HOUSING FOR FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN
SAN FRANCISCO
TODAY’S PRESENTATION

• 5-Year Planning Priorities
• Why it is important to retain families
• Data and information on San Francisco’s families
• Potential solutions for family housing
PLANNING PRIORITIES

Through this 5-Year Work Program, the Citywide Planning Division works toward the following planning priorities, working closely with City and community partners:

An equitable, affordable, and diverse city

A resilient and environmentally sustainable city

A connected, equitable, and affordable transportation system

An appealing and engaging urban environment

A democratic, connected, and inclusive city
All our Planning Priorities serve families, but families with children also have specific needs.

Affordable family friendly housing

Quality childcare, schools, and afterschool programs

Access to parks, recreation, and open space

Transportation options

Safe and clean neighborhoods
WHO IS ADDRESSED IN THIS REPORT?
Households with children under 18

WHY RETAIN FAMILIES?

• Foster sustainable communities and produce public health benefits
• Create a City for all
• Benefits for cultural diversity and contribution to cultural diversity
## SHARE OF HOUSEHOLDS THAT ARE FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN <18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Population Density per Square Mile</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Households that are Families with Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>8,092</td>
<td>1,318,168</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee, WI</td>
<td>6,190</td>
<td>230,221</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>27,016</td>
<td>3,109,784</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>11,844</td>
<td>1,045,560</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
<td>7,676</td>
<td>249,903</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>3,915</td>
<td>263,107</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td>4,347</td>
<td>248,546</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis, MN</td>
<td>7,085</td>
<td>163,540</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>12,787</td>
<td>252,699</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>9,864</td>
<td>266,707</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>7,255</td>
<td>283,510</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>17,169</td>
<td>345,811</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE Changing COMPOSITION of FAMILIES: INCOME

US Census Bureau
THE CHANGING COMPOSITION OF FAMILIES: RACE & ETHNICITY

CHILDREN < 18

TOTAL POPULATION

U.S. Census Bureau 2010
PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN BY NEIGHBORHOOD

Total number of children by neighborhood

American Community Survey, US Census Bureau 2014
can you get rid of 2010 data here?
GROWTH IN SFUSD STUDENTS IN EXISTING AND NEW HOUSING STOCK

SFUSD Data, 2014
WHAT ARE THE HOUSING STOCK ISSUES?

- Affordability
- Unit size
AFFORDABILITY: CAN FAMILIES FIND HOUSING?

2015 Market snapshot of available for-sale housing

9% affordable and family-friendly

91% of housing not affordable or not adequate 2 bdrms

based on the median family income
max. home value: $452,762

Governing and Axiometrics Data
UNIT SIZE: EXISTING & NEW HOUSING STOCK BY UNIT SIZE

- Built Before 2005
- Built Since 2005

Data Analysis from American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample maintained by IPUMS USA and the American Community Survey pretabulated data from American Factfinder
WHAT CAN WE DO?

1. Simplify Minor Expansions
2. Provide Options for Downsizing
3. More Homes Within Existing Housing Stock
4. Build new for families
SIMPLIFY MINOR EXPANSIONS

Removing neighborhood notification for minor expansions
HOUSEHOLD TYPES BY BEDROOM, 2013

Data Analysis from American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample maintained by IPUMS USA and the American Community Survey pretabulated data from American Factfinder
MORE HOMES WITHIN EXISTING HOUSING STOCK

- Accessory Dwelling Units
- Junior Accessory Dwelling Units

Flexible-use suite with independent access in single-family home.
## BUILD NEW FOR FAMILIES

### PRECEDENT STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City, Country</th>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver, CA</td>
<td>High-Density Housing for Families with Children Guidelines, 1992</td>
<td>Guest suites, indoor and outdoor open space; 25% family-units; considering increase to 35% with 10% of units 3+ bdrms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td>Courtyard Housing Competition, 2007</td>
<td>Block-level interior courtyards and open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeryville, CA</td>
<td>Family Friendly section in Residential Design Guidelines, 2012</td>
<td>Attract families into larger units instead of unrelated adults; 15% 3 bdrms, 35% 2 bdrms, maximum 10% studios in all 10+ unit developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne, AUS</td>
<td>Better Apartments, 2015</td>
<td>Improving apartment living by focusing on internal amenities and policy objectives to accompany Higher Density Housing Guidelines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FAMILY-FRIENDLY CHARACTERISTICS

Site-Level
- GETTING AROUND: TRANSIT, CARSHARING, PARKING AND BICYCLE STORAGE
- CHILDCARE
- ACCESS TO SCHOOLS

Building- and Lot-Scale
- OUTDOOR & PLAY SPACE
- SUPERVISION
- ACCESS TO LIGHT AND NATURE
- NOISE
- FLEXIBLE COMMUNITY SPACE
- STORAGE SPACE
- CONCENTRATION OF FAMILY UNITS
- ON-SITE LAUNDRY
- GUEST SUITE

Unit-Level
- DAYLIGHT AND VENTILATION
- STORAGE SPACE
- TWO AND THREE BEDROOM UNITS
- FLEXIBILITY
FAMILY-FRIENDLY CHARACTERISTICS

SITE LEVEL CONSIDERATIONS

- Could the City set aside more spaces for car sharing service on on-street locations?
- Could on-street carsharing spaces be provided adjacent to projects that reduce or eliminate parking in their projects?
- Should bicycle parking requirements include accommodation for more bikes and for larger cargo bikes?
- How can transit better serve families?
- How can the City better coordinate with the school district and neighborhood schools to accommodate trips?
FAMILY-FRIENDLY CHARACTERISTICS

BUILDING- AND LOT-SCALE CONSIDERATIONS

OUTDOOR & PLAY SPACE
- Could the existing open space requirements be more specific in requiring a certain percentage of vegetation or green space?
- Should open space be more/less programmed?
- Can roofs be designed for safe open space for all ages?
- Are there qualitative characteristics that give preference for a shared courtyard or rear yard versus private street-facing balconies?
- Given the encouragement and opportunity to design rooftops and other podium spaces as livable ecosystems with usable open space, should the Planning Code be amended to require a certain percentage of vegetated area on usable roof decks?

SUPERVISION

ACCESS TO LIGHT AND NATURE

NOISE

FLEXIBLE COMMUNITY

STORAGE SPACE

CONCENTRATION OF FAMILY UNITS

ON-SITE LAUNDRY

GUEST SUITE
FAMILY-FRIENDLY CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT-LEVEL CONSIDERATIONS

**DAILY AND VENTILATION**
- Are certain spaces in units more important in terms of access to daylight?
- Should second/third bedrooms be allowed to use borrowed light to incentivize them, but not for the first bedroom?
- Should outdoor ventilation be required for new units and retrofitted for old?
- Should access to fresh air in a unit be improved?
- Should operable windows with child safety locks be required?
- Should incentives be given for family-friendly housing in areas that do not have high levels of airborne environmental pollution?

**STORAGE SPACE**

**TWO AND THREE BEDROOM UNITS**

**FLEXIBILITY**
MODEL FOR A NEW, OLD HOUSING TYPE, THE "MISSING MIDDLE"
SUCCESSFUL S.F. HOUSING TYPES

Irving & 39th (RH-2)

Bay & Leavenworth (RH-3)

Funston & Anza (RH-2)

Irving & 2nd (RH-2)
EXISTING BARRIERS TO CREATING MORE OF THE “MISSING MIDDLE”

Parcels above existing density limits per zoning

75% of our land is restricted to RH-1 and RH-2
CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS

1. Explore additional tools to make existing housing more family-friendly
2. Consider adopting a definition of family-friendly building and family-friendly unit into the General Plan
3. Look for solutions to overcrowded living conditions
4. Learn more about residents in existing larger units
5. Talk with stakeholders about design questions.
6. Further develop the Missing Middle, a mid-scale family-oriented building typology