avenues) is currently the terminus for the 49-Van Ness-Mission, 9AX-San Bruno Express, 9BX-San Bruno Express, and 9X-San Bruno Express lines. This site has the capacity to accommodate ground floor commercial uses and some 80 dwelling units. In addition, SFMTA and Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) properties collectively called Upper Yard and BART Station area, with some in-fill development along San Jose Avenue can together have capacity for more than 400 new units. A transfer of the site to the Mayor's Office of Housing is underway.

  - **Presidio Trolley Coach Division (at Geary and Masonic)** — Covers 5.4 acres and services about 170 trolley coaches. It is an attractive location for retail, office and housing development. If rezoned from P (Public) to NC-3 (Neighborhood Commercial-Moderate Scale) like the adjacent properties along Geary Boulevard, the site has a capacity of 392 units.

  - **Woods Motor Coach Division (adjacent to the 22nd Street Caltrain Station)** — At the end of the Dogpatch's main neighborhood commercial street, this 3.9 acre site is ideal for high-density, mixed use residential development. It lies within the Central Waterfront plan area and is estimated to have a housing potential capacity of about 1,000 new units.

  - **Potrero Trolley Coach Division Yard (Mariposa and Bryant)** — Currently housing about 180 trolley coaches on 4.4 acres. SFMTA is looking at a multi-story parking garage above the yard, or market-rate and affordable housing. If developed as a Planned Unit Development (PUD), this site could accommodate 318 units.

  - **18th & Castro Streets** — The SFMTA is also in conversation with the AIDS Housing Alliance to develop the two parking lots in the Castro for some 100 housing units specifically for people with HIV/AIDS.

- **San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD):** The SFUSD prepared a Facilities Master Plan that identifies possible surplus land that could become available for housing development. The SFUSD's Seven/Eleven Committee for Long-Term Leasing and Property Sales has determined that approximately 20% of the District's current square footage is considered surplus. They have engaged Bay Area Economics to study the potential and viability of housing for some of these areas. SFUSD concluded the study and its recommendations at the end of 2009. The following is a list of vacant land owned by the SFUSD:

  - 11001 Connecticut Street
  - 7th Avenue @ Lawton
  - Florence Martin CC (1155 Page Street)
  - Former Phoenix School (1950 Mission Street)
  - Former San Miguel Elementary School Campus (300 Seneca Avenue)

- Golden Gate Annex (1601 Turk Street)
- The Former Gloria R Davis Middle School Campus (1195 Hudson Street)

- **San Francisco Community College District (SFCCD)/ San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC):** Both the SFCCD and the SFPUC's Water Department share ownership of the 25-acre Balboa reservoir site. The reservoir is also within the Planning Department's Better Neighborhoods Balboa Park Station study area. Planning estimates between 575 to 1,000 new housing units could be built on this site. A planning process for this site is underway.

- **Central Freeway Parcels:** Demolition of the Central Freeway freed up some seven acres of public lands for residential development. The freeway parcels have an estimated housing development potential capacity of 900 units. About half of these public lands will be dedicated to affordable housing.

Table I-69
Summary of Housing Potential in City-Owned Lands

Site	Acreage	No. of Potential Units
MTA Phelan Loop Turnaround	1.4	80
MTA Green LRV Division Upper Yard	1.8	200
MTA Balboa Park Station Infill Housing on San Jose Avenue	7.7	222
MTA Presidio Trolley Division Yard	5.4	392
MTA Woods Motor Coach Division Yard	3.9	1,000
MTA Potrero Trolley Coach Division Yard	4.4	318
SFCCD Balboa Reservoir	10.0	575
PUC Balboa Reservoir	15.0	425
Central Freeway Parcels	7.0	900
TOTAL	56.6	4,112



APPENDICES

APPENDICES

A. Evaluation of the 2009 Housing Element

As part of the Housing Element update process, California Government Code Sections 65588(a) and (b) require an evaluation of San Francisco's existing Housing Element. This review consists of three parts: 1) a summary of San Francisco's housing production during the 2007-2014 reporting period; 2) a review of the programs and analysis of the appropriateness of the 2009 Housing Element goals, objectives and policies and the effectiveness of the housing element in achieving those goals and objectives; and, 3) an evaluation of the progress in implementation of the housing element.

A review and evaluation of the *2009 Housing Element* objectives and policies is essential to an effective housing element update. Reviewing housing targets and production measures, examining the appropriateness and effectiveness of objectives and policies as stated in the existing element, and evaluating implementation programs initiated during the reporting period will all serve to strengthen the revised *Housing Element* and help address the city's ongoing housing challenges. An evaluation of the implementation programs is presented in a matrix at the end of this appendix.

Housing Targets and Production

The State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) set San Francisco's fair share of the regional housing need for the 2007-2014 reporting period at 31,193 units. This Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) process also established that 61% of these units (18,878 units) be affordable to lower income households and the remaining 39% (12,315 units) could be met by market rate housing production. The 2009 Housing Element suggested that the total number of housing units allocated to San Francisco by the RHNA process was not realistic given the national recession, funding constraints and impediments to housing production, but still accepted the allocation as its quantified housing production goal.

Although San Francisco is falling short of meeting its state mandated fair share housing targets, approximately 18,080 new housing units were built from 2007 to the first quarter of 2014 (Table A-1); this is about 600 units more than that built between 1999 and 2006. Furthermore, an additional 4,680 units were under construction at the end of March 2014. If these units are fully constructed by the end of 2014, it would represent 15% of the RHNA production targets. At the time of this report's writing, the City is about 300 units short of meeting is its market rate production target. Given the number of units under construction, San Francisco will meet its production targets for market rate housing. With increased production targets, San Francisco only met 41% of its production goal for low income housing, a noticeable decline from the 74% produced in the previous reporting period. Shrinking federal and state subsidies have affected construction of units affordable to lower income households.

Income Category	ABAG/HCD Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHNA) Production Goals 2007–June 2014		Actual New Housing Production and Acquisition/Rehabilitation 2007–Q1 2014*			
	No. of Units	% of Total	No. of Units	% of Actual Production	Under Construction	% of RHNA Goal
Low (< 80% AMI)	12,124	38.9%	4,978	27.5%	700	41.1%
Moderate (80–120% AMI)	6,754	21.7%	1,107	6.1%	206	16.4%
Market (over 120% AMI)	12,315	39.5%	11,993	66.3%	3,777	97.4%
TOTALS	31,193	100.0%	18,078	100.0%	4,683	58.0%

SOURCE: Housing Inventory, Mayor's Office of Housing, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure

*Acquisition/Rehabilitation units included to the extent allowed by Housing Element law. Acquisition/Rehabilitation project umbers provided by Mayor's Office of Housing and Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure

Table A-1
Housing Production Targets and Actual Housing Production by Income Category, 2007–Q1 2014

The greatest deficiency for the reporting period continues to be in the production of moderate-income housing, where the city produced just 16% of its target. Nevertheless, this represents a significant increase in moderate-income housing - an additional 53% from the 725 units produced during the 1999-2006 reporting period. The primary obstacle to the production of moderate-income housing in high land cost markets such as San Francisco is profitability. ABAG's 2007 study, A Place Called Home, shows that other communities in the Bay Area with high land values have also failed to produce sufficient moderate-income housing. Almost all of the moderate-income housing produced during the reporting period came from the inclusionary housing programs and, with increasing land and production costs, there is little reason to think this trend will change.

Housing Programs and Initiatives

The 2009 Housing Element reorganized but retained the intent of the 2004 Residence Element. The 2009 Housing Element continued to place greater emphasis on identifying appropriate locations for new housing citywide, especially increased density near downtown; on implementing area plans to build new neighborhoods in appropriate locations; on improving the livability of existing neighborhoods through good design, mixed-use development, increased density near transit, improved infrastructure and public amenities, and reduced parking requirements; on protecting the affordability of existing housing and building more new affordable housing; on streamlining the housing production process through program EIRs and Area Plan EIRs; on creating mixed-income communities; on providing more family housing; and on managing homelessness through supportive housing.

New Area Plans

Several new area plans were adopted during the 2007-2014 reporting period. These plans seek to capitalize on each area's unique assets for current and future residents, and strengthen neighborhoods by encouraging new housing in transit-rich areas where neighborhood shops and services are concentrated.

- The Better Neighborhoods Program was started in 2000 and used intensive community-based planning to incorporate recognition of citywide needs, including housing goals, into the planning process for each neighborhood. Three neighborhoods – Balboa Park, Central Waterfront, and Market and Octavia – were initially selected to serve as models for similar future programs in other parts of the city. The Market Octavia Plan was adopted and approved in May 2008 and Balboa Park in April 2009. The Central Waterfront Plan was included in the Eastern Neighborhoods environmental review and plan adoption process and adopted December 2008.

- The Eastern Neighborhoods (EN) planning process is a large-scale community planning effort in several neighborhoods in the eastern portion of San Francisco originally including the South of Market, Mission, Potrero Hill/Showplace Square, Bayview, and Visitacion Valley neighborhoods. Eventually the Bayview, (adopted by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency in June 2006), and Visitacion Valley (adopted in December 2008, re-adopted in 2014) neighborhoods underwent separate planning and plan adoption processes. The Central Waterfront was incorporated into the EN environmental review and plan adoption process. These EN plans were adopted in December 2008.

- Treasure Island, Parkmerced and Hunters Point/Candlestick Point (Phase I & II) are three large developments that received entitlements through Development Agreements, approved by the City in 2010 and 2011. Together, they are expected to produce up to 26,000 units, up to 6,300 of which will be affordable (23,700 net units and 5,400 net affordable), over the next several years. In each case, the developer has committed to funding and building significant transit and transportation improvements, as well as parks and other amenities to serve future residents.

Program Environmental Impact Reports

A major new policy in the 2009 Housing Element encouraged the preparation of detailed Program Environmental Impact Reports (EIR) and the use of subsequent community plan exemptions, where appropriate, for new planning areas in order to streamline environmental review by reducing duplication in the EIR process. The pilot project for this type of program EIR was the Market/Octavia Area Plan, which analyzed the area plan at a programmatic level while also providing project-level environmental review of former freeway parcels where the plan foresees specific residential growth. The Market/Octavia program EIR was completed in the summer of 2008, and the first Community Plan Exemption (CPE) for a project was issued for a 25-unit mixed use building. Subsequent area plans, including the Eastern Neighborhoods and Transit Center District Plans, also approved programmatic EIRs. To date, over 40 projects have received CPEs from the Planning Department.

Affordable Housing

San Francisco faces a continuing shortage of affordable housing residents of all but the highest income levels. In response to the high projections of housing needs for San Francisco set forth in the 2009 and previous Housing Elements, San Francisco has instituted several strategies for producing new affordable housing units. These strategies seek to support affordable housing production by increasing site availability and capacity for permanently affordable housing, and to encourage the distribution of affordable housing throughout all neighborhoods, thereby offering diverse housing choices and promoting economic and social integration.

- Planning Department - Inclusionary Housing Program. In 2001, San Francisco greatly increased the capacity for affordable housing production through expansion of its Inclusionary Housing Program and increased fees to the Affordable Housing Fund. Between 2007-2013, the inclusionary program produced 986 affordable units. This represents an annual average of 140 units compared to the average 112 units produced during the 1996-2006 reporting period. This is also more than a thirteenfold increase from the 73 units produced from 1992 (when the program first began) to 1998. The inclusionary program also contributed almost $28.4 million to the Affordable Housing Fund in in-lieu fees between 2007 and 2013.

  In 2006, the program was further modified as follows: expanded coverage with a lower threshold to include projects with five or more new units; increased the percentage of affordable units required to 15% on-site and 20% off-site; increased the amount of in-lieu fees in order to cover the increasing costs of constructing affordable units; and required off-site affordable units to be rental affordable to households making up to 60% of the San Francisco Area Median Income (SFAMI) - or if for ownership, units affordable to those making 80% to 120% of SFAMI - and be located within a mile of the subject development. Because median income for the City of San Francisco is lower than area median income, program affordability levels are tied to the metropolitan median income or SFAMI. This better reflects local conditions and further enhances program affordability. The threshold reverted to 10 units or more and affordability requirements were reduced to 12% for on-site inclusionary units in 2010.

  In late 2009, the Second District Court of Appeal issued Palmer/Sixth Street Properties

vs. City of Los Angeles, which held that the California Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act preempts local municipalities from mandating that newly constructed dwelling units be rented at low-income rents. As this case impacts future rental units provided through San Francisco's Inclusionary Program, the City is proceeding with amendments to this legislation which would clarify the Program as fee-based, and retain the option of building the units on-site or off-site to for-sale projects only, yet offering rental projects the ability to take advantage of on-site or off -site options should they wish to waive their Costa-Hawkins rights.

- *Redevelopment Agency – Housing Participation Policy.* Changes to the Redevelopment Agency's Housing Participation Policy also occurred in 2002, with required unit percentages and affordability requirements similar to the City's Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program. However, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency was dissolved along the rest of redevelopment agencies in California in 2012. Nevertheless, prior to its dissolution, the agency produced 340 affordable units during the 2007-2014 reporting period.

- *Jobs Housing Linkage Program.* In February 2001, the Office-Affordable Housing Production Program (OAHPP) was revised and expanded; it was also renamed the Jobs-Housing Linkage Program (JHLP). The original OAHPP required office development project sponsors to directly provide housing or to contribute land or in-lieu fees to a housing developer as a condition of approval for large-scale office development. The JHLP was expanded in scope and application to include all types of commercial development (e.g., hotels, entertainment, R&D, large retail etc.); monitoring and collection of fees paid was also enhanced.

  From 2007-2013, JHLP contributions to the Affordable Housing Fund fell to under $1 million, compared with over $42 million collected during the previous reporting period of 1999-2006. This was largely due to funds being returned to developers of projects canceled during the Great Recession. However, almost $6 million JHLP funds were collected in fiscal year 2012-2013 as the development environment began to recover, and fee collections are expected to increase substantially during the next reporting period, as the economy continues to grow.

HOPE SF Program

The City developed the 2006 HOPE SF program to increase affordable housing production. Modeled after the federal HOPE VI program, HOPE SF will provide up to $95 million in funding to replace existing public housing and add mixed-income units, while planning for needed transit improvements, community facilities, and public amenities. HOPE SF will replace all publicly assisted units (without displacing existing residents) in five public housing sites across the city, while also creating up to 3,500 new homes. The pilot project for HOPE SF, Hunter's View in the Bayview District, broke ground in 2010 and welcomed its first residents in January 2013.

At-Risk Affordable Housing

The number of affordable housing units at risk of converting to market rate, including Single Resident Occupancy (SRO) units, has been substantially reduced by the Mayors Office of Housing (MOH) and the Redevelopment Agency (SFRA). At risk units were transferred to non profits and provided operating subsidies, ensuring their long term affordability. As called for in the 2004 Housing Element capital improvement projects were implemented for distressed public housing, and several public housing projects, such as Hayes Valley and Valencia Gardens, were rebuilt during the reporting period using federal HOPE VI funds.

The Residential Conversion and Demolition Guidelines, the Condominium Conversion Ordinance (which limits the annual number of apartments that can convert to condominiums), and the City's Rent Control policies all continue to limit the demolition or conversion of existing affordable housing.

Emergency Shelters and Supportive Housing

The Department is currently drafting legislation that would allow emergency shelters as of right in at least one zoning district in the city, bringing San Francisco into compliance with California state law. Currently there are two Zoning Administrator interpretations that shape the City's definition of "homeless shelter." Per these interpretations, shelters operating on a long-term basis (more than one month) are considered to be "group housing" while those operating on a short-term basis (night-to-night) are considered to be "hotel uses" under the Planning Code. Group housing in principally permitted ("as of right") in several zoning districts, including the C-2 and C-3 Zoning Districts. Hotel uses do not appear to be principally permitted in any zoning district (where allowed, they are allowed with Conditional Use Authorization). The Department intends for the legislation to be adopted before December 2014.

Density Bonus

The City has continued the policy of establishing special use districts (SUDs) and height exceptions intended to support the development of affordable housing by allowing density bonuses for higher percentages of affordable or special needs housing. Almost all new Area Plans adopted during the 2007-2014 reporting period also include these policies, as well as additional affordable housing impact fees. Floor area ratio (FAR) limitations have been removed in the downtown areas to encourage housing development. The Board of Supervisors is currently considering legislation to exempt on-site inclusionary units from existing density limits in certain districts, essentially giving developers who include affordable units within their projects a density bonus.

In February 2014, the Department released an RFP for consultant support to develop a more proactive program to implement government Code Section 65915. For example the proactive approach may follow the model of other municipalities which indicate which exemptions will be not be deemed as potentially having an adverse impact on health and safety. The Planning Department intends to draft a proposal for a proactive program before December 31, 2014.

ADA Reasonable Accommodations

The Department is working to adopt an ordinance that establishes a procedure for making requests for reasonable accommodation in land use, zoning and building regulations, policies, practices and procedures of the jurisdiction to comply fully with the intent and purpose of fair housing laws. The Department is working with the Mayor's Office on Disability and other City agencies to create a streamlined process for persons with disabilities seeking fair access to housing. Specifically, the process would exempt applications for certain non-compliant parking facilities, ramps and elevators from the standard variance process, eliminating the need for the project to be approved at a hearing. Instead, applications would be approved through an administrative variance. The City passed this legislation December 2014.

Accessory Dwelling Units

Allowing an additional on-site unit in existing residential structures is an effective and inexpensive way to realize greater housing potential. Several measures seeking to create additional housing opportunities through such a mechanism have been introduced in the last 20 years, but were deemed politically infeasible due to neighborhood opposition. In the past year, however, the Board of Supervisors has passed several pieces of legislation around secondary dwelling units. One ordinance, approved in April 2014, waives some restrictions for homeowners in and around the Castro Neighborhood Commercial District who wish to add a dwelling unit within the existing building envelope. Another, passed soon after, created an amnesty program for illegal dwelling units that were built before January 1, 2013.

OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES - IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAMS EVALUATION

The following review of past and current implementation programs is organized by the eight issues identified in the 2009 Housing Element: 1) Adequate Sites; 2) Conserve and Improve Existing Stock; 3) Equal Housing Opportunities; 4) Facilitate Permanently Affordable Housing; 5) Remove Constraints to the Construction and Rehabilitation of Housing; 6) Maintain the Unique and Diverse Character of San Francisco's Neighborhoods; 7) Balance Housing Construction and Community Infrastructure; and 8) Prioritizing Sustainable Development.

1. ADEQUATE SITES

Objective 1 details San Francisco's strategy for increasing the overall net supply of housing. Production of new housing and increasing density of development was the primary strategy.

OBJECTIVE 1

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

New Housing Production

From 2007 – Q1 2014, net addition to San Francisco's housing stock was over 14,800 units. This unit gain reflects the cumulative efforts of a range of public agency programs and private investment throughout the city. This total is the net balance of new construction, demolished units, alterations.

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Q1 2104	TOTALS
Units Entitled by Planning	1,960	2,418	2,056	11,979	15,057	2,750	2,552	1,222	39,994
Units Issued Building Permits	3,281	2,197	752	1,203	2,033	3,888	3,168	6,435	22,957
Units Completed	2,567	3,263	3,454	1,230	269	1,317	1,960	4,703*	14,060

* Under construction

Table A-2
Planned Capacity & Programs, Estimated Growth

Major Plans and Developments

A number of area and community planning efforts were also adopted during the 2007-2014 reporting period. The resulting plans and rezoning in these areas increase potential housing capacity. As shown in Table A-3 below, these programs created capacity for growth estimated to be over 49,500 units.

Area	Program	Estimated Plan Growth
Treasure Island	Project/Plan	8,000
Candlestick Point	Project/Plan	7,850
Parkmerced	Project/Plan	5,700
Central SoMa	Area Plan	3,500
Showplace Square/Potrero Hill	Area Plan	3,200
Western SoMa	Area Plan	2,900
East SoMa	Area Plan	2,900
Hunters Point Shipyard	Project/Plan	2,650
Central Waterfront	Area Plan	2,000
Mission	Area Plan	1,700
Visitacion Valley/Schlage	Project/Plan	1,680
Executive Park	Area Plan	1,600
Transbay	Area Plan	1,350
Glen Park	Area Plan	150
Total		45,180

Table A-3
Planned Capacity & Programs, Estimated Growth

In addition, there were several other initiatives pursued by the City from 2007-2014 to create more housing units. These include:

Table A-4
Surplus Properties Transferred to MOH

Area
114 Elmira
155 & 165 Grove
195 Portola
301 WIlde
341 Corbett
395 Justin
949 Vermont
1051 Palou
Junipero Serra @ Shields
Lawton & 20th Avenue
San Jose @ Cuvier
San Jose @ Milton
Alemany & Ocean

- **Housing Development on Public Land.** Over the past ten years, the City has engaged in several major planning efforts which include the identification of housing opportunities on public lands. In particular, the City seeks to take advantage of new and rehabilitated housing on former military properties in San Francisco – the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard and Treasure Island. Through the Planning Department's Better Neighborhoods Program, the City is pursuing the development of affordable housing on several significant public sites. The Market-Octavia Plan calls for the development of up to 900 units of housing on the former Central Freeway parcels, one-half of which could be affordable and/or senior units. The Balboa Park Plan recommends the construction of affordable housing on portions of the Phelan Loop owned by the San Francisco Community College District, on existing bus yards owned by the Municipal Railway, and on portions of the unused Balboa Reservoir, owned by the Public Utilities Commission. The HOPE SF program will result in the creation of thousands of net new units of housing on existing public housing sites.

- **Surplus Public Lands.** In 2004, the City adopted the Surplus City Property Ordinance. This ordinance requires that surplus public land be identified and evaluated for potential use as homeless housing. It also established a Citizens Advisory Committee to explore affordable housing development at sites determined to be surplus, or, if identified as such, if this land should be sold to raise money for affordable housing development. The removal of the Central Freeway created a variety of surplus parcels in the Market-Octavia plan area that will be developed as housing, and several publicly owned sites in the Eastern Neighborhoods are also being considered for affordable housing development. Table A-4 lists other sites that have been transferred to MOH for consideration as affordable housing.

- **Secondary Units.** Allowing an additional on-site unit in existing residential structures is an effective and inexpensive way to realize greater housing potential. Several measures seeking to create additional housing opportunities through such a mechanism have been introduced in the last 20 years, but were deemed politically infeasible due to neighborhood opposition. However, in 2014 the Board of Supervisors passed several pieces of legislation around secondary dwelling units. One ordinance, approved in April 2014, waives some restrictions for homeowners in and around the Castro Neighborhood Commercial District who wish to add a dwelling unit within the existing building envelope. Another, passed soon after, created an amnesty program for illegal dwelling units that were created before January 1, 2013. Although 43 secondary units were legalized from 2007-2013, 154 were removed during the same period.

- **Institutional Master Plans.** The City requires that large institutions create Institutional Master Plans (IMPs) whose purpose are to provide the public with information regarding institutional operations including future expansion, construction, and property acquisition.

  Although IMPs are informational only and do not explicitly require that institutions provide housing for its students or workers, the process has directly contributed to increasing the amount of housing large institutions must plan to accommodate demand. For example, through the IMP process, San Francisco State University increased the amount of student housing it planned to provide from 845 to 1,200 units.

During the 2007-2014 reporting period, a total of 22 IMPs were completed, among which the following included residential components:

1. The Art Institute of California – San Francisco
2. University of San Francisco
3. Academy of Art University
4. University of the Pacific, Arthur A. Dugoni School of Dentistry
5. California College of Arts and Crafts

- **30K by 2020.** On December 18, 2013, Mayor Ed Lee issued Executive Directive 13-01: Housing Production & Preservation of Rental Stock, which directed all City departments to prioritize the construction and development of all net new housing, including permanently affordable housing. In his 2014 State of the City address, Mayor Lee set a goal for the production of 30,000 new and rehabilitated housing units by 2020, at least 30% of which would be permanently affordable to low and moderate-income families.

2. CONSERVE AND IMPROVE EXISTING STOCK

Objectives 2 and 3 focus on retaining the existing supply of housing, particularly rental housing, affordable units and residential units located in commercial and industrial areas, and maintaining existing housing in decent condition.

OBJECTIVE 2

RETAIN EXISTING HOUSING UNITS, AND PROMOTE SAFETY AND MAINTENANCE STANDARDS, WITHOUT JEOPARDIZING AFFORDABILITY.

- The City has codified controls on applications that propose the loss of dwellings and live-work units by merger, conversion or demolition. Except in the case of unsound or unsafe housing, or the most expensive single family homes, dwelling removal requires a hearing before the Planning Commission, and applicants must meet a majority of the criteria for dwelling loss to be approved, in order to retain the city's existing sound housing stock. Roughly 950 units were demolished between 2007 and 2013, representing about 0.3% of the city's housing stock. However, the City's one-to-one replacement policy requires almost all of the demolished units to be replaced with the same number of new units or more. Compared with the just over 1,000 units demolished during the 1999-2006 period, the annual rate of demolitions has increased slightly.

- The City's dwelling unit merger policy was codified in 2008 to require Planning Commission review of any proposal to merge dwelling units. Planning Code Section 317 establishes criteria to evaluate such proposals, and emphasizes the importance of existing units to the city's housing stock. From 1999-2006, 315 dwelling units were lost due to a merger with another unit, while from 2007-2013, 191 dwelling units were lost due to mergers. This represents a 40% decrease in the annual average number of units lost due mergers. Table A-5 lists annual units lost through demolitions, conversions and mergers.

Table A-5
Units Lost Through Demolition, Conversion and Merger

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	TOTALS
Demolitions	81	29	29	170	84	127	429	949
Conversions	1	1	12	10	3	1	0	28
Units merged	16	28	42	22	22	23	38	191

- The Residential Hotel Conversion Ordinance preserves the city's valuable supply of single room occupancy (SRO) residential units and restricts their conversion to commercial uses. Originally adopted in 1980 and strengthened in 1990, this program is still in effect and the loss of SRO units has been minimized. The total number of residential rooms held steady during the 2007-2013 reporting period, increasing slightly to 19,380. However, the share of rooms owned and operated by non-profit organizations (which ensure permanent affordability) increased from 17% in 2000 to 28% in 2013. The SRO Hotel Safety and Stabilization Task Force continues to monitor SRO units in the city.

  Several measures have been implemented to slow the loss of single-room occupancy (SRO) residential hotel units in San Francisco, such as increased safety regulations, transfer of residential hotel buildings to non-profit organizations, ensuring the long-term affordability of these units, and the reauthorization of the Single Room Occupancy Hotel Safety and Stabilization Task Force that was set to expire in 2009. Many SROs in the city have now been transferred to non-profit ownership or management, helping ensure the continued viability that these important affordable housing resources provide, but operating and rehabilitation subsidies are needed for many of the properties acquired 10-15 years ago. New affordable SROs are being built with supportive services for this population.

- **Legalization of existing illegal secondary units.** Several attempts were made over the past 20 years to legalize some of the estimated 20,000 illegal secondary units scattered throughout the city as a way to retain this supply of housing that is generally more affordable. In April 2014, legislation was enacted amending the Planning and Building Codes to provide a process for granting legal status to existing dwelling units constructed without the required permits and temporarily suspending the code enforcement process for units in the process of receiving legal status.

- **Publicly Funded Rehabilitation.** The City sponsored the rehabilitation of 969 units during the last reporting period. Funding from these programs, administered by the Mayor's Office of Housing and the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, enabled the units to be revitalized while retaining affordability.

- **HOPE-SF Program.** Until the mid-2000s, the Federal HOPE VI program provided funds for rehabilitating public housing projects throughout the country. As the amount of funds available through the HOPE VI program began to dwindle, the City began exploring other funding options, and launched the HOPE-SF initiative in 2006. HOPE-SF calls for using City funds to rebuild 2,500 units of public housing in several distressed sites across the city. These developments would be rebuilt at higher density and as mixed-income communities with neighborhood services. An important part of the HOPE-SF program is the one-to-one replacement of subsidized housing units and the programs established to ensure right of return for existing residents. The first completed HOPE-SF project welcomed its first residents in January 2013.

- **Unreinforced Masonry Buildings.** There are approximately 90 units in 30 unreinforced masonry buildings that require seismic upgrading. The Department of Building Inspection is currently pursing abatement actions for these structures. This number is down from 11,850 units and 399 buildings in 2002. Most of these rehabilitated units are in residential hotels (SROs) and apartment buildings occupied by lower income households.

- **Property Maintenance Assistance.** The CERF/CHRP programs continue to assist low-income property owners in repairing code violations that might otherwise lead to abatement of housing units. New CERF loans average four to five per year, and new CHRP loans average 10-15 per year.

OBJECTIVE 3

PROTECT THE AFFORDABILITY OF THE EXISTING HOUSING STOCK, ESPECIALLY RENTAL UNITS.

- *Rent Control.* The San Francisco Rent Ordinance was enacted effective June 13, 1979 by the Board of Supervisors and signed by the Mayor to alleviate the City's affordable housing crisis. The Ordinance applies to most rental units built before June 1979, and places limits on the amount of rent increases which can be charged and on the reasons for evicting a tenant. Although the number of rent controlled units continues to decline, particularly in smaller two-unit buildings that are not subject to condominium conversion controls, approximately 170,000 rental units are protected by rent control. Tenants in these units are safeguarded from excessive rent increases.

- *First-time Homeowner Assistance Programs.* The Mayor's Office of Housing offers several funding programs to assist moderate and low-income households in purchasing their first property. These funds include the Downpayment Assistance Loan Program (DALP), City Second Loan Program, and Mortgage Credit Certificate Program (MCC) that assist with the funding of a down payment and increase a household's ability to qualify for a mortgage. The Office of Housing also administers assistance programs targeted specifically at police and first responders (First Responders Downpayment Assistance Loan Program and Police in the Community Program) and teachers (Teacher Next Door Program).

- *Community Land Trusts.* The City established a Community Land Trust Task Force in 2001 to explore the feasibility of using land trust structures to enhance affordable housing opportunities in San Francisco. Land trusts and other limited equity ownership models may be an effective way of retaining affordability in tight housing markets.

  A pilot project sponsored by the San Francisco Community Land Trust (SFCLT) was approved in 2006 and opened in 2009 at 55 Columbus Avenue. The building contains 21 apartments housing 80-plus tenants, primarily elderly Chinese immigrant families. SFCLT will retain ownership of the land, but will sell the apartments to existing tenants as the Columbus United Cooperative. Resident-owners will own a limited equity stake allowing them to sell their units in the future, but the resale price will be controlled to ensure permanent affordability. SFCLT has since acquired several other properties throughout the city, and is exploring a variety of tools to ensure permanent affordability for residents.

In May 2012, the SFCLT acquired its second property – a 10-unit property that was scheduled for public foreclosure auction in April 2012. This house became SFCLT's first resident operated non-profit cooperative in January 2013. In addition, the SFCLT also purchased a five-unit property that was at risk of Ellis Act eviction in January 2013 through the SoMa Stabilization Fund and community partnerships. More recently, in June 2014, the SFCLT assisted residents of the Merry Go Round House to purchase their 14-unit building.

- *Affordable Housing Monitoring Programs.* The Mayor's Office of Housing manages a number of programs to set and implement monitoring standards and procedures for projects receiving housing subsidies. Monitored subsidies include loans for owner-occupied single-family homes, multi-family rental units, and the refinancing of affordable housing projects. Through an annual recertification process, MOH staff review management practices, income and rent levels, and occupancy status at subject properties to ensure compliance with affordability requirements. MOH significantly improved its Asset Management and BMR and Inclusionary monitoring programs near the end of the reporting period through investments in technology and process improvements. MOH and the Planning Department regularly update the Inclusionary Procedures Manual (most recently in 2013), which contains procedures for monitoring and enforcing the policies that implement the program.

- *Acquisition of At-Risk Affordable Housing.* The acquisition of affordable housing units at-risk of converting to market rate due to expiring HUD mortgages or other subsidies has been an important part of the City's efforts to increase the stock of affordable housing. Concerted efforts by MOH and SFRA have resulted in securing financing for most of these properties to come under non-profit ownership to ensure permanent affordability. From 2007 to 2013, a total of 969 affordable units were preserved through these efforts. Assisted housing developments include multifamily rental housing complexes that receive government assistance from federal, State, and/or local programs (or any combination of rental assistance, mortgage insurance, interest reductions, and/or direct loan programs) which are eligible to change to market-rate housing due to termination of a rent subsidy contract (e.g., Housing Choice Vouchers, Section 8) mortgage prepayment (e.g., FHA), or other state or local programs with expiring use restrictions. While most traditionally at-risk conversions have been averted, a new need has emerged to preserve affordability and community stability of rental housing stock restricted by the City's rent stabilization ordinance. Because many such sites are too small for traditional local financing models (less than 20 units) MOH is currently working on a "small site" program that could allow the acquisition and rehabilitation of smaller sites, requiring a creative model addressing the specifics of these properties.

- *Single Room Occupancy (SRO).* Residential hotels in San Francisco are regulated by Administrative Code Chapter 41 – the Residential Hotel conversion and Demolition Ordinance, enacted in 1981. This ordinance preserves the stock of residential hotels and regulates the conversion and demolition of residential hotel units. At the end of the 2007-2014 reporting period, 19,382 residential hotel rooms existed in San Francisco; 71% were in for-profit residential hotels and 29% were in non-profit hotels. `

- *Other Programs.* The Condominium Conversion Ordinance puts a cap on the number of rental units converted to ownership units at 200 per year in order to limit the loss of rental units, which are generally more affordable housing opportunities. These controls remain an important feature of the City's ability to retain its rental housing stock. The

Rent Control Board also continues to implement rent control as a measure to retain affordability in rental housing. However between 2007 and 2013, 2,718 units were converted to condominiums in two-unit buildings, which continue to be exempted from the condominium conversion ordinance. From 2007-2013, a total of 2,718 rental units were lost due to two-unit building condominium conversions.

3. EQUAL HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES

Both the 2004 and 2009 Housing Elements called for increasing production of affordable housing, preserving affordable housing, encouraging economic integration in housing development, and the expansion of financial resources for permanently affordable housing. Several objectives and policies from the 2009 Housing Element made significant contributions to San Francisco's efforts to provide, retain, and fund affordable housing citywide.

OBJECTIVE 4

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

- *Inclusionary Housing Program.* The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors adopted new code language in 2002 that placed a 10% affordable requirement on all housing projects over 10 units and a 12% affordable requirement on developments over 10 units that seek conditional use approval. Prior to this adoption, inclusionary housing was only encouraged, not required. A total of 869 units were produced by the City's inclusionary policy during the 1999-2006 reporting period.

  The City modified and expanded the requirements again in 2006, eliminating the distinction for conditional use applications, and now requires 15% on-site inclusionary and 20% off-site. The program was also expanded to include projects containing five to nine units. Between 2007 and 2013, 986 inclusionary units were produced.

- *Redevelopment Agency Housing Participation Policy.* Changes to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency's Housing Participation Policy also occurred in 2002, with required unit percentages and affordability requirements similar to the City's Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program in effect at that time. In September 2008, the Agency recommended adoption of new requirements similar to those adopted by the City in 2006. The Redevelopment Agency was dissolved along the rest of redevelopment agencies in California in 2012. Nevertheless, prior to its dissolution, the agency produced 340 affordable units during the 2007-2014 reporting period.

- *Density Bonuses and FAR limits.* The City has continued the policy of establishing special use districts (SUDs) and height exceptions intended to support the development of affordable housing by allowing density bonuses for higher percentages of affordable or special needs housing. Almost all new Area Plans adopted during the 2007-2014 reporting period also include these policies, as well as additional affordable housing impact fees. Floor area ratio (FAR) limitations have been removed in the downtown areas to encourage housing development. The following SUDs were adopted during the 2007-2014 reporting period:

Laguna, Haight, Buchanan and Hermann Streets SUD
Van Ness & Market Downtown Residential SUD
Third Street and Le Conte Avenue Affordable Housing SUD
Presidio-Sutter SUD

- The Board of Supervisors is currently considering legislation to exempt on-site inclusionary units from existing density limits in certain districts, essentially giving developers who include affordable units within their projects a density bonus. In February 2014, the Department released an RFP for consultant support to develop a more proactive program to implement government Code Section 65915. For example, the proactive approach may follow the model of other municipalities which indicate which exemptions will be not be deemed as potentially having an adverse impact on health and safety. The Planning Department intends to draft a proposal for a proactive program before December 31, 2014.

- *Family Housing.* The construction of new family housing, especially affordable family housing, was a major goal of the 2009 Housing Element. Some 1,340 units of designated affordable family housing, consisting of three or more bedrooms, were produced from 2007 to 2013. This represents roughly 30% of all affordable housing constructed in the city or 7% of total housing production during that time. In addition, 267 single-family homes were completed during the reporting period, representing 1.8% of all new construction.

OBJECTIVE 5

ENSURE THAT ALL RESIDENTS HAVE EQUAL ACCESS TO AVAILABLE UNITS.

- *Preventing Discrimination*. The Fair Housing Unit of San Francisco's Human Rights Commission (HRC) investigates and mediates complaints of discrimination in housing based on race, religion, sexual orientation, and numerous other characteristics and qualities discrimination against families with children. Protection from such discrimination stems from several local ordinances, including five sections of the Municipal Police Code that prohibit specific kinds of housing discrimination. HRC staff also provides counseling on fair housing and general housing rights, offers referrals to other agencies, conducts research on fair housing practices, and hosts training and educational sessions.

- *Fair Housing.* The product of a multi-agency effort coordinated by the Mayor's Office of Housing, the City regularly updates and releases an Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing report, the latest of which covers 2013-2018. The report discusses the challenges of affordability, accessible housing, and alleged discrimination in the city's housing market. The paper also offers recommendations on increasing community acceptance of affordable housing and the promotion of fair housing practices in public housing. These action items are incorporated into the City's 2010-2015 Consolidated Plan and its associated Action Plan.

- *Economic Integration.* The City revised and expanded its inclusionary affordable housing policy in 2002 and again in 2006, as discussed in greater detail under Objective 4 above. The policy requires the provision of affordable units in development projects with five or more units and discourages the provision

of off-site units to meet this requirement; moreover if the required affordable units are built off site, they must be located within one mile. Over time, this will lead to greater economic integration of units within housing developments.

The HOPE-SF program, launched in 2006, will rebuild existing public housing projects as mixed-income developments, at increased density and with additional public amenities. The pilot project for HOPE SF, Hunter's View in the Bayview District, broke ground in 2010 and welcomed its first residents in January 2013.

- *Affordability Targets.* Since adoption of the 1990 Residence Element, the Mayor's Office of Housing (MOH) and the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (SFRA) have targeted their affordable housing programs to serve low and very low-income households to the maximum extent feasible. For most rental housing units, household income may not exceed 60% of area median income (AMI). Most ownership units can range from 80% to 120% AMI, but must average 100% AMI.

  Changes to the City's inclusionary program in 2006 require any off-site BMR units to be either rental units, or ownership units affordable to 80% AMI. These agencies have also dedicated increasing resources to assisting households at income levels below the maximum income levels for each program. For example, notices of funding availability for family rental housing currently require that units targeted toward households with extremely low incomes (i.e., at or below 20% of area median income) be included in the development.

- *Rent Control and Tenants' Rights.* The San Francisco Human Rights Commission administers numerous programs to investigate and mediate conflicts around alleged housing discrimination. The City's Rent Stabilization Board Commission - comprised of tenant, landlord, and neutral representatives - oversees the Rent Stabilization Board, the City agency charged with monitoring and enforcing the city's rent control ordinance. The Rent Board offers counseling and referral services to tenants faced with property management problems or the threat of eviction. The City's Rent Control ordinance requires property owners to compensate tenants that are evicted due to a major capital improvement project or an owner move-in. The number of total evictions represented by Ellis Act and owner move-in evictions rose to 1,728 from 2007-2013; this is a substantial increase from 531 reported for 1999 – 2006.

OBJECTIVE 6
REDUCE HOMELESSNESS AND THE RISK OF HOMELESSNESS.

- *10-Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness.* Recognizing the need for an integrated service system, the City adopted the Continuum of Care Plan in 1995 in an effort to better coordinate housing, health, and human services for homeless individuals and families. This plan was updated in 2001.

  In 2002, San Francisco passed Proposition N, the Care Not Cash initiative, the primary goal of which as to reduce homelessness and improve the health and welfare of homeless indigent adults receiving cash assistance through permanent housing opportunities and enhanced services. Under Care Not Cash, funding that would have otherwise been used for cash aid to homeless individuals is instead used to expand permanent housing and services. The program emphasizes placement in

permanent supportive housing, where individuals have access to on-site case managers and a menu of supportive services that support housing stability. Under this plan, the City proposed a total of 3,000 units in supportive housing by 2014. As of 2009, almost 2,200 units of supportive, SRO housing are available through the City's master lease program. An April 2007 commitment to double the production of family supportive housing was made in response to the concern that the City's supportive housing programs over the last few years served primarily single people.

Under the program, the number of cash payments made dropped from 2,334 in 2004 to 371 in 2014. The number of individuals who have moved into housing, as of April 2014, is 4,351.

- *Master Lease Program.* The City created a Master Lease Program in 1999 that provides housing with supportive services for persons leaving homeless shelters. This program was expanded significantly from 2003 to 2007 to focus on providing supportive housing. To date, more than 95% of all individuals placed in this program maintain housing stability from year to year.

3. FACILITATE PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING

OBJECTIVE 7

SECURE FUNDING AND RESOURCES FOR PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING, INCLUDING INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS THAT ARE NOT SOLELY RELIANT ON TRADITIONAL MECHANISMS OR CAPITAL.

- *Permanent Affordability*. Long-term or permanent affordability remains a priority for the programs of the Mayor's Office of Housing (MOH). For almost all programs, affordability terms of 50 to 75 years are now standard. The term of affordability is greater than the anticipated life of the developments funded by public funds. Where project sponsors have sought additional money from the City to extend the useful life of the building, MOH requires an extension of the term of affordability. In addition, the lead role played by non-profit entities in sponsoring affordable housing has meant that, in practice, housing developments will remain affordable even after the expiration of the 50 to 75 year term, since such assets must continue to be used for purposes consistent with the corporate purpose of the organization.

Table A-6
Jobs-Housing Linkage Fees, 2007–2014

Fiscal Year	Amount Collected
2007-2008	$(5,438,726)
2008-2009	$-
2009-2010	$(8,775)
2010-2011	$(9,122)
2011-2012	$567,229
2012-2013	$5,717,152
Total	$827,758

- *Jobs-Housing Linkage Program*. The global financial crisis of 2008 resulted in a substantial drop in funds for affordable housing collected under the Jobs-Housing Linkage Program (JHLP) over the 2007-2014 reporting period. Not only did new development applications decline precipitously, but projects that were cancelled after already gotten entitlements and paid fees were refunded their JHLP contributions as well. The recovery of the economy has led to a dramatic increase in JHLP funds collected, with $5.7 million collected in fiscal 2012-2013 alone. Funds are expected to increase during the next reporting period due to planned pipeline development. *Inclusionary In-lieu Fees.* The City's revised and expanded inclusionary program, and increased in-lieu fees, resulted in payments of $23 million to the Affordable Housing Fund during the 1999-2006 reporting period. Like the expected increase in JHLP revenue, dramatic increases in the payments to the AHF are also expected from the inclusionary program, as in-lieu fee payments under the revised program were almost $51 million in fiscal 2007-2008 alone.

- *Inclusionary In-lieu Fees.* The City's revised and expanded inclusionary program, and increased in-lieu fees, resulted in payments of $28 million to the Affordable Housing Fund between 2007 and 2013. Like the expected increase in JHLP revenue, dramatic increases in the payments to the AHF are also expected from the inclusionary program as the economy continues to recover.

- *Affordable Housing Trust Fund.* In 2012, San Francisco voters approved Proposition C, the Affordable Housing Trust Fund, which should provide up to $50 million annually to support housing affordability in the city. The impetus for Prop C was the 2011 demise of the Redevelopment Agency, which had, up to that point, generated up to $50 million annually in funds for affordable housing. The funding comes from money that had already been allocated towards affordable housing, as well as a portion of the hotel tax and the city's reformed business tax. The Housing Trust Fund will receive $20 million in its first year and increasing amounts thereafter, up to $50 million annually by year 12.

- *Regional Grants.* San Francisco was successful in advocating for language in the 2007-2014 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) process to direct more transportation money to jurisdictions that agree to take on greater housing growth. Recently, the Association of Bay Area Governments FOCUS program, which seeks to encourage growth near transit in the Bay Area, designated several neighborhoods in San Francisco as Priority Development Areas (PDAs). PDAs are regionally-designated areas prioritized for housing development, and therefore eligible for grant funding. Planned PDAs would be eligible for capital infrastructure funds, planning grants, and technical assistance while Potential PDAs would be eligible for planning grants and technical assistance, but not capital infrastructure funds. Currently, a number of neighborhoods, representing approximately 40% of the city's land area, have been identified as PDAs.

Table A-7
Inclusionary Housing Fees, 2007-2013

Fiscal Year	Amount Collected
2007–2008	$37,617,828
2008–2009	$(7,155,039)
2009–2010	$(10,246,292)
2010–2011	$(2,497,264)
2011–2012	$1,536,683
2012–2013	$9,130,671
Total	$28,386,587

Year	Amount
2007	$2,141,360
2008	$1,931,198
2009	$2,197,230
2010	$1,966,400
2011	$2,102,332
2012	$2,093,382
2013	$1,536,000
2014	$1,602,970
Total	$15,570,872

OBJECTIVE 8

BUILD PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTOR CAPACITY TO SUPPORT, FACILITATE, PROVIDE AND MAINTAIN AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

Table A-8
CDBG 2007–2013

- *Non-Profit Support.* The Mayor's Office of Housing continues to administer Housing Program Grants from the federal Community Development Block Grant program (CDBG), which amounted to $15.6 million between 2007 and 2014 (Table A-8). These funds are granted to local non-profit housing agencies to build local capacity and support housing activities consistent with the consolidated plan.

OBJECTIVE 9

PRESERVE UNITS SUBSIDIZED BY FEDERAL, STATE OR LOCAL SOURCES.

- *HOPE-SF Program.* Until the mid-2000s, the Federal HOPE VI program provided funds for rehabilitating public housing projects throughout the country. As the amount of funds available through the HOPE VI program began to dwindle, the City began exploring other funding options, and launched the HOPE-SF initiative in 2006. HOPE-SF calls for using City funds to rebuild 2,500 units of public housing in several distressed sites across the city. These developments would be rebuilt at higher density and as mixed-income communities with neighborhood services. An important part of the HOPE-SF program is the one-to-one replacement of subsidized housing units and the programs established to ensure right of return for existing residents.

- *Acquisition of At-Risk Affordable Housing.* The acquisition of affordable housing units at-risk of converting to market rate due to expiring HUD mortgages or other subsidies has been an important part of the City's efforts to increase the stock of affordable housing. Concerted efforts by MOH and SFRA have resulted in securing financing for most of these properties to come under non-profit ownership to ensure permanent affordability. From 2007 to 2013, a total of 969 affordable units were preserved through these efforts. Assisted housing developments include multifamily rental housing complexes that receive government assistance from federal, State, and/or local programs (or any combination of rental assistance, mortgage insurance, interest reductions, and/or direct loan programs) which are eligible to change to market-rate housing due to termination of a rent subsidy contract (e.g., Housing Choice Vouchers, Section 8) mortgage prepayment (e.g., FHA), or other state or local programs with expiring use restrictions. While most traditionally at-risk conversions have been averted, a new need has emerged to preserve affordability and community stability of rental housing stock restricted by the City's rent stabilization ordinance. Because many such sites are too small for traditional local financing models (less than 20 units) MOH is currently working on a "small site" program that could allow the acquisition and rehabilitation of smaller sites, requiring a creative model addressing the specifics of these properties.

5. REMOVE CONSTRAINTS TO THE CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION OF HOUSING

The 2009 Housing Element continued several 2004 Housing Element and 1990 Residence Element objectives that encompass citywide and regional concerns and priorities related to the production and allocation of housing, including improving access to housing opportunities, adjusting affordability standards, preventing discrimination, minimizing or mitigating displacement, increasing production of family-sized units, creating mixed-income neighborhoods, reducing homelessness and the risk of homelessness, revitalizing neighborhoods to improve quality of life, increasing density near transit, providing neighborhoods with adequate transit and amenities, increasing available funding for transit-oriented development, expanding regional transit systems to discourage commuting by car, and promoting increased affordable housing production across the region.

OBJECTIVE 10

ENSURE A STREAMLINED, YET THOROUGH, AND TRANSPARENT DECISION-MAKING PROCESS.

- *Program EIRs.* The Market & Octavia Area Plan was developed with a program EIR designed to include sufficient detail to avoid the need for additional project EIRs, and thus streamline the housing production process. The Market/Octavia program EIR was completed in the summer of 2008, and the first Community Plan Exemption (CPE) for a project was issued for a 25-unit mixed use building. Subsequent area plans, including the Eastern Neighborhoods and Transit Center District Plans, also approved programmatic EIRs, and to date over 40 projects have received CPEs from the department.

- *Entitlement Process Improvements.* In December of 2013, San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee issued Executive Directive 13-01, directing City departments with legal authority over the permitting or mapping of new or existing housing to implement process improvements to facilitate the production of affordable housing units and preserve existing rental stock. In response, a number of City departments formed a Housing working group, releasing a memo recommending a number of process improvements to meet the mayor's directive. Included among them are priority and concurrent review processing for residential projects that include higher levels of affordable units, inter-agency MOUs relating to the review and approval process for affordable housing projects, and expediting the hiring of City staff who review housing permits.

- The Planning Department and DBI have also been working to implement an online Permit & Project Tracking System (PPTS), which will allow the public to file certain types of applications and permits and track the status of planning applications and building permits online. The Planning Department launched PPTS in the fall of 2014, DBI is expected to follow in 2015.

- *Consolidated Plan.* The Mayor's Office of Community Development (MOCD) Consolidated Plan identifies the specific housing needs of San Francisco's low-income residents, based on demographic and other information. The 2010 Consolidated Plan, which covers the 2010-2014 period, contains the following priorities which are used to allocate affordable housing funds: 1) create housing opportunities for the homeless; 2) create affordable rental housing opportunities for individuals and families with incomes up to 60% of the area median income (AMI), and; 3) create homeownership opportunities for individuals and families with incomes up to 120% AMI.

  The Mayor's Office of Housing (MOH) continues to collaborate with the Department of Public Health and Human Services to develop supportive housing opportunities that directly and effectively address the needs of homeless persons. Additionally, MOH continues to develop high quality affordable rental housing opportunities for households at or below 50% AMI, along with administering new homeownership opportunities (most arising from San Francisco's inclusionary housing policy) for households generally ranging from 80% to 120% AMI.

6. MAINTAIN THE UNIQUE AND DIVERSE CHARACTER OF SAN FRANCISCO'S NEIGHBORHOODS

OBJECTIVE 11

SUPPORT AND RESPECT THE DIVERSE AND DISTINCT CHARACTER OF SAN FRANCISCO'S NEIGHBORHOODS.

- *Residential Design Guidelines.* In 1989, the Planning Department proposed a set of design guidelines to help ensure that new residential development respects the unique character of many of San Francisco's neighborhoods. These guidelines were refined and adopted as part of the 1990 *Residence Element* update, and were updated again in 2003 as part of the 2004 *Housing Element* program.

- *New Area Plans.* Through the Better Neighborhoods and other area plan programs, the Planning Department continues to explore ways to develop and enhance the quality and livability of existing residential neighborhoods. The Eastern Neighborhoods new area plans initiated during the 1999-2006 reporting period and recently adopted in 2008, identify core elements that help create vibrant neighborhoods, such as walkability, availability of services, transit access, housing choices, and unique character. These new area plans incorporate these ideas into the development of community goals and neighborhood improvements.

- *Housing Development in Residential Neighborhoods.* Almost 3,100 units of housing were developed in San Francisco's existing residential neighborhoods from 2007-2013, representing 17% of all housing production in the city during that time period. This figure includes all new units constructed in the city's traditionally residential RH and RM districts (Residential House and Residential Mixed). The City has been able to locate this substantial amount of new housing in existing residential areas without significant adverse impacts to prevailing neighborhood character. The Better Neighborhoods and Eastern Neighborhoods programs provide for an increase in the number of housing units built in these districts near transit and other services.

- *Historic Resources.* Several districts and buildings were designated landmarks during the 2007-2014 reporting period, including the Duboce Park Landmark District, the Market Street Masonry Landmark District, Twin Peaks Tavern, Marcus Books and the Doelger homes Sales Office. Historic Context Statements were completed for all the Better Neighborhoods and Eastern Neighborhoods plan areas as well Japantown and the Transbay District. As new plan areas are established, an evaluation of historic resources will be performed where appropriate. The Planning Department will also be revising the historic context statement for the City, which provides a framework for the evaluation of the significance of potential historic resources. This work is also expected to be completed in 2014.

7. BALANCE HOUSING CONSTRUCTION AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE

OBJECTIVE 12

BALANCE HOUSING GROWTH WITH ADEQUATE INFRASTRUCTURE THAT SERVES THE CITY'S GROWING POPULATION.

- *IPIC.* A major feature of the various Area Plans adopted during the 2007-2014 reporting period are the inclusion of impact fees, levied on any new development taking place within the plan area. These fees are used to partially fund the various infrastructure improvements necessary to support new residents. A multi-agency group, the Interagency Plan Implementation Committee (IPIC) was formed to manage the collection of the fee and prioritize capital projects in coordination with Community Advisory Committees in each neighborhood. In each of the past two years (FY13 and FY14), IPIC collected roughly $6 million in impact fees. Fee collections are projected to grow dramatically over next reporting period, with a total of $70 million expected from FY2013-2017.

- *Parking Requirements.* Neighborhood planning policies seek to reduce parking requirements below one space per unit in areas near transit in order to increase density, discourage automobile use, and create more walkable neighborhoods.

8. PRIORITIZE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

OBJECTIVE 13

PRIORITIZE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN PLANNING FOR AND CONSTRUCTING NEW HOUSING.

Green Building - Quality of Life Improvements. The City has made a substantial effort to incorporate green building principles and green design into development projects during the last several years. In 2006, the Planning Department and other permitting agencies began to expedite permits for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certified gold buildings. Moreover, in 2008 the City adopted a Green Building Ordinance that requires all new residential and commercial construction, as well as renovations to certain buildings, to meet green building standards.

Table A-9 is a review of all the implementation programs of the 2009 *Housing Element*:

Table A-9
Review of Implementation Programs from 2009 Housing Element

Objective/ Policy/ Implementation (Policy/ Program)	*Evaluation*	*Continue / Modify / Delete*
OBJECTIVE 1 Identify and make available for development adequate sites to meet the city's housing needs, especially permanently affordable housing.		
IP 1 Planning staff shall provide data to the Planning Commission on the expected unit type and income level of any proposed projects or area plans under review, including how such units would address the City's fair share of the Regional Housing Needs.	Staff includes a table in each commission approved case report indicating projects approved relative to RHNA targets. The Department updates this data on a quarterly basis in coordination with the quarterly pipeline report. See Table A-1 of the Housing Element Part 1 Appendix A.	Continue. Planning Staff will continue to provide RHNA targets in commission reports.
IP 2 Planning shall continue to make data on housing production available to the public through the annual Housing Inventory, and increase its notification and distribution to neighborhood organizations.	The Planning Department releases the Housing Inventory on an annual basis. The report is posted to the department's website [ex: http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1663] and hard copies are distributed to public libraries and other interested parties.	Continue. Program effective, staff will continue to produce the Housing Inventory.
IP 3 All agencies subject to the Surplus Property shall annually report surplus property to the DRE/Assessor's Office, for use by MOH in land evaluation. MOH shall continue evaluating surplus publicly-owned land for affordable housing development potential. To the extent that land is not suitable for development, MOH shall sell surplus property and use the proceeds for affordable housing development for homeless people consistent with the Surplus Property Ordinance (this should all be together and mirror the ordinance).	A Budget and Legislative Analyst's Office report completed in Spring 2012 at the request of Supervisor Mark Farrell, found that required annual surplus property reports have not been prepared since 2007. The same report inventoried City-owned properties from ten City departments, finding just two of the 15 properties transferred to MOH for affordable housing were being used for that purpose. A subsequent Civil Grand Jury report similarly concluded that publicly-owned surplus properties were not being optimized, and issued a set of recommendations for putting them towards greater use. http://civilgrandjury.sfgov.org/2012_2013/Optimizing_Use_of_Publicly-Owned_Real_Estate_5-29-13-3.pdf	Continue. Staff will continue to work with agencies on Surplus property.
IP 4 MOH shall continue to actively pursue surplus or underused publicly-owned land for housing potential, working with agencies not subject to the Surplus Property Ordinance such as the SFPUC, SFUSD and MTA to identify site opportunities early and quickly. City agencies shall continue to survey their properties for affordable housing opportunities or joint use potential.	The Planning Department, in coordination with OEWD, SFMTA and a number of other City agencies, is currently developing an inter-agency working group to holistically address public site development throughout the city. For more information: http://commissions.sfplanning.org/cpcpackets/Public_Sites_Framework.pdf	Continue. Staff will continue to work with agencies on Surplus property.
IP 5 Consistent with the SFMTA's Climate Action Plan, MTA shall continue Transit-Oriented Development efforts, including identifying large MTA sites (rail, storage and maintenance yards) that can serve as potential housing sites and working with MOH and the private sector towards their development.	Construction on the Phelan Loop & Public Plaza, a large SFMTA site that will soon feature a 72-unit affordable housing development, is currently underway. In addition, SFMTA's 'Real Estate and Facilities Vision for the 21st Century' report, published January 15, 2013, identifies three priority sites for TOD potential: Presidio South, Upper Yard and Potrero. http://archives.sfmta.com/cms/cmta/documents/1-29-13VisionReport.pdf.	Continue. Staff will continue working with the SFMTA on implementing the Climate Action Plan and support TOD efforts.

Objective/ Policy/ Implementation (Policy/ Program)	*Evaluation*	*Continue / Modify / Delete*
IP 6 To further smaller scale TOD opportunities, Planning and MTA shall evaluate smaller surplus MTA-owned sites (typically surface parking lots) and identify barriers towards their redevelopment, such as Planning Code issues, neighborhood parking needs and community sentiment.	SFMTA's 'Real Estate and Facilities Vision for the 21st Century' report, published January 15, 2013, identifies and analyzes the agency's smaller surplus properties for potential development.	Continue. Staff will continue working with the SFMTA on smaller scale TOD opportunities.
IP 7 The Redevelopment Agency shall continue to set-aside sites in redevelopment areas for affordable housing development.	SFRA has been disbanded as of March 1, 2012. The Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, the successor agency, continues to work with MOH to provide affordable housing in former redevelopment areas. http://sf-moh.org/index.aspx?page=952	Modify. The Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, the successor agency, continue to work with the MOH to provide affordable housing in former redevelopment areas.
IP 8 Planning, Redevelopment and MOEWD shall complete long range planning processes already underway: Japantown, Glen Park, the Northeast Embarcadero Study, Candlestick / Hunters Point, India Basin Shoreline Community Planning Process, and Treasure Island.	See table A-3 in the Housing Element Part 1 Appendix A.	Continue. Staff will continue to implement long range plans.
IP 9 Planning shall publish its work program annually, citing all community planning processes that are to be initiated or are underway. This annual work program shall be located on the Department's website after it is adopted by the Board of Supervisors.	Example: http://commissions.sfplanning.org/cpcpackets/Work_Program_Memo_FY14-16_01-16-14.pdf	Continue. Staff will continue to publish its work program annually.
IP 10 At the initiation of any community planning process, the Planning Department shall notify all neighborhood organizations who have registered with the Planning Department on its Neighborhood Organization List and make continued outreach efforts will all established neighborhood and interest groups in that area of the city.	The Department's Communications staff maintains a complete and up-to-date list of neighborhood organizations throughout the city. For more information: http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1654	Continue. Staff continue to utilize the Neighborhood Organization Lists for outreach efforts.
IP 11 At the conclusion of any community planning process, the Planning Commission shall ensure that the community project's planning process has entailed substantial public involvement before approving any changes to land use policies and controls.	For a recent example, see the SF Planning Commission's endorsement of the Japantown Cultural Heritage and Economic Strategy (JCHESS), which includes specific reference to the project's extensive public process, as well as the written support the document received from local stakeholders. http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/plans-and-programs/in-your-neighborhood/japantown/JCHESS_SIGNED_CPC_Resolution.pdf	Continue. Staff will continue plan for public involvement before any land use changes.

Objective/ Policy/ Implementation (Policy/ Program)	*Evaluation*	*Continue / Modify / Delete*
IP 12 Planning shall continue to require integration of new technologies that reduce space required for non-housing functions, such as parking lifts, tandem or valet parking, into new zoning districts, and shall also incorporate these standards as appropriate when revising existing zoning districts.	Example: Planning Code Sec. 151.1(g)(1)(B)(i): For projects with 50 dwelling units or more, all residential accessory parking in excess of 0.5 spaces per unit shall be stored and accessed by mechanical stackers or lifts, valet, or other space-efficient means that reduces space used for parking and maneuvering, and maximizes other uses.	Continue. Program effective.
IP 13 When considering legalization of secondary units within a community planning processes, Planning should develop design controls that illustrates how secondary units can be developed to be sensitive to the surrounding neighborhood, to ensure neighborhood character is maintained.	In 2014 the Planning Department introduced a pilot program in the Castro neighborhood, which allows an additional unit to be added within the existing building envelope. The pilot program will be monitored to see how the additional units will impact the neighborhood. Additionally, the Department is hiring a consultant to study the feasibility of accessory dwelling units depending on the building space available, for example attics, soft stories, garages, etc.	Continue. The Department continues to study the feasibility of secondary units.
IP 14 Planning shall continue to impose requirements under the Jobs Housing Linkage Program, and shall work with new or expanding commercial and institutional uses to plan for the related housing need they generate. The fee structure should also be reviewed regularly to ensure that developers continue to contribute adequately to the costs created by the demand for housing caused by their projects, while not damaging project feasibility.	The Jobs-Housing Linkage Program Fee Schedule, last updated January 1, 2014, is available here: http://www.sf-moh.org/index.aspx?page=1031	Continue. Program effective.
IP 15 Planning should work with DPH to tailor the use of the Healthy Development Measurement Tool (HDMT) in development of neighborhood or citywide plans to be effective given the tradeoffs inherent in achieving affordable housing, and utilize the information received in the development of policy and programs.	The Planning Department continues to consult SFDPH on the Sustainable Communities Index for large planning processes that include large changes in infrastructure. Recent examples include the Western SOMA Community Plan and the Health Services Master Plan	Continue. Planning Staff are working with DPH and other agencies to refine metrics of the tool.
IP 16 Planning shall continue to implement City requirements for Institutional Master plans (Section 304.5 of the Planning Code) to ensure that institutions address housing and other needs, with full participation by the Planning Commission, community and neighborhood organizations, other public and private agencies and the general public.	Seepage A10. in the Housing Element Part 1 Appendix A for a complete list of completed Institutional Master Plans.	Continue. Program effective.

Objective/ Policy/ Implementation (Policy/ Program)	*Evaluation*	*Continue / Modify / Delete*
IP 17 The Planning Department shall require the preparation of an analysis that includes a site survey to identify potential noise-generating uses within two blocks of the project site prior to completion of the environmental review for all residential projects located in areas exceeding 75 Ldn. The analysis shall include at least one 24-hour noise measurement (with maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes). The analysis shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that Title 24 standards, where applicable, can be met. If there are particular circumstances about the proposed project site that appear to warrant heightened concern about noise levels in the vicinity, the Department may require the completion of a detailed noise assessment prior to the first project approval action, in order to demonstrate that acceptable interior noise levels consistent with those in the Title 24 standards can be attained.	The Planning Department's Environmental Planning division maintains a map layer of ambient noise levels throughout the city. Residential projects located in areas exceeding 75 Ldn (60 Ldn in Eastern Neighborhood Plan Areas) are required to complete noise surveys during the environmental review process to ensure interior noise levels will not exceed standards set by Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations.	Continue. Program effective.
IP 18 To minimize effects on development in noisy areas, for new residential uses located in areas exceeding 75 Ldn, the Planning Department shall, through its building permit review process, in conjunction with noise analysis, require that open space required under the Planning Code for such uses be protected, to the maximum feasible extent, from existing ambient noise levels that could prove annoying or disruptive to users of the open space. Implementation of this measure could involve, among other things, site design that uses the building itself to shield on-site open space from the greatest noise sources, construction of noise barriers between noise sources and open space, and appropriate use of both common and private open space in multi-family dwellings, and implementation would also be undertaken consistent with other principles of urban design.	The Planning Department's Environmental Planning division maintains a map layer of ambient noise levels throughout the city. Residential projects located in areas exceeding 75 Ldn (60 Ldn in Eastern Neighborhood Plan Areas) are required to complete noise surveys during the environmental review process to ensure interior noise levels will not exceed standards set by Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations.	Continue. Program effective.

Objective/ Policy/ Implementation (Policy/ Program)	*Evaluation*	*Continue / Modify / Delete*
OBJECTIVE 2 Retain existing housing units, and promote safety and maintenance standards, without jeopardizing affordability.		
IP 19 Planning shall continue to implement the recently adopted Planning Code Section 317, which codifies review criteria for allowing housing demolition, conversion and mergers, amend it when necessary, and shall continue to apply Section 311 of the Planning Code to deny residential demolition permits until approval of a new construction permit is obtained. Planning shall also continue to require that all publicly subsidized housing units be replaced one for one.	See table A-5 in the Housing Element Part 1 Appendix A for statistics on Demolitions, Conversions and Mergers since 2007. http://www.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/planning/article3zoningprocedures?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca$anc=JD_317	Continue. Program effective.
IP 20 Planning shall continue to require Discretionary Review (DR) for all dwelling unit merger applications.	See page A.10 in the Housing Element Part 1 Appendix A for statistics on Discretionary Review filings for dwelling unit merger applications since 2007.	Continue. Program Effective.
IP 21 The Department of Building Inspection (DBI) shall continue its earthquake preparedness programs, such as the UMB Loan Program, the Building Occupancy Resumption Program, which allows San Francisco building owners to pre-certify private post-earthquake inspection of their buildings, and the Community Action Plan for Seismic Safety, under which DBI is developing a program which mandates seismic upgrades for "soft-story" buildings.	SFDBI's Earthquake Preparedness page: http://sfdbi.org/earthquake-preparedness-0	Continue. Program effective.
IP 22 The Mayor's Office, in cooperation with the Department of Building Inspection (DBI), shall pursue programs, both voluntary and mandatory, to promote seismic upgrades for "soft-story" buildings.	San Francisco's Mandatory Soft Story Program was signed into law on April 18th 2013. Details of the ordinance are available here: http://sfdbi.org/mandatory-soft-story-program. To date, SFDBI has accepted over 630 screening forms from property owners, and has granted 23 building permits for retrofitting work.	Continue. Program effective.
IP 23 The Department of Building Inspection (DBI) shall continue to provide educational programs to assist property owners with non-structural improvements that assist in long-term safety, such as securing water heaters and developing household emergency plans.	SFDBI's educational information is available here: http://sfdbi.org/brochures	Continue. Program effective.

Objective/ Policy/ Implementation (Policy/ Program)	*Evaluation*	*Continue / Modify / Delete*
IP 24 DBI shall continue to provide and improve public information materials for residents and property owners about best practices and programs to maintain and enhance their home(s), including advertising of funding sources. DBI shall provide language translation of all materials, and shall explore methods of working through neighborhood organizations to expand knowledge about programs	SFDBI's educational information is available here: http://sfdbi.org/brochures	Continue. Program effective.
IP 25 The Mayor's Office of Neighborhood Services shall expand the capacity of the Neighborhood Empowerment Network (NEN), a partnership of City Agencies, local non profits and committed community leaders, to share information to prepare homeowners and residents for natural disasters.	http://www.empowersf.org/	Continue. Program effective.
IP 26 DBI shall continue to ensure that residential units meet building code standards by responding to complaints and through periodic inspection.	http://www.sfdbi.org/inspection-services	Continue. Program effective.
IP 27 The City shall continue to seek outside funding to help low and moderate income homeowners to address building code issues related to accessibility, health and safety as well as funding for energy efficiency and green energy.	The City continues to provide funding for low and moderate income homeowners through the following programs: CalHome Loan Program (major rehabilitation) Code Enforcement Rehabilitation(CERF) Loan Program (minor rehabilitation) LEAD-Based Paint Hazards Control Grant Program Underground Utility Grant Program - UUP CalHome Grant Program Code Enforcement Rehabilitation Fund (CERF) Grant Program Federal grants, including HUD's Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control; and local sources such as CERF and CHIRP and GreenFinanceSF Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) Financing Program	Continue. Program effective.

Objective/ Policy/ Implementation (Policy/ Program)	*Evaluation*	*Continue / Modify / Delete*
OBJECTIVE 3 Protect the affordability of the existing housing stock, especially rental units		
IP 28 DBI and DPW shall continue to monitor the conversion of tenancies in common to condominiums.	The condo conversion program is managed by SFDPW. Condo conversions are tracked annually by the Planning Department in the Housing Inventory. Tenancies-in-common are not tracked separately, but comprise the vast majority of residential condominium conversions. http://sfdpw.org/index.aspx?page=1710#Condo1 See table A-5 in the Housing Element Part 1 Appendix A.	Continue. Program effective.
IP 29 Planning shall continue to enforce the Residential Hotel Unit Conversion and Demolition Ordinance.	Residential Hotel Unit conversions and demolitions are tracked by SFDBI and reported annually in the Planning Department's Housing Inventory.	Continue. Program effective.
IP 30 The Department of Health and Human Services (HSA) shall continue to facilitate the transfer of residential hotels to effective non-profit housing organizations; and HSA, DPH, and MOH should develop programs that further encourage non-profit operation of SROs.	See page A.11 in the Housing Element Part 1 Appendix A for statistics regarding the city's For-Profit and Non-Profit Residential Hotel buildings and rooms.	Continue. Program in process.
IP 31 MOH shall implement the Small Site Acquisition and Rehabilitation Program using inclusionary in-lieu fees to enable non-profits to acquire existing rental properties under 25 units for long-term affordability; and shall explore other methods of support, such as low-interest rate financing and technical assistance for small site affordable development.	MOH has begun to implement the Small Site Acquisition and Rehabilitation Program using funding from the Housing Trust Fund. It expects to purchase its first building by the end of 2014.	Continue. Program in process.
IP 32 MOH / SFRA shall continue funding the acquisition and rehabilitation of landmark and historic buildings for use as affordable housing.	In 2011, 2 out of the 3 buildings rehabilitated through MOH/SFRA funding were Category A historic resource buildings.	Continue. Program is ongoing.
IP 33 MOH shall continue to monitor the sale, re-sale, rental and re-rental of all privately developed below-market-rate housing units originating from the City's Inclusionary Housing Program to insure that they are sold or rented at restricted prices.	http://sf-moh.org/index.aspx?page=152	Continue. Program ongoing.

Objective/ Policy/ Implementation (Policy/ Program)	*Evaluation*	*Continue / Modify / Delete*
OBJECTIVE 4 Foster a housing stock that meets the needs of all residents across lifecycles.		
IP 34 The Mayor's Office of Housing shall develop, and City agencies shall utilize, a common definition for family housing (2 or more bedrooms), to guide the provision of family units in both private and public construction.	Planning Code Section 207.6 defines family-sized units as units containing at least 2 bedrooms.	Continue. Program effective.
IP 35 Planning should evaluate the impact of requiring minimum percentages of family units in new recently adopted community plans, by tracking the number of these units proposed and produced within required monitoring reports. Planning shall continue the practice if this evaluation demonstrates that the requirement promotes family housing accessible to residents.	Area Plan Monitoring Reports are completed every 5 years. Market Octavia: 143 2+ BR units (out of 556 total, roughly 26%) produced between 2005-2009 Central Waterfront: 123 2+BR units (104 out of 198, 53%) produced between 2006-2010 East Soma: 123 2+BR units (179 out of 975, 18%) produced between 2006-2010 Mission: 123 2+BR units (out of 284, 43%) produced between 2006-2010 Showplace Square Potrero Hill: 142 2+ BR units (out of 604, 24%) produced between 2006-2010	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 36 The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors shall continue efforts to meet the goal of the Next Generation SF agenda, including planning for and/or acquiring sites for 3,000 family units by 2011. Units will be completed based on funding availability.	At least 1,950 2+ bedroom units were completed in San Francisco in 2009 and 2010. Due to the significant downturn in the economy, only 348 total units were completed in 2011.	Delete.
IP 37 The Department of Aging and Adult Services (DAAS), through the Community Living Fund, will continue to support home and community-based services that help individuals remain housed-either in their home in appropriate locations.	http://www.sfhsa.org/388.htm	Continue. Program ongoing.

Objective/ Policy/ Implementation (Policy/ Program)	*Evaluation*	*Continue / Modify / Delete*
IP 38 Planning shall continue to implement Planning Code Section 209, which allows a density bonus of twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a principal use in the district, when the housing is specifically designed for and occupied by senior citizens, physically, developmentally or mentally disabled persons.	Planning Code Section 209.1 principally permits the following - Dwelling specifically designed for and occupied by senior citizens, as defined in Section 102.6.1 and meeting all of the requirements of that Section, at a density ratio or number of dwelling units not exceeding twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted above as a principal use in the district. - in all residential districts. Planning Code Section 209.3 principally permits the following - Residential care facility providing lodging, board and care for a period of 24 hours or more to six or fewer persons in need of specialized aid by personnel licensed by the State of California. Such facility shall display nothing on or near the facility which gives an outward indication of the nature of the occupancy except for a sign as permitted by Article 6 of this Code, shall not provide outpatient services and shall be located in a structure which remains residential in character. Such facilities shall include but not necessarily be limited to a board and care home, family care home, long-term nursery, orphanage, rest home or home for the treatment of addictive, contagious or other diseases or psychological disorders. - in all residential districts.	Continue. Program effective.
IP 39 Planning will develop a legislative ordinance that will enable persons with disabilities who require reasonable accommodation" as exceptions to the City's Planning Code to bypass the currently required variance process, and to access a streamlined procedure permitting special structures or appurtenances such as access ramps of lifts and other non-physical accommodations.	Planning has developed a legislative ordinance that will enable persons with disabilities who require reasonable accommodation" as exceptions to the City's Planning Code to bypass the currently required variance process, and to access a streamlined procedure permitting special structures or appurtenances such as access ramps of lifts and other non-physical accommodations and will be implemented in Fall of 2014	Completed.

Objective/ Policy/ Implementation (Policy/ Program)	*Evaluation*	*Continue / Modify / Delete*
IP 40 Planning will amend the San Francisco Planning Code to identify the appropriate districts, development standards, and management practices for as of right emergency shelters, per Government code section 65583(a), which requires the City to identify at least one zoning district where emergency shelters are allowed as of right. Emergency shelters will only be subject to the same development and management standards that apply to other uses within the identified zone. The City will amend and aim to locate zoning for by-right shelters close to neighborhood amenities & support services, which are generally found in the City's Commercial (C) and Neighborhood Commercial (NC) districts, and which, per Appendix D-3, include a significant amount of housing opportunity sites.	SF Planning has begun its initial outreach to key stakeholders and plans to introduce legislation by the end of 2014.	Continue. Staff will adopt legislation by Fall of 2014.
IP 41 Through its core staff of Historic Preservation Technical Specialists, Planning staff will continue to provide information about preservation incentives to repair, restore, or rehabilitate historic resources towards rental housing in lieu of demolition, including local incentives, those offered through California Office of Historic Preservation, Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credits that can help subsidize rental projects, and creative solutions provided for within the California Historic Building Code (CHBC).	Examples: http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1832#faq6 http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=5078	Continue. Staff is planning to adopt legislation by Fall of 2014.
IP 42 MOH shall encourage economic integration by locating new affordable and assisted housing opportunities outside concentrated low-income areas wherever possible, and by encouraging mixed-income development such as for-profit/non-profit partnerships. MOH shall and regularly provide maps and statistics to the Planning Commission on the distribution of projects. This information shall be included in the annual Housing Inventory.	See Housing Inventory Table A-2 http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1663	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 43 Planning and MOH shall continue to implement and update the Citywide Inclusionary Housing Program, which promotes the inclusion of permanently affordable units in housing developments of 10 or more units.	Ongoing: http://www.sf-moh.org/index.aspx?page=263	Continue. Program ongoing.

Objective/ Policy/ Implementation (Policy/ Program)	*Evaluation*	*Continue / Modify / Delete*
OBJECTIVE 5 Ensure that all residents have equal access to available units.		
IP 44 All housing agencies shall require associated project sponsors to provide the agency with an outreach program that includes special measures designed to attract those groups identified as least likely to apply.	http://sf-moh.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=6983	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 45 The Mayor's Office on Housing (MOH) shall work with the SFRA, SFHA, HSA, DPH, and nonprofit and private housing providers to develop a "one- stop" center providing information on all affordable housing opportunities within the City, including BMRs, providing specific information about the availability of units and related registration processes, and applications.		Modify. The Mayor's Office on Housing (MOH) shall work with SFHA, HSA, DPH, and nonprofit and private housing providers to develop a website providing information on affordable housing opportunities within the City, including BMRs, providing specific information about the availability of units and related registration processes, and applications.
IP 46 The City's Human Rights Commission (HRC) will continue to support and monitor the Fair Housing Access laws and advise the Mayor's Office of Housing and the Mayor's Office on Disability on issues of accessibility and impediments to Fair Housing. The HRC will investigate and mediate discrimination complaints. When appropriate, the HRC will provide referrals to other government agencies.	http://www.sf-hrc.org/	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 47 The HRC will continue to assist in resolving landlord-tenant problems in rental housing, including single room occupancy hotels.	http://www.sf-hrc.org/	Continue. Program ongoing.

Objective/ Policy/ Implementation (Policy/ Program)	*Evaluation*	*Continue / Modify / Delete*
IP 48 The Board of Supervisors shall continue to uphold local measures prohibiting tenant harassment. Section Sec. 37.10B of the City's Administrative Code prevents landlords or their agents from doing specified acts, such as abusing the right of entry to the unit, threatening or attempting to coerce a tenant to move, or interfering with the tenant's right of privacy.	SF Administrative Code Section 37.10B: http://www.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/administrative/chapter37residentialrentstabilizationand?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca$anc=JD_37.10B	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 49 DBI shall enforce housing codes where such infractions adversely affect protected resident categories, and shall monitor the correction of such continuing code violations to prevent the loss of housing.	http://sfdbi.org/inspection-services-divisions#ces	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 50 The City and all of its partners shall continue to provide translation of all marketing materials, registration processes, applications, etc. Such materials should be marketed broadly and specifically target underserved populations.	A recent example: http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/plans-and-programs/in-your-neighborhood/ocean_ave_corridor/Ocean-Avenue-Corridor-Design-Announcement-Final-Chinese.pdf	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 51 The Police Department will continue to implement San Francisco's Municipal Police Code under Article 1.2, which prohibits housing discrimination against families with minor children. This law prohibits the most common forms of discrimination, such as restrictive occupancy standards, rent surcharges and restrictive rules.	SF Police Code Article 1.2: http://sf-hrc.org/sites/sf-hrc.org/files/migrated/FileCenter/Documents/Governing_Laws/Police_Code_Article_1.2_9_24_12.pdf	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 52 The City will continue to promote access to housing by families by enforcing Section 503(d) of the City's Housing Code, and supporting amendments that increase equity.	SF Housing Code Section 503: http://www.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/sfbuilding/housingcode-2013edition/chapter5spaceandoccupancystandards?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca$anc=JD_H503	Continue. Program ongoing.

Objective/ Policy/ Implementation (Policy/ Program)	*Evaluation*	*Continue / Modify / Delete*
OBJECTIVE 6 Reduce homeless and the risk of homelessness.		
IP 53 The Department of Public Health, the Human Services Agency; the Mayor's Office of Community Development; the Department on the Status of Women; the Department of Children, Youth and Their Families; the Mayor's Office of Housing; and the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency shall continue to implement the City's "10 Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness" and the "Continuum of Care: Five-Year Strategic Plan of San Francisco."	The Department of Public Health, the Human Services Agency; the Mayor's Office of Community Development; the Department on the Status of Women; the Department of Children, Youth and Their Families; the Mayor's Office of Housing continue to implement the 10 year plan to end the "Continuum of Care Five-Year Strategic Plan of San Francisco." The City has also created a new Mayoral office, the Housing, Opportunity, Partnerships and Engagement (HOPE), which find ways to improve outcomes for individuals in all forms of city sponsored housing-including shelters, supportive, public and affordable housing.	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 54 The San Francisco Local Homeless Coordinating Board (LHCB) will continue to work with the Mayor's Office of Housing, the Human Service Agency and the Department of Public Health to phase out ineffective shelter-based programs and to create 3,000 new units according to a "housing first "model."	The San Francisco Local Homeless Coordinating Board (LHCB) will continue to work with the Mayor's Office of Housing, the Human Service Agency and the Department of Public Health to maintain and expand housing solutions to homelessness by focusing on new housing, coordinated assessment to place the longest term homeless people in service enriched housing. The "10 Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness" opened 3,000 new units.	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 55 HSA will continue to facilitate permanent SRO housing through its Master Lease Program, which renovates hotels to be managed by nonprofit agencies providing case management and supportive services on-site, and to fund non-profit agencies to provide on-site supportive services; as well as through programs such as its transitional housing partnership with affordable housing developers.	http://www.sfhsa.org/91.htm	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 56 DPH shall continue to offer permanent supportive housing and shelter programs; as well as services and clinics which deliver a variety of health services to homeless persons; and to provide on-site case managers who can help residents avoid eviction.	The Department of Public Health continues to provide the following programs, Direct Access to Housing (DAH) Program (permanent supportive housing), Homeless Death Prevention (shelter), Winter Shelter Program (shelter) Community Housing Partnership (shelter)	Continue. Program ongoing.

Objective/ Policy/ Implementation (Policy/ Program)	*Evaluation*	*Continue / Modify / Delete*
OBJECTIVE 7 Secure funding and resources for permanently affordable housing, including innovative programs that are not solely reliant on traditional mechanisms of capital.		
IP 57 The City shall continue to require that new development contributes towards the related affordable housing need they generate, either through financial contributions or through development of affordable housing units. The City shall continue to monitor the inclusionary housing program, including annually updating the nexus and feasibility analysis as appropriate.	The Planning Department's annual Housing Inventory tracks affordable housing units created through the inclusionary housing program.	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 58 The San Francisco Redevelopment Agency will continue to maximize its contribution towards permanent affordable housing construction by exceeding the statutory 20% of tax increment financing for affordable housing, and aiming to devote 50% of tax increment funds towards housing. It shall continue its practice of reauthorizing Tax Increment Financing in expiring redevelopment areas wherever possible to continue revenue for affordable housing purposes.	SFRA has been disbanded as of March 1, 2012. The Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, the successor agency, continues to work with MOH to provide affordable housing in former redevelopment areas. http://sf-moh.org/index.aspx?page=952	Modify. The Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure ("OCII"), as the successor to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, will contribute to the development of permanently affordable housing by fulfilling its enforceable obligations, which require OCII to fund and otherwise facilitate the construction of thousands of affordable housing units. OCII will maximize its contribution by continuing to leverage tax increment funding with outside funding sources wherever possible to ensure timely delivery of affordable units pursuant to those enforceable obligations.

Objective/ Policy/ Implementation (Policy/ Program)	*Evaluation*	*Continue / Modify / Delete*
IP 59 HSA and DPH will continue to administer operating subsidies for special needs housing through their supportive housing programs.	The Human Services Agency and the Department of Public Health continue to offer the Season of Sharing Fund (rental subsidy); The Homeless Prenatal Program (rental subsidy); Housing for Single Adults and Families with Disabilities (rental subsidy for designated sites)	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 60 MOH, SFRA, and SFHA will continue efforts to provide financial support to nonprofit and other developers of affordable housing, through CDBG and other funding sources.	SFRA has been disbanded as of March 1, 2012. MOH continues this effort. http://sf-moh.org/index.aspx?page=952 See table A-8 of the Housing Element Part I Appendix A.	Modify. MOH, and SFHA will continue efforts to provide financial support to nonprofit and other developers of affordable housing, through CDBG and other funding sources.
IP 61 Under the oversight of the Capital Planning Committee, the City shall formalize an interagency grant committee tasked with creating a coordinated grant strategy for pursuing stimulus funds for housing and supporting infrastructure.	The Transportation Working Group is the grant committee that formed from the Capital Planning Committee. And meets regularly for transportation funding to support housing.	Delete. Program completed
IP 62 The City's housing agencies shall keep apprised of federal and state affordable housing funds and other grant opportunities to fund affordable housing for the City of San Francisco, and shall work with federal Representatives to keep the abreast of the specifics of the housing crisis in San Francisco. MOH, SFRA and other agencies shall continue to use such funds for housing at all AMI levels below market.	Although the SFRA was disbanded in 2012, the Mayors Office of Housing continue to keep apprised of federal and state affordable housing funds.	Continue. The City's housing agencies shall keep apprised of federal and state affordable housing funds and other grant opportunities to fund affordable housing for the City of San Francisco, and shall work with federal Representatives to keep the abreast of the specifics of the housing crisis in San Francisco. MOH, MOCD and other agencies shall continue to use such funds for affordable housing

Objective/ Policy/ Implementation (Policy/ Program)	*Evaluation*	*Continue / Modify / Delete*
IP 63 Planning shall monitor the construction of middle income housing under new provisions included within the inclusionary requirements of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans, and consider expanding those provisions Citywide if they meet Housing Element goals.	The Eastern Neighborhoods Plans include an option, restricted to infill sites in the newly created UMU district, for developers to provide a higher number of affordable units at a higher, "middle-income" price as a way of satisfying the inclusionary requirements. Eastern Neighborhoods defines 'Middle Income Households' as those making between 120-150% of median income. Affordable units produced in the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Areas are tracked in the EN Monitoring reports; to date, no middle-income units have been completed in any of the Eastern Neighborhood Plan Areas.	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 64 MOH shall continue to administer first time home buyer programs.	http://sf-moh.org/index.aspx?page=181	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 65 Planning shall continue implementing the City's requirement set forth in Planning Code Section 167 that units be sold and rented separately from parking so as to enable the resident the choice of owning a car.	Planning Code Section 167: http://www.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/planning/article15off-streetparkingandloading?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:sanfranciscо_ca$anc=JD_167	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 66 The City shall pursue federal and state opportunities to increase programs for limited equity homeownership, homeowner assistance programs and down payment assistance. Programs specific to the recent foreclosure trends should be pursued as appropriate. Upon implementation, all programs have a significant pre-purchase counseling program, and that consumers are supported by a post-purchase services network to assure access to information and services to prevent foreclosure.	MOH has a section of its website devoted to foreclosure-related concerns and programs: http://sf-moh.org/index.aspx?page=922 MOH includes funding for pre- and post-purchase counseling in its annual budget. MOH requires every adult household member applying for a City administered homeownership assistance program, in connection with the purchase of a residential unit, to attend Pre-Purchase Homeownership workshop, and meet with a counselor for a one-on-one counseling session	Continue. Program ongoing.

Objective/ Policy/ Implementation (Policy/ Program)	*Evaluation*	*Continue / Modify / Delete*
OBJECTIVE 8 Build public and private sector capacity to support, facilitate, provide and maintain affordable housing.		
IP 67 MOH shall continue to coordinate local affordable housing efforts and set strategies and priorities to address the housing and community development needs of low-income San Franciscans.	http://sf-moh.org/index.aspx?page=35	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 68 OEWD shall coordinate with institutions and employer organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce, to facilitate their advocation, sponsorship or even subsidization of affordable housing, including the organization of a collective housing trust fund. As part of this effort, OEWD shall explore targets for construction of employer assisted housing, similar to the City of Chicago's program that created a goal that 10% of all "Plan For Transformation" units be employer-assisted.	The San Francisco Housing Trust Fund was a ballot-initiative measure that was passed in November of 2012. The Housing Trust Fund begins in year one with a general fund revenue transfer of $20 million and increases to $50 million over time. The Housing Trust Fund will capture revenue from former Redevelopment Agency Tax Increment funds (an example of what is being referred to as "boomerang" funds in post-redevelopment California), a small portion of the Hotel Tax which has been appropriated yearly for affordable housing, plus an additional $13 million in new General Fund revenue from an increase in business license fees. The consensus business tax reform measure, Proposition E, which also passed on the November ballot, will generate $28.5 million in the first year–$13 million of which will go to fund affordable and workforce housing. It is estimated that $1.5 billion will be invested in affordable housing production and housing programs over the next thirty years.	Continue. OEWD shall continue to coordinate with institutions and employer organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce, to facilitate their advocation, of the housing trust fund.
IP 69 MOH, SFRA, and other housing agencies shall continue to provide support to nonprofit and faith-based organizations in creating affordable housing, including both formal methods such as land donation, technical assistance and training to subsidized housing cooperative boards, and informal methods such as providing information about programs that reduce operations costs, such as energy efficient design.	SFRA has been disbanded as of March 1, 2012. MOH continues this effort. http://sf-moh.org/index.aspx?page=952	Modify. MOH continues this effort.
IP 70 Planning, MOH, DBI and other agencies shall continue to provide informational sessions at Planning Commission, Department of Building Inspection Commission and other public hearings to educate citizens about affordable housing, including information about its residents, its design, and its amenities.	Planning Staff continues to present the Housing Inventory at the Planning Commission and engages the Community Advisory Committees in Market Octavia and Eastern Neighborhoods on affordable housing issues.	Continue. Program ongoing

Objective/ Policy/ Implementation (Policy/ Program)	*Evaluation*	*Continue / Modify / Delete*
IP 71 Planning staff shall support affordable housing projects in the development review process, including allowing sponsors of permanently affordable housing to take full advantage of allowable densities provided their projects are consistent with neighborhood character.	See Planning Director's Bulletin No. 2, last updated in February of 2014, which states that affordable housing developments be prioritized ahead of all other applications. http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=8460	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 72 The City shall encourage manufactured home production, per California law (Government Code 65852.3), and explore innovative use of manufactured home construction that works within the urban context of San Francisco.	2 pre-fabricated homes have been constructed in the city during the reporting period.	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 73 OEWD and Planning shall continue to apply a 3-year time limit to Conditional Use Authorizations, by tying approvals to building permits (which expire in 3 years). Planning shall work with DBI to ensure notification of Planning when building permits are renewed, and review the appropriateness of continuing the Conditional Use Authorization along with building permit renewal.	Standard language in the Conditions of Approval for Conditional Use Authorizations: "The Commission may also consider revoking the approvals if a permit for the project has been issued but is allowed to expire and more than three (3) years have passed since the Motion was approved." For a recent example: http://commissions.sfplanning.org/cpcpackets/2012.0752C.pdf	Continue. Program ongoing.

Objective/ Policy/ Implementation (Policy/ Program)	*Evaluation*	*Continue / Modify / Delete*
OBJECTIVE 9 Protect the affordability of units at risk of losing subsidies or being converted to market rate housing.		
IP 74 SFRA shall continue monitoring of all "at risk" or potentially at risk subsidized affordable housing units, to protect and preserve federally subsidized housing.	SFRA has been disbanded as of March 1, 2012. The Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, the successor agency, continues to work with MOH to protect and preserve subsidized units. = http://sf-moh.org/index.aspx?page=952	Modify. SFRA has been disbanded as of March 1, 2012. The Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, the successor agency, continues to work with MOH to protect and preserve subsidized units.
IP 75 SFRA shall continue to ensure relocation of all tenants who are displaced, or who lose Section 8 subsidies, through housing reconstruction and preferential consideration.	SFRA has been disbanded as of March 1, 2012. The Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, the successor agency, continues to work with MOH to ensure relocation of tenants who are displaced or who lose Section 8 subsidies. http://sf-moh.org/index.aspx?page=952	Modify. SFRA has been disbanded as of March 1, 2012. The Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, the successor agency, continues to work with MOH to ensure relocation of tenants who are displaced or who lose Section 8 subsidies.
IP 76 MOH shall continue to lead a citywide effort, in partnership with SFRA, SFHA and other City agencies to prioritize and facilitate the preservation and redevelopment of the City's distressed public housing according to the recommendations of the HOPE SF task force.	http://www.hope-sf.org/	Continue. Program ongoing.

Objective/ Policy/ Implementation (Policy/ Program)	*Evaluation*	*Continue / Modify / Delete*
OBJECTIVE 10 Ensure streamlined, yet thorough and transparent decision-making process.		
IP 77 Where conditional use authorization is required, the Planning Code should provide clear conditions for deliberation, providing project sponsors, the community, and the Planning Commission with certainty about expectations.	The process for obtaining Conditional Use Authorization, including the Planning Commission's conditions for deliberation, is detailed in the CUA application packet, available at the Planning Information Center and on the department's website: http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=481	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 78 Planning shall implement a Preliminary Project Assessment phase to provide project sponsors with early feedback on the proposed project, identify issues that will may overlap among the various departments, and increase the speed at which the project can move through all City review and approval processes.	On February 1, 2011, the department began requiring any project proposing to add 6 or more dwelling units, or to construct more than 10,000 square feet of non-residential space to submit a Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA). To date, over 200 PPA applications have been filed with the department, at least half of which involved proposed residential uses. Completed PPA letters are posted on the department's website as well as on the SF Property Information Map: http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2786	Continue. Program developed and is ongoing.
IP 79 Planning shall continue to utilize, and explore ways to increase the benefits of Community Plan exemptions and tiered environmental reviews. As a part of this process, Planning shall prioritize projects which comply with CEQA requirements for infill exemptions by assigning planners immediately upon receipt of such applications.	The first Community Plan Exemption (CPE) for a project was issued for a 35-unit mixed use building in the Market-Octavia Plan Area in July of 2009. Since then over 40 projects have received CPEs from the department. A current list of CPEs is available here: http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2780	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 80 The Department of the Environment, Planning and other agencies shall coordinate City efforts to update the Climate Action Plan, create climate protection amendments to the San Francisco General Plan, and develop other plans for addressing greenhouse gases necessary per AB 32 and SB 375.	Climate Action Strategy updated 2013: http://www.sfenvironment.org/sites/default/files/engagement_files/sfe_cc_ClimateActionStrategyUpdate2013.pdf Each department required to produce and update a Department Climate Action Plan annually.	Continue. Program ongoing.

Objective/ Policy/ Implementation (Policy/ Program)	*Evaluation*	*Continue / Modify / Delete*
IP 81 Planning shall implement tools to decrease EIR production time, such as creating an established pool for consultant selection for project applications to streamline environmental review processes for project applicants; screening applications upon intake to identify necessary special studies and the likely level of review required for the project, which will allow project sponsors to initiate any required special studies while the application is waiting to be assigned to a planner; and adding Planning staff to increase in-house resources for transportation environmental review.	Environmental Planning has implemented several tools to decrease EIR production time, including creating an established pool for consultant selection for project applications to streamline environmental review processes, adding staff for transportation review, and providing a screening of applications through the established Preliminary Project Application process. In addition, Planning will continue to implement streamlined processes, including but not limited to: Community Plan Exemptions that tier from previously certified Community Plan EIR's; participate in the preparation of Preliminary Project Assessments that outline the anticipated requirements for CEQA compliance, including necessary technical studies; and implement recent and pending updates to the CEQA Guidelines that provide mechanisms for streamlining the environmental assessment of infill development projects .	Modify. Planning shall continue to implement tools and processes that streamline CEQA compliance, thereby reducing the time required for production of environmental documents and CEQA processes.

Objective/ Policy/ Implementation (Policy/ Program)	*Evaluation*	*Continue / Modify / Delete*
OBJECTIVE 11 Recognize the diverse and distinct character of San Francisco's neighborhoods.		
IP 82 Planning staff shall coordinate the City's various design guidelines and standards, including those in the General Plan, Planning Code, and Residential Design Guidelines into a comprehensive set of Design Standards. This effort shall include development of Neighborhood Commercial Design Standards as well as updates to existing standards.	The City is currently starting an outreach process for the Neighborhood Commercial Design Guidelines.	Continue. Program in process.
IP 83 Planning staff shall reform the Planning Department's internal design review process to ensure consistent application of design standards, establish a "Residential Design Team" who shall oversee application of the standards on small projects, and continue the "Urban Design Advisory Team" to oversee design review for larger projects.	The Residential Design Advisory Team (RDAT) meets three times a week to ensure smaller residential projects are consistent with the department's Residential Design Guidelines. The Urban Design Advisory Team (UDAT) meets once a week to provide design review on larger projects. Both teams are comprised of planners from the department's Current and Citywide divisions.	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 84 Planning staff shall continue to work with the design community to provide informational sessions at the Planning Commission, Department of Building Inspection Commission and in public forums to educate decision makers and citizens about architectural design.	Ongoing.	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 85 Planning staff shall continue to use community planning processes to develop policies, zoning, and design standards that are tailored to neighborhood character; and shall include design standards for mixed use, residential and commercial buildings in development of new community plans (if not covered by the City's comprehensive Design Standards described above).	Recent example: Central SoMa Plan http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2557	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 86 Planning Department staff shall continue project review and historic preservation survey work, in coordination with the Historic Preservation Commission; and shall continue to integrate cultural and historic surveys into community planning projects.	http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1825	Continue. Program ongoing.

Objective/ Policy/ Implementation (Policy/ Program)	*Evaluation*	*Continue / Modify / Delete*
IP 87 Planning Department staff shall develop a process for Neighborhood Design Guideline review and approval. Staff shall ensure any new guidelines facilitate certainty in the pre-development process, and do not add undue burden on planners or developers.	Ongoing.	Continue. Program in process.
IP 88 Planning Department staff shall research mechanisms to help preserve the character of certain distinctive neighborhoods and unique areas which are worthy of recognition and protection, but which may not be appropriate as historical districts. Such mechanisms should recognize the particular qualities of a neighborhood and encourage their protection, maintenance and organic growth, while providing flexibility of approach and style so as not to undermine architectural creativity, existing zoning, or create an undue burden on homeowners.	Ongoing.	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 89 Planning shall complete and adopt the Preservation Element of the General Plan.	Currently in draft: http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=3928 Preservation Element will be presented to the HPC in Spring 2014 for review and comment. Funding is set aside for FY 2015-16 for CEQA review.	Continue. Program ongoing.

Objective/ Policy/ Implementation (Policy/ Program)	*Evaluation*	*Continue / Modify / Delete*
OBJECTIVE 12 Balance housing growth with adequate infrastructure that serves the city's growing population.		
IP 90 Planning shall cooperate with infrastructure agencies such as SFMTA and DPW to plan for adequate transportation to support the needs of new housing, and within each community planning process shall develop clear standards for transit and transportation provision per unit.	The Interagency Plan and Infrastructure Committee (IPIC) , meetings on monthly basis to coordinate infrastructure improvements in the Plan Areas.	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 91 Planning shall ensure community plans for growth are accompanied by capital plans and programs to support both the "hard" and "soft" elements of infrastructure needed by new housing.	The Interagency Plan and Infrastructure Committee (IPIC) , meetings on monthly basis to coordinate infrastructure improvements in the Plan Areas.	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 92 Planning shall formalize an "Implementation Group" in the Planning Department, to manage the implementation of planned growth areas after Plan adoption, including programming impact fee revenues and coordinating with other City agencies to ensure that needed infrastructure improvements are built.	http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2893	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 93 Planning shall update CEQA review procedures to account for trips generated, including all modes, and corresponding transit and infrastructure demands, with the goal of replacing LOS with a new metric measuring total number of new automobile trips generated (ATG).	Environmental Planning is refining the metric which uses person trips and vehicle miles traveled.	Continue. Program in process.
IP 94 Planning shall update other elements of the City's General Plan, such as the Open Space, Transportation and Community Facilities Element to plan for infrastructure to support projected growth.	Open Space Element - Final Draft, scheduled for adoption in March 2014. Transportation Element - Preliminary assessment of existing plan and update need completed, in workplan for FY14-16. Urban Design Element - in workplan for FY14-16.	Continue. The Recreation Open Space Element was adopted in Summer of 2014 and staff is working on updating the Transportation Element.

Objective/ Policy/ Implementation (Policy/ Program)	*Evaluation*	*Continue / Modify / Delete*
IP 95 Planning and SFMTA shall coordinate housing development with implementation and next phases of the ongoing Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP), which adjusts transit routes to increase service, improve reliability, and reduce travel delay to better meet current and project travel patterns throughout the City.	The DEIR for the Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP) was released in July 2013. The project is currently undergoing an extensive public outreach process to collect feedback and make adjustments to route change proposals.	Continue. Program is ongoing and is now called Muni Forward.
IP 96 Planning and other relevant agencies shall maintain consistency of development fees, while updating such fees through regular indexing according to construction cost index to maintain a correct relationship between development and infrastructure costs. Fees to be updated include the Transportation Impact Development Fee, Area Plan specific impact fees, downtown impact fees, and other citywide impact fees.	The current schedule of fees, updated regularly, is available to the public here: http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=513	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 97 The PUC will continue to ensure charges for system upgrades are equitably established, so that new growth will pay its way for increased demands placed on the system, while all residents pay for general system upgrades and routine and deferred maintenance.	The SFPUC's rates policy is available here: http://www.sfwater.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=3236	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 98 The PUC will continue to implement conservation regulations and incentives such the City's Green Building Ordinance and the Stormwater Design Guidelines.	The SFPUC's website includes a page devoted to Conservation which includes tips, resources, information about rebates and incentives. http://www.sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=136	Continue. Program ongoing.

Objective/ Policy/ Implementation (Policy/ Program)	*Evaluation*	*Continue / Modify / Delete*
OBJECTIVE 13 Prioritize sustainable development in planning for and constructing new housing.		
IP 99 Regional planning entities such as ABAG shall continue to prioritize regional transportation decisions and funding to "smart" local land use policies that link housing, jobs and other land uses, including focusing on VMT reduction. The City shall encourage formalization of state policy that similarly prioritizes transportation and infrastructure dollars transit infrastructure for "smart growth" areas such as San Francisco, rather than geographic allocation.	In July of 2013 Plan Bay Area was adopted by MTC and ABAG. The Plan includes the region's Sustainable Communities Strategy and the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan. Regional planning entities MTC and ABAG continue to prioritize regional transportation decisions and funding to "smart" local land use policies that link housing, jobs and other land uses, including focusing on VMT reduction. The City shall encourage formalization of state policy that similarly prioritizes transportation and infrastructure dollars transit infrastructure for "smart growth" areas such as San Francisco, rather than geographic allocation.	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 100 The City shall coordinate with regional entities to complete the necessary planning document for SB 375, including a "Sustainable Communities Strategy" (SCS) which promotes sustainable growth; and corresponding updates to the Housing, Recreation and Open Space, and Land Use Elements of the General Plan.	Plan Bay Area, the nine-county Bay Area's long-range integrated transportation and land-use housing strategy through 2040, was jointly approved by ABAG and MTC on July 18th, 2013.	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 101 The City shall advocate at the federal level for the Federal Transportation Reauthorization Act to include sustainable growth language that links transportation and land use, and create strong links between transportation funding and transit-oriented development, such as mixed-income housing.	The San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) was supportive of MAP-21 the latest Federal Transportation Reauthorization Act and continues to play an active role in federal transportation dollars that support transit-oriented development. In March of 2014 the SFCTA lead staff as well as SFCTA commissioners traveled to DC to speak to federal transportation officials about Bay Area transportation priorities. SFCTA will continue to advocate at the federal level for transit-oriented development	Continue. The City will continue to advocate at the federal level for transit oriented development
IP 102 On a local level, the City shall prioritize planned growth areas such as designated Priority Development Areas (PDAs), Area Plans or Redevelopment Areas for regional, state and federal bond and grants, especially for discretionary funding application processes such as the State's Prop 1C.	Ongoing. The City continues to prioritize planned growth areas such as designated Priority Development Areas (PDAs), Area Plans or Redevelopment Areas for regional, state and federal bond and grants, especially for discretionary funding application processes such as the State's Prop 1C.	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 103 The San Francisco Transportation Authority shall implement regional traffic solutions that discourage commuting by car, such as congestion pricing, parking pricing by demand, and shall continue to work with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) on funding strategies.	The SFCTA's efforts in this area include the Parking Management Study completed Fall 2009 and Mobility, Access and Pricing Study in Winter 2010. The SFCTA also manages the distribution of MTC's One Bay Area Grant funds to local transportation-related projects: http://www.sfcta.org/funding-opportunities/onebayarea-grant	Continue. Program ongoing.

Objective/ Policy/ Implementation (Policy/ Program)	*Evaluation*	*Continue / Modify / Delete*
IP 104 The City shall continue to support efforts to use state or regional funds to give housing subsidies or income tax credits to employees who live close to their workplaces, and shall consider offering housing subsidies or income tax credits to employees who live close to their workplaces.	Ongoing.	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 105 The City will continue to support transit-related income tax credits to encourage employees to commute to work via transit. The City shall also require master developers to provide transit passes as a condition of approval in major development projects, such as Visitacion Valley, Executive Park and Bayview; and shall explore local requirements that require new developments to provide residents with a MUNI Fast Pass as part of condominium association benefits to promote local transit use.	The City continues to support these efforts.	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 106 OEWD will facilitate employer-supported transit and transportation demand management (TDM) programs, including rideshare matching, transit improvements, bicycle and pedestrian facility improvements, parking management and restriction of free parking; , and continue to require that employers offer commuter benefits per Section 421 of the Environment Code to encourage employees to use transit or carpool.	The SFMTA, in coordination with several other City agencies, is leading an effort to codify a citywide TDM framework, towards the goal of achieving 50% of all trips made by 'sustainable modes' by 2018. http://sfmta.com/projects-planning/planning/transportation-demand-management	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 107 DBI, Planning, and the Department of Environment shall continue to implement the City's Green Building Ordinance, mandating that newly constructed residential buildings must meet a sliding scale of green building requirements based on the project's size in order to increase energy and water efficiency in new buildings and significant alterations to existing buildings.	http://sfdbi.org/green-building-ordinance	Continue. Program ongoing.
IP 108 The City shall continue local and state incentive programs for green upgrades.	http://www.sfenvironment.org/buildings-environments/green-building/policy-incentives-and-resources http://www.sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=129	Continue. Program ongoing

B. Public Participation

Information for General Public (Ongoing)

- Housing Element included in Department work program, San Francisco Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors public hearings
- Planning Department Website and other media
- Public hearing on Housing Inventory, Planning Commission – annually

Focused Outreach to Stakeholders (January through August 2014)

- Individual meetings with key stakeholders to scope the Housing Element (Fall 2013)
  - Affordable Housing Advocates, Housing Advocates, Development Community
  - City Agencies
- Citywide Housing production goals – convened by the Mayor
  - Affordable Housing Advocates, Housing Advocates, Development Community, Non-profit Housing Developers, Architects
  - Business community, finance community
- Inclusionary Housing Program updates
  - Affordable Housing Advocates, Housing Advocates, Development Community
  - City Agencies
- Density Bonus Legislation
  - Affordable Housing Advocates, Housing Advocates, Development Community, Non-profit Housing Developers, Architects
  - City Agencies
  - Community members – Invest in Neighborhoods,

- Emergency Shelter Legislation
  - Shelter Operators
  - Mayor's Office on Homelessness
  - City Agencies
- Reasonable Accommodation Legislation
  - Advocates
  - City Agencies

Public Hearings and Proceedings

- Planning Commission Initiation and Adoption (2 hearing minimum), Land Use Committee, Board of Supervisors (minimum 2 hearings)
  - Emergency Shelter Legislation
  - Reasonable Accommodation Legislation
  - Inclusionary Housing Program updates
  - Housing Element 2014
  - Process Improvements Legislation
  - Density Bonus Legislation

C. Implementing Programs

ADEQUATE SITES

OBJECTIVE 1:

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

1. Planning staff shall provide data to the Planning Commission through the Quarterly Residential Pipeline Dashboard on the expected unit type and income level of any proposed projects or area plans under review, the cumulative ratio of affordable and inclusionary housing to market rate housing, including how such units would address the City's fair share of the Regional Housing Needs. The Department will work to include information about new jobs created in the city by wage. The Department will also summarize available sales price data for new housing as a part of the Quarterly Residential Pipeline Dashboard to help the Planning Commission, planning staff and the public understand trends in housing prices of new construction.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Funding Source: Annual Work Program
Schedule: Ongoing

2. Planning shall continue to make data on housing production available to the public through the annual *Housing Inventory*, including breaking out housing production trends by income level for all Planning Districts and adopted Area Plans, and increase its notification and distribution to neighborhood organizations.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Funding Source: Maintain in annual Work Program
Schedule: Continue existing efforts

3. All agencies subject to the Surplus Property shall annually report surplus property to the DRE/Assessor's Office, for use by MOH in land evaluation. MOH shall continue evaluating surplus publicly-owned land for affordable housing development potential. To the extent that land is not suitable for development, MOH shall sell surplus property and use the proceeds for affordable housing development for homeless people consistent with the Surplus Property

Ordinance (this should all be together and mirror the ordinance).

Lead Agency:	Mayor's Office of Housing
Supporting Agencies:	All City Agencies
Funding Source:	Maintain in annual Work Program
Schedule:	Continue existing efforts

4. MOH shall continue to actively pursue surplus or underused publicly-owned land for housing potential, working with agencies not subject to the Surplus Property Ordinance such as the SFPUC, SFUSD and MTA to identify site opportunities early and quickly. City agencies shall continue to survey their properties for affordable housing opportunities or joint use potential, and OEWD and MOH will establish a Public Sites Program that will assist in identifying opportunity sites and priorities for affordable housing development.

Lead Agency:	Mayor's Office of Housing
Supporting Agencies:	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, San Francisco Unified School District, Municipal Transportation Agency
Funding Source:	Maintain in annual Work Program
Schedule:	Continue existing efforts

5. Consistent with the SFMTA's Climate Action Plan, MTA shall continue Transit-Oriented Development efforts, including identifying large MTA sites (rail, storage and maintenance yards) that can serve as potential housing sites and working with MOH and the private sector towards their development.

Lead Agency:	Municipal Transportation Authority
Supporting Agencies:	Mayor's Office of Housing
Funding Source:	Annual Work Program
Schedule:	Ongoing

6. To further smaller scale TOD opportunities, Planning and MTA shall evaluate smaller surplus MTA-owned sites (typically surface parking lots) and identify barriers towards their redevelopment, such as Planning Code issues, neighborhood parking needs and community sentiment.

Lead Agencies:	Municipal Transportation Authority, Planning Department
Supporting Agencies:	Mayor's Office of Housing
Funding Source:	Annual Work Program
Schedule:	Ongoing

7. The Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII) continues its efforts in former redevelopment areas as planned.

Lead Agency:	Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure
Funding Source:	Maintain in annual Work Program
Schedule:	Continue existing efforts

8. Planning, OCII and MOEWD shall implement long range processes.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Supporting Agencies: Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, Office of Economic and Workforce Development, San Francisco Housing Authority
Funding Source: Maintain in annual Work Program
Schedule: Implement long range planning processes for:
Cnadlestick/Hunters Point Shipyard
Japantown
Glen Park
Parkmerced
Transbay

9. Planning shall publish its work program annually, citing all community planning processes that are to be initiated or are underway. This annual work program shall be located on the Department's website after it is adopted by the Board of Supervisors.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Funding Source: Annual Work Program
Schedule: Ongoing

10. At the initiation of any community planning process, the Planning Department shall notify all neighborhood organizations who have registered with the Planning Department on its Neighborhood Organization List and make continued outreach efforts will all established neighborhood and interest groups in that area of the city.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Funding Source: Annual Work Program (part of outreach for community planning process budget)
Schedule: Implement at the beginning of every community planning process.

11. At the conclusion of any community planning process, the Planning Commission shall ensure that the community project's planning process has entailed substantial public involvement before approving any changes to land use policies and controls.

Lead Agency: Planning Commission
Funding Source: Annual Work Program (part of outreach for community planning process budget)
Schedule: Implement at the beginning of every community planning process.

12. Planning shall continue to require integration of new technologies that reduce space required for non-housing functions, such as parking lifts, tandem or valet parking, into new zoning districts, and shall also incorporate these standards as appropriate when revising existing zoning districts.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Funding Source: Annual Work Program

Schedule: Ongoing

13. When considering legalization of secondary units within a community planning processes, Planning should develop design controls that illustrates how secondary units can be developed to be sensitive to the surrounding neighborhood, to ensure neighborhood character is maintained.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Funding Source: Annual Work Program
Schedule: Ongoing

14. Planning shall continue to impose requirements under the Jobs Housing Linkage Program, and shall work with new or expanding commercial and institutional uses to plan for the related housing need they generate. The fee structure should also be reviewed regularly to ensure that developers continue to contribute adequately to the costs created by the demand for housing caused by their projects, while not damaging project feasibility.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Supporting Agencies: Mayors Office of Housing
Funding Source: Annual Work Program
Schedule: Ongoing

15. Planning continues to consult SFDPH on the Sustainable Communities Index for large planning processes that include large changes in infrastructure. Recent examples include the Western SoMa Community Plan and Health Services Master Plan.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Supporting Agencies: Department of Public Health
Funding Source: Annual Work Program
Schedule: Ongoing

16. Planning shall continue to implement City requirements for Institutional Master plans (Section 304.5 of the Planning Code) to ensure that institutions address housing and other needs, with full participation by the Planning Commission, community and neighborhood organizations, other public and private agencies and the general public.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Funding Source: Not required
Schedule: Ongoing

17. The Planning Department shall require the preparation of an analysis that includes a site survey to identify potential noise-generating uses within two blocks of the project site prior to completion of the environmental review for all residential projects located in areas exceeding 75 Ldn. The analysis shall include at least one 24-hour noise measurement (with maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes). The analysis shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that Title 24 standards, where applicable, can be met. If there are particular circumstances about the proposed project site that appear to warrant heightened concern about noise levels in the vicinity, the Department may require the completion of a detailed noise assessment

prior to the first project approval action, in order to demonstrate that acceptable interior noise levels consistent with those in the Title 24 standards can be attained.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Funding Source: Not required
Schedule: Ongoing, subject to change with EIR

18. To minimize effects on development in noisy areas, for new residential uses located in areas exceeding 75 Ldn, the Planning Department shall, through its building permit review process, in conjunction with noise analysis, require that open space required under the Planning Code for such uses be protected, to the maximum feasible extent, from existing ambient noise levels that could prove annoying or disruptive to users of the open space. Implementation of this measure could involve, among other things, site design that uses the building itself to shield on-site open space from the greatest noise sources, construction of noise barriers between noise sources and open space, and appropriate use of both common and private open space in multi-family dwellings, and implementation would also be undertaken consistent with other principles of urban design.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Funding Source: Not required
Schedule: Ongoing, subject to change with EIR

Strategies for Further Review

- MOH should explore programs that promote donation of land for affordable housing development to the City, including community land trust programs. One possibility may be the review of programs that could allow the donation of real estate as a charitable contribution, similar to the Conservation Tax Incentive promoted by the Trust for Public Land for open space purposes, where taxpayers can deduct up to 50% of adjusted gross income (AGI) for donations or bargain sales of qualified conservation easements.

- Planning should continue to explore area-specific strategies to maximize opportunities for affordable housing, such as identifying affordable housing site opportunities, or developing additional inclusionary measures that are tailored to particular neighborhoods, within community planning processes,

- Planning should explore methods for promoting increased mixed uses, including the consideration of requiring conditional use authorization for single-use development projects in mixed use zoning districts, (such as Neighborhood Commercial zoning districts).

- Planning and MOH should explore incentives for student housing. Student housing is already exempt from the City's Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, but additional modifications may assist in increasing the feasibility and supply of student housing.

CONSERVE AND IMPROVE EXISTING STOCK

OBJECTIVE 2:

RETAIN EXISTING HOUSING UNITS, AND PROMOTE SAFETY AND MAINTENANCE STANDARDS, WITHOUT JEOPARDIZING AFFORDABILITY.

19. The City should develop an effective enforcement program for short term rentals. The enforcement program should serve the existing law's goal in protecting the housing supply from conversion to commercial hotels. The Planning Department should conduct a study on the impact of short term rentals on the broader housing supply in the city, focusing especially on neighborhoods with greater levels of short term rentals. Based on this study and evaluation of the enforcement program, the City shall revisit the law as understanding of these impacts expand.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Funding Source: Not required
Schedule: The Planning Department will aim to have study completed by 2015.

20. Planning shall continue to implement the recently adopted Planning Code Section 317, which codifies review criteria for allowing housing demolition, conversion and mergers, amend it when necessary, and shall continue to apply Section 311 of the Planning Code to deny residential demolition permits until approval of a new construction permit is obtained. Planning shall also continue to require that all publicly subsidized housing units be replaced one for one.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Funding Source: Not required
Schedule: Ongoing

21. Planning shall continue to require Discretionary Review (DR) for all dwelling unit merger applications.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Funding Source: Not required
Schedule: Ongoing – existing process

22. The Department of Building Inspection (DBI) shall continue its earthquake preparedness programs, such as the UMB Loan Program, the Building Occupancy Resumption Program, which allows San Francisco building owners to pre-certify private post-earthquake inspection of their buildings, and the Community Action Plan for Seismic Safety, under which DBI is developing a program which mandates seismic upgrades for "soft-story" buildings.

Lead Agency: Department of Building Inspection
Supporting Agencies: Planning Department
Programs: Unreinforced Masonry Building (UMB) Loan Program
Building Occupancy Resumption Program (BORP)
Community Action Plan for Seismic Safety (CAPSS)
City Policy Concerning Seismic Retrofit Upgrades for Soft-Story, Wood-Frame Construction
Funding Source: Bond Reallocation
Schedule: Ongoing

23. The Mayor's Office, in cooperation with the Department of Building Inspection (DBI), shall

pursue programs, both voluntary and mandatory, to promote seismic upgrades for "soft-story" buildings.

Lead Agency:	Mayor's Office
Supporting Agencies:	Department of Building Inspection
Funding Source:	Not Required
Schedule:	Ongoing

24. The Department of Building Inspection (DBI) shall continue to provide educational programs to assist property owners with non-structural improvements that assist in long-term safety, such as securing water heaters and developing household emergency plans.

Lead Agencies:	Department of Building Inspection, Mayor's Office of Housing
Programs:	"What You Should Know" Publication Series Brownbag Lunch Seminars and Video-On-Demand MOH's Homeowner's Resource Information website
Funding Source:	Annual Work Program
Schedule:	Ongoing (existing program)

25. DBI shall continue to provide and improve public information materials for residents and property owners about best practices and programs to maintain and enhance their home(s), including advertising of funding sources. DBI shall provide language translation of all materials, and shall explore methods of working through neighborhood organizations to expand knowledge about programs.

Lead Agency:	Department of Building Inspection
Programs:	Code Enforcement Outreach Program "Meet the DBI Pros" Summit Participation in the "Big Rumble" Resource Fairs and other community events. Recent events include Chinatown Community Street Fair, Cinco de Mayo, Excelsior Festival, Fiesta on the Hill, Bernal Heights Street Fair, Sunset Community Festival and West Coast Green Conference & Expo
Funding Source:	Annual Work Program
Schedule:	Ongoing (existing program)

26. The Mayor's Office of Neighborhood Services shall expand the capacity of the Neighborhood Empowerment Network (NEN), a partnership of City Agencies, local non profits and committed community leaders, to share information to prepare homeowners and residents for natural disasters.

Lead Agency:	Mayor's Office of Neighborhood Services
Programs:	NEN Empowerment Summit NEN Clean and Green Summit Community Challenge Grants
Supporting Agencies:	Member organizations of the Neighborhood Empowerment Network
Funding Source:	Annual Work Program
Schedule:	Ongoing

27. DBI shall continue to ensure that residential units meet building code standards by responding to complaints and through periodic inspection.

Lead Agency:	Department of Building Inspection, Building Inspection Division
Funding Source:	Annual Work Program
Schedule:	Ongoing

28. The City shall continue to seek outside funding to help low and moderate income homeowners to address building code issues related to accessibility, health and safety as well as funding for energy efficiency and green energy.

Lead Agency:	Mayor's Office of Housing
Programs:	CalHome Loan Program (major rehabilitation) Code Enforcement Rehabilitation(CERF) Loan Program (minor rehabilitation) LEAD-Based Paint Hazards Control Grant Program Underground Utility Grant Program - UUP CalHome Grant Program Code Enforcement Rehabilitation Fund (CERF) Grant Program
Funding Source:	Federal grants, including HUD's Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control; and local sources such as CERF and CHIRP
Schedule:	Ongoing

Strategies For Further Review

- DBI should consider additional programs that support voluntary home maintenance and seismic retrofitting, including expedited plan review and fee rebates.
- MOH and DBI should explore methods to, and seek funding for, programs that can increase maintenance and safety standards while not unduly increasing rents or displacing low-income households, such as a City-funded loan program aimed at meeting the needs of lower-income owners, similar to Chicago's H.O.M.E.'s Upkeep and Repair Services Program.
- The BIC should evaluate the current uses of the Code Enforcement Rehabilitation Fund (CERF) and determine whether the program could be improved or expanded.
- As a part of the CAPPS Program, DBI should evaluate the need for revisions to the San Francisco Building Code; the need for the retrofit of designated shelters or the determination of alternate seismically safe locations; and the need for mitigation programs for critical non-ductile concrete buildings.
- DBI should evaluate alternative uses of the Seismic Safety Loan Program, and consider making it available for use in rehabilitating properties for conversion to limited-equity housing cooperatives.

OBJECTIVE 3:

PROTECT THE AFFORDABILITY OF THE EXISTING HOUSING STOCK, ESPECIALLY RENTAL UNITS.

29. DBI and DPW shall continue to monitor the conversion of tenancies in common to condominiums.

Lead Agency: Department of Building Inspection
Supporting Agencies: Department of Public Works
Funding Source: Annual Work Program
Schedule: Ongoing

30. Planning shall continue to enforce the Residential Hotel Unit Conversion and Demolition Ordinance.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Funding Source: Not required
Schedule: Ongoing

31. The Department of Health and Human Services (HSA) shall continue to facilitate the transfer of residential hotels to effective non-profit housing organizations; and HSA, DPH, and MOH should develop programs that further encourage non-profit operation of SROs.

Lead Agency: Health and Human Services
Supporting Agencies: Department of Public Health, Mayor's Office of Housing
Funding Source: San Francisco General Fund
Schedule: Ongoing

32. MOH shall continue to implement the Small Site Acquisition and Rehabilitation Program which formally launched in July 2014 using inclusionary in-lieu fees and other public funds, to enable non-profits to acquire existing rental properties under 25 units for long-term affordability. The City will explore additional funding sources to expand the program to sclae, as well as other methods of support, such as low-interest rate financing and in-kind technical assistance for small site acquisition and property management.

Lead Agency: Mayor's Office of Housing
Funding Source: Inclusionary Housing Program
Schedule: Implemented and ongoing

33. MOH shall continue funding the acquisition and rehabilitation of landmark and historic buildings for use as affordable housing.

Lead Agency: Mayor's Office of Housing
Supporting Agencies: Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure
Funding Source: State grants, Historic Preservation Tax Credit programs and in lieu funds from the Inclusionary Housing Program
Schedule: Ongoing

34. MOH shall continue to monitor the sale, re-sale, rental and re-rental of all privately developed below-market-rate housing units originating from the City's Inclusionary Housing Program

to insure that they are sold or rented at restricted prices.

Lead Agency: Mayor's Office of Housing
Funding Source: Inclusionary Housing Program
Schedule: Ongoing

35. MOHCD and Planning will research policy and funding strategies, such as first right of refusal policy, that will help tenants buy their rent-controlled buildings from private landlords and convert them into limited- and zero-equity housing cooperatives.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Funding Source: Not required
Schedule: Ongoing

Strategies For Further Review

- The City should evaluate the role of rent-controlled units in meeting affordable housing needs, in order to develop policies that effectively continue their protection, and possibly implement requirements for their replacement. As part of this work, the City should consider pursuit of state legislative efforts that eliminate housing displacement pressures.
- The Rent Board should explore requiring proof of full-time residency for rent controlled units, to ensure they are fully occupied and not used as a second home, pied-à-terre or executive housing.
- The City should continue to monitor the effectiveness of current condominium conversion restrictions intended to moderate conversion and maintain supply of affordable rental housing in the City.
- MOH, SFRA HHS and DPH should explore how to expand the creation of permanently affordable units for single person households, particularly outside of well-served locations such as the Tenderloin and SOMA.
- MOH, SFRA and DBI should work cooperatively with affordable housing groups to identify and develop tools that would facilitate rehabilitation of at-risk rental units on an ongoing basis.

EQUAL HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES

OBJECTIVE 4:

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

36. The Mayor's Office of Housing shall develop, and City agencies shall utilize, a common definition for family housing (2 or more bedrooms) and consider standards for minimum unit sizes and bedroom sizes, to guide the provision of family units in both private and public construction.

Lead Agency: Mayor's Office of Housing
Supporting Agencies: Planning Department, Department of Building Inspection

Funding Source: Annual Work Program
Schedule: Ongoing

37. Planning should study the relationship between unit sizes and household size and types, including evaluation of units built as a result unit mix requirements in recently adopted community plans. This study should also evaluate older housing stock. Outcomes shall inform future policies and regulations related to minimum unit and bedroom sizes for both affordable housing and market-rate housing to accommodate larger households and/or families in San Francisco.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Funding Source: Annual Work Program
Schedule: The Planning Department will aim to have study completed by 2016.

38. The Department of Aging and Adult Services (DAAS), through the Community Living Fund, will continue to support home and community-based services that help individuals remain housed- either in their home in appropriate locations.

Lead Agency: Department of Aging and Adult Services
Supporting Agencies: Community Living Fund Linkages Program
Funding Source: San Francisco General Fund
Schedule: Ongoing

39a. Planning shall continue to implement Planning Code Section 209, which allows a density bonus of twice the number of dwelling units otherwise permitted as a principal use in the district, when the housing is specifically designed for and occupied by senior citizens, physically, developmentally or mentally disabled persons.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Funding Source: Not required
Schedule: Ongoing

39b. Planning will develop a density bonus program with the goal of increasing the production of affordable housing. The program will be structured to incentivize market rate projects to provide significantly greater levels of deed-restricted affordable housing than required by the existing City Programs.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Funding Source: Not required
Schedule: 2015

40. Planning has developed a a legislative ordinance that will enable persons with disabilities who require reasonable accommodation" as exceptions to the City's Planning Code to bypass the currently required variance process, and to access a streamlined procedure permitting special structures or appurtenances such as access ramps of lifts and other non-physical accommodations and will be implemented in Winter 2015.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Funding Source: Not required
Schedule: Completed

41. Planning will amend the San Francisco Planning Code to identify the appropriate districts, development standards, and management practices for as of right emergency shelters, per Government code section 65583(a), which requires the City to identify at least one zoning district where emergency shelters are allowed as of right. Emergency shelters will only be subject to the same development and management standards that apply to other uses within the identified zone. The City will amend and aim to locate zoning for by-right shelters close to neighborhood amenities and support services, which are generally found in the city's Commercial (C) and Neighborhood Commercial (NC) districts, and which, per Appendix D-3, include a significant amount of housing opportunity sites.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Funding Source: Not required
Schedule: Completed

42. Through its core staff of Historic Preservation Technical Specialists, Planning staff will continue to provide information about preservation incentives to repair, restore, or rehabilitate historic resources towards rental housing in lieu of demolition, including local incentives, those offered through California Office of Historic Preservation, Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credits that can help subsidize rental projects, and creative solutions provided for within the California Historic Building Code (CHBC).

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Funding Source: Annual Work Program
Schedule: Ongoing

43. MOH shall encourage economic integration by locating new affordable and assisted housing opportunities outside concentrated low-income areas wherever possible, and by encouraging mixed-income development such as for-profit/non-profit partnerships. MOH shall and regularly provide maps and statistics to the Planning Commission on the distribution of projects. This information shall be included in the annual Housing Inventory.

Lead Agencies: Mayor's Office of Housing
Programs: Mayor's Office of Housing Annual Report
Funding Source: Not required.
Schedule: Present to Planning Commission on an annual basis.

44. Planning and MOH shall continue to implement and update the Citywide Inclusionary Housing Program, which promotes the inclusion of permanently affordable units in housing developments of 10 or more units. The City shall evaluate the effectiveness of this program including: on-site, off-site, in-lieu fees, and land dedication options, and develop modifications to maximize the delivery of affordable housing units and mixed-income development in San Francisco neighborhoods through this program.

Lead Agencies:	Planning Department, Mayor's Office of Housing, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure
Programs:	Citywide Inclusionary Housing Program
Funding Source:	Not required.
Schedule:	Ongoing

Strategies For Further Review

- The Tax Assessors Office should evaluate the primary inhibitors to downsizing, and examine the incentives offered by Prop 60, which allows senior owners to move into "equal" or "lesser" value units while retaining their previously established Prop. 13 taxable values.

- Planning staff should review the Planning Code's incentives for senior housing development.

- MOH, OCII and other housing entities should explore methods of collaborating with special needs advocacy groups to increase outreach to historically socio-economically disadvantaged populations.

- Supportive housing providers should explore ways to increase design and program elements in supportive housing which increase safety and inclusion, and provide trainings for housing staff to increase understanding of residents and reduce bias.

- DAAS should explore the potential for partnerships with HSA, MOH and nonprofit developers interested in developing adult residential care facilities to increase supportive housing options for the elderly, particularly people with dementia.

- DBI should study ways to encourage inclusion of "Universal Design" elements into new projects, especially small-scale, cost-effective measures such as installation of appliances and countertops at accessible heights, flat light switches, and levers and grab bars; resulting programs should balance the benefits of physical accessibility with the benefits of housing affordability.

- DAAS should work with MOH and OCII to explore ways to implement the GreenHouse model, a small-scale living environment of 6 to 10 seniors with nursing care needs that can be integrated into existing neighborhoods as infill development.

- DAAS, HSA, and/or MOH should actively work towards the development of sites for residential care facilities that are close to existing services – one promising option is to develop affordable residential care settings directly on the Laguna Honda Hospital campus. They should also work towards acquisition of housing that could be rehabilitated towards the Green House model in the Bayview district, which is particularly underserved.

- During community planning processes, Planning should explore partnerships with agencies such as RPD, OEWD, MOH and DCYF for cross-discipline efforts that may improve conditions in disadvantaged neighborhoods and increase access to housing, jobs, and public services.

- Planning should examine incentives such as density bonuses, or other zoning related mechanisms that encourage long-term (i.e. deed-restricted) permanently affordable rental housing.

OBJECTIVE 5:

ENSURE THAT ALL RESIDENTS HAVE EQUAL ACCESS TO AVAILABLE UNITS.

45. All housing agencies shall require associated project sponsors to provide the agency with an outreach program that includes special measures designed to attract those groups identified as least likely to apply.

Lead Agencies:	Mayor's Office of Housing, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, San Francisco Housing Authority
Funding Source:	Not required.
Schedule:	Ongoing (part of project review)

46. The Mayor's Office on Housing (MOH) shall work with SFHA, HSA, DPH, and nonprofit and private housing providers to develop a website providing information on affordable housing opportunities within the city, including BMRs, providing specific information about the availability of units and related registration processes, and applications.

Lead Agency:	Mayor's Office of Housing
Supporting Agencies:	San Francisco Housing Authority, Human Services Agency, Department of Public Health
Funding Source:	Program funding
Schedule:	Online by the end of 2010. Pursue a physical location following the completion of the online version is up and running.

47. The City's Human Rights Commission (HRC) will continue to support and monitor the Fair Housing Access laws and advise the Mayor's Office of Housing and the Mayor's Office on Disability on issues of accessibility and impediments to Fair Housing. The HRC will investigate and mediate discrimination complaints. When appropriate, the HRC will provide referrals to other government agencies.

Lead Agency:	Mayor's Office of Housing
Supporting Agencies:	Mayor's Office Disability, Human Rights Commission
Funding Source:	Annual Work Program
Schedule:	Ongoing – existing program

48. The HRC will continue to assist in resolving landlord-tenant problems in rental housing, including single room occupancy hotels.

Lead Agency:	Human Rights Commission
Supporting Agencies:	Mayor's Office of Housing
Funding Source:	Annual Work Program
Schedule:	Ongoing – existing program

49. The Board of Supervisors shall continue to uphold local measures prohibiting tenant harassment. Section Sec. 37.10B of the City's Administrative Code prevents landlords or their agents from doing specified acts, such as abusing the right of entry to the unit, threatening or attempting

to coerce a tenant to move, or interfering with the tenant's right of privacy.

Lead Agency: Board of Supervisors
Supporting Agencies: Human Rights Commission, Rent Board
Funding Source: Annual Work Program
Schedule: Ongoing

50. The City should continue to evaluate the effectiveness of existing programs to discourage displacement and to provide evicted tenants with sufficient relocation accommodations.Relocation services including counseling, locating replacement housing, and moving expenses should be provided to match the needs of displaced tenants. The City and the Board of Supervisors should continue to pursue necessary legislative modifications at local and State levels to minimize the adverse effects of evictions on tenants.

Lead Agency: Board of Supervisors
Funding Source: Annual Work Program
Schedule: Ongoing

51. DBI shall enforce housing codes where such infractions adversely affect protected resident categories, and shall monitor the correction of such continuing code violations to prevent the loss of housing.

Lead Agency: Department of Building Inspection
Funding Source: Annual Work Program
Schedule: Ongoing

52. The City and all of its partners shall continue to provide translation of all marketing materials, registration processes, applications, etc. Such materials should be marketed broadly and specifically target underserved populations.

Lead Agency: Mayor's Office of Housing
Supporting Agencies: Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, San Francisco Housing Authority, Human Services Agency
Funding Source: Annual Work Program
Schedule: Ongoing

53. The Police Department will continue to implement San Francisco's Municipal Police Code under Article 1.2, which prohibits housing discrimination against families with minor children. This law prohibits the most common forms of discrimination, such as restrictive occupancy standards, rent surcharges and restrictive rules.

Lead Agency: Police Department
Supporting Agencies: Rent Board
Funding Source: Annual Work Program
Schedule: Ongoing

54. The City will continue to promote access to housing by families by enforcing Section 503(d) of the City's Housing Code, and supporting amendments that increase equity.

Lead Agency:	Mayor's Office of Housing
Supporting Agencies:	Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure,, San Francisco Housing Authority, Human Services Agency, Rent Board
Funding Source:	Annual Work Program
Schedule:	Ongoing – existing program

Strategies For Further Review

- MOH should explore methods of partnering with community service providers and housing rights advocates to expand community knowledge of, and access to, the "one-stop" center above.
- All housing agencies should work together to explore how to expand assistance for residents transitioning from supportive services to rental housing, by providing credit help, clean slate programs, and security deposit assistance.
- The Board of Supervisors shall explore ways in which the City can support housing rights advocates, to assist in disseminating information to the widest possible audience.

OBJECTIVE 6:

REDUCE HOMELESSNESS AND THE RISK OF HOMELESSNESS

55. The Department of Public Health, the Human Services Agency; the Mayor's Office of Community Development; the Department on the Status of Women; the Department of Children, Youth and Their Families; the Mayor's Office of Housing continue to implement the 10 year plan to end the "Continuum of Care Five-Year Strategic Plan of San Francisco." The City has also created a new Mayoral office, the Housing, Opportunity, Partnerships and Engagement (HOPE), which find ways to improve outcomes for individuals in all forms of city sponsored housing-including shelters, supportive, public and affordable housing.

Lead Agency:	Human Services Agency
Supporting Agencies:	San Francisco Local Homeless Coordinating Board, San Francisco 10 Year Plan Implementation Council, Department of Public Heath, Mayor's Office of Community Development; Department on the Status of Women; Department of Children, Youth and Their Families; Mayor's Office of Housing; Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure
Funding Source:	San Francisco General Fund; private donations, government grants, CDBG and HOME funds
Schedule:	Ongoing

56. The San Francisco Local Homeless Coordinating Board (LHCB) will continue to work with the Mayor's Office of Housing, the Human Service Agency and the Department of Public Health to maintain and expand housing solutions to homelessness by focusing on new housing, coordinated assessment to place the longest term homeless people in service enriched housing. The "10 Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness" opened 3,000 new units.

Lead Agency:	San Francisco Local Homeless Coordinating Board
Programs:	Local Operating Subsidy Program Care Not Cash Project Homeless Connect Local Outreach Team
Funding Source:	San Francisco General Fund; private donations, government grants, CDBG and HOME funds
Schedule:	Completed and ongoing

57. HSA will continue to facilitate permanent SRO housing through its Master Lease Program, which renovates hotels to be managed by nonprofit agencies providing case management and supportive services on-site, and to fund non-profit agencies to provide on-site supportive services; as well as through programs such as its transitional housing partnership with affordable housing developers.

Lead Agency:	Human Services Agency
Programs:	Master Lease Program (SRO units) Permanent Supportive Housing for Families (nonprofit partnership)
Funding Source:	Program funding
Schedule:	Ongoing

58. DPH shall continue to offer permanent supportive housing and shelter programs; as well as services and clinics which deliver a variety of health services to homeless persons; and to provide on-site case managers who can help residents avoid eviction.

Lead Agency:	Department of Public Health
Supporting Agencies:	Human Services Agency
Programs:	Direct Access to Housing (DAH) Program (permanent supportive housing) Homeless Death Prevention (shelter) Winter Shelter Program (shelter) Community Housing Partnership (shelter)
Funding Source:	San Francisco General Fund, State dollars targeted toward mentally ill adults who are homeless / at-risk of homelessness; Federal grants; Reimbursement through the Federally Qualified Health Center system, and revenue from tenant rent.
Schedule:	Ongoing

59. The Planning Department will ensure that transitional and supportive housing is a residential use through code and/or policy changes.

Lead Agency:	Planning Department
Funding Source:	Annual Work Program
Schedule:	Ongoing

Strategies For Further Review

- HSA should explore new ways to provide permanently affordable and service-enriched housing to reduce the need for temporary homeless shelters, and to place homeless people in

housing directly off the streets, without first going through a "readiness process," shelter, or transitional housing program.

- HSA should explore the potential to create or set aside publicly constructed housing for homeless families with children, with supportive services for residents.

- HSA should continue to work with Redevelopment and MOH, and nonprofit partners such as the Coalition on Homelessness to expand ways to move homeless people currently within the shelter system toward permanently affordable housing.

FACILITATE PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING

OBJECTIVE 7:

SECURE FUNDING AND RESOURCES FOR PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING, INCLUDING INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS THAT ARE NOT SOLELY RELIANT ON TRADITIONAL MECHANISMS OR CAPITAL.

60. The City shall continue to require that new development contributes towards the related affordable housing need they generate, either through financial contributions or through development of affordable housing units. The City shall continue to monitor the inclusionary housing program, including annually updating the nexus and feasibility analysis as appropriate.

Lead Agency:	Planning Department
Programs:	Inclusionary Housing Program (applied to residential development) Jobs Housing Linkage Program (applied to nonresidential development)
Funding Source:	Self-funded (above programs)
Schedule:	Ongoing

61. The Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure ("OCII"), as the successor to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, will contribute to the development of permanently affordable housing by fulfilling its enforceable obligations which require OCII to fund and otherwise facilitate the construction of thousands of affordable housing units. OCII will maximize its contribution by continuing to leverage tax increment funding with outside funding sources wherever possible to ensure timely delivery of affordable units pursuant to those enforceable obligations.

Lead Agency:	Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure
Programs:	Mayors of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS Program Limited Equity Homeownership Program
Funding Source:	Tax increment funding
Schedule:	Ongoing

62. HSA and DPH will continue to administer operating subsidies for special needs housing through their supportive housing programs.

Lead Agency: Human Services Agency
Programs: The Season of Sharing Fund (rental subsidy); The Homeless Prenatal Program (rental subsidy); Housing for Single Adults and Families with Disabilities (rental subsidy for designated sites)
Supporting Agencies: Department of Public Health
Funding Source: San Francisco General Fund; state and federal grants.
Schedule: Ongoing

63. MOH, and SFHA will continue efforts to provide financial support to nonprofit and other developers of affordable housing, through CDBG and other funding sources.

Lead Agency: Human Services Agency
Supporting Agencies: San Francisco Housing Authority
Funding Source: Annual Work Program, Community Development Block Grants
Schedule: Ongoing

64. The City's housing agencies shall keep apprised of federal and state affordable housing funds and other grant opportunities to fund affordable housing for the City of San Francisco, and shall work with federal Representatives to keep the abreast of the specifics of the housing crisis in San Francisco. MOH, MOCD and other agencies shall continue to use such funds for affordable housing

Lead Agency: Mayor's Office of Housing
Supporting Agencies: San Francisco Housing Authority
Funding Source: Local, state and federal grant programs.
Schedule: Ongoing

65. In accordance with the Proposition K Affordable Housing Goals ballot- initiative measure passed in November 2014, the City shall strive to achieve thirty-three percent of new residential units affordable to low- and moderate-income households in new Area Plans and Special Use Districts with significantly increased development potential or those amended to significantly increase development potential. MOH and Planning shall consider, within the context of a community planning process, zoning categories which require a higher proportion of affordable housing where increased density or other benefits are granted. Options include Affordable Housing Only Zones (SLI); Affordable Housing Priority Zones (UMU) or Special Use Districts on opportunity sites.

Lead Agency: Mayor's Office of Housing
Supporting Agencies: Planning Department
Funding Source: Annual work program
Schedule: Ongoing

66. Planning shall monitor the construction of middle income housing under new provisions included within the inclusionary requirements of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans, and consider expanding those provisions Citywide if they meet Housing Element goals.

Lead Agency:	Planning Department
Supporting Agencies:	Mayor's Office of Housing
Funding Source:	Annual work program (part of existing reporting requirements)
Schedule:	Ongoing

67. MOH shall continue to administer first time home buyer programs.

Lead Agency:	Mayor's Office of Housing
Programs:	City's Down Payment Assistance Loan Program, City Second Loans, Teacher Next Door Program (TND), Police in the Community Loan Program Inclusionary, Affordable Housing Program.
Funding Source:	CalFHA, participating lenders.
Schedule:	Ongoing

68. Planning shall continue implementing the City's requirement set forth in Planning Code Section 167 that units be sold and rented separately from parking so as to enable the resident the choice of owning a car.

Lead Agency:	Planning Department
Funding Source:	Not required
Schedule:	Ongoing

69. The City shall pursue federal and state opportunities to increase programs for a variety of affordable homeownership opportunities. Programs specific to the recent foreclosure trends should be pursued as appropriate. Upon implementation, all programs have a significant prepurchase counseling program, and that consumers are supported by a post-purchase services network to assure access to information and services to prevent foreclosure.

Lead Agency:	Mayor's Office of Housing
Supporting Agencies:	Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure
Programs:	MOH's Homebuyer Education Counseling Program "Don't Borrow Trouble" Campaign
Funding Source:	Annual Work Program
Schedule:	Ongoing

Strategies for Further Review

- MOH should explore federal and state stimulus opportunities to increase programs for limited equity homeownership, homeowner assistance programs and down payment assistance; ensuring all programs have a significant prepurchase counseling program, and that consumers are supported by a post-purchase services network to assure access to information and services to prevent foreclosures.

- The Board of Supervisors should explore the creation of a permanent local source of affordable housing funding for the City, such as a housing trust fund. The City should also support efforts at the state level to establish a similar permanent state source of funding for affordable housing.

- Planning, in cooperation with other agencies, should explore the use of Tax Increment Financing outside redevelopment areas to further the development of affordable housing and supportive infrastructure.

- MOH and Planning should continue to consider, within the context of a community planning process, zoning categories which require a higher proportion of affordable housing where increased density or other benefits are granted. Options include Affordable Housing Only Zones (SLI); Affordable Housing Priority Zones (UMU) or Special Use Districts on opportunity sites.

- DBI should review Building Code requirements to examine ways to promote "affordable by design" housing, including pre-built housing, affordable by design, construction types that allow housing at the ground floor of podiums, and other low cost construction types.

OBJECTIVE 8:

BUILD PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTOR CAPACITY TO SUPPORT, FACILITATE, PROVIDE AND MAINTAIN AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

70. MOH shall continue to coordinate local affordable housing efforts and set strategies and priorities to address the housing and community development needs of low-income San Franciscans.

Lead Agency:	Mayor's Office of Housing
Programs:	Citywide Loan Committee, *San Francisco's 2010-2015 Consolidated Plan*, *2010-2011 Action Plan*
Funding Source:	Annual Work Program
Schedule:	Ongoing

71. The City shall continue to implement the Housing Trust Fund. The San Francisco Housing Trust Fund was a ballet-initiative measure that was passed in November of 2012. The Housing Trust Fund begins in year one with a general fund revenue transfer of $20 million and increases to $50 million over time. The Housing Trust Fund will capture revenue from former Redevelopment Agency Tax Increment funds (an example of what is being referred to as "boomerang" funds in post-redevelopment California), a small portion of the Hotel Tax which has been appropriated yearly for affordable housing, plus an additional $13 million in new General Fund revenue from an increase in business license fees. The consensus business tax reform measure, Proposition E, which also passed on the November ballot, will generate $28.5 million in the first year–$13 million of which will go to fund affordable and workforce housing. It is estimated that $1.5 billion will be invested in affordable housing. In addition to the Housing Trust fund, City Agencies and other institutions will continue to work on additional funding sources for affordable housing in accordance with the Proposition K Affordable Housing Goals ballot-initiative measure passed in November of 2014.

Upon implementation or passage of policies, legislation, executive orders, rules, regulations, and procedures impacting the creation, preservation, improvement, or removal or residential housing, the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and all other elected officials, and all City Agencies shall implement such policies, legislations, executive orders, rules, regulations, and procedures in such a manner as to further or maintain Proposition K Affordable Housing Goals.

Lead Agency: Office of Economic and Workforce Development
Funding Source: Donations from private institutions, organizations and businesses within San Francisco
Schedule: Completed and ongoing

72. MOH, OCII, and other housing agencies shall continue to provide support to nonprofit and faith-based organizations in creating affordable housing, including both formal methods such as land donation, technical assistance and training to subsidized housing cooperative boards, and informal methods such as providing information about programs that reduce operations costs, such as energy efficient design.

Lead Agency: Mayor's Office of Housing
Supporting Agencies: Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure San Francisco Housing Authority, Department of Building Inspection
Funding Source: Annual Work Program
Schedule: Ongoing

73. Planning, MOH, DBI and other agencies shall continue to provide informational sessions at Planning Commission, Department of Building Inspection Commission and other public hearings to educate citizens about affordable housing, including information about its residents, its design, and its amenities.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Supporting Agencies: Department of Building Inspection, Mayor's Office of Housing, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, San Francisco Housing Authority
Programs: Planning's "Basics of Good Design" program (presentation by Planning staff and SFAIA); MOH's "In the Field: Best Practices in Construction and Design of Affordable Housing"
Funding Source: Annual Work Program
Schedule: Ongoing

74. Planning staff shall support affordable housing projects in the development review process, including allowing sponsors of permanently affordable housing to take full advantage of allowable densities provided their projects are consistent with neighborhood character.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Funding Source: Annual Work Program
Schedule: Ongoing

75. The City shall encourage manufactured home production, per California law (Government Code 65852.3), and explore innovative use of manufactured home construction that works within the urban context of San Francisco.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Supporting Agencies: Department of Building Inspection, Mayor's Office of Housing
Funding Source: Annual Work Program
Schedule: Ongoing

76. OEWD and Planning shall continue to apply a 3-year time limit to Conditional Use Authorizations, by tying approvals to building permits (which expire in 3 years). Planning shall work with DBI to ensure notification of Planning when building permits are renewed, and review the appropriateness of continuing the Conditional Use Authorization along with building permit renewal.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Supporting Agencies: Department of Building Inspection
Funding Source: Annual Work Program
Schedule: Ongoing

Strategies for Further Review

- Planning, OEWD and MOH should explore the option of allowing expired entitlements to continue if the site is sold to an affordable housing developer, if project sponsors agree to increased affordability requirements.
- OEWD and MOH should explore partnerships between developers and employers, such as master lease programs that ensures that a given number of units will be rented by the employer or their a sub lessee (the employee); or purchase guarantees to accompany the construction of for-sale housing, where an employer agrees to purchase a given number of units in a development if those units are not otherwise purchased, in exchange for price discounts for employees.
- MOH and Planning should explore expansion of the land donation alternative included in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans as a way to fulfill Inclusionary Zoning requirements, and should work with the Tax Assessors office to explore tax incentives that could facilitate the donation of land from private property owners to the City or non-profits for the development of affordable housing.

OBJECTIVE 9:

PROTECT THE AFFORDABILITY OF UNITS AT RISK OF LOSING SUBSIDIES OR BEING CONVERTED TO MARKET RATE HOUSING.

77. MOH and MOCD shall continue monitoring of all "at risk" or potentially at risk subsidized affordable housing units, to protect and preserve federally subsidized housing.

Lead Agency: Mayor's Office of Housing
Program: Assisted Housing Preservation Program (HPP)
Funding Source: Annual Work Program
Schedule: Ongoing

78. MOH shall continue to ensure relocation of all tenants who are displaced, or who lose Section 8 subsidies, through housing reconstruction and preferential consideration.

Lead Agency: Mayor's Office of Housing
Program: Certificate of Preference Program
Funding Source: Tax increment funding
Schedule: Ongoing

79. MOH shall continue to lead a citywide effort, in partnership with SFHA and other City agencies to prioritize and facilitate the preservation and redevelopment of the City's distressed public housing according to the recommendations of the HOPE SF task force.

Lead Agencies: San Francisco Housing Authority, Mayor's Office of Housing Program: HOPE SF
Funding Source: Local public funding, private capital, HOPE VI and other federal funding
Schedule: Ongoing

Strategies for Further Review

- MOH and the SFHA, shall explore the creation of a residents and/or non-profit ownership and management program to acquire existing "at risk" buildings.

REMOVE CONSTRAINTS TO THE CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION OF HOUSING

OBJECTIVE 10: ENSURE A STREAMLINED, YET THOROUGH, AND TRANSPARENT DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

80. Where conditional use authorization is required, the Planning Code should provide clear conditions for deliberation, providing project sponsors, the community, and the Planning Commission with certainty about expectations.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Funding Source: Annual Work Program
Schedule: Ongoing as community plans are completed and/or amended

81. Planning shall continue to implement a Preliminary Project Assessment phase to provide project sponsors with early feedback on the proposed project, identify issues that will may overlap among the various departments, and increase the speed at which the project can move through all City review and approval processes.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Supporting Agencies: Department of Building Inspection, Department of Public Works, Fire Department
Funding Source: Planning Department Application Fees
Schedule: Completed and ongoing

82. Planning shall continue to utilize, and explore ways to increase the benefits of Community Plan exemptions and tiered environmental reviews. As a part of this process, Planning shall prioritize projects which comply with CEQA requirements for infill exemptions by assigning planners immediately upon receipt of such applications.

Lead Agency:	Planning Department
Funding Source:	Annual Work Program
Schedule:	Implemented/ongoing

83. The Department of the Environment, Planning and other agencies shall coordinate City efforts to update the Climate Action Plan, create climate protection amendments to the San Francisco General Plan, and develop other plans for addressing greenhouse gases necessary per AB 32 and SB 375.

Lead Agency:	Department of the Environment
Supporting Agencies:	Planning Department, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Funding Source:	Annual Work Program, state grants
Schedule:	Ongoing

84. Planning shall continue to implement tools and processes that streamline CEQA compliance, thereby reducing the time required for production of environmental documents and CEQA processes. In addition to contracting with previously established pools of qualified consultants to produce necessary technical studies (e.g., transportation) and environmental documents (e.g., EIRs), Planning will continue to implement streamlined processes, including but not limited to: Community Plan Exemptions that tier from previously certified Community Plan EIR's; participate in the preparation of Preliminary Project Assessments that outline the anticipated requirements for CEQA compliance, including necessary technical studies; and implement recent and pending updates to the CEQA Guidelines that provide mechanisms for streamlining the environmental assessment of infill development projects .

Lead Agency:	Planning Department
Funding Source:	Annual Work Program
Schedule:	Ongoing

Strategies for Further Review

- Planning should continue to examine how zoning regulations can be clarified, and design guidelines developed through community planning processes. Planning staff should adhere to such controls in reviewing and recommending approval of projects.

MAINTAIN THE UNIQUE AND DIVERSE CHARACTER OF SAN FRANCISCO'S NEIGHBORHOODS

OBJECTIVE 11:

RECOGNIZE THE DIVERSE AND DISTINCT CHARACTER OF SAN FRANCISCO'S NEIGHBORHOODS.

85. Planning staff shall coordinate the City's various design guidelines and standards, including those in the General Plan, Planning Code, and Residential Design Guidelines into a comprehen-

sive set of Design Standards. This effort shall include development of Neighborhood Commercial Design Standards as well as updates to existing standards.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Funding Source: Annual Work Program
Schedule: Ongoing

86. Planning staff shall reform the Planning Department's internal design review process to ensure consistent application of design standards, establish a "Residential Design Team" who shall oversee application of the standards on small projects, and continue the "Urban Design Advisory Team" to oversee design review for larger projects.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Funding Source: Annual Work Program
Schedule: Ongoing

87. Planning staff shall continue to work with the design community to provide informational sessions at the Planning Commission, Department of Building Inspection Commission and in public forums to educate decision makers and citizens about architectural design, including co-housing, shared housing and group housing.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Programs: Planning's "Basics of Good Design" program (presentation by Planning staff and SFAIA); Planning's "Good Design" Brown Bag Lunch Series; MOH's "In the Field: Best Practices in Construction and Design of Affordable Housing"
Funding Source: Annual Work Program
Schedule: Ongoing

88. Planning staff shall continue to use community planning processes to develop policies, zoning, and design standards that are tailored to neighborhood character; and shall include design standards for mixed use, residential and commercial buildings in development of new community plans (if not covered by the City's comprehensive Design Standards described above).

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Funding Source: Annual Work Program
Schedule: Ongoing (community planning processes will be identified in the Department's work program on an annual basis).

89. Planning Department staff shall continue project review and historic preservation survey work, in coordination with the Historic Preservation Commission; and shall continue to integrate cultural and historic surveys into community planning projects.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Funding Source: Annual Work Program and grants from the Historic Preservation Fund
Schedule: Ongoing (community planning processes will be identified in the Department's work program on an annual basis).

90. Planning Department staff shall continue to develop a process for Neighborhood Design Guideline review and approval including developing next steps for public dissemination.

Lead Agency: Planning Department Legislative Division
Funding Source: Annual Work Program
Schedule: Ongoing

91. Planning Department staff shall research mechanisms to help preserve the character of certain distinctive neighborhoods and unique areas which are worthy of recognition and protection, but which may not be appropriate as historical districts. Such mechanisms should recognize the particular qualities of a neighborhood and encourage their protection, maintenance and organic growth, while providing flexibility of approach and style so as not to undermine architectural creativity, existing zoning, or create an undue burden on homeowners.

Lead Agency: Planning Department, Citywide Division
Funding Source: Annual Work Program
Schedule: Ongoing

92. The Planning Department has a completed draft of the Preservation Element and the final document will undergo Environmental Review in 2015.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Funding Source: Annual Work Program and grant from the Historic Preservation Fund
Schedule: Ongoing

Strategies for Further Review

- Planning should explore ways to encourage property owners to use preservation incentives and federal tax credits for rehabilitation of qualified historical resources, Mills Act property tax abatement programs, the State Historic Building Code, and tax deductions for preservation easements.
- Planning should explore ways to assist in federal environmental review and review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act for historically significant local buildings receiving federal assistance.
- All agencies should explore ways to incorporate design competitions and peer review on major projects.

BALANCE HOUSING CONSTRUCTION AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE

OBJECTIVE 12:

BALANCE HOUSING GROWTH WITH ADEQUATE INFRASTRUCTURE THAT SERVES THE CITY'S GROWING POPULATION.

93. Planning shall cooperate with infrastructure agencies such as SFMTA and DPW to plan for adequate transportation to support the needs of new housing, and within each community planning process shall develop clear standards for transit and transportation provision per unit.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Supporting Agencies: San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, Department of Public Works, Bay Area Rapid Transit
Funding Source: Annual Work Program
Schedule: Ongoing (community planning processes will be identified in the Department's work program on an annual basis).

94. Planning shall ensure community plans for growth are accompanied by capital plans and programs to support both the "hard" and "soft" elements of infrastructure needed by new housing.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Funding Source: Annual Work Program (funded under the Implementation Group)
Schedule: Ongoing (community planning processes will be identified in the Department's work program on an annual basis).

95. The Planning Department's "Implementation Group" shall continue to manage the implementation of planned growth areas after Plan adoption, including programming impact fee revenues and coordinating with other City agencies to ensure that needed infrastructure improvements are built.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Funding Source: Annual Work Program
Schedule: Ongoing

96. The Planning Department continues to update CEQA review procedures to account for trips generated, including all modes, and corresponding transit and infrastructure demands, with the Goal of replacing LOS with a new metric measuring the total number of new automobile trips generated. The Planning department is currently refining the metric to be consistent with State Guidelines.

Lead Agency: Office of Economic and Workforce Development, San Francisco County Transportation Authority (TA), Planning Department
Supporting Agencies: City Attorney, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
Funding Source: Annual Work Program

97. Planning should maintain and update as necessary other elements of the City's General Plan.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Funding Source: Annual Work Program
Schedule: Ongoing

98. Planning and the SFMTA continue to coordinate housing development with implementation and the Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP). The TEP adjusts transit routes to increase service, improve reliability, and reduce travel delay to better meet current and project travel patterns throughout the City. The Department in coordination with the SFMTA should provide annual updates on the TEP.

Lead Agency:	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
Supporting Agencies:	Planning Department
Funding Source:	San Francisco Proposition K funding; outside grants
Schedule:	Ongoing

99. Planning and other relevant agencies shall maintain consistency of development fees, while updating such fees through regular indexing according to construction cost index to maintain a correct relationship between development and infrastructure costs. Fees to be updated include the Transportation Impact Development Fee, Area Plan specific impact fees, downtown impact fees, and other citywide impact fees.

Lead Agency:	Planning Department
Supporting Agencies:	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency; San Francisco Unified School District; Department of Children Youth & Families; Recreation and Parks Department, etc.
Funding Source:	Annual Work Program
Schedule:	Ongoing

100. The PUC will continue to ensure charges for system upgrades are equitably established, so that new growth will pay its way for increased demands placed on the system, while all residents pay for general system upgrades and routine and deferred maintenance.

Lead Agency:	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Funding Source:	Not required
Schedule:	Ongoing

101. The PUC will continue to implement conservation regulations and incentives such the City's Green Building Ordinance and the Stormwater Design Guidelines.

Lead Agency:	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Supporting Agencies:	Department of the Environment, Planning Department
Funding Source:	Annual Work Program
Schedule:	Ongoing

Additional Strategies for Further Review

- Planning shall consider incentive programs such as requiring larger new housing developments to provide transit passes to their residents as a part of association dues or monthly rent; or requiring new developments that include car-sharing parking spots to encourage carshare memberships to their residents.

- Planning shall explore the creation of a definition of neighborhood serving uses that reflects use categories which clearly serve the daily needs of adjacent residents, perhaps modeled on North Beach SUD requirements which restrict to "neighborhood-serving retail sales and personal services of a type which supplies commodities or offers personal services to residents," (Planning Code Section 780.3).

PRIORITIZING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

OBJECTIVE 13:

PRIORITIZE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN PLANNING FOR AND CONSTRUCTING NEW HOUSING.

102. Regional planning entities such as ABAG shall continue to prioritize regional transportation decisions and funding to "smart" local land use policies that link housing, jobs and other land uses, including focusing on VMT reduction. The City shall encourage formalization of state policy that similarly prioritizes transportation and infrastructure dollars transit infrastructure for "smart growth" areas such as San Francisco, rather than geographic allocation.

Lead Agency:	Association of Bay Area Governments
Supporting Agencies:	Metropolitan Transportation Council
Funding Source:	Proposition 84, other grants
Schedule:	Ongoing

103. Plan Bay Area, the nine-county Bay Area's long-range integrated transportation and land-use housing strategy through 2040, was jointly approved by ABAG and MTC on July 18th, 2013. The Planning Department will continue to coordinate with regional entities for implementation of the Plan.

Lead Agency:	Planning Department
Supporting Agencies:	Department of the Environment, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, Mayor's Office
Funding Source:	Annual Work Program, with Proposition 84 grants
Schedule:	Completed and ongoing

104. The San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) was supportive of MAP-21 the latest Federal Transportation Reauthorization Act and continues to play an active role in federal transportation dollars that support transit-oriented development. In March of 2014 the SFCTA lead staff as well as SFCTA commissioners traveled to DC to speak to federal transportation officials about Bay Area transportation priorities. SFCTA will continue to advocate at the federal level for transit-oriented development

Lead Agency:	Mayor's Office
Supporting Agencies:	Planning Department, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
Funding Source:	Not required.
Schedule:	Completed and ongoing

105. On a local level, the City shall prioritize planned growth areas such as designated Priority Development Areas (PDAs), Area Plans or Redevelopment Areas for regional, state and federal bond and grants, especially for discretionary funding application processes such as the State's Prop 1C.

Lead Agencies:	Mayor's Office, Board of Supervisor's
Supporting Agencies:	Planning Department, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, other agencies as necessary

Funding Source: Annual Work Programs
Schedule: Ongoing

106. The San Francisco Transportation Authority shall implement regional traffic solutions that discourage commuting by car, such as congestion pricing, parking pricing by demand, and shall continue to work with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) on funding strategies.

Lead Agency: San Francisco Transportation Authority
Supporting Agencies: Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Programs: On-Street Parking Management and Pricing Study
Congestion Pricing Program
Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
Geary Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
Funding Source: Proposition K Funding; state and Federal grants
Schedule: Ongoing; Geary BRT to begin construction TBD, with service potentially beginning in 2015.

107. The City shall continue to support efforts to use state or regional funds to give housing subsidies or income tax credits to employees who live close to their workplaces, and shall consider offering housing subsidies or income tax credits to employees who live close to their workplaces.

Lead Agency: Mayor's Office
Funding Source: Not required
Schedule: Ongoing

108. The City will continue to support transit-related income tax credits to encourage employees to commute to work via transit. The City shall also require master developers to provide transit passes as a condition of approval in major development projects, such as Visitacion Valley, Executive Park and Bayview; and shall explore local requirements that require new developments to provide residents with a MUNI FastPass as part of condominium association benefits to promote local transit use.

Lead Agency: Planning Department
Supporting Agencies: San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency,
San Francisco Transportation Authority
Funding Source: Annual Work Program
Schedule: Ongoing

109. OEWD will facilitate employer-supported transit and transportation demand management (TDM) programs, including rideshare matching, transit improvements, bicycle and pedestrian facility improvements, parking management and restriction of free parking; , and continue to require that employers offer commuter benefits per Section 421 of the Environment Code to encourage employees to use transit or carpool.

Lead Agency:	Office of Economic and Workforce Development
Supporting Agencies:	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, Department of the Environment
Programs:	Commuter Benefits Program (Environment Code Section 421, requires all employers with at least 20 full-time employees to provide transit benefits)
Funding Source:	Not required.
Schedule:	Ongoing

110. DBI, Planning, and the Department of Environment shall continue to implement the City's Green Building Ordinance, mandating that newly constructed residential buildings must meet a sliding scale of green building requirements based on the project's size in order to increase energy and water efficiency in new buildings and significant alterations to existing buildings.

Lead Agencies:	Planning Department, Department of Building Inspection, Department of the Environment
Program:	Green Building Ordinance (Building Code, Chapter 13)
Funding Source:	Annual Work Program
Schedule:	Ongoing

111. The City shall continue local and state incentive programs for green upgrades.

Lead Agencies:	Department of Building Inspection, Department of the Environment, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Programs:	Green Financing Programs to Fund Energy and Water Conservation Improvements (allows building owners to fund these improvements with the financing attached to the property and paid back through a special line item on the property tax bill over the life of the improvements); GoSolarSF (pays for approximately half the cost of installation of a solar power system, and more to qualified low-income residents)
Funding Source:	Annual Work Program
Schedule:	Ongoing

Additional Strategies for Further Review

- DBI should work with the Rent Board and other building-owner organizations to explore incentives that can be offered to landlords to promote "green" capital improvements, such as enabling restricted tenant pass-throughs when such improvements will result in a tangible financial benefit to the tenant.

D. Estimating Potential Development Capacity

INTRODUCTION

The Planning Department faces many policy questions relating to the future development, its location and type, within San Francisco. To inform this discussion, the Department relies on a number of data sources compiled into key databases to analyze existing and future land use trends and potential. The "build out" database is a collection of parcel-based data which quantifies existing land use conditions and, given zoning and height information, estimates for each parcel the potential for additional development. The database is set up with a series of scripts (see Attachment D-1) enabling testing of possible rezoning scenarios with relative ease. The result is a cumulative estimate of vacant and underdeveloped sites' potential development at less than the theoretical maximum capacity allowed under current zoning. This estimate is necessarily conservative as it takes into account neighborhood character wherein existing residential structures typically fall below building densities and heights allowed by zoning.

TERMS

The terms used in the tables and Housing Element Part I: Data and Needs Analysis are explained below:

- ***Housing Potential Sites***: These are sites suitable for residential development based on criteria and site analyses of each district in the city. They consist of vacant or "undeveloped" parcels and "soft sites," which are determined appropriate for residential development based chiefly on database analysis including screening based on existing uses and preliminary surveys.

- ***Vacant or Near Vacant and Undeveloped Lands:*** A parcel is considered "vacant" or "near vacant" and undeveloped if development is 5% or less of the potential development. This criterion thus includes unimproved or undeveloped lots used for open storage, surface parking, or other open air uses. Large lots with very small structures, for example a one-level grocery store with a relatively large parking lot, also fit under this description. These sites theoretically could be readily developed for residential use.

- ***Underdeveloped Sites or "Soft Sites"***: A second category of housing potential sites includes parcels which exceed 5% but not 30% of potential development square foot-

age but were considered reasonable candidates for redevelopment. These include sites with building uses that significantly underutilize the site such as. These sites may have structures that could be reused or rebuilt for residential use.

GENERAL APPROACH TO ESTIMATING POTENTIAL CAPACITY

The build out database uses zoning information to estimate the potential development for each of more than 150,000 parcels in San Francisco. Given the number of parcels in the city, it is not feasible to calculate capacity for parcels individually. Accordingly, a batch treatment, and thus larger datasets of information, is needed.

Potential development is counted in residential units and in commercial gross square feet. A parcel may have residential, commercial or residential and commercial development capacity depending on the specific combination of zoning and height district. *Attachment D-2* summarizes permitted land uses and general development standards for the city's zoning districts. These development standards include density and open space requirements relevant to estimating potential capacity of each parcel. Setbacks, where appropriate [largely in residential districts, but mainly in the RH-1(detached) district], are built in the "buildable envelope" of the parcel.

Once the development potential for residential and commercial space is calculated, information on existing housing units and commercial square footage can be used to calculate the net potential for each parcel. For example, for a parking lot or a one-storey building in an 80-foot height zoning district, most of the potential capacity remains unused or underdeveloped; for two-storey homes in most residential neighborhoods, however, the potential capacity would be considered built out.

The degree to which a parcel is considered built out is measured as its development "*softness*" and expressed as a percentage of how much of the parcel's potential development capacity is utilized, aggregating residential and non-residential uses. The softness categories in use are 5% and 30%; the categories are mutually exclusive, and a parcel's softness is counted in the category it falls immediately beneath. For example, a parcel that is developed to 20% of its zoned capacity will fall in the 30% softness bracket. The total remaining potential is measured in the field `Netsqft`, while remaining housing potential is recorded in `Netunits`. `Netsqft` is total potential square feet minus total existing square feet. `Netunits`, similarly, is total potential units minus total existing units. Rather than being mutually exclusive measures, or `Netunits` being contained in `Netsqft`, they measure different things.[1]

1 Netsqft doesn't distinguish between what uses exist and could exist in a building, but is strictly a measure of how large the building is relative to the estimated potential given the zoning and height combination. Netunits in turn only compares existing and potential residential units. If the existing unit count happens to be small relative to non-residential uses in a building , the space for the additional, or net units could end up consuming more space than the net remaining buildable space. In order for the net residential units to be developed, there would, apart from an expansion of the building, also need to be a conversion of existing commercial uses to residential. This principle, if uncommon in practice, is illustrated in Figure D-1 .

For the purpose of determining remaining development potential capacity, the Planning Department does not consider any parcel developed to more than 30% of its capacity as a "soft site," or a candidate for additional square footage or intensification. However, as net units are tallied separately as the difference between potential and existing units, a parcel is only considered soft if the actual building size is small enough to warrant a softness classification. In other words, a building could conceivably have a potential for more residential units per existing density controls, but if it is already built to capacity in terms of square footage, it is not considered "soft" as an increase in residential units would need to come at the expense of existing uses in the building (whether as a split of existing units, or conversion of commercial space) and not through building expansion.

SPECIFIC APPROACH BY ZONING DISTRICT TYPE

Different development assumptions were applied to parcels based on general zoning designations. In addition to development standards specific to zoning, these assumptions are based on existing development patterns including commercial and residential mix.

- ***Downtown:*** In all C-2, C-3 and C-M districts, it is assumed that the primary use will be commercial and this is thus assigned 90% of the square footage with the remaining 10% going to residential use. This is a conservative estimate as recent developments in these districts have far higher residential shares. For example, a 140,640 sq ft office building was converted into a 100% residential building with 104 units. Another example is a low-rise tourist hotel was demolished and redeveloped into a 43-storey, 495-unit rental building with just the ground floor for commercial/retail uses.

- ***Industrial and South of Market districts*:** It is assumed in these districts that a certain proportion of the lots will be developed as residential and the remaining will be devoted to commercial use. This is also a conservative assumption as industrial buildings have been converted to 100% residential use as is the case in live/work or loft-style developments.

- ***PDR Districts:*** Envelope is determined as FAR times lot area. FAR varies by height district. No residential uses assigned to preserve remaining viable industrial uses in San Francisco.

- ***Downtown Residential Districts:*** For these districts, bulk controls play a significant role in determining the amount of developable space, so floor plates was varied for different portions of the building depending on the height district. Residential to commercial uses was assigned in ratios 6:1.

- ***Eastern Neighborhoods Residential Districts:*** For Mixed-Use-Residential and Downtown Residential-South Beach, residential to commercial uses were assigned in a 3:1 ratio and 6:1 ratio, respectively. Buildable area is stories times 80% of lot area.

- ***Multi-Use:*** This covers all Residential-Mixed (RM) districts. It assumes one primary use – residential – with no secondary use. Residential density limits determine the number of units, constrained by the height limit and rear yard requirements.

- ***Residential:*** This assumes housing as the sole use in all residential (RH) districts. This scenario also assumes one unit for each RH-1 lot, two units for RH-2, and three units for RH-3. For larger lots, the conditional use density limits apply.

- ***Residential-Transit Oriented:*** As no residential density is specified, an average unit size of 1,000 sq ft plus 20% circulation/building inefficiency was used. The buildable envelope was calculated using 55% lot cover for each floor. No commercial uses assumed.

- ***Mixed:*** All neighborhood commercial districts and the Chinatown Mixed Use districts are assumed to have commercial as the primary use, built-out based on the FAR, with residential as a secondary use, built-out to residential density limits. Residential development, however, is trimmed down based on the height limits.

- ***Neighborhood Commercial Mixed, No Density Limits:*** A new, more flexible class of neighborhood commercial districts has been introduced not nominally constraining residential density, except for a requirement that 40% of units be two-bedrooms or larger. Height limit, rather than FAR was used to determine the built-out envelope. For these districts we divided evenly capacity between residential and commercial space.

- ***Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Districts:*** A number of new zoning districts in the Eastern Neighborhoods emphasize use flexibility and are less prescriptive in terms of allowed density for residential uses. For these districts, FAR determines the buildable area, and FAR in turn varies depending on building height. In these districts, commercial uses are given priority, ranging between 50% to 75% of buildable space.

By taking into account existing development patterns including commercial and residential mix, these assumptions are by design on the conservative side. Recent residential developments in downtown, for example, have far exceeded the 90% commercial and 10% residential mix. Similarly, 100% residential projects have occurred in industrial and South of Market districts.

DATA

The Department relies on a number of sources to provide the key information that forms the basis for the capacity calculations (Table D-1). While each data set is subject to errors in substance and time, we are confident that the method is meaningful in the aggregate assuming that errors are geographically randomly distributed. We have not found evidence that errors exhibit clustering.

Table D-1
Data Inputs and Sources

Data	Source(s)
Housing Units	Assessor's Office, Department of Building Inspection, Mayor's Office of Housing, Planning Department, San Francisco Housing Authority, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency
Zoning Districts and Development Standards	Planning Department
Height Limits	Planning Department
Building Square Footage	Assessor's Office, LIDAR* 3D data set
Commercial Square Footage	Dun & Bradstreet, LIDAR* 3D data set
Historic Survey Rating Status	Planning Department
Public Facilities	Department of Telecommunications and Information Services
Transfer of Development Right status	Planning Department
Development Pipeline	Department of Building Inspection, Planning Department, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

Notes:* **Li**ght **D**etection **a**nd **R**anging, a remote sensing system used to collect three-dimensional topographic data, was used to estimate existing building square footage.

CALCULATING CAPACITY

Table D-2 summarizes the algorithm for calculating residential and commercial square footage, respectively, for each district. For practical reasons, districts were grouped in general zoning district classes; for example, the over 20 distinct, named neighborhood commercial districts were grouped with general neighborhood commercial districts. Assumptions also include: the height of one floor or one storey was considered on average 10 feet; square footage of a new dwelling unit was estimated at a gross 1,200 square feet, including circulation space, building inefficiencies, parking etc.

The purpose of the build out has been to determine buildable capacity. Given the variety of land uses allowed in most districts, buildable capacity is categorized at the most basic level: residential or non-residential/commercial use. Accordingly, commercial space is treated as a generic category for the purposes of calculating potential non-residential space.[2]

Limitations

For reasons of data architecture, Special Use Districts (SUDs) overlaid on zoning districts were generally not included for build out calculation, with the exception of the Van Ness Market Downtown Residential Special Use District, which could readily be mapped and treated as a downtown residential district. All occurrences of this Special Use District/C-3 zoning combination could thus be treated the same way.

2 For some districts the script accounts for different commercial categories separately to better reflect specific district limitations on certain uses.

Another shortcoming of the build out script is that it does not at this time estimate the possibility of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) option available to parcels larger than ½ acre in single ownership. While PUDs allow slightly greater density, they allow less than the density allowed by a district one class denser in order to not qualify as a rezoning. Capacity, this way, for sites eligible for PUD is estimated on the conservative side.

Finally, inaccuracies crop up where lots are split into multiple zoning and/or height districts. The lot proportions in each district cannot be determined at the database level.[3] In most of these cases, the more conservative zoning or height district was picked, and capacity calculated accordingly. For some larger sites, the height to be used by the script was assigned manually to better reflect actual conditions.

It is important to note that the buildout dataset lacks a time dimension and makes no assumptions or claims about economic or political conditions. Construction on sites may or may not happen depending on economic conditions, and would need to go through the normal review channels prior to realization. Moreover, this exercise of estimating the city's remaining potential development capacity should not be taken as an identification of soft sites or parcels that will turn over and be developed. Market pressures can push development in parcels that may have existing land uses that exceed 30% or even 50% of its zoned capacity.

Table D-2
Buildout Calculation Algorithm by Zoning District

District	District Class	Algorithm	Constraint
RH-1, RH-1(D), RH-2, RH-3	Residential	The suffix of the district determines number of possible units. A test is performed to see if lot is large enough for Conditional Use additional units. No commercial allowed. No non-residential assumed for these districts.	If average unit size times units is larger than buildable envelope, subtract one unit until units fit in envelope.
RM-1, RM-2, RM-3, RM-4	Residential-Multi	The suffix of the district determines the allowable density. RM-1, for example, allows one unit per 800 square feet of lot area. No non-residential assumed for these districts.	If average unit size times units is larger than buildable envelope, subtract one unit until units fit in envelope.
RTO	Residential	Calculate buildable envelope by taking 55% of lot area times stories. Divide envelope by average unit size. No non-residential uses assumed for these districts.	If average unit size times units is larger than buildable envelope, subtract one unit until units fit in envelope.
RC, CRNC, CVR, CCB	Mixed	Commercial uses given a FAR of 1 by default. Rest of envelope given to residential uses, within the limits of the density cap.	If the number of units at the average unit size plus the 1 FAR commercial yields less than the total potential envelope, add commercial space up to the allowed commercial FAR.
C-3, C-2	Downtown	Envelope is determined by FAR. Assign 90% to commercial, 10% to residential. Divide residential space by average unit size to get unit count.	Lots smaller than 7,500 square feet are assigned only half FAR.

3 Once we digitize a citywide height layer, this issue can be better addressed within a geographic information system.

District	District Class	Algorithm	Constraint
DTR	High Density Residential	Envelope is determined by height, not by FAR. Height less than 24 stories results in floor plate of 7,500 sf, less than 30, 8,500, less than 35, 9,000, 36 and higher, 10,000 sf floor plate. Upper third of tower has a reduced floor plate by 10%. Residential to commercial space is assigned 6:1.	Because floor plate for this zone type is constrained regardless of lot size, a check was included to allow extra towers on very large lots to approximate square footage if lot was split. The constant used was 4, meaning that lots more than four times the floor plate would be candidates for a second tower, thereby ensuring that bulk controls in these districts would not be artificially limited on oversize lots.
MUO, UMU, MUR	Eastern Neighborhood Mixed	Envelope is set to stories times FAR. FAR in turn varies by height district. (Portion of) FAR is used, rest is residential. If four stories, set retail, office=1 FAR each. If five-six stories, set retail =1 FAR, office=2 FAR. If 8 stories or more, set retail =1, office=3 FAR.	
MUR, DTR-S	Eastern Neighborhood Mixed	Envelope is stories times lot area. We assign most space to residential use here. 25% Commercial, 75% residential.	
M-1, M-2	Industry	Assign residential square footage based on half of residential density allowed for district. Commercial use is FAR times commercial share of development.	
NC-1, NC-2, NC-3, named NC's, RED, RSD	Mixed	Commercial uses given a FAR of 1 by default. Rest of envelope given to residential uses, within the limits of the density cap.	If the number of units at the average unit size plus the 1 FAR commercial yields less than the total potential envelope, add commercial space up to the allowed commercial FAR.
NCT districts	Mixed, no density limits	Most districts capacity shared evenly between residential and commercial development. As no residential density is specified, an average gross unit size of 1,200 sq. ft. was used.	
PDR-1, PDR-2	PDR	Envelope is FAR times lot area. FAR varies by height district. No residential space.	
SLI, SLR, SPD, SSO	South of Market Mixed Use	Multiply the commercial share of the lot by FAR to arrive at commercial square footage. The FAR varied for SSO lots depending on height limit. Divide the product of the residential share, number of buildable stories (limited by FAR) and .75 lot cover by the average size of a unit; this yields the number of units. Multiply this number by the average unit size to arrive at residential square footage.	

Exceptions

There were sites which would qualify for a softness label on metrics alone, but for a number of reasons were excluded from the overall softness tally. These cases are listed in Table D-3. These exceptions have been taken largely for practical reasons. For example, fire stations, schools and other public community facilities may be in structures that do not fully utilize the parcels' potential capacity based on underlying zoning standards. These buildings, however, serve a public function and may not likely be turning over for additional development. Similarly, freeways and other dedicated rights-of-way, even if these parcels are zoned for residential uses, are not considered as land suitable for development. Also underutilized parcels that may have residential or mixed uses with at least 10 units are not considered soft for this exercise. It is assumed for the purposes of estimating land inventory that such sites will not likely be demolished and rebuilt. These exemptions, as well as the assumptions and limitations cited in previous sections, therefore make this a very conservative estimate of the city's remaining capacity.

Table D-3
Soft Site Exceptions

Override Type	Description
Lot functions as open space for or otherwise connected to adjacent property	Lot is deeded open space for adjacent development.
Public or other large facility not likely to change	Fire stations, museums, schools etc.
Historic designation or otherwise significant	Exclusion from the softsite tally includes Category I and Category II buildings as well as California Historic Resource Status Codes 1 thru 5, all suffixes.
Incorrect (too low) base data	If existing square footage information is deemed to be on the low side, the net capacity figure can be overstated. For example, the square footage reported represents only one condominium in a multi-unit structure.
TDR Used	If a Certificate of Transfer was issued, lot was marked as not soft as capacity has been transferred under §128.
Residential units	If more than 10 residential units were on site, the site was considered not soft.
Pipeline	A development event is in the pipeline. Site is assumed not soft if construction has already started or if the proposed project has received planning entitlements and/or building permits have been approved or issued.
ROW	Freeway or other dedicated rights-of-way.

Figure D-1

Relationship Between Building Envelopes, Net Square Feet, and Net Units[4]



4 As net units is the nominal difference between existing and proposed units, the net unit estimate will in some cases presuppose that, in order to realize the net unit figure, existing non-residential building space will need to be converted into residential use. The figure shows this in the uncommon situation where a building has far more non-residential than residential space, and thus can add a relatively large number of units--more than could typically fit in the net square feet available between the existing building size and what could be built if fully developed.

Attachment D-1

Main Build-Out Functions

Note: These functions were used for the buildout calculations in Microsoft Access's Visual Basic for Applications interface.

```
Option Compare Database
Option Explicit
'---------------------------------
'Class MixedUseCapacity
'---------------------------------

Function MixedGeneral(inStories As Integer, inLotArea As Double, _
 inresdensity As Integer, inFAR As Single, rearYard As Double, flag As Byte)


Dim varunits As Integer
Dim varressqft As Double
Dim varcommsqft As Double
Dim vartotsqft As Double
Dim check, potEnvelope, farOverride As Single

'If infar > inStories Then
'tempFAR = inStories
'End If

farOverride = 1 'set a commercial far at 1 as a default.
varunits = Int(inLotArea / inresdensity)
varressqft = varunits * grossUnitSize(1)
varcommsqft = inLotArea * farOverride
vartotsqft = varressqft + varcommsqft

'this compares totalsqft to the theoretical envelope given res/com mix. If
larger than 1, subtract units.

potEnvelope = ((farOverride * inLotArea) + (inStories - farOverride) *
(inLotArea * (1 - rearYard)))
check = (vartotsqft / potEnvelope)

Select Case check 'if envelope is not filled, add commercial
  Case Is > 1
     'varressqft = potEnvelope - inLotArea
     'varunits = varressqft / grossUnitSize(1)
    varcommsqft = potEnvelope - varressqft
  Case Else
    Do While potEnvelope > vartotsqft And varcommsqft < (inLotArea * inFAR)

       'varunits = varunits - 1
       'potEnvelope = ((farOverride * inLotArea) + (inStories - farOverride)
* (inLotArea * (1 - rearYard)))
      varcommsqft = varcommsqft + 1000
       'varressqft = varunits * grossUnitSize(1)
      vartotsqft = varressqft + varcommsqft
    Loop
End Select

Select Case flag
  Case 1
    MixedGeneral = varunits
  Case 2
    MixedGeneral = varcommsqft
```

```
End Select

End Function
---------------------------------------------------------------------------

Function C3General(ByVal inStories As Integer, ByVal inLotArea As Double, _
ByVal inFAR As Single, ByVal inZoning As String, flag As Byte)

 'returns residential square feet for c3 districts by designating envelope
 'as FAR times lotsize (when height limit allows) and distributing 90% to
commercial.
 'Limits potential for lots smaller than 7500 sqft to half the FAR
otherwise used.

 Dim varunits As Integer
 Dim varressqft As Double
 Dim varcommsqft As Double
 Dim vartotsqft As Double

 vartotsqft = inLotArea * inStories
 If inLotArea <= 7500 And (inZoning = "C-3-O" Or inZoning = "C-3-O(SD)")
Then
  Select Case inStories < 9
   Case True
    varcommsqft = inLotArea * inStories * 0.9
    varressqft = inLotArea * inStories * 0.1
   Case Else    'buildings taller than 10 stories will use only half the
possible FAR
    varcommsqft = inLotArea * (0.5 * inFAR) * 0.9
    varressqft = inLotArea * (0.5 * inFAR) * 0.1
  End Select
 Else
  If inStories > inFAR Then
   varcommsqft = (inLotArea * inFAR * 0.9)
   varressqft = (inLotArea * inFAR * 0.1)
  Else
   varcommsqft = inLotArea * inStories * 0.9
   varressqft = inLotArea * inStories * 0.1
  End If
 End If

Select Case flag
  Case 1
    C3General = varressqft
  Case 2
    C3General = varcommsqft
End Select



End Function
---------------------------------------------------------------------------

Function SOMGeneral(ByVal inZoning As String, ByVal inLotArea As Double,
ByVal inStories As Integer, _
ByVal inFAR As Single, ByVal inShare As Single, ByVal rearYard As Single,
flag As Byte) As Long
'works on soma districts; uses average unit size rather than units relative
to lot area. Since these districts
 'are very permissive density-wise (1 per 200 sf lot area), using average
size yields an estimate on the conservative side.

 'leave out the rearyard usage for now; go with FAR.

 Dim varcommsqft, varressqft As Long
 Dim varfar As Single
 Dim lotCoverage As Single
 lotCoverage = 1 - rearYard
```

```
 varfar = 0

 If InStr(1, inZoning, "SSO") > 0 Then
  Select Case inStories
   Case 4, 5
    varfar = 3
   Case 6, 8
    varfar = 4
   Case 13
    varfar = 4.5
   Case Else
    varfar = inFAR
  End Select
 End If

 If varfar = 0 Then
  varfar = inFAR
 End If
 varressqft = inLotArea * (1 - inShare) * varfar * (1 - rearYard)

 If inStories <= varfar Then
  varressqft = inLotArea * (1 - inShare) * inStories * (1 - rearYard)
  varcommsqft = inLotArea * inShare * inStories
 Else
  varcommsqft = inLotArea * inShare * varfar
  varressqft = inLotArea * (1 - inShare) * varfar * (1 - rearYard)
 End If

Select Case flag
  Case 1
    SOMGeneral = varressqft
  Case 2
    SOMGeneral = varcommsqft
End Select

End Function
---------------------------------------------------------------------------

Function ENMixed(ByVal inStories As Integer, ByVal inLotArea As Long, flag
As Byte)
 Dim retail As Long
 Dim office As Long
 Dim resSf As Long
 Dim FAR As Single
 Dim envelope As Long
 Dim totComSf As Long
 '***returns commercial square footage for eastern neighborhood zoning
districts. Allocates commercial primarily based on
 '***FAR (variable by height district) and leaving the rest to residential.
 envelope = inStories * inLotArea

 Select Case inStories
  Case Is <= 4
   FAR = 3
   retail = inLotArea * 1
   office = inLotArea * 1
   totComSf = retail + office
   resSf = FAR * inLotArea - totComSf
  Case Is = 5
   FAR = 4
   retail = inLotArea * 1
   office = inLotArea * 2
   totComSf = retail + office
   resSf = FAR * inLotArea - totComSf
  Case Is = 6
   FAR = 5
   retail = inLotArea * 1
```

```
    office = inLotArea * 2
    totComSf = retail + office
    resSf = FAR * inLotArea - totComSf
   Case Is = 8
    FAR = 6
    retail = inLotArea * 1
    office = inLotArea * 3
    totComSf = retail + office
    resSf = FAR * inLotArea - totComSf
   Case Is > 8
    FAR = 7.5
    retail = inLotArea * 1
    office = inLotArea * 3
    totComSf = retail + office
    resSf = FAR * inLotArea - totComSf
 End Select

 Select Case flag
  Case 1
    ENMixed = resSf
  Case 2
    ENMixed = totComSf
End Function
---------------------------------------------------------------------------

Function NCTGeneral(ByVal inStories As Integer, _
ByVal inLotArea As Double, ByVal rearYard As Single, ByVal comShare As
Single, flag As Byte) As Long
 '***Projects number of units on NC lots without density control.
 Dim envelope As Double
 Dim varunits As Integer
 Dim varressqft As Double
 Dim vartotsqft As Double
 Dim varcomsqft

 envelope = inLotArea * (1 - rearYard) * inStories
 varunits = envelope * (1 - comShare) / grossUnitSize(0.5)
 varcomsqft = envelope * comShare
 vartotsqft = varressqft + varcomsqft

 Do While ceil(vartotsqft / (inLotArea * (1 - rearYard))) > Nz(inStories,
0)
  varunits = varunits - 1
  varressqft = varunits * grossUnitSize(0.5)
  vartotsqft = varressqft
 Loop


Select Case flag
  Case 1
    NCTGeneral = varunits
  Case 2
    NCTGeneral = varcomsqft
End Select
End Function
---------------------------------------------------------------------------

'---------------------------------
'Other functions
'---------------------------------

Function grossUnitSize(parkingperunit As Single) As Long
  Const parkingSqft As Integer = 300
  Const circulationPercent As Single = 0.15
  Dim circulationSqft As Integer
  Const baseSize As Integer = 713
    Const usableOpenSpace As Integer = 80
  circulationSqft = baseSize * circulationPercent
```

```
  grossUnitSize = baseSize + parkingperunit * parkingSqft + circulationSqft
+ usableOpenSpace

End Function
-------------------------------------------------------------------------

Function C2_resunits(ByVal inStories As Integer, ByVal inLotArea As Double,
_
ByVal inFAR As Single) As Integer
 'returns residential units for C2 districts. Full FAR is given to
commercial,
 'any remaining square footage given to residential. Residential rear yard
requirement
 'NOT implemented in this function.

 Dim varressqft As Long
 Dim varresunits As Long
 Dim envelope As Long
 Dim varcommsqft As Long

 varcommsqft = inLotArea * inFAR
 envelope = inLotArea * inStories
 varresunits = Int(inLotArea / 800)
 varressqft = varresunits * grossUnitSize(1)

 If ceil(varcommsqft / inLotArea) > inStories Then
  varcommsqft = inLotArea * inStories

 End If
 Do While varcommsqft + varressqft > envelope And varresunits > 0
  varresunits = varresunits - 1
  varressqft = varresunits * grossUnitSize(1)
 Loop

 C2_resunits = varresunits
End Function
-------------------------------------------------------------------------

Function C2_sqft(ByVal inStories As Integer, ByVal inLotArea As Double, _
ByVal inFAR As Single)
 Dim varcommsqft As Double
 varcommsqft = inLotArea * inFAR
 If ceil(varcommsqft / inLotArea) > inStories Then
  varcommsqft = inLotArea * inStories
 End If
 C2_sqft = varcommsqft
End Function
-------------------------------------------------------------------------

Function C3_ressqft(ByVal inStories As Integer, ByVal inLotArea As Double,
_
ByVal inFAR As Single, ByVal inZoning As String)

 Dim xy As New MixedUseCapacity
 C3_ressqft = xy.C3General(inStories, inLotArea, inFAR, inZoning, 1)
End Function
-------------------------------------------------------------------------

Function C3_commsqft(ByVal inStories As Integer, ByVal inLotArea As Double,
_
ByVal inFAR As Single, ByVal inZoning As String)

 Dim xy As New MixedUseCapacity
 C3_commsqft = xy.C3General(inStories, inLotArea, inFAR, inZoning, 2)
End Function
-------------------------------------------------------------------------
```

```
Function DTR_Commsqft(ByVal inStories As Integer, ByVal inLotArea As
Double, ByVal inShare As Double, ByVal rearYard As Single)

 Dim varTowerEnvelope As Long
 varTowerEnvelope = towerEnvelope(inStories, inLotArea, inShare, rearYard)

 DTR_Commsqft = (varTowerEnvelope * (1 - inShare))
End Function
------------------------------------------------------------------------
Function DTR_ressqft(ByVal inStories As Integer, ByVal inLotArea As Double,
ByVal inShare As Double, ByVal rearYard As Single)

 Dim varTowerEnvelope As Long
 varTowerEnvelope = towerEnvelope(inStories, inLotArea, inShare, rearYard)

 DTR_ressqft = (varTowerEnvelope * (inShare))
End Function
------------------------------------------------------------------------

Function towerEnvelope(ByVal inStories As Integer, ByVal inLotArea As
Double, ByVal inShare As Double, ByVal rearYard As Single) As Long

 Dim varLowerTowerFloorplateSqft As Double
 Dim varLowerTowerStories As Byte
 Dim varlowertowersqft As Double

 Dim varTowerstories As Byte
 Dim varTowerEnvelope As Double

 Dim varUpperTowerFloorPlateSqft As Double
 Dim varUpperTowerStories As Double
 Dim varUpperTowerSqft As Double

 Dim varPodiumStories As Byte
 Dim varPodiumSqft As Double

 Dim varTowers As Integer
 Dim varNextTower As Double

 Const areaFactor As Byte = 5

 If inStories <= 12 Then
  varPodiumStories = inStories
  varPodiumSqft = varPodiumStories * inLotArea * (1 - rearYard)
 Else
  If inStories <= 24 Then
   varLowerTowerFloorplateSqft = 7500
   varPodiumStories = 8
   varLowerTowerStories = inStories - varPodiumStories
   varUpperTowerStories = 0

  ElseIf inStories <= 30 Then
   varLowerTowerFloorplateSqft = 8500
   varPodiumStories = 8
   varLowerTowerStories = inStories - varPodiumStories
   varUpperTowerStories = 0

  ElseIf inStories <= 35 Then
   varLowerTowerFloorplateSqft = 9000
   varUpperTowerFloorPlateSqft = varLowerTowerFloorplateSqft - (0.1 *
varLowerTowerFloorplateSqft)
   varPodiumStories = 12
   varTowerstories = inStories - varPodiumStories
   varUpperTowerStories = (1 / 3) * varTowerstories
   varLowerTowerStories = (2 / 3) * varTowerstories

  ElseIf inStories > 35 Then
   varLowerTowerFloorplateSqft = 10000
```

```
   varUpperTowerFloorPlateSqft = varLowerTowerFloorplateSqft - (0.1 *
varLowerTowerFloorplateSqft)
   varPodiumStories = 12
   varTowerstories = inStories - varPodiumStories
   varUpperTowerStories = (1 / 3) * varTowerstories
   varLowerTowerStories = (2 / 3) * varTowerstories
  End If

  varNextTower = (varLowerTowerFloorplateSqft * areaFactor)
  varTowers = Int(inLotArea / varNextTower)
  If varTowers < 1 Then
   varTowers = 1
  End If

  '***podium envelope
  varPodiumSqft = (varPodiumStories * inLotArea) * (1 - rearYard)

  '***lower tower envelope
  Select Case inLotArea
   Case Is >= varLowerTowerFloorplateSqft
    varlowertowersqft = (varLowerTowerStories *
varLowerTowerFloorplateSqft) * varTowers
   Case Else
    varlowertowersqft = (varLowerTowerStories * inLotArea) * varTowers
  End Select

  '***upper tower envelope
  Select Case inLotArea
   Case Is >= varUpperTowerFloorPlateSqft
    varUpperTowerSqft = (varUpperTowerStories *
varUpperTowerFloorPlateSqft) * varTowers
   Case Else
    varUpperTowerSqft = (varUpperTowerStories * inLotArea) * varTowers
  End Select
 End If

 varTowerEnvelope = varPodiumSqft + varlowertowersqft + varUpperTowerSqft
 towerEnvelope = varTowerEnvelope
End Function
-------------------------------------------------------------------------
Function EN_com(ByVal inStories As Integer, ByVal inLotArea As Long)

Dim xyz As New MixedUseCapacity
EN_com = xyz.ENMixed(inStories, inLotArea, 2)
End Function
-------------------------------------------------------------------------


Function EN_res(ByVal inStories As Integer, ByVal inLotArea As Long)
Dim xyq As New MixedUseCapacity
EN_com = xyq.ENMixed(inStories, inLotArea, 1)
End Function
-------------------------------------------------------------------------

Function EN_PDR_com(ByVal inStories As Integer, ByVal inLotArea As Long)
 Dim retail As Long
 Dim office As Long
 Dim resSf As Long
 Dim PDR As Long
 Dim FAR As Single
 Dim totComSf As Long
 '***Returns commercial square footage for eastern neighborhoods PDR
districts.

 If inLotArea < 2500 Then
  Select Case inStories
   Case Is <= 4
    FAR = 3
```

```
    retail = inLotArea * 1
    office = inLotArea * 1
    PDR = FAR * inLotArea - (retail + office)
    totComSf = retail + office + PDR
   Case Is = 5
    FAR = 4
    retail = inLotArea * 1
    office = inLotArea * 1
    PDR = FAR * inLotArea - (retail + office)
    totComSf = retail + office + PDR
   Case Is = 6
    FAR = 5
    retail = inLotArea * 1
    office = inLotArea * 1
    PDR = FAR * inLotArea - (retail + office)
    totComSf = retail + office + PDR
   Case Is = 8
    FAR = 6
    retail = inLotArea * 1
    office = inLotArea * 1
    PDR = FAR * inLotArea - (retail + office)
    totComSf = retail + office + PDR
   Case Is > 8
    FAR = 7.5
    retail = inLotArea * 1
    office = inLotArea * 1
    PDR = FAR * inLotArea - (retail + office)
    totComSf = retail + office + PDR
  End Select

ElseIf inLotArea >= 2500 And inLotArea < 5000 Then
  Select Case inStories
   Case Is <= 4
    FAR = 3
    retail = 2500
    office = inLotArea * 1
    PDR = FAR * inLotArea - (retail + office)
    totComSf = retail + office + PDR
   Case Is = 5
    FAR = 4
    retail = 2500
    office = inLotArea * 1
    PDR = FAR * inLotArea - (retail + office)
    totComSf = retail + office + PDR
   Case Is = 6
    FAR = 5
    retail = 2500
    office = inLotArea * 1
    PDR = FAR * inLotArea - (retail + office)
    totComSf = retail + office + PDR
   Case Is = 8
    FAR = 6
    retail = 2500
    office = inLotArea * 1
    PDR = FAR * inLotArea - (retail + office)
    totComSf = retail + office + PDR
   Case Is > 8
    FAR = 7.5
    retail = 2500
    office = inLotArea * 1
    PDR = FAR * inLotArea - (retail + office)
    totComSf = retail + office + PDR
  End Select

ElseIf inLotArea >= 5000 Then
  Select Case inStories
   Case Is <= 4
    FAR = 3
```

```
    retail = 2500
    office = 5000
    PDR = FAR * inLotArea - (retail + office)
    totComSf = retail + office + PDR
   Case Is = 5
    FAR = 4
    retail = 2500
    office = 5000
    PDR = FAR * inLotArea - (retail + office)
    totComSf = retail + office + PDR
   Case Is = 6
    FAR = 5
    retail = 2500
    office = 5000
    PDR = FAR * inLotArea - (retail + office)
    totComSf = retail + office + PDR
   Case Is = 8
    FAR = 6
    retail = 2500
    office = 5000
    PDR = FAR * inLotArea - (retail + office)
    totComSf = retail + office + PDR
   Case Is > 8
    FAR = 7.5
    retail = 2500
    office = 5000
    PDR = FAR * inLotArea - (retail + office)
    totComSf = retail + office + PDR
  End Select
 End If

 EN_PDR_com = retail + office + PDR
End Function
-------------------------------------------------------------------------

Function SOM_commsqft(ByVal inZoning As String, ByVal inLotArea As Double,
ByVal inStories As Integer, _
ByVal inFAR As Single, ByVal inShare As Single, ByVal rearYard As Single)
As Long
'works on soma districts; uses average unit size rather than units relative
to lot area. Since these districts
 'are very permissive density-wise (1 per 200 sf lot area), using average
size yields an estimate on the conservative side.

Dim xz As New MixedUseCapacity

 SOM_commsqft = xz.SOMGeneral(inZoning, inLotArea, inStories, inFAR,
inShare, rearYard, 2)
End Function
-------------------------------------------------------------------------

Function SOM_ressqft(ByVal inZoning As String, ByVal inLotArea As Double,
ByVal inStories As Integer, _
ByVal inFAR As Single, ByVal inShare As Single, ByVal rearYard As Single)
As Long
 Dim pz As New MixedUseCapacity
 SOM_ressqft = pz.SOMGeneral(inZoning, inLotArea, inStories, inFAR,
inShare, rearYard, 1)
End Function
-------------------------------------------------------------------------

Function Mixed_Comml(inStories As Integer, inLotArea As Double, _
 inresdensity As Integer, inFAR As Single, rearYard As Double)
Dim tempUnits
Dim xx As New MixedUseCapacity

Mixed_Comml = xx.MixedGeneral(inStories, inLotArea, inresdensity, inFAR,
rearYard, 2)
```

```
End Function
---------------------------------------------------------------------------

Function Mixed_Units(inStories As Integer, inLotArea As Double, _
 inresdensity As Integer, inFAR As Single, rearYard As Double)
'***Projects number of units on mixed-zoned lots. Maximizes residential per
density limit, assigns rest to commercial up to FAR.
Dim tempUnits
Dim xx As New MixedUseCapacity
Mixed_Units = xx.MixedGeneral(inStories, inLotArea, inresdensity, inFAR,
rearYard, 1)
End Function
---------------------------------------------------------------------------


Function MUR_DTR_S_Comsqft(ByVal inStories As Integer, ByVal inLotArea As
Double, ByVal inShare As Single, ByVal rearYard As Single) As Long

 Dim varcomsqft As Double
 Dim vartotsqft As Double

 '***companion function to MUR_Ressqft. Com share set in separate lookup
table and passed in.

 vartotsqft = inLotArea * inStories * (1 - rearYard)
 varcomsqft = (vartotsqft * (1 - inShare))
 MUR_DTR_S_Comsqft = varcomsqft

End Function
---------------------------------------------------------------------------

Function MUR_DTR_S_Ressqft(ByVal inStories As Integer, ByVal inLotArea As
Double, ByVal inShare As Single, ByVal rearYard As Single) As Long

 Dim varressqft As Double
 Dim vartotsqft As Double

 '***companion function to MUR_comsqft. Com share set in separate lookup
table and passed in.
 vartotsqft = inLotArea * inStories * (1 - rearYard)

 varressqft = (vartotsqft * inShare)
 MUR_DTR_S_Ressqft = varressqft

End Function
---------------------------------------------------------------------------

Function NCT_ComSqft(ByVal inStories As Integer, _
ByVal inLotArea As Double, ByVal rearYard As Single, ByVal comShare As
Single) As Long
 '***Projects number of units on NC lots without density control.
Dim klm As New MixedUseCapacity
NCT_ComSqft = klm.NCTGeneral(inStories, inLotArea, rearYard, comShare, 2)

End Function
---------------------------------------------------------------------------

Function NCT_Units(ByVal inStories As Integer, _
ByVal inLotArea As Double, ByVal rearYard As Single, ByVal comShare As
Single) As Integer
 '***Projects commercial use based on set share
Dim kl As New MixedUseCapacity
NCT_Units = kl.NCTGeneral(inStories, inLotArea, rearYard, comShare, 1)

End Function
---------------------------------------------------------------------------

Function RH_units(ByVal inZoning As String, ByVal inStories As Integer, _
```

```
ByVal inLotArea As Double, ByVal rearYard As Single)
 '***Projects number of units on RH-zoned lots
 Dim varunits As Single
 Dim varressqft As Double
 Dim vartotsqft As Double
 Const rh1nxt As Integer = 3000
 Const rh2nxt As Integer = 1500
 Const rh3nxt As Integer = 1000
 Dim rhzoning As Integer
 Dim rhnumber As Integer

 rhzoning = InStr(1, inZoning, "RH-")

 If rhzoning = 1 Then
  rhnumber = (CInt(Mid(Nz(inZoning, 0), 4, 1)))
 End If
 'first of three blocks testing whether lot is large enough for CU units

 Select Case inLotArea
  Case Is >= 1500
 If rhnumber = 1 Then
  If inLotArea >= 1 * rh1nxt And InStr(1, inZoning, "RH-1(D)") = 0 Then
   varunits = Int(inLotArea / (rh1nxt))
   varressqft = varunits * grossUnitSize(1)
   vartotsqft = varressqft
   Do While ceil(vartotsqft / (inLotArea * (1 - rearYard))) > inStories
    varunits = varunits - 1
    varressqft = varunits * grossUnitSize(1)
    vartotsqft = varressqft
   Loop
   RH_units = varunits
  Else
   varunits = rhnumber
   varressqft = varunits * grossUnitSize(1)
   vartotsqft = varressqft
   Do While ceil(vartotsqft / (inLotArea * (1 - rearYard))) > inStories
    varunits = varunits - 1
    varressqft = varunits * grossUnitSize(1)
    vartotsqft = varressqft
   Loop
   RH_units = varunits
  End If
  'second of three blocks testing whether lot is large enough for CU units
 ElseIf rhnumber = 2 Then
  If inLotArea >= 2 * rh2nxt Then
   varunits = Int(inLotArea / rh2nxt)
   varressqft = varunits * grossUnitSize(1)
   vartotsqft = varressqft
   Do While ceil(vartotsqft / (inLotArea * (1 - rearYard))) > inStories
    varunits = varunits - 1
    varressqft = varunits * grossUnitSize(1)
    vartotsqft = varressqft
   Loop
   RH_units = varunits
  Else
   varunits = rhnumber
   varressqft = varunits * grossUnitSize(1)
   vartotsqft = varressqft
   Do While ceil(vartotsqft / (inLotArea * (1 - rearYard))) > inStories
    varunits = varunits - 1
    varressqft = varunits * grossUnitSize(1)
    vartotsqft = varressqft
   Loop
   RH_units = varunits
  End If
  'third of three blocks testing whether lot is large enough for CU units
 ElseIf rhnumber = 3 Then
  If inLotArea >= 3 * rh3nxt Then
```

```
   varunits = Int(inLotArea / (rh3nxt))
   varressqft = varunits * grossUnitSize(1)
   vartotsqft = varressqft
   Do While ceil(vartotsqft / (inLotArea * (1 - rearYard))) > inStories
    varunits = varunits - 1
    varressqft = varunits * grossUnitSize(1)
    vartotsqft = varressqft
   Loop
   RH_units = varunits
  Else
   varunits = rhnumber
   varressqft = varunits * grossUnitSize(1)
   vartotsqft = varressqft
   Do While ceil(vartotsqft / (inLotArea * (1 - rearYard))) > inStories
    varunits = varunits - 1
    varressqft = varunits * grossUnitSize(1)
    vartotsqft = varressqft
   Loop
   RH_units = varunits
  End If
 Else
  RH_units = 0
 End If
Case Else
 RH_units = 0

End Select
End Function
---------------------------------------------------------------------------

Function RM_Units(ByVal inStories As Integer, _
ByVal inLotArea As Double, ByVal inresdensity As Double, ByVal rearYard As
Single) As Long
 '***Projects number of units on RM-zoned lots
 Dim varunits As Integer
 Dim vardensity As Double
 Dim varressqft As Double
 Dim vartotsqft As Double

 vardensity = inLotArea / inresdensity
 varunits = Int(vardensity)
 varressqft = varunits * grossUnitSize(1)
 vartotsqft = varressqft
 Do While (vartotsqft / (inLotArea * (1 - rearYard))) > inStories
  varunits = varunits - 1
  varressqft = varunits * grossUnitSize(1)
  vartotsqft = varressqft
 Loop

 RM_Units = varunits

End Function
---------------------------------------------------------------------------

Function RTO_Units(ByVal inZoning As String, ByVal inStories As Integer, _
ByVal inLotArea As Double, ByVal rearYard As Single)
 '***Projects number of units on R-zoned lots
 Dim envelope As Double
 Dim varunits As Integer
 Dim varressqft As Double
 Dim vartotsqft As Double

 If InStr(1, inZoning, "RTO") Then
  envelope = inLotArea * 0.55 * inStories
  varunits = envelope / grossUnitSize(0.75)
  vartotsqft = varressqft

  Do While ceil(vartotsqft / (inLotArea * (1 - rearYard))) > Nz(inStories,
```

```
0)
   varunits = varunits - 1
   varressqft = varunits * grossUnitSize(1)
   vartotsqft = varressqft
  Loop
  RTO_Units = varunits
 Else
  RTO_Units = Null
 End If

End Function
-------------------------------------------------------------------------
Function RTO_MixUnits(ByVal inStories As Integer, _
ByVal inLotArea As Double, ByVal rearYard As Single)
 '***Projects number of units on RED-Mixed-zoned lots in West Soma
 Dim resenvelope As Double
 Dim varunits As Long
 Dim varressqft As Double
 Dim varcomsqft As Double
 Dim vartotsqft As Double

 If Lotarea >= 1200 Then
  varcomsqft = 1200
 Else
  varcomsqft = inLotArea
 End If

 resenvelope = inLotArea * (1 - rearYard) * inStories - varcomsqft
 varunits = resenvelope / grossUnitSize(1)
 vartotsqft = varressqft

 Do While ceil(vartotsqft / (inLotArea * (1 - rearYard))) > Nz(inStories,
0)
  varunits = varunits - 1
  varressqft = varunits * grossUnitSize(1)
  vartotsqft = varressqft
 Loop
 RTO_MixUnits = varunits

End Function
-------------------------------------------------------------------------

Function height_stories(ByVal in_limit As String)
 '***Returns number of stories allowed given the height limit
 Dim varstring As String
 Dim varheight As Integer

 If (InStr(1, in_limit, "OS/") = 1) _
  And (InStr(1, in_limit, "-") > 0) Then
  varstring = Mid(in_limit, 4, InStr(1, in_limit, "-") - 4)
  varheight = CInt(varstring)
 ElseIf InStr(1, in_limit, "-") > 0 Then
  varstring = Left(in_limit, InStr(1, in_limit, "-") - 1)
  varheight = CInt(varstring)
 ElseIf InStr(1, in_limit, "X") > 0 Then
  varstring = Left(in_limit, InStr(1, in_limit, "X") - 1)
  varheight = CInt(varstring)
 Else
  varheight = 0
 End If

 height_stories = Int(varheight / 10)
End Function
-------------------------------------------------------------------------

Function ceil(ByVal innumber As Double)
 '***Returns the next integer up; used for calculating number of stories
 '***given the lot area and building square footage
```

```
 If Int(innumber) > innumber Then
  ceil = Int(innumber) + 1
 Else
  ceil = Int(innumber)
 End If
End Function
---------------------------------------------------------------------------

Function old_unit_size()
 '***Used for assumptions about square footage of existing units
 old_unit_size = 765 * 1.2
End Function
---------------------------------------------------------------------------

Function new_unit_size(ByVal in_option As Boolean)
 '***Use for calculating square footage of new residential units.
 '***Case true for live-work, case false for everything else.
 If in_option Then
  new_unit_size = 1000
 Else
  new_unit_size = 1000 * 1.2
 End If
End Function
---------------------------------------------------------------------------

Function calc_softness(ByVal intotsqft As Double, ByVal insqft As Double)
 Select Case Nz(insqft, 0)
  Case 0 To (intotsqft * 0.05)
   calc_softness = 5
  Case (intotsqft * 0.05) To (intotsqft * 0.3)
   calc_softness = 30
  Case (intotsqft * 0.3) To (intotsqft * 0.4)
   calc_softness = 40
  Case (intotsqft * 0.4) To (intotsqft * 0.5)
   calc_softness = 50
  Case Else
   calc_softness = Null
 End Select
End Function
---------------------------------------------------------------------------
```

Attachment D-2

Summary of Residential Development Standards by Zoning District

Zoning District	Maximum Dwelling Unit Density	Other Residential Uses (Permitted as of Right)	Residential Conditional Uses (Subject to Commission Approval)	Usable Open Space Requirements for Dwelling Units
RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS				
RH-1(D) House, One-Family (Detached Dwellings)	One dwelling unit per lot. (11 du/acre)	Residential care facility for 6 or fewer.	Residential care facility for 7 or more.	300 sq.ft. per unit if private; 400 sq.ft. per unit if common.
RH-1 House, One-Family	One dwelling unit per lot; up to one unit per 3000 sq.ft. of lot area (maximum of 3 units) with conditional use approval. (17 du/acre)	Residential care facility for 6 or fewer.	Residential care facility for 7 or more.	300 sq.ft. per unit if private; 400 sq.ft. per unit if common.
RH-1(S) House, One-Family with Minor Second Unit	Same as RH-1; or 2 dwelling units per lot with second unit limited to 600 sq.ft. of net floor area. (35 du/acre)	Residential care facility for 6 or fewer.	Residential care facility for 7 or more.	300 sq.ft. per unit if private; 400 sq.ft. per unit if common.
RH-2 House, Two-Family	Two dwelling units per lot; up to one unit per 1500 sq.ft. of lot area with conditional use approval. (35 du/acre)	Residential care facility for 6 or fewer.	Residential care facility for 7 or more; group housing, boarding; group housing, religious orders; group housing, medical and educational institutions.	125 sq.ft. per unit if private; 166 sq.ft. per unit if common.
RH-3 House, Three-Family	Three dwelling units per lot; up to one unit per 1000 sq.ft. of lot area with conditional use approval. (52 du/acre)	Residential care facility for 6 or fewer.	Residential care facility for 7 or more; group housing, boarding; group housing, religious orders; group housing, medical and educational institutions.	100 sq.ft. per unit if private; 133 sq.ft. per unit if common.
RM-1 Mixed (Apartments and Houses), Low Density	Three dwelling units per lot or one dwelling unit per 800 sq.ft. of lot area. (54 du/acre)	Residential care facility for 6 or fewer; group housing, boarding; group housing, religious orders.	Residential care facility for 7 or more; group housing, medical and educational institutions.	100 sq.ft. per unit if private; 133 sq.ft. per unit if common.

Zoning District	Maximum Dwelling Unit Density	Other Residential Uses (Permitted as of Right)	Residential Conditional Uses (Subject to Commission Approval)	Usable Open Space Requirements for Dwelling Units
RM-2 Mixed (Apartments and Houses), Moderate Density	Three dwelling units per lot or one dwelling unit per 600 sq.ft. of lot area. (77 du/acre)	Residential care facility for 6 or fewer; group housing, boarding; group housing, religious orders.	Residential care facility for 7 or more; group housing, medical and educational institutions.	80 sq.ft. per unit if private; 106 sq.ft. per unit if common.
RM-3 Mixed (Apartments and Houses), Medium Density	Three dwelling units per lot or one dwelling unit per 400 sq.ft. of lot area. (109 du/acre)	Residential care facility for 6 or fewer; group housing, boarding; group housing, religious orders.	Residential care facility for 7 or more; group housing, medical and educational institutions.	60 sq.ft. per unit if private; 80 sq.ft. per unit if common.
RM-4 Mixed (Apartments and Houses), High Density	Three dwelling units per lot or one dwelling unit per 200 sq.ft. of lot area. (218 du/acre)	Residential care facility for 6 or fewer; group housing, boarding; group housing, religious orders.	Residential care facility for 7 or more; group housing, medical and educational institutions.	36 sq.ft. per unit if private; 48 sq.ft. per unit if common.
RC-3 Residential-Commercial Combined, Medium Density	Three dwelling units per lot or one dwelling unit per 400 sq.ft. of lot area. (109 du/acre)	Residential care facility for 6 or fewer; group housing, boarding; group housing, religious orders.	Residential care facility for 7 or more; group housing, medical and educational institutions.	60 sq.ft. per unit if private; 80 sq.ft. per unit if common.
RC-4 Residential-Commercial Combined, High Density	Three dwelling units per lot or one dwelling unit per 200 sq.ft. of lot area. (218 du/acre)	Residential care facility for 6 or fewer; group housing, boarding; group housing, religious orders.	Residential care facility for 7 or more; group housing, medical and educational institutions.	36 sq.ft. per unit if private; 48 sq.ft. per unit if common.
RTO Residential Transit Oriented Development	Permitted 1 dwelling unit per 600 square feet of lot area; may exceed this limit for BMR units, affordable housing, or other special uses. With a conditional use permit density may exceed 1 unit per 600 and is then limited by height, bulk and unit mix requirements. (77 du/acre)	Residential care facility for 6 or fewer; group housing, boarding; group housing, religious orders.	Residential care facility for 7 or more; group housing, medical and educational institutions.	100 sq.ft. per unit if private; 133 sq.ft. per unit if common.

Zoning District	Maximum Dwelling Unit Density	Other Residential Uses (Permitted as of Right)	Residential Conditional Uses (Subject to Commission Approval)	Usable Open Space Requirements for Dwelling Units
RTO-M Residential Transit Oriented Development, Mission	Permitted 1 dwelling unit per 400 square feet of lot area; may exceed this limit for BMR units, affordable housing, or other special uses; Density may exceed 1 unit per 400 and is then limited by height, bulk and unit mix requirements. 40% required to contain at least 2 bedrooms or 30% required to contain at least 3 bedrooms. (109 du/acre)	Residential care facility for 6 or fewer; group housing, boarding; group housing, religious orders.	Residential care facility for 7 or more; group housing, medical and educational institutions.	100 sq.ft. per unit if private; 133 sq.ft. per unit if common.
NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS (NCD)				
Pacific NCD	One dwelling unit per 1,000 sq.ft. of lot area. (44 du/acre)	Group housing	Residential care facility for 6 or fewer.	100 sq.ft. per unit if private; 133 sq.ft. per unit if common.
NC-1 NC Cluster District, **NC-2** Small-Scale NCD, **NC-S** NC Shopping Center, **Inner Sunset NCD, Sacramento NCD, West Portal NCD**	One dwelling unit per 800 sq.ft. of lot area. (54 du/acre)	Group housing; residential care facility for 6 or fewer.	Residential care facility for 7 or more.	100 sq.ft. per unit if private; 133 sq.ft. per unit if common.
NC-3 Moderate-Scale NCD, **Castro NCD, Inner Clement NCD, Outer Clement NCD, Upper Fillmore NCD, Haight NCD, Union NCD, 24th-Noe Valley NCD**	One dwelling unit per 600 sq.ft. of lot area. (77 du/acre)	Group housing; residential care facility for 6 or fewer.	Residential care facility for 7 or more.	80 sq.ft. per unit if private; 100 sq.ft. per unit if common.

Zoning District	Maximum Dwelling Unit Density	Other Residential Uses (Permitted as of Right)	Residential Conditional Uses (Subject to Commission Approval)	Usable Open Space Requirements for Dwelling Units
Broadway NCD, Upper Market NCD, North Beach NCD, Polk NCD	One dwelling unit per 400 sq.ft. of lot area. (109 du/acre)	Group housing; residential care facility for 6 or fewer.	Residential care facility for 7 or more.	60 sq.ft. per unit if private; 80 sq.ft. per unit if common.
NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT DISTRICTS (NCTD)				
Hayes-Gough NCTD, Upper Market NCTD	No density limit; density controlled by physical envelope controls of height, setbacks, open space, and exposure. (N/A)	Group housing; residential care facility for 6 or fewer.	Residential care facility for 7 or more.	60 sq.ft. per unit if private; 80 sq.ft. per unit if common.
NCT-2 Small-Scale NCTD	No density limit; density controlled by physical envelope controls of height, setbacks, open space, and exposure. 40% required to contain at least 2 bedrooms or 30% required to contain at least 3 bedrooms. (N/A)	Group housing; residential care facility for 6 or fewer.	Residential care facility for 7 or more.	100 sq.ft. per unit if private; 133 sq.ft. per unit if common.
NCT-3 Moderate-Scale NCTD, **Mission NCTD**	No density limit; density controlled by physical envelope controls of height, setbacks, open space, and exposure. 40% required to contain at least 2 bedrooms or 30% required to contain at least 3 bedrooms. (N/A)	Group housing, residential care facility.	Not applicable.	80 sq.ft. per unit if private; 100 sq.ft. per unit if common.
Valencia NCTD, 24th-Mission NCTD, SOMA NCTD	No density limit. 40% required to contain at least 2 bedrooms or 30% required to contain at least 3 bedrooms. (N/A)	Group housing; residential care facility for 6 or fewer.	Residential care facility for 7 or more.	80 sq.ft. per unit if private; 100 sq.ft. per unit if common.

Zoning District	Maximum Dwelling Unit Density	Other Residential Uses (Permitted as of Right)	Residential Conditional Uses (Subject to Commission Approval)	Usable Open Space Requirements for Dwelling Units
MIXED USE DISTRICTS				
CCB Chinatown Community Business, **CVR** Chinatown Visitor Retail, **CRNC** Chinatown Residential Neighborhood Commercial,	One dwelling unit per 200 sq.ft. of lot area. (218 du/acre)	Group housing, residential care facility.	Not applicable.	48 sq.ft.
RED Residential Enclave	One dwelling unit per 400 sq.ft. of lot area. (109 du/acre)	SRO units.	Residential care facility.	60 sq.ft. per unit if all private; 80 sq.ft. if common space. 36 sq.ft. per unit for live/work units.
SPD South Park	No density limit. 40% required to contain at least 2 bedrooms or 30% required to contain at least 3 bedrooms. (N/A)	SRO units.	Group housing; residential care facility.	80 sq.ft. per unit; 54 sq.ft. if publicly accessible.
RSD Residential/ Service	One dwelling unit per 200 sq.ft. of lot area for projects below 40 ft; above 40 ft., density determined by conditional use process. (218 du/acre)	SRO units.	Group housing; residential care facility.	36 sq.ft. per unit if private; 48 sq.ft. per unit if common.
SLR Service/ Light Industrial/ Residential	One dwelling unit per 200 sq.ft. of lot area. (218 du/acre)	SRO units.	Group housing; residential care facility.	60 sq.ft. per unit if private; 80 sq.ft. per unit if common.
SLI Service/ Light Industrial	By conditional use only if low income; otherwise, not permitted; one dwelling unit per 200 sq.ft. of lot area. (218 du/acre)	Not applicable.	SRO units, if low income; group housing; residential care facility.	36 sq.ft.
SSO Service/ Secondary Office	By conditional use only; one dwelling unit per 200 sq.ft. of lot area. (218 du/acre)	SRO units.	Group housing; residential care facility.	36 sq.ft.

Zoning District	Maximum Dwelling Unit Density	Other Residential Uses (Permitted as of Right)	Residential Conditional Uses (Subject to Commission Approval)	Usable Open Space Requirements for Dwelling Units
RH-DTR Rincon Hill Downtown Residential, **SB DTR** South Beach Downtown Residential	No density limit. 40% required to contain at least 2 bedrooms or 30% required to contain at least 3 bedrooms. (N/A)	Not applicable.	Residential care facility.	75 sq.ft. per unit; up to 50% may be provided off-site if publicly accessible.
MUG Mixed Use - General, **MUR** Mixed Use - Residential, **MUO** Mixed Use – Office	No density limit. 40% required to contain at least 2 bedrooms or 30% required to contain at least 3 bedrooms. (N/A)	SRO units.	Student housing; residential care facility.	80 sq.ft. per unit; 54 sq.ft. if publicly accessible.
UMU Urban Mixed Use	No density limit. 40% required to contain at least 2 bedrooms or 30% required to contain at least 3 bedrooms. (N/A)	Not applicable.	Student housing; residential care facility.	80 sq.ft. per unit; 54 sq.ft. if publicly accessible.
TB DTR Transbay Downtown Residential (Redevelopment Project Area)	No density limit. (N/A)	Group housing, residential care facility.	Not applicable.	16 sq.ft. per unit plus common space located in the center of each block
COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS				
C-2 Community Business	Dwelling at a density of the closest R district, but in no case less be less than one dwelling unit per 800 sq.ft. of lot area. (54 du/acre)	Group housing; residential care facility.	Not applicable.	Same as the requirement for the nearest R district.
C-M Heavy Commercial	By conditional use only; dwelling at a density of the closest R district, but in no case less be less than one dwelling unit per 125 sq.ft. of lot area. (348 du/acre)	Group housing; residential care facility.	Not applicable.	36 sq.ft. per unit if private; 48 sq.ft. per unit if common.

Zoning District	Maximum Dwelling Unit Density	Other Residential Uses (Permitted as of Right)	Residential Conditional Uses (Subject to Commission Approval)	Usable Open Space Requirements for Dwelling Units
DOWNTOWN COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS				
C-3-O Downtown - Office, **C-3-R** Downtown - Retail, **C-3-G** Downtown - General	Dwelling at a density of the closest R district, but in no case less be less than one dwelling unit per 125 sq.ft. of lot area. Higher density permitted with conditional use. (348 du/acre)	Group housing; residential care facility.	Not applicable.	36 sq.ft. per unit if private; 48 sq.ft. per unit if common.
C-3-S Downtown Support	Dwelling at a density of the closest R district, but in no case less be less than one dwelling unit per 125 sq.ft. of lot area. Higher density permitted with conditional use. (348 du/acre)	Group housing.	Residential care facility.	36 sq.ft. per unit if private; 48 sq.ft. per unit if common.
INDUSTRIAL AND PDR (PRODUCTION, DISTRIBUTION, AND REPAIR) DISTRICTS				
M-1 Light Industrial	Dwelling at a density of the closest R district, but in no case less be less than one dwelling unit per 800 sq.ft. of lot area. (54 du/acre)	Residential care facility.	Group housing;	36 sq.ft. per unit if private; 48 sq.ft. per unit if common.
M-2 Heavy Industrial	Dwelling at a density of the closest R district, but in no case less be less than one dwelling unit per 800 sq.ft. of lot area. (54 du/acre)	Not applicable.	Group housing;	36 sq.ft. per unit if private; 48 sq.ft. per unit if common.
PDR-1-B PDR - Light Industrial Buffer, **PDR-1-D** PDR - Design, **PDR-1-G** PDR - General, **PDR-2** Core PDR – Bayview	Dwelling units or group housing not permitted. (N/A)	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.

Zoning District	Maximum Dwelling Unit Density	Other Residential Uses (Permitted as of Right)	Residential Conditional Uses (Subject to Commission Approval)	Usable Open Space Requirements for Dwelling Units
PUBLIC USE DISTRICT				
P Public	Dwelling units or group housing not permitted. (N/A)	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
SPECIAL USE DISTRICTS (SUD)				
Van Ness SUD	No density limit; density controlled by physical envelope controls of height, setbacks, open space, and exposure. (N/A)	Residential care facility for 6 or fewer; group housing, boarding; group housing, religious orders.	Residential care facility for 7 or more; group housing, medical and educational institutions.	36 sq.ft. per unit if private; 48 sq.ft. per unit if common.
Folsom and Main Residential/ Commercial SUD	No density limit; density controlled by physical envelope controls of height, setbacks, open space, and exposure. (N/A)	Group housing; residential care facility.	Not applicable.	36 sq.ft. per unit if private; 48 sq.ft. per unit if common.
North of Market Residential SUD Subarea No. 1	One dwelling unit per 125 sq.ft. of lot area; double density provisions do not apply. (348 du/acre)	Residential care facility for 6 or fewer; group housing, boarding; group housing, religious orders.	Residential care facility for 7 or more; group housing, medical and educational institutions.	36 sq.ft. per unit if private; 48 sq.ft. per unit if common.
North of Market Residential SUD Subarea No. 2	One dwelling unit per 200 sq.ft. of lot area; double density provisions do not apply. (218 du/acre)	Residential care facility for 6 or fewer; group housing, boarding; group housing, religious orders.	Residential care facility for 7 or more; group housing, medical and educational institutions.	36 sq.ft. per unit if private; 48 sq.ft. per unit if common.
Van Ness and Market Downtown Residential SUD	No density limit; density controlled by physical envelope controls of height, setbacks, open space, and exposure. (N/A)	Group housing; residential care facility.	Not applicable.	36 sq.ft. per unit if private; 48 sq.ft. per unit if common; up to 40% may be provided off-site if within the SUD or within 900 feet of the project site.

Zoning District	Maximum Dwelling Unit Density	Other Residential Uses (Permitted as of Right)	Residential Conditional Uses (Subject to Commission Approval)	Usable Open Space Requirements for Dwelling Units
Lakeshore Plaza SUD	By conditional use only; one dwelling unit per 3,000 sq.ft. of lot area on first and second stories only; group housing is not permitted. (15 du/acre)	Not applicable.	Residential care facility.	300 sq.ft. per unit if private; 400 sq.ft. per unit if common.