



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Executive Summary Conditional Use

HEARING DATE: JANUARY 25, 2018

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Date: January 18, 2018
Case No.: **2017-013406CUA**
Project Address: **1177 California Street, Units 1014 & 1015**
Zoning: RM-4 (Residential, Mixed, High Density)
65-A Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 0253A/096 + 097
Project Sponsor: Dera-Jill Pozner, Pozner Architecture and Design
1634 Hayes Street
San Francisco, CA 94117
Staff Contact: Seema Adina – (415) 575-8722
seema.adina@sfgov.org
Recommendation: **Disapproval**

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project sponsor seeks a Conditional Use Authorization, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 317 to merge two dwelling units within a 248 residential and 6 commercial-unit condominium building. The project would merge a 1,399 square foot, two-bedroom, two and a half-bath dwelling unit (#1014) with a 795 square foot, one-bedroom, one-bath dwelling unit (#1015). The Project would remove a wall between the units to create one three-bedroom, three and a half-bathroom unit on the tenth floor of the subject property.

SITE DESCRIPTION AND PRESENT USE

The project is located on the southeastern side of California Street, at the intersection of Jones and California Streets, Block 0253A, Lots 096 and 097. The condominium building's entire parcel measures approximately 15,000 square feet, with the lots under consideration measuring 1,399 and 795 square feet respectively. The Project Site is occupied by an 18-story residential building containing 254 condominiums units, 248 of which are residential.

SURROUNDING PROPERTIES AND NEIGHBORHOOD

The property is located in the Nob Hill neighborhood, within the High Density Mixed Residential (RM-4), and a 65-A Height and Bulk District. Uses in the immediate vicinity are primarily residential with structures that range from as little as two stories to multi-story residential towers. Adjacent to the subject property is a concert venue, The Masonic, and immediately across California Street is the Grace Cathedral.

PUBLIC COMMENT

To date, the Department has not received any correspondence related to the project.

HEARING NOTIFICATION

TYPE	REQUIRED PERIOD	REQUIRED NOTICE DATE	ACTUAL NOTICE DATE	ACTUAL PERIOD
Classified News Ad	20 days	January 5, 2018	January 3, 2018	22 days
Posted Notice	20 days	January 5, 2018	January 5, 2018	20 days
Mailed Notice	20 days	January 5, 2018	January 5, 2018	20 days

ISSUES AND OTHER CONSIDERATION

- Conditional Use Authorization: The project requires a Conditional Use Authorization to merge two dwelling units. In addition to Conditional Use Authorization findings, the Commission must consider separate criteria outlined in Section 317(g)(2).

The Project would potentially eliminate a housing unit that is considered more affordable, by eliminating the 795 square foot one-bedroom, one-bathroom unit. The Project would merge a two-bedroom, two and a half-bath unit with a one-bedroom, one bath unit to create one three-bedroom three and a half-bath unit. As per Mayor Lee's December 18, 2013 Executive Directive, all housing should be preserved when possible.

The merging of two units below the City's Periodic Adjustment to Numerical Criteria into one unit that would be unaffordable to a larger percentage of the population than the two individual units considered separately would not be in the best interest of the community. For these reasons **the Department recommends denial of the Conditional Use Authorization.**

REQUIRED COMMISSION ACTION

In order for the Project to proceed, the Commission must grant Conditional Use Authorization to allow the merging of units pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 317.

BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- The Project will result in a net loss of housing stock.
- The Project would merge two units into one merged unit that is unaffordable to a larger percentage of the population than the two individual units considered separately.
- The merger is not necessary to create family housing.
- The Project does not support the objectives and policies of the Housing Element, in that the residential merger removes a more affordable unit from the housing stock.

Attachments:

Block Book Map

Sanborn Map

Zoning Map

Aerial Photographs

Contextual Photographs

Environmental Determination

Conditional Use Authorization Notice

Removal of Dwelling Units: Periodic Adjustment to Numerical Criteria, December 2017

Housing for Families with Children Report, January 2017

Project Sponsor Submittal

Reduced Floor Plans

Attachment Checklist

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Executive Summary | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project sponsor submittal |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Draft Motion | Drawings: <u>Existing Conditions</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental Determination | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Check for legibility |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Zoning District Map | Drawings: <u>Proposed Project</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Height & Bulk Map | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Check for legibility |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Parcel Map | 3-D Renderings (new construction or significant addition) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sanborn Map | <input type="checkbox"/> Check for legibility |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aerial Photo | <input type="checkbox"/> Wireless Telecommunications Materials |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Context Photos | <input type="checkbox"/> Health Dept. review of RF levels |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Site Photos | <input type="checkbox"/> RF Report |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Community Meeting Notice |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Housing Documents |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program: Affidavit for Compliance |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Residential Pipeline |

Exhibits above marked with an "X" are included in this packet SA
Planner's Initials



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Subject to: (Select only if applicable)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Affordable Housing (Sec. 415) | <input type="checkbox"/> First Source Hiring (Admin. Code) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Jobs Housing Linkage Program (Sec. 413) | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Care Requirement (Sec. 414) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Downtown Park Fee (Sec. 412) | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Planning Commission Draft Motion

HEARING DATE: JANUARY 25, 2018

Case No.: **2017-013406CUA**
Project Address: **1177 California Street, Units 1014 & 1015**
Zoning: RM-4 (Residential, Mixed, High Density)
65-A Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 0253A/096 + 097
Project Sponsor: Dera-Jill Pozner, Pozner Architecture and Design
1634 Hayes Street
San Francisco, CA 94117
Staff Contact: Seema Adina – (415) 575-8722
seema.adina@sfgov.org

ADOPTING FINDINGS RELATING TO THE DISAPPROVAL OF A CONDITIONAL USE AUTHORIZATION PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 303 AND 317 OF THE PLANNING CODE TO ALLOW A DWELLING UNIT MERGER FOR THE PROJECT INVOLVING THE MERGER OF A 1,399 SQUARE FOOT, TWO-BEDROOM, TWO AND A HALF-BATH DWELLING UNIT (#1014) WITH A 795 SQUARE FOOT, ONE-BEDROOM, ONE-BATH DWELLING UNIT (#1015) TO CREATE ONE 2,194 SQUARE FOOT, THREE-BEDROOM DWELLING WITHIN THE RM-4 (RESIDENTIAL, MIXED, HIGH DENSITY) ZONING DISTRICT AND THE 65-A HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICT.

PREAMBLE

On October 18, 2017 Dera-Jill Pozner (hereinafter "Project Sponsor") filed an application with the Planning Department (hereinafter "Department") for a Conditional Use Authorization under Planning Code Sections 303 and 317 to merge two dwelling units within the RM-4 (Residential, Mixed, High Density) District and a 65-A Height and Bulk District.

On January 25, 2018, the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting on Conditional Use Application No. 2017-013406CUA and adopted a motion to intent to disapprove Conditional Use Authorization for Application No. 2017-013406CUA.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The Project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") as a Class 1 categorical exemption.

The Commission has heard and considered the testimony presented to it at the public hearing and has further considered written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of the applicant, Department staff, and other interested parties.

MOVED, that the Commission hereby disapproves the Conditional Use Authorization pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 317 to allow a dwelling unit merger that would merge a 1,399 square foot, two-bedroom, two and a half-bath dwelling unit (#1014) with a 795 square foot, one-bedroom, one-bath dwelling unit (#1015) to create one 2,194 square foot, three-bedroom dwelling unit under Case No. 2017-013406CUA, based on the following findings:

FINDINGS

Having reviewed the materials identified in the preamble above, and having heard all testimony and arguments, this Commission finds, concludes, and determines as follows:

1. The above recitals are accurate and constitute findings of this Commission.
2. **Site Description and Present Use.** The proposed project (Project) is located on the southeast corner of California and Jones Street, Block 0253A and Lots 096 and 097. The condominium building's entire parcel measures approximately 15,000 square feet, with the lots under consideration measuring 1,399 and 795 square feet respectively. The Project Site is occupied by an 18-story mixed-use building containing 254 condominium units, 248 of which are residential.
3. **Surrounding Properties and Neighborhood.** The subject property is located in the Nob Hill neighborhood, within the Residential Mixed High Density District (RM-4), and a 65-A Height and Bulk District. Uses in the immediate vicinity are primarily residential with structures that range from as little as two-stories to multi-story residential towers. Adjacent to the subject property is a concert venue, The Masonic, and immediately across California Street is the Grace Cathedral.
4. **Project Description.** The Project includes a dwelling unit merger of two dwelling units within an 18-story building with 248 dwelling units. The project would merge a 1,399 square foot, two-bedroom, two and a half-bath dwelling unit (#1014) with a 795 square foot, one-bedroom, one-bath dwelling unit (#1015). The Project would remove a wall between the units to create one three-bedroom unit.
5. **Public Comment/Community Outreach.** To date, the Department has not received correspondence related to the project.
6. **Planning Code Compliance:** The Commission finds that the Project is consistent with the relevant provisions of the Planning Code in the following manner:

- A. **Residential Merger – Section 317:** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 317, Conditional Use Authorization is required for applications proposing to merge dwelling units. This Code Section establishes a checklist of criteria that delineate the relevant General Plan Policies and Objectives.

As the Project requires Conditional Use Authorization per the requirements of the Section 317, the additional criteria specified under Section 317 have been incorporated as findings as part of this Motion. See Item 8, “Additional Findings pursuant to Section 317” below.

7. **Planning Code Section 303** establishes criteria for the Planning Commission to consider when reviewing applications for Conditional Use Authorization. On balance, the project does **not** comply with all said criteria in that:

- A. The proposed new uses and building, at the size and intensity contemplated and at the proposed location, will provide a development that is necessary or desirable, and compatible with, the neighborhood or the community.

The Project would merge two owner-occupied units, resulting in the loss of one dwelling unit in the City and County of San Francisco. Both units are of ample size to meet the needs of the community. The Commission finds that the creation of one 2,194 square foot dwelling unit that is unaffordable to the majority of the population is not necessary or desirable for the community.

- B. The proposed project will not be detrimental to the health, safety, convenience or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity. There are no features of the project that could be detrimental to the health, safety or convenience of those residing or working the area, in that:

- i. Nature of proposed site, including its size and shape, and the proposed size, shape and arrangement of structures;

The Project would merge two existing dwellings that are of ample size to serve as individual dwelling units. The creation of one 2,194 square foot dwelling that is unaffordable to the majority of the population would be detrimental to the community as it removes a unit from the city’s housing stock.

- ii. The accessibility and traffic patterns for persons and vehicles, the type and volume of such traffic, and the adequacy of proposed off-street parking and loading;

The Project does not trigger additional parking and would not increase the amount of traffic because the project would merge two dwelling units.

- iii. The safeguards afforded to prevent noxious or offensive emissions such as noise, glare, dust and odor;

The Project would merge two existing dwelling units and not create any additional noise, glare, dust or odor.

- iv. Treatment given, as appropriate, to such aspects as landscaping, screening, open spaces, parking and loading areas, service areas, lighting and signs;

The Project does not require any additional landscaping, screening, or open space and does not propose any exterior changes.

- C. That the use as proposed will comply with the applicable provisions of the Planning Code and will not adversely affect the General Plan.

The Project will not comply with all applicable requirements and standards of the Planning Code, and is not consistent with the Objectives and Policies of the General Plan as documented under item 9 below.

- D. That the use as proposed would provide development that is in conformity with the purpose of the applicable Use District.

The existing building is located in an RM-4 Zoning District, where residential uses are principally permitted. The project proposes to merge two existing uses that are principally permitted and conforms to the purposes of the Use District.

- 8. **Planning Code Section 317(g)(2)** establishes criteria for the Planning Commission to consider when reviewing applications requesting to merge residential units. On balance, the project does not comply with said criteria in that:

- A. Whether removal of the unit(s) would eliminate only owner occupied housing, and if so, for how long the unit(s) proposed to be removed have been owner occupied;

The Project proposes to merge units 1014 and 1015 within an existing 18-story building with 248 dwelling units. The owner of the units resides in unit 1014, a 1,399 square foot unit that was purchased by the applicant in 2004, and also resides in unit 1015, a 795 square foot unit purchased by the applicant in 2007. Unit 1015 has been owner-occupied from time of purchase in 2007 – 2010, and then again from 2016 to the present.

Although the unit is currently owner occupied (since 2016), there is no compelling reason to remove a smaller, and thus by size, more affordable unit. As per Mayor Lee's December 18, 2013 Executive Directive, all housing, especially rental housing stock, should be preserved when possible.

- B. Whether removal of the unit(s) and the merger with another is intended for owner occupancy;

While the merger is intended to be owner-occupied, the Commission has determined that there is no compelling reason as to why the owner would need to merge the adjacent unit. Once the units are

merged, there is little chance that the City would recoup the loss of the rental unit. As per Mayor Lee's December 18, 2013 Executive Directive, all housing should be preserved when possible.

- C. That the removal of the unit will remove an affordable housing unit as defined in Section 401 of this Code or housing subject to the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance;

The Project will not eliminate any affordable housing units. Pursuant to the City's Periodic Adjustment to Numerical Criteria, a single family home valued at or above \$1,900,000 is considered to be unaffordable. Unit 1015, the least expensive of the two units, and the unit to be removed, was appraised at \$910,000 in an appraisal dated May 18, 2017 by Churton & Associates. This unit is far below the metric of unaffordability as established by the City. The merging of two units into one unit that would be unaffordable to a larger percentage of the population than the two individual units considered separately would not be in the best interest of the community. Thus, the Commission has determined that there is no compelling justification for an increase in unaffordability of the merged units.

- D. If removal of the unit removes an affordable housing unit as defined in Section 401 of this Code or units subject to the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance, whether replacement housing will be provided which is equal or greater in size, number of bedrooms, affordability, and suitability to households with children to the units being removed;

As discussed above, neither of the units is considered an affordable unit, or subject to the Residential Rent Stabilization Arbitration Ordinance because they are residential condominiums, however Unit 1015 is substantially smaller, and by virtue of size, more affordable than the units combined. It is also well below the threshold of unaffordability pursuant to the City's Periodic Adjustment to Numerical Criteria.

- E. How recently the unit being removed was occupied by a tenant or tenants;

According to the Project Sponsor, Unit 1015 was occupied by tenants from 2011 – 2016.

- F. Whether the number of bedrooms provided in the merged unit will be equal to or greater than the number of bedrooms in the separate units;

The Project would merge the two-bedroom unit with the one-bedroom unit to create a 3-bedroom, 3.5-bath unit. The new unit will have three bedrooms which is equal to the sum of the bedrooms in Units 1014 and 1015.

- G. Whether removal of the unit is necessary to correct design or functional deficiencies that cannot be corrected through interior alterations;

The reconfiguration and merger of the units is not necessary or desirable. While the Project Sponsor states the merger is to correct for design or functional deficiencies because the units were initially built as tourist hotel rooms, the units both individually meet the Planning Code's residential standards.

Though the entire building is nonconforming with respect to allowable density, all Zoning Districts have been allowed to add Accessory Dwelling Units and forgo density limitations. This displays the City's desire to create and preserve as many units as possible. Once the units are merged, there is little chance that the City would recoup the loss of the unit. As per Mayor Lee's December 18, 2013 Executive Directive, all housing, especially rental housing stock, should be preserved when possible.

- H. The appraised value of the least expensive Residential Unit proposed for merger only when the merger does not involve an Unauthorized Unit.

According to an appraisal done by Churton & Associates on May 18, 2017, unit 1015 is valued at \$910,000. The smaller unit is well below the threshold of unaffordability established at \$1,900,000. Unit 1014, the larger of the two units, has been appraised at \$1,700,000, which is also below the threshold of unaffordability. The combined value of the two units is \$2,610,000 placing the potential merger past the scope of unaffordability pursuant to the City's Periodic Adjustment to Numerical Criteria. The merging of the units would be unaffordable to a larger percentage of the population than the two individual units considered separately and thus would not be in the best interest of the community. The Numerical Criteria is based on 2015-2017 data.

9. **General Plan Compliance.** The Project is, on balance, inconsistent with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan:

HOUSING ELEMENT

Objectives and Policies

OBJECTIVE 2:

Retain existing housing units, and promote safety and maintenance standards, without jeopardizing affordability.

Policy 2.2:

Retain existing housing by controlling the merger of residential units, except where a merger clearly creates new family housing.

The reconfiguration and merger of the units is not necessary or desirable. While the sponsor states the merger would create a family-sized unit, according to Department's January 2017 report entitled "Housing for Families with Children," this merger would continue to exacerbate the discrepancy of occupied units and family housing in its current configuration. Only 30% of 3+ bedroom units in San Francisco are occupied by families with children, and the remaining 70% are occupied by seniors, couples without children, single people, and unrelated individuals.¹ The combination of the two units would exacerbate the discrepancy between the City's measure of people and occupied housing.

The report also indicates that family-sized units can be considered adequately-sized two-bedroom units ranging from 700-1,100 square feet. Unit 1014, the two-bedroom, two and a half-bathroom unit,

¹ San Francisco Planning Department. (2017). *Housing for Families with Children*. San Francisco.

exceeds this range at 1,399 square feet in size and may be considered a family-sized unit on its own, without exacerbating the level of unaffordability for the unit pursuant to the City's Periodic Adjustment to Numerical Criteria. Once the units are merged, there is little chance that the City would recoup the loss of the unit. As per Mayor Lee's December 18, 2013 Executive Directive, all housing should be preserved when possible.

10. **Planning Code Section 101.1(b)** establishes eight priority-planning policies and requires review of permits for consistency with said policies. On balance, the project does comply with said policies in that:

- 1) That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses be enhanced.

The dwelling unit merger would not remove or cause the removal of neighborhood serving retail uses.

- 2) That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods.

The Project would not conserve existing housing, since it would merge two dwelling units into one dwelling unit. The merging of two units into one unit that would exceed \$1,900,000 and be unaffordable to a larger percentage of the population than the two individual units considered separately, and would thus affect the cultural and economic diversity of the neighborhood. The Proposed Project, therefore, is inconsistent with the policies of Section 101.1(b)(2).

- 3) That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced,

The two existing dwelling units are not designated as affordable housing units, so the Project would not impact any affordable housing.

- 4) That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking.

The Project is not expected to create additional traffic or parking demand and would not overburden the streets or neighborhood parking.

- 5) That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced.

The Project does not involve commercial office development and would not impact the industrial or service sector economies.

- 6) That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.

The Project will not change the seismic and fire safety standards of the Building.

- 7) That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved.

The existing building is not considered to be a City Landmark or a historic resource.

- 8) That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

The Project does not propose any exterior changes; therefore, the Project would not impact any nearby park or open space.

11. The Project is not consistent with and would not promote the general and specific purposes of the Code provided under Section 101.1(b) in that, as designed, the Project would not contribute to the character and stability of the neighborhood and would not constitute a beneficial development.
12. The Commission hereby finds that approval of the Conditional Use Authorization would not promote the health, safety and welfare of the City.

DECISION

That based upon the Record, the submissions by the Applicant, the staff of the Department and other interested parties, the oral testimony presented to this Commission at the public hearings, and all other written materials submitted by all parties, the Commission hereby **DISAPPROVES Conditional Use Application No. 2017-013406CUA** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 317 to allow a dwelling unit merger that would merge a 1,399 square foot, two-bedroom, two and a half-bath dwelling unit (#1014) with a 795 square foot, one-bedroom, one-bath dwelling unit (#1015). The subject property is located within the RM-4 (High Density Mixed Residential) Zoning District, and a 65-A Height and Bulk District

APPEAL AND EFFECTIVE DATE OF MOTION: Any aggrieved person may appeal this Conditional Use Authorization to the Board of Supervisors within thirty (30) days after the date of this Motion No. XXXXX. The effective date of this Motion shall be the date of this Motion if not appealed (After the 30-day period has expired) OR the date of the decision of the Board of Supervisors if appealed to the Board of Supervisors. For further information, please contact the Board of Supervisors at (415) 554-5184, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102.

Protest of Fee or Exaction: You may protest any fee or exaction subject to Government Code Section 66000 that is imposed as a condition of approval by following the procedures set forth in Government Code Section 66020. The protest must satisfy the requirements of Government Code Section 66020(a) and must be filed within 90 days of the date of the first approval or conditional approval of the development referencing the challenged fee or exaction. For purposes of Government Code Section 66020, the date of imposition of the fee shall be the date of the earliest discretionary approval by the City of the subject development.

If the City has not previously given Notice of an earlier discretionary approval of the project, the Planning Commission's adoption of this Motion, Resolution, Discretionary Review Action or the Zoning Administrator's Variance Decision Letter constitutes the approval or conditional approval of the development and the City hereby gives **NOTICE** that the 90-day protest period under Government Code Section 66020 has begun. If the City has already given Notice that the 90-day approval period has begun for the subject development, then this document does not re-commence the 90-day approval period.

I hereby certify that the Planning Commission ADOPTED the foregoing Motion on January 25, 2018.

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary


AYES:

NAYS:

ABSENT:

ADOPTED: January 25, 2018


Block Book Map



SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Case Number 2017-013406CUA
Conditional Use Authorization
Dwelling Unit Merger
1177 California Street

Sanborn Map*



SUBJECT PROPERTY


*The Sanborn Maps in San Francisco have not been updated since 1998, and this map may not accurately reflect existing conditions.



**SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

Case Number 2017-013406CUA
Conditional Use Authorization
Dwelling Unit Merger
1177 California Street

Zoning Map



SUBJECT PROPERTY



SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Case Number 2017-013406CUA
Conditional Use Authorization
Dwelling Unit Merger
1177 California Street

Aerial Photograph



SUBJECT PROPERTY



SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Case Number 2017-013406CUA
Conditional Use Authorization
Dwelling Unit Merger
1177 California Street

Contextual Photographs



Case Number 2017-013406CUA
Conditional Use Authorization
Dwelling Unit Merger
1177 California Street

Contextual Photographs



Case Number 2017-013406CUA
Conditional Use Authorization
Dwelling Unit Merger
1177 California Street

Environmental Determination

Case Number 2017-013406CUA
Conditional Use Authorization
Dwelling Unit Merger
1177 California Street



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Address		Block/Lot(s)	
Case No.	Permit No.	Plans Dated	
<input type="checkbox"/> Addition/ Alteration	<input type="checkbox"/> Demolition (requires HRER if over 45 years old)	<input type="checkbox"/> New Construction	<input type="checkbox"/> Project Modification (GO TO STEP 7)
Project description for Planning Department approval.			

STEP 1: EXEMPTION CLASS TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

Note: If neither class applies, an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i> is required.	
	Class 1 – Existing Facilities. Interior and exterior alterations; additions under 10,000 sq. ft.
	Class 3 – New Construction/ Conversion of Small Structures. Up to three (3) new single-family residences or six (6) dwelling units in one building; commercial/office structures; utility extensions.; ; change of use under 10,000 sq. ft. if principally permitted or with a CU. Change of use under 10,000 sq. ft. if principally permitted or with a CU.
	Class ___

STEP 2: CEQA IMPACTS TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

If any box is checked below, an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i> is required.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality: Would the project add new sensitive receptors (specifically, schools, day care facilities, hospitals, residential dwellings, and senior-care facilities) within an Air Pollution Exposure Zone? Does the project have the potential to emit substantial pollutant concentrations (e.g., backup diesel generators, heavy industry, diesel trucks)? <i>Exceptions: do not check box if the applicant presents documentation of enrollment in the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) Article 38 program and the project would not have the potential to emit substantial pollutant concentrations. (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Air Pollutant Exposure Zone)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Hazardous Materials: If the project site is located on the Maher map or is suspected of containing hazardous materials (based on a previous use such as gas station, auto repair, dry cleaners, or heavy manufacturing, or a site with underground storage tanks): Would the project involve 50 cubic yards or more of soil disturbance - or a change of use from industrial to residential? If yes, this box must be checked and the project applicant must submit an Environmental Application with a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. <i>Exceptions: do not check box if the applicant presents documentation of enrollment in the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) Maher program, a DPH waiver from the</i>

	<i>Mahe program, or other documentation from Environmental Planning staff that hazardous material effects would be less than significant (refer to EP_ArcMap > Maher layer).</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Transportation: Does the project create six (6) or more net new parking spaces or residential units? Does the project have the potential to adversely affect transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle safety (hazards) or the adequacy of nearby transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities?
<input type="checkbox"/>	Archeological Resources: Would the project result in soil disturbance/modification greater than two (2) feet below grade in an archeological sensitive area or eight (8) feet in a non-archeological sensitive area? <i>(refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Archeological Sensitive Area)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment: Does the project site involve a subdivision or lot line adjustment on a lot with a slope average of 20% or more? <i>(refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Slope = or > 20%: Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? <i>(refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography)</i> If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Seismic: Landslide Zone: Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? <i>(refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones)</i> If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Seismic: Liquefaction Zone: Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? <i>(refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones)</i> If box is checked, a geotechnical report will likely be required.
<u>If no boxes are checked above, GO TO STEP 3. If one or more boxes are checked above, an Environmental Evaluation Application is required, unless reviewed by an Environmental Planner.</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project can proceed with categorical exemption review. The project does not trigger any of the CEQA impacts listed above.
Comments and Planner Signature (optional):	

STEP 3: PROPERTY STATUS – HISTORIC RESOURCE TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

PROPERTY IS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING: <i>(refer to Parcel Information Map)</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Category A: Known Historical Resource. GO TO STEP 5.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Category B: Potential Historical Resource (over 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 4.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Category C: Not a Historical Resource or Not Age Eligible (under 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 6.

**STEP 4: PROPOSED WORK CHECKLIST
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

Check all that apply to the project.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	1. Change of use and new construction. Tenant improvements not included.
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Regular maintenance or repair to correct or repair deterioration, decay, or damage to building.
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Window replacement that meets the Department's <i>Window Replacement Standards</i> . Does not include storefront window alterations.
<input type="checkbox"/>	4. Garage work. A new opening that meets the <i>Guidelines for Adding Garages and Curb Cuts</i> , and/or replacement of a garage door in an existing opening that meets the Residential Design Guidelines.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5. Deck, terrace construction, or fences not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
<input type="checkbox"/>	6. Mechanical equipment installation that is not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
<input type="checkbox"/>	7. Dormer installation that meets the requirements for exemption from public notification under <i>Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 3: Dormer Windows</i> .
<input type="checkbox"/>	8. Addition(s) that are not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way for 150 feet in each direction; does not extend vertically beyond the floor level of the top story of the structure or is only a single story in height; does not have a footprint that is more than 50% larger than that of the original building; and does not cause the removal of architectural significant roofing features.
Note: Project Planner must check box below before proceeding.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project is not listed. GO TO STEP 5.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project does not conform to the scopes of work. GO TO STEP 5.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project involves four or more work descriptions. GO TO STEP 5.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project involves less than four work descriptions. GO TO STEP 6.

**STEP 5: CEQA IMPACTS – ADVANCED HISTORICAL REVIEW
TO BE COMPLETED BY PRESERVATION PLANNER**

Check all that apply to the project.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	1. Project involves a known historical resource (CEQA Category A) as determined by Step 3 and conforms entirely to proposed work checklist in Step 4.
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Interior alterations to publicly accessible spaces.
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Window replacement of original/historic windows that are not “in-kind” but are consistent with existing historic character.
<input type="checkbox"/>	4. Façade/storefront alterations that do not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5. Raising the building in a manner that does not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.
<input type="checkbox"/>	6. Restoration based upon documented evidence of a building's historic condition, such as historic photographs, plans, physical evidence, or similar buildings.
<input type="checkbox"/>	7. Addition(s) , including mechanical equipment that are minimally visible from a public right-of-way and meet the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation</i> .
<input type="checkbox"/>	8. Other work consistent with the <i>Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties</i> (specify or add comments):

<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>9. Other work that would not materially impair a historic district (specify or add comments):</p> <p>(Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator) _____</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>10. Reclassification of property status. (Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator)</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"> <input type="checkbox"/> Reclassify to Category A <input type="checkbox"/> Reclassify to Category C </p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a. Per HRER dated: _____ (attach HRER)</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">b. Other (specify): _____</p>
<p>Note: If ANY box in STEP 5 above is checked, a Preservation Planner MUST check one box below.</p>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Further environmental review required. Based on the information provided, the project requires an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i> to be submitted. GO TO STEP 6.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Project can proceed with categorical exemption review. The project has been reviewed by the Preservation Planner and can proceed with categorical exemption review. GO TO STEP 6.</p>
<p>Comments (optional):</p> 	
<p>Preservation Planner Signature:</p> 	

**STEP 6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Further environmental review required. Proposed project does not meet scopes of work in either (check all that apply):</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"> <input type="checkbox"/> Step 2 – CEQA Impacts <input type="checkbox"/> Step 5 – Advanced Historical Review </p> <p>STOP! Must file an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i>.</p>			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>No further environmental review is required. The project is categorically exempt under CEQA.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <p>Planner Name:</p> <p>Project Approval Action:</p> <p>If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project.</p> </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <p>Signature:</p> </td> </tr> </table> <p>Once signed or stamped and dated, this document constitutes a categorical exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code.</p> <p>In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, an appeal of an exemption determination can only be filed within 30 days of the project receiving the first approval action.</p> <p>Please note that other approval actions may be required for the project. Please contact the assigned planner for these approvals.</p>		<p>Planner Name:</p> <p>Project Approval Action:</p> <p>If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project.</p>	<p>Signature:</p>
<p>Planner Name:</p> <p>Project Approval Action:</p> <p>If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project.</p>	<p>Signature:</p> 			

Conditional Use Authorization Notice

Case Number 2017-013406CUA
Conditional Use Authorization
Dwelling Unit Merger
1177 California Street



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 • San Francisco, CA 94103 • Fax (415) 558-6409

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Hearing Date: **Thursday, January 25, 2017**
Time: **Not before 1:00 PM**
Location: **City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 400**
Case Type: **Conditional Use**
Hearing Body: **Planning Commission**

PROPERTY INFORMATION		APPLICATION INFORMATION	
Project Address:	1177 California Street, Units 1014 & 1015	Case No.:	2017-013406CUA
Cross Street(s):	Jones	Building Permit:	TBD
Block /Lot No.:	0253A / 096	Applicant:	Dera-Jill Pozner
Zoning District(s):	RM-4 / 65-A	Telephone:	(415) 871-5355
Area Plan:	N/A	E-Mail:	derajill@gmail.com
PROJECT DESCRIPTION			
<p>The proposal is for Conditional Use Authorization, pursuant to Planning Code Section 303 and 317 to merge two dwelling units within a 254-unit building. The project would merge a 1,399 square foot, two-bedroom, three-bath unit (#1014) with a 799 square foot, one-bedroom, one-bath unit (#1015).</p> <p>A Planning Commission approval at the public hearing would constitute the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section 31.04(h).</p>			
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION			
<p>ARCHITECTURAL PLANS: If you are interested in viewing the plans for the proposed project please contact the planner listed below. The plans and Department recommendation of the proposed project will be available prior to the hearing through the Planning Commission agenda at: http://www.sf-planning.org or by request at the Planning Department office located at 1650 Mission Street, 4th Floor.</p> <p>Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Commission or the Department. All written or oral communications, including submitted personal contact information, may be made available to the public for inspection and copying upon request and may appear on the Department's website or in other public documents.</p>			
<p>FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE CONTACT PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF: Planner: Seema Adina Telephone: (415) 575-8722 E-Mail: seema.adina@sfgov.org</p>			

Removal of Dwelling Units: Periodic Adjustment to Numerical Data December 2017

Case Number 2017-013406CUA
Conditional Use Authorization
Dwelling Unit Merger
1177 California Street



SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING
DEPARTMENT

Removal of Dwelling Units Periodic Adjustment to Numerical Criteria

The values associated with the following criteria are subject to administrative updates and shall be adjusted periodically by the Zoning Administrator based on established economic real estate and construction indicators.

CRITERION:	INITIAL VALUE:	BASED UPON:
1. 80th Percentile of San Francisco single-family home values (structure & land)	\$1,900,000	2015-2017 City Assessor's Data
2. Replacement Cost per square foot for all occupied, finished spaces	\$240.00	DBI Index
3. Replacement Cost per square foot for unfinished space with flat ceiling & >7'-6" of headroom (e.g., basements, garages)	\$110.00	DBI Index
4. Replacement Cost per square foot for unfinished space with sloping ceiling & >5'-0" of headroom (e.g., attic space below pitched roof)	\$60.00	DBI Index
5. Replacement Cost per square foot for non-occupiable space without legal headroom (e.g., 30" high crawl space below raised floor)	\$15.00	DBI Index
6. Replacement Cost per square foot for site work (e.g., walks, driveways, landscaping, retaining walls not part of the building foundation, etc.)	\$0.00	(cost excluded)

The following values are subject to non-legislative updates and may be adjusted periodically by the Planning Commission to further the efficacy of Section 317, in order to promote the objectives of the General Plan and Planning Code.

CRITERION:	INITIAL VALUE: (Adopted May 18, 2007)	BASED UPON:
1. Definition B of Demolition re: removal of the front and rear building walls	> 50%	policy efficacy
2. Definition B of Demolition re: removal of all exterior walls,	> 65%	policy efficacy
3. Definition C of Demolition re: removal, replacement, relocation of the defining elements of the existing building envelope and volume (measured in square feet)	> 50%	policy efficacy
4. Definition of (Tantamount to) Merger re: reduction of an existing Residential Unit's floor area (measured in square feet)	> 25%	policy efficacy
5. Definition of (Tantamount to) Conversion re: reduction of an existing Residential Unit's floor area (measured in square feet)	> 25%	policy efficacy


Housing for Families with Children

January 2017

Case Number 2017-013406CUA
Conditional Use Authorization
Dwelling Unit Merger
1177 California Street

HOUSING FOR FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN

JANUARY 17, 2017





Mayor

Edwin M. Lee

Board of Supervisors

London Breed, President

Malia Cohen

Mark Farrell

Sandar Fewer

Jane Kim

Aaron Peskin

Eric Mar

Hillary Ronen

Ahsha Safai

Jeff Sheehy

Katy Tang

Norman Yee

Planning Commission

Rodney Fong, President

Rich Hillis

Christine Johnson

Joel Koppel

Myrna Melgar

Kathrin Moore

Dennis Richards

San Francisco Planning Department

John Rahaim, Director of Planning

Susan Exline

Anne Brask

Sheila Nickolopoulos




SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Families with children are essential to keeping San Francisco a diverse, thriving city.

The challenge of keeping families in San Francisco is multifaceted, exacerbated by the rate at which we are seeing low and middle-income families leave the City. A rapidly growing income inequality and the lack of housing have taken on increased urgency as we continue to grapple with a multitude of issues for all San Franciscans: schools, transportation, gentrification and displacement, public safety, and more. However, we have opportunities to improve.

We have a responsibility to implement family friendly housing policies that will allow families from all socioeconomic backgrounds to live here and thrive. This requires access to jobs, quality education, cultural diversity, equitable public transit, plentiful open space, and more to improve the housing options for families in coming decades. To this purpose, the Planning Department is pleased to have prepared Housing for Families with Children, that explains existing conditions and provides a number of considerations for family friendly housing policies. I believe it is a crucial part of the conversations we need to have collectively as a City to address the challenges we continue to face and provide new possible solutions.

I would also like to thank Mayor Edwin Lee and Supervisor Norman Yee for their ongoing support in this and other efforts to grow and strengthen family friendly policies in San Francisco. And a special thanks goes to Planning staff for their hard work and commitment to making San Francisco a more family friendly city.



John Rahaim
Director of San Francisco Planning

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377



NORMAN YEE

San Francisco is best known for its diversity of culture, people, and ideas. It's what attracts so many people to visit our beautiful city and what makes it such a wonderful place to call home. We are seeing record numbers of new residents, yet we are also seeing many families leave. San Francisco has the lowest number of children of any major city in US. A mere 18% of households have children compared to the nationwide average of 29.4%.

The need for action is clear. San Francisco must reverse the trend and attract more families to live in San Francisco. When we lose our families, we lose part of what makes San Francisco a strong, vibrant community.

As a City, we have shown a commitment to children, youth and families through the historic creation of the Children & Youth Fund, investing millions to support wellness, afterschool, and educational programs. In 2014, the voters of San Francisco also established the Our Children, Our Families Council, which brings together all City departments in order to streamline direct services, but also focus on how we can make our infrastructure—transportation, streets, housing—more efficient for families with children.

One of the major crises we are facing is housing affordability. Due to the high cost of living, we are seeing families getting priced out of the City. While this is a large factor, another issue that hasn't garnered as much needed attention is that we are not building housing for new families. In order for us to retain and attract families with children, we must look at ways we can make San Francisco family-friendly by design. What elements and attributes make a building fit for families with children? What factors create an environment that allows families to grow into their homes? That was why I introduced legislation calling on the Planning Department to develop a policy paper on defining family-friendly housing.

As a City, we need to promote family-friendly housing and incentivize building more housing designed for families at all income levels.

This policy paper will discuss:

1. The current trends in San Francisco's housing stock.
2. The current demographics of family and housing situation.
3. Characteristics of child friendly housing.
4. Ways of improving existing housing developments for families.
5. Case studies from other cities in family friendly housing standards.

Member, Board of Supervisors
District 7



City and County of San Francisco

NORMAN YEE

As a San Francisco parent and an educator, I believe that children and families must be one of our greatest priorities if we want thriving neighborhoods and healthy communities.

This paper is a starting point and I hope that we will think boldly about ways we can bring these ideas into action. I would like to extend my sincere thanks to the incredible staff at the Planning Department, many of whom are working parents, who have worked tirelessly on this paper.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Norman Yee".

Norman Yee
District 7 Supervisor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	02
Definition of a Family	03
Chapter I: Demographics	06
Chapter II: San Francisco's Housing Stock.....	14
Chapter III: Characteristics of Quality Child-Friendly Housing Stock	18
Chapter IV: Improving Existing Housing for Families	28
Model for a New Old Housing Type, the "Missing Middle"	32
Conclusion & Next Steps	36
Appendix: What Other Cities are Doing	38

INTRODUCTION

San Francisco's overall population of children has remained steady for the last 15+ years, but the trend holds that families leave the city as their children reach school age. But as the city's large population of 20-34 year olds have children and continue to value urban amenities, that trend may reverse. The City has the opportunity to improve the housing options for families in coming decades. While the problem of keeping families of all economic levels in San Francisco is complex and includes a multitude of challenges, such as schools, transportation options, access to parks, public safety, etc., the focus of this briefing is quality affordable housing for families with children.

This briefing, prepared by the San Francisco Planning Department, presents the existing demographics and future projections for families with children in San Francisco in Chapter I. Multiple data sources point to an increase in our population of children, with most growth in eastern and southern San Francisco. Data also reflects the national trend towards increasing income inequality. Middle income families are decreasing while low income and high income populations increase.

Chapter II describes our existing housing stock and development trends for new housing. Since 2010, 61% of new market rate development has been studios and one-bedroom units, predominantly in larger buildings. Where we fall short in producing new housing for families, more families are living in overcrowded conditions and an increasing number of families are in SROs.

Chapter III looks at how possible changes to the types of new construction could improve housing options for families with children. Understanding that families grow and change over time, the design considerations that can be applied to new housing stock would meet the needs of residents across generations; flexible and adaptable for toddlers, teens, twentysomethings, and beyond. These design considerations fall loosely into three categories: site level characteristics, building characteristics, and unit characteristics. These design ideas are drawn from research on how other cities that have successfully adopted family friendly housing design policies. This chapter also includes the tradeoffs associated with designing family friendly housing, including the potential for increased costs with more amenities. These design ideas are intended for new market rate development. Affordable housing developments are already successfully building with families in mind, such as the Broadway Family Apartments in Chinatown, the Mosaica development in the Mission, and Mercy Family Housing at 10th & Mission.

In Chapter IV, we offer considerations and tradeoffs for modifications to existing housing, such as simplifying the process for adding bedrooms or tapping into two large reserves—underutilized ground floors and underbuilt lots — to add units to existing buildings. This can increase the number of units and give families flexibility over time.

This briefing also includes a section on San Francisco's "Missing Middle" — a range of multi-unit or clustered housing types compatible in scale with single-family homes that can help meet the growing demand for walkable urban living. An astonishing 72% of the city's privately owned parcels are zoned for single-family housing (RH-1) and two-unit housing (RH-2). This puts the burden of population growth on the remaining 28% of parcels, which already houses all of our businesses, institutions, and mixed use housing. Through good design, multi-unit or clustered housing types could be accommodated among single-family homes in neighborhoods already rich with family-friendly amenities. We are simply not building housing for families and this mid-size type of housing would help address this need. But the City will have to tackle the significant limitations of existing zoning and density controls to begin to build the Missing Middle.



DEFINITION OF A FAMILY

Families come in all shapes and sizes and some include children and others do not. This paper focuses on the households that include children under 18 years of age. These children may live with a parent, a grandparent, or a caretaker.

WHY CHILDREN AND FAMILIES ARE IMPORTANT TO CITIES

- *Benefit equity.* Family friendly housing policies will allow families from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds to live in San Francisco and have access to the jobs, education, and other opportunities that the city provides. This benefits families, communities, and employers.
- *Foster sustainable communities and produce public health benefits.* Being able to walk, bike, or take transit is a benefit to kids and parents. Compact living is more efficient and allows for a greater diversity in travel mode choices, thus reducing a household's carbon footprint.
- *Create a city for all.* In a city with residents of all age groups, public infrastructure created with children in mind results in a higher standard of safety and livability. This means better facilities for pedestrians, more traffic-calming and safer streets, better public transit, and improved parks and open spaces.¹
- *Benefit cultural diversity.* Children are exposed to diverse people and a wide array of cultural activities when living in cities. Being able to interact with people from a range of backgrounds is important for kids from an early age.
- *Benefit multi-generational and community supports and resources.* Building housing for families allows people to stay in the city once they have children, allowing grandparents, extended family, and close friends to be more connected to these families and their children than they otherwise would be.
- *Contribute to community and culture.* The presence of people across the age spectrum enriches the experience of those around them and children are no exception. Ensuring that children make up a significant segment of San Francisco's population provides opportunities for connection and perspective that adults without children in the city otherwise would not have.

¹ <http://www.livablecities.org/articles/why-it-important-have-children-living-downtown>





CHAPTER ONE: DEMOGRAPHICS

FAMILIES IN SAN FRANCISCO TODAY

San Francisco has the lowest percentage of children of any large, major US city. Of the 12 largest cities in the United States, San Francisco ranks lowest for the percentage of households that are families with children; a mere 18% of our households have children.² Comparatively, 29.4% of households in major cities nationwide have children 18 and under. This low percentage holds true from 1980 as well, when only 18.9% of the San Francisco's households had children under the age of 19.³

Population Density and Share of Households that are Families with Children < 19 in Large Cities Nationwide

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

Population Density and Share of Households that are Families with Children < 19 in the Bay Area³


	Population Density per Square Mile	Total Households	% of Households that are Families with Children
Santa Clara	5,256	604,204	38.4%
Solano	476	141,758	38.1%
Contra Costa	1,300	375,364	37.3%
Alameda	2,048	545,138	34.6%
San Mateo	8,014	257,837	34.1%
Napa	165	48,876	33.8%
Sonoma	270	185,825	30.9%
Marin	476	103,210	29.0%
San Francisco	17,169	345,811	18.0%

San Francisco also has the least children of any Bay Area county by a significant margin.

FAMILY INCOME

There has been an overall rise in median family income to \$107,700 for a family of four in 2016. And the percentage of high income families is increasing—in 2000, 12.7% of the population made over \$150,000 annually; adjusted to 2014 dollars, we saw this increase to 19.3% of the population. The percentage of low income families is also increasing. Since 2000, households making less than \$25,000 have increased 7%. The percentage of households making more than \$150,000 has also increased by 6%.⁴ Reflecting national trends, the middle class is diminishing.

Breakdown of Total Population Annual Income




⁴ 2000 Census; 2010, 2014 American Community Survey; 5 Year. Nominal numbers used for annual income. Note that Consumer Price Index for 2000, 2010, 2014 are 180.2, 227.5, 251.9, respectively.

RACIAL DEMOGRAPHICS


The racial demographics of San Francisco's children has shifted in the past 15 years. The percentage of white, multiracial, and Hispanic children has increased, while the percentage of Black and Asian has decreased rapidly. These changes mirror the overall changes in San Francisco's population over the past 15 years, except for the declining population of Asian children, which diverges from the increasing Asian population.

WHERE FAMILIES LIVE IN SAN FRANCISCO


While the neighborhoods to the south and west (Bayview, Excelsior, Sunset, Bernal Heights, etc) are generally thought of as the areas with more kids, children are living throughout the City. Because there are fewer total households in the south and western neighborhoods, there is a greater concentration of children, i.e. more households with kids, than in other neighborhoods.



Composition of Children (0-18) from 2000, 2010, and 2014



Composition of Population from 2000, 2010, and 2014



US Census (2000, 2010), American Community Survey 5-Year (2014)

2010-2040 POPULATION CHANGES IN SAN FRANCISCO

San Francisco's total population steadily increased between 2000 and 2010 and then increased dramatically between 2010 and 2016. As Baby Boomers age in urban areas and younger generations come for jobs and urban amenities, San Francisco's population is expected to grow significantly between 2010 and 2040. The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) predicts San Francisco's total population will rise to 1,085,730 by 2040.

The large Millennial cohort of 20 to 34 years olds who currently live in San Francisco are just reaching average child-bearing age (33 for women in San Francisco⁵). Like previous generations, they may elect to move out of the city when they start families. But it could also be that their preference for urban living marks a shift in demographic trends.


National demand among all generations for more urban, walkable neighborhoods has been increasing. Recently studies by the Urban Land Institute and RCLCO note just how popular these urban amenities are. The RCLCO study found that 77% of Millennials are seeking an urban, walkable lifestyle.⁶ Many academics and journalists posit that this preference for urban living could potentially be a generational shift while others note that the urban millennial generation has not hit peak childbearing years and that once they do, they may continue previous generational trends of moving out of urban areas after having children.⁷

Either outcome will likely be influenced by the availability or lack of family friendly housing and resources. Regardless of what Millennials do as they start families, they are currently living in cities and driving market demands in urban areas. If the City's goal is to retain this population and accommodate some of the projected growth in the population of children, we will have to build accordingly.

Projections seem to indicate that there will be some growth in our population of children. SFUSD produces demographic projection every ten years based on their data. The most recent projections, completed in 2010, indicate a continued growth in the population of children in SFUSD, which has been a trend since 2008.

SFUSD bases their projections on anticipated children in the existing housing stock and new housing stock. They project between 3,000-6,000 new students by 2023 from the existing housing stock. SFUSD anticipates that by 2040, new households will increase the public school population by between 7,000 and 14,000 students. SFUSD anticipates that these students will live in the neighborhoods where we expect to see most of our new housing development, i.e. along the eastern side of San Francisco and in the Park Merced area.

Percentage of Population by Generation in San Francisco



5 https://www.sfdph.org/dph/files/MCHdocs/Epi/BirthData_SF_2010_Brief_v20130402.pdf. 6 <http://missingmiddlehousing.com/about/demand-market/> 7 <http://cityobservatory.org/kids-in-cities/#4>

POPULATION PROJECTIONS


In addition to data collected by the US Census Bureau, data from the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) is used throughout this white paper. SFUSD data provides information on children in the Transitional Kindergarten program (ages 4-5) thru 12th grade (ages 17-18).

SFUSD's detailed data on students in public schools includes information on where students live at the unit level. This information provides us a snapshot on where kids are living who attend SFUSD. Using this information, SFUSD can calculate their yield rates, i.e. project how many students they can expect to attend SFUSD. Their low per-unit yield for market rate units is 0.01. That is, for every 100 market rate unit constructed, they expect to see one additional student in SFUSD. New below-market-rate units, either inclusionary or in 100% affordable developments, have higher yield rates, inclusionary is 0.25 per unit and stand-alone affordable buildings are 0.5 students per unit. Their high yield rate is 0.20 for market-rate units and inclusionary and stand-alone affordable buildings are projected to yield the same in both low and high yield scenarios.


By 2040, SFUSD anticipates seeing the most growth in their student population from children living in eastern and southern San Francisco, as well as the Park Merced area. Most of this growth is due to significant new housing development planned for these areas of the city. This calculation takes into consideration where existing students live, the predicted turnover rate, and expected population growth.

ABAG provides projections for the entire child population under 18. Projections show that while the 5-17 population grows at a more rapid rate, both show a steady increase to 2060. 50,900 0-4 year olds are expected to live in San Francisco by 2060, compared to the 35,700 in 2010.


Projected SFUSD K-12 Enrollment from Existing Housing Stock



Projected SFUSD K-12 Enrollment from New Housing Stock



ABAG Population Projections for 0-17



CHAPTER TWO: SAN FRANCISCO'S HOUSING STOCK

SAN FRANCISCO'S HOUSING STOCK

The availability and affordability of housing will be a significant factor in shaping San Francisco's population changes in coming decades. If San Francisco wants to maintain, or even increase, the proportion of families with children, we need to first understand what our housing stock looks like and where it both succeeds and fails to meet the needs of families. What follows is a description of our existing housing stock and development trends for new housing, as well as the opportunities and tradeoffs of creating more family friendly housing.

Two significant housing stock issues impact San Francisco's families: affordability and unit size. Families need more affordable housing options, but they also need larger units to accommodate children and sometimes multiple generations. While more space would accommodate families, larger units are more expensive. Some considerations, which are detailed in following chapters, that might be able to produce affordable units that are right-sized to families:

- More economical shared bathrooms, as opposed to en-suite bathrooms
- More smaller bedrooms would give family members privacy without significantly increasing the square footage of the unit
- Including guest suites in a building to provide residents with the room to host visiting family and friends, without needing to have a spare bedroom

Just as additional space comes with a cost, so do amenities. The City will want to prioritize amenities, as each in-unit amenity (such as washer/dryer) and building amenity (like minimum play space), adds to the cost. For example, where good public amenities are available, such as playgrounds and parks, relaxing building requirements for open space could help decrease unit cost. More discussions of these tradeoffs is included in Chapter V, which talks about specific design characteristics of family friendly housing.

DECREASING AFFORDABILITY

Affordability is the single most pressing issues for families and all San Franciscans. The vast majority of both ownership and rental properties are not affordable to families. Based on prices in September 2015, 91% of all home sale listings in San Francisco were either not affordable or less than two bedrooms, making a mere 9% of the housing stock on the market family friendly to those earning the median family income.⁸ Based on the 2016 median income for a family of four of \$107,700,⁹ a family could afford a home priced at \$417,949.¹⁰ But in summer 2016, the median sale price of a two-bedroom home in San Francisco is \$1,246,500.¹¹ The rental market is equally hostile to the needs of families: the median asking rent in May 2016 was \$5,050 for a two bedroom unit and a family of four earning the median income can afford \$2,749 in rent for a two-bedroom unit.¹²

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 workers who cannot afford to live in the city; and an increase in the homeless population.

8 <http://www.governing.com/gov-data/other/family-housing-affordability-in-cities-report.html#calculation> 9 http://sfmohcd.org/sites/default/files/Documents/MOH/2016_AMI_IncomeLimits-SanFranHMFA.pdf 10 http://sfmohcd.org/sites/default/files/Documents/MOH/2016_AMI_InclusionaryPurchaseCalcs_SanFranHMFA.pdf 11 http://www.trulia.com/real_estate/San_Francisco-California/market-trends/ 12 http://sfmohcd.org/sites/default/files/Documents/MOH/2016_AMI_RentLimits-SanFranHMFA_ForMOHsf.pdf


HOUSING STOCK TRENDS

Unit size is also an issue for families because larger household sizes need more bedrooms. While we continue to refine our data on bedroom counts, best estimates are that 28% of units built before 2005 are two bedroom units and 33% of units are three or more bedrooms.¹³

While data on the number of bedrooms in both older and newer stock is difficult to gather, the trends seem to indicate that older housing units have more bedrooms and are larger than newer units. Between January 2005 and June 2015, 61% of the 23,202 units of new market rate development has been studios and one-bedroom units, predominantly in larger buildings. New market rate housing produced relatively few units with three or more bedrooms.

As market rate housing produces more smaller units, affordable housing (also referred to as below-market-rate) caters much more to families. Of the 529 affordable housing projects built between 2011 and 2015, 53% (280) were family units with two or more bedrooms. But the production of these affordable family units doesn't compensate for the the smaller units being produced at market rate because the income requirements for affordable housing are only applicable to some families and because 280 units of affordable family housing over five years is insufficient to meet demand.

Percentage of Units Built Before and After 2005



¹³ San Francisco Housing Database. It is worth noting that San Francisco lacks reliable data on the bedroom composition of units. Although this data is tracked by the Assessor's Office, it is often inaccurate. In Victorian and Edwardian units, double parlors or formal dining rooms are often used as bedrooms. Changes in bedroom count due to remodels are often not captured as well.

MISMATCH OF PEOPLE AND HOUSING

Only 30% of 3+ bedroom units in San Francisco are occupied by families with children. The remaining 70% of these larger units are occupied by seniors (25%), couples or families without children (25%), single people (3%), and unrelated individuals (13%).

In economic terms, this is a mismatch between people and spaces, supply and demand.¹⁴ As of 2013, 40% of San Francisco families lived in 3+ bedroom units; 33% in two bedroom units; 15% in one bedroom units, and 10% in studios or Single Room Occupancy Hotels (SROs). There is little research or analysis for why this happens in San Francisco. Further work could explore who is part of this 70% living in larger units and why they are living in larger units. They could be empty nesters, about to become seniors, or younger couples, with the possibility of having children in the future. For some it could be that Prop 13 and rent control actually make it less expensive to stay in larger units than to move and downsize. Some may prefer living with roommates to living alone. For others, they simply want more space. There are likely other reasons as well. But it would be informative to have a better understanding of how much is personal choice versus economic necessity, and where policy can better help align our supply of larger units with the needs of families.


One result of lack of affordability and availability of appropriate unit size is overcrowding. Overcrowding, defined by

the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) as greater than 1.01 people per habitable room, is an issue in San Francisco. Severe overcrowding is defined as greater than 1.51 people per habitable room. The neighborhoods that have the most households living in overcrowded conditions are Chinatown, Visitacion Valley, Downtown/Civic Center, and Oceanview. The situation in Chinatown is particularly bad, with 24% of households living in overcrowded conditions. The neighborhoods with the most people living in uncrowded households are Twin Peaks, Diamond Heights/Glen Park, Presidio Heights, and Noe Valley.¹⁵

Families with children are consistently the majority of overcrowded homes in San Francisco. Since 2005, the number of overcrowded households that are families with children has remained steady, making up about 26,000 of the households in the city or 50% of the total households in the City that are overcrowded.

Families living in Single Room Occupancy buildings (SROs) are an extreme example of overcrowding. A recent report by the SRO Families United Collaborative, 2015 SRO Families Report Living in the Margins: An analysis and Census of San Francisco Families Living in SROs, highlights the severe challenges facing families living in SROs. There are an estimated 699 families living in SROs, 457 of which are in Chinatown. These families are crowded into one-room, most of which lack basic necessities like full bathrooms and kitchenettes. These families are our city's working poor and have been on waitlists for housing for sometimes up to ten years.

Household Types by Bedroom, 2013



¹⁴ Data Analysis from American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample maintained by IPUMS USA and the American Community Survey pretabulated data from American Factfinder

¹⁵ http://www.sustainablecommunitiesindex.org/city_indicators/view/49

CHAPTER THREE: CHARACTERISTICS OF QUALITY CHILD-FRIENDLY HOUSING STOCK

CHARACTERISTICS OF CHILD-FRIENDLY HOUSING

Based on our research of other cities (detailed in the Appendix) and data gathered through focus groups, the Planning Department identified a number of characteristics that benefit families with children. The majority of the following characteristics are specific to the needs of families, while some qualities enhance living in multifamily units. The reason for also including these latter characteristics, for example qualities such as daylight and noise, is to consider ways of potentially enhancing our multifamily stock and providing a viable alternative to costly single family homes or moving to the suburbs.

The two key challenges for families are affordability and size. This chapter discusses design characteristics of family friendly housing that loosely fall into three categories: site level characteristics (parking & vehicle storage, childcare, access to schools); building characteristics (outdoor & play spaces, supervision, outlook, noise control); and unit characteristics (daylight and ventilation, space, flexibility).

The challenge of integrating these design characteristics into new housing is how to do it in ways that do not make our housing even more unaffordable for the very families we are trying to house. In all the following sections we should consider the tradeoffs of how design elements or amenities are added or incentivized. The characteristics in this section could also be considered to be part of a menu so that depending on project and site characteristics different features could be included.

SITE-LEVEL CHARACTERISTICS

① Getting Around: Transit, Carsharing, Parking and Bicycle Storage

Many San Francisco families are challenged by coordinating access to workplaces for adult members of the household with school and daycare access for children, to say nothing of frequent errands like grocery shopping or trips to the library. In our fairly dense, urban environment, it is challenging to use individual automobiles that must be parked (even if temporarily) at home, school, work, and for shopping. Parents need multiple options—transit, car share, private automobile, or bikes—for local and longer-distance trips.

Providing off-street parking comes with a high cost: it consumes a lot of space that could be used for other things, such as additional housing units and community amenities, and it requires expensive engineering to construct the open space needed for parking garages. In larger buildings, it also requires more expensive concrete construction. A parking space adds an average of \$38,000 per unit but depending on location can be up to \$100,000 per unit.¹⁶ Off-street parking has social costs too: it inhibits making great and safe family-friendly streets due to the higher frequency of curb cuts and cars crossing the sidewalk. Parking also makes it difficult to provide direct access from low-floor residences to at-grade play areas.

While SF Muni and BART have increased and improved service within San Francisco, it is a challenge to make the many daily trips to work, school, daycare, or activities by public transportation. A survey that is currently being conducted by the Mayor's Office and the Transportation Authority will provide us with additional data to help understand the commute patterns and needs of families with school age children.¹⁷

Bicycling and car sharing are two alternatives to single occupancy vehicles and public transportation that are gaining popularity. They both allow the flexibility of a personal vehicle without the burden of individual ownership. In a city where bike infrastructure is growing rapidly, large cargo bikes have become a feasible and popular way to transport children. Unfortunately, standard bike racks are not large enough for these bikes, and bicycle storage is as critical as vehicle parking in an urban environment.

Another alternative to owning a car in San Francisco is taking advantage of the carshare and rideshare programs and taxis in the City. Car-share programs allow anyone to borrow a car to run errands, go on day-trips, or drop-off/pick-up kids from school. Car sharing programs allow and even encourage households to reduce private vehicle usage and ownership.

¹⁶ <http://sf.curbed.com/2016/6/8/11890176/it-costs-38000-to-create-one-parking-space-in-sf> ¹⁷ https://usfca.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe1/form/SV_a5Jr7WCyPspvuFT

A U.C. Berkeley study showed that 30% of City CarShare members had sold one or more vehicles and two-thirds of members decided not to buy a vehicle due to availability of car sharing.¹⁸ A challenge to the use of car-sharing programs is the frequent need to “chain” trips with several links in a journey. A parent’s morning might include dropping off a child at school, running an errand, and continuing on to their workplace. Current car share models in San Francisco does not accommodate these types of trips, but models in other cities, such as Car 2 Go demonstrate that such a model could potentially add flexibility to families who need these types of trips. Other alternatives include taxis and ridesharing programs. A kid-centered shuttle service was recently developed and is being studied to determine its potential costs and benefits and its wider applicability to potentially reducing drive alone school related trips.

There are three family focused Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures included in the Planning Department’s TDM options for new projects. If included in development, these options give projects points towards reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and decreasing environmental impacts under CEQA. This is one way the City is already incentivizing family friendly transportation options.

1. A new development can either provide on-site secure location for storage of personal car seats, strollers, and cargo bicycles or other large bicycles. Personal car seat storage should be located near off-street car-share parking space(s), or provide one shopping cart for every 10 residential units and one cargo bicycle for every 20 Dwelling Units. All equipment shall be kept clean and well maintained
2. The Development Project shall include an on-site childcare facility to reduce commuting distances between households, places of employment, and childcare. The on-site childcare facility must comply with all state and City requirements, including provisions within the San Francisco Planning Code.
3. For residential Development Projects that meet the dwelling unit mix requirements in Planning Code Section 207.6(c)(2), a property owner shall include all of the following measures:

CSHARE-1: Car-Share Parking and Membership Option D or E; AND

FAMILY-1: Family TDM Amenities, Options A and B.



Photo Credit: Bicycle Coalition



Photo Credit: Bicycle Coalition

Questions:

Could the City set aside more spaces for car sharing services 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?

¹⁸ <http://sf.streetsblog.org/2009/02/02/does-car-sharing-reduce-your-driving/>

2 CHILD CARE

For fulltime working parents with young children, childcare in San Francisco is both expensive and difficult to find. The recent increase in housing prices is increasing the cost and limiting the availability of childcare.¹⁹ Our current Planning approvals process combined with state licensing requirements create several barriers to more childcare.

One challenge is San Francisco's current requirement of a Conditional Use authorization for childcare facilities serving 13 or more children. In addition, California state licensing for dedicated childcare centers include physical requirements of upwards of 100 square feet per child; substantial additional plumbing (toilets, lavatories, drinking fountains, and sinks); specific fire safety measures; and a minimum of 75 square feet per child of outdoor play space for the exclusive use of the childcare center during hours of operation.

Family (in-home) childcare have less onerous spatial requirements and may be desirable in family-friendly developments. These are occasionally incorporated into affordable housing rental developments like 1180 Fourth Street, developed and operated by Mercy Housing. Designing and marketing a unit that meets the needs of an in-home childcare unit could provide much-needed space at a fraction of the cost of a larger facility. Such units should include: combined living/dining rooms with excellent sightlines throughout, including kitchen, bathroom, and diaper changing area; ground-floor or elevator-access location fully accessible, including bathtub for bathing as required; and thoughtful access for children's families who live outside the development while maintaining a secure environment for other residents. Recent legislation initiated by Supervisor Yee and adopted earlier this year (Board File 150793/2-16) allows for new developments to provide this space in-lieu of the childcare impact fee.

Questions:

Should San Francisco make childcare facilities be permitted uses in most zoning districts and eliminate the Conditional Use requirements?

Are there other ways in which to ensure adequate childcare resources?

3 ACCESS TO SCHOOLS

With so few public school bus routes, almost all younger children must be accompanied by an adult to and from school. San Francisco households with children frequently are located at some distance (as measured by miles, but particularly by time) from schools and workplaces.

The San Francisco Safe Routes to School program aims to increase bicycle, pedestrian, and traffic safety around schools; to decrease traffic congestion around schools; to reduce childhood obesity by increasing number of children walking and biking to school; and to improve air quality, community safety and security, and community involvement around school. The program is led by the Department of Public Health in conjunction with the police, school district, MTA, CTA, SF Environment, YMCA, and the bicycle coalition. This year, it will expand to 35 elementary schools, three middle schools, and two high schools.

The Planning Department's Green Connections Plan includes a network of streets designated as walking routes, intended to connect schools, parks, and other facilities via safe, walkable, bikable streets. The Plan was completed in 2014, and the first pilot project is under way.

Questions:

How can the Planning Department and city agencies work more closely with SFUSD to ensure adequate schools within walking distance, especially in areas with an increasing population of children?

Are there opportunities to add space, including rooftop green space, to these existing school facilities, particularly are school campuses are upgraded through the bond process?

¹⁹ <http://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/Growing-day-care-squeeze-as-providers-priced-out-6732281.php>

BUILDING-AND LOT-SCALE CHARACTERISTICS

1 OUTDOOR & PLAY SPACE

The design and programming of efficient and high quality outdoor open space is an opportunity to support families and their children. Nature and outdoor play are basic physiological and mental health needs for people of all ages. Greenery and vegetation should be maximized to give all residents adequate outdoor play and open space. There should be a common space large enough to accommodate adults without children and families with children.

Outdoor space must be built to stand up to wear and tear. Plantings must be sufficient in size and quality to withstand rough and tumble children's play. Outdoor areas should be designed with interesting and safe materials, sunlight access, and plentiful vegetation. While a roof deck could potentially be designed as a playspace, the design of this space is critical and it would need to be shielded from the wind and also allow both sun and shade access so that the space will be well used.

San Francisco allows required residential open space to be included either in common areas of a building or privately (such as decks assigned to a particular residence). For developments with four or more units, the greatest required amount of privately-provided open space is 100 square feet per unit. In many of our taller and denser neighborhoods, the requirement is 60 square feet per unit while some of our densest neighborhoods only require 36 square feet per unit.

Questions:

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?

2 SUPERVISION

Children are safer and parents more comfortable when children's outdoor play areas are visible from adult spaces. In low-density environments with single-family homes and two or three family stacked flats, such supervision is often easily accommodated from the kitchen to the backyard. Higher-density environments like podium apartment buildings and towers make such supervision a challenge in several ways. Upper-floor units are simply too far from the ground or even a podium courtyard to achieve satisfactory parental oversight from within the unit. In addition, few kitchens have windows in recent higher-density construction, so a parent cannot take care of cleaning and such responsibilities while maintaining visual and aural access to play space. Lastly, most higher-density homes are located in double-loaded configurations (on both sides of a central hallway), so half or more of the units do not overlook the shared open space (backyard).

Questions:

Should larger units in larger developments be located on lower floors facing secure common open space?

Is supervision of outdoor play less critical when sufficient private open space is attached to a unit, such as a balcony or terrace?

Could common open space be more distributed throughout the development?

3 ACCESS TO LIGHT AND NATURE

Views of trees and the natural environment improve health and wellbeing by providing visual relief. Many homes in denser parts of the city face streets, yards, and courts that are mostly or entirely paved. It is more difficult to grow trees and plants on top of structures (such as parking/commercial podiums or on roofs) than in natural ground. Where units face one another, a certain amount of separation should be provided to allow each unit to enjoy their shared outlook.

The interagency Better Streets Plan (BSP) and the PUC's Stormwater Management Requirements (SMR) address adding trees and vegetation to our public streets (BSP) and within properties including podium courtyards and rooftops (SMR), primarily within medium- to large-scale new developments.

The Planning Code requires that all dwelling units in all zoning use districts face an open area (Section 140). This requirement must only be met for a single room in each dwelling; other rooms may open into light wells or use "borrowed" light and air through another room. Generally, an open space at least 20 to 25 feet in any dimension meets this requirement (the minimum dimension can increase in taller buildings). The code does not further regulate the character of this space, such as required plantings.

Questions:

Should we have minimum standards for the landscaping of rear yards and courts at whatever level they occur? How do we balance required landscape with child-friendly play areas? What are the cost implications of such requirements?

What are the essential qualities of a good outlook? How are these balanced with affordability needs?

Should we re-examine requirements for outlooks onto inner courtyards different than outer courtyards?

Do these vary depending on proximity of the residence to a large park or body of water?

4 NOISE

The closeness of urban living requires detailed design to maintain privacy and comfort in each unit. Research indicates that satisfaction with high-density living is very dependent on visual and acoustic privacy, and it often a reason families prefer quieter suburban living. Lack of privacy will increase a person's perception of crowding and will discourage many from urban living. Acoustic privacy should be achieved between rooms in a unit, between units, and between buildings in a development. Common walls between units and around shared areas should have a sound class of 55 decibels and should be enforced at the design stage of project review.²⁰ This would create additional privacy and comfort within each unit.

The Building Code regulates airborne Sound Transmission Class (STC) for both partitions (walls) and floor/ceiling assemblies and also structure-borne Impact Insulation Class (IIC) for floor/ceiling assemblies. IIC measures the attenuation of impact noise like footfalls, which are the most frequent noise complaint in multifamily buildings.

Densely-developed urban areas like San Francisco include significant sources of environmental noise from outside a residence, too. These can be joyous sounds of children at a playground, or the noxious noise freeways. Regulations exist that preclude operable windows to achieve ventilation where the environmental noises are too great, providing instead ducted ventilation and high-STC windows.

Questions:

Should family-friendly housing include higher (more demanding) STC or IIC standards?

Are Environmental/CEQA reviews on Noise too strict for playgrounds and spaces for children?

Should incentives be given for family-friendly housing in areas that do not have high levels of environmental noise?

²⁰ <https://www.sfdph.org/dph/files/EHSdocs/ehsNoise/GuidelinesNoiseEnforcement.pdf>

5 FLEXIBLE COMMUNITY SPACE

In dense urban environments where families (and others) may not have the space to host meetings, dinners, birthday parties, or other groups, an indoor flexible space would be a common amenity for families with children. Common indoor space can also create community interactions and support a neighborhood feeling among residents.

In addition, in small urban apartments, there is no space to repair bikes, work on science projects, or build weekend projects. A shared hobby room or utility space with a utility sink and lockers for tool storage would give all residents a dedicated tinkering space. Many current developments include common spaces such as these, though they are not directly marketed to families.

These flexible community spaces should be designed with regard to the anticipated age mix of residents, the ability of management to supervise them, and the availability of similar amenities in accessible, nearby community facilities. Adaptable spaces allow for many different accommodations in response to demographic shifts, instead of targeting one audience.

In stacked multifamily buildings, an amenity room might be on a different floor or even a different building in larger developments, either of which presents challenges to supervising one's child. In such situations, a generous common hallway can serve as an informal common playspace for young children to play. This arrangement will be better for all inhabitants if, as mentioned above, family-sized units are grouped together.

6 BUILDING STORAGE SPACE

Bulk storage for each dwelling unit can help families with large items, such as strollers, wheeled toys, suitcases, sports equipment, and holiday decorations. Preferably all but at least 30 square feet should be located in a separate storage room within the building at or near the entry. Storage space should be easily accessible and in a secure area of the building.

While space is at a premium, the types of storage space mentioned above could easily be tucked away in the ground floor of the building and could be swapped out for other amenities currently provided. Designers should look for opportunities inside of units too--often soffit space above bathrooms and kitchens in higher ceiling apartments, under stairs, etc. Although it would be ideal to have storage space for each floor, there may be cost implications to this design.

Questions

Should we require a specific amount of storage in the building versus in individual units? Is there a preference in storage type?

Should existing parking requirements for cars and bike parking be made more flexible to accommodate storage?

7 CONCENTRATION OF FAMILY UNITS

When there is a mix of households with children and households without children in a building, larger family-friendly households could be grouped together. Grouping of similar households could result in fewer complaints about different activities and noise. This concentration also gives children peers to play with; encourages a sense of community; and supports the provision of adequate outdoor and indoor space and amenities for families with children.

Questions

Should we concentrate larger units adjacent to the courtyards to better achieve both access and lower the cost?

8 ON-SITE LAUNDRY

Onsite laundry is an important amenity for families. It reduces travel time and increases family time. Onsite laundry can also increase interaction between units, particularly if it opens to a shared courtyard or other common-use space. Laundry facilities on each floor are more convenient for families than laundry in a basement or other remote location, but may also increase the cost of housing.

Questions

Does San Francisco want to require on-site in-unit or same-floor laundry facilities, particularly for 2+ bedroom units?

9 GUEST SUITE

A guest suite in a multiunit building would give families a place to host guests or grandparents. Guest suites would be a shared amenity available to any building resident. In San Francisco, one new development, 100 Van Ness, included a guest suite, but it faced challenges with code compliance and opposition from the hotel industry.

Providing guest suites presents enforcement challenges. In a city where Airbnb is popular for visitors, the guest suite may create an undesired effect of others besides family's guests staying there unless strict regulations were enforced by the Rental or Home Owners Association.

Questions

Could guest suites provide a viable option in certain locations or are these types of suites unnecessary given the large market for sites such as Airbnb and other shared housing sites?

UNIT CONSIDERATIONS

1 DAYLIGHT AND VENTILATION

Natural light is incredibly important for people's health, well-being, and enjoyment of a home. Daylight illuminates spaces without excessive artificial light, saving energy and costs. A home and room face many design challenges when considering the orientation, size of windows, depth of rooms, and ceiling height of each space; each affecting the amount of daylight in a space and presenting opportunities for a family to experience rooms differently.

Natural ventilation significantly improves air quality and is a major factor for one's health and wellbeing, and especially for the health of children. Inner portions of homes without cross-ventilation can become stagnant and even moldy. Multiple inlet and outlet areas in a unit allow for better flow of air with cross ventilation through a space. Well-considered light wells that open to the exterior both at the bottom and top can be used to help provide cross-ventilation where it might not otherwise be achievable.

The Planning Code includes exposure requirements for minimum access to daylight and air for each unit, generally a minimum of 25 feet from the face of the window to the nearest parallel wall beyond. These exposure requirements must only be met in a single room within each home, not every room. The Building Code has minimum requirements for natural light and ventilation, but allows them to be met using artificial light and mechanical ventilation, respectively. The Building Code also allows bedrooms and other rooms to use "borrowed light" through an interior opening to a room with a window, rather than requiring windows for each room. Neither code requires windows for kitchens or bathrooms. San Francisco allows bathroom and kitchen ventilation to be provided purely through mechanical means, using ducted vents alone rather than windows.

The San Francisco Health Code requires that homes in areas where outdoor air contains a certain threshold of particles per million provide ventilation using MERV 4(?) filters and not open windows. This filtration requirement reduces access to San Francisco's winds to quickly dissipate odors and provide fresh air through open windows.

Questions:

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 first bedrooms?

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?

UNIT STORAGE SPACE

2

Units should have enough space to accommodate various family uses and storage that allows everyone to live comfortably. The creative design of individual units could include built-in storage and shelving for linens and other household items.

Questions:

Should we require a specific amount of storage in individual storage units versus in the building? Is there a preference in storage type?

3 TWO AND THREE BEDROOM UNITS

Some cities, such as Vancouver, require a minimum size for two bedroom units because the units being produced were not sized for families. Implementation of this requirement in San Francisco would be difficult due to the volume of our projects. In addition, initial indicators in San Francisco do not lead to the same need to set a minimum size. With a few exceptions, the market here has been producing adequately sized two-bedroom units ranging 700-1,100 square feet. However, this size should continue to be monitored to ensure that the few exceptions do not shift market trends. Requiring minimum sized units could rule out smaller two bedrooms that would potentially accommodate lower income families that would prefer smaller units near jobs and schools than larger homes with longer commutes.

Research indicates that crowded environments can negatively affect children's social adjustment. Several findings from studies found a sharp increase in children's misbehaviors when they live in homes with more than 2.3 residents per room.²¹ Family units require a minimum of two bedrooms to provide enough privacy and space for each family member. Given San Francisco's trend towards smaller families, the two bedroom unit is considered adequate for most families, but as discussed above, the need for some three-bedroom units will continue.

Larger units are more expensive, and the three-bedroom units provided in new housing are often located on the top floor and billed as luxury penthouse units. Vancouver is considering requiring that three-bedroom units be located in lower parts of the building. These units could be located off the courtyard and could therefore potentially be more affordable and more family-friendly.

Requirements for affordable family housing from funding streams such as the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (CTCAC) are an interesting model for considering what families need. CTCAC requires "large family housing" applications to include at least 25% three-bedroom units or larger, and at least an additional 25% two bedrooms and larger. Four-bedroom and larger units must have at minimum two full bathrooms. These requirements also stipulate developments of 20 units or more to include outdoor play/recreational facilities suitable and available to all tenants, for children of all ages, and to provide interior common spaces scaled to the size of the development. For example, 31 to 60 units must provide at least 1,000 square feet of total common space while 61 to 100 units must provide at least 1,400 square feet. In addition, on-site laundry facilities (or individual laundries) must be provided, and all units must include a dishwasher.

21 <http://www.courtyardhousing.org/downloads/ChildFriendlyHousing.pdf>

Large open space requirements could raise costs for a development and drive up the price of the housing. It's important to remember that CTCAC is trying to make sure publicly subsidized affordable housing meets some minimum standards that will work throughout the state. San Francisco is the densest city in the state with some of the most extreme housing market pressures and should likely deviate when considering what standards would work best for its context.

Questions:

Could design recommendations be included at Preliminary Project Assessment level for two and three bedroom unit design?

Should we incentivize the creation of family housing that meets some of the standards such as the CTCAC requirements? Does this model provide ideas to consider in San Francisco?

Is there a need to require a minimum size for two-bedroom units?

4 FLEXIBILITY

Families' space needs vary over time. Very young children can share bedrooms, but as they get older, children of different genders typically want separate bedrooms. Extended family members may join the household, perhaps to care for children or to be cared for themselves. Families may also wish to host overnight guests at their home, especially in the fifth most-expensive hotel market in the US.²² Families benefit from flexible spaces that can be used as a guest room, study, or den.

One strategy to address affordability that is being pursued in various urban living situations is having an independently-accessed living suite that can be locked-off from the remainder of the home. Much like a connecting hotel room, this might mean a room in an apartment building that has an independent door to the hallway, but also can open to the adjacent home. Equipped with a full bathroom and a kitchenette, such a space might first be used as a separate rental studio apartment, later serve as a child's bedroom, and after the children have left home, provide a place for an ailing family elder to live in close proximity to family who can care for them. (In low-density neighborhoods, the approach can be a freestanding secondary structure, variously called a rear cottage, granny flat, or accessory dwelling unit.) Alternatively, one or more of these small, flexible-use spaces could be provided as part of a larger development.

Questions:

Should San Francisco follow Vancouver's lead and incentivize or require indoor common spaces?

What are other important adaptable spaces?

Should family-friendly units be located together to allow parents and guardians to share child supervision more easily?

Should we pursue allowing some type of lock-off suite?

²² <http://www.hotel-price-index.com/2014/fall/us/chapter-2/>

CHAPTER FOUR: IMPROVING EXISTING HOUSING FOR FAMILIES

Modifications to existing housing stock could improve housing options for families. For example, simplifying the approval and permitting process for adding bedrooms would give families flexibility to grow where they are already settled. Tapping into two large reserves -- underutilized ground floors and underbuilt lots -- to add units to existing buildings would increase housing options without changing the fabric of the city's neighborhoods.

SIMPLIFY MINOR EXPANSIONS

The flexibility to add bedrooms to existing housing stock would give families additional space as they grow and shrink over time. Changes to existing processes could allow minor modifications and expansions of buildings into rear yards. In addition, streamlining the Planning and DBI approvals processes, especially regarding minor modifications, could reduce costs and allow greater flexibility for expansions while still maintaining open space and rear yards.

In 2014, the Mayor's Housing Task Force Working Group recommended exploring the feasibility and benefits of removing neighborhood notification requirements for certain minor permit scopes. These and other potential changes that reexamine code requirements would allow families to expand or alter their homes without an extensive process. Relieving an applicant of added time and process could result in more flexible and less expensive family units.


The Planning Code has maintained strict regulations on converting ground floor space in residential buildings to habitable rooms (bedroom, living room, bathroom, etc.). Known as Rooms Down controls, these regulations aim to prevent illegal units in buildings that are already at or beyond allowable density. Combinations of bathrooms, laundry facilities, and wet bars are controlled to prevent the possibility of sectioning off the lower floor as a separate dwelling unit.

However, new legislation to allow accessory dwelling units (ADUs) in buildings throughout San Francisco is now in conflict with these strict Rooms Down controls. In the light of these new ADU programs (discussed further below), the Rooms Down controls may be unnecessary in their current form. Further relaxing these controls would ease the process for owners who want to add new bedrooms as their families grow.

PROVIDE OPTIONS FOR DOWNSIZING

To attract and keep families in San Francisco, allow them to grow, and to accommodate multi-generational households, the city will need more two or three bedroom units. While the City can require the building of multi-bedroom units in new development, it cannot monitor who lives in these units.

As only 30% of existing three or more bedroom units are occupied by families with children,²³ further analysis should look closer at the existing housing stock and the myriad reasons we do not see the availability of this larger housing stock for our larger households. While many people want to continue to live in larger homes, some might want to move out or downsize, but simply do not have options. Proposition 13 and rent control create barriers to moving. And for homeowners who purchased their homes decades ago and wish to sell, much of their gain may be lost to capital gains taxes upon sale. Therefore they will not be able to access the cash tied up in their home unless they move to a less costly city. Exploring options for greater flexibility here will assist both existing homeowners and larger households, especially families with children. Policy and programmatic solutions to explore may include additional ways to support programs such as the recently initiated Home Match²⁴ and options for no or low interest loans to add accessory dwelling units or junior accessory units in single-family homes.



²³ Data Analysis from American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample maintained by IPUMS USA and the American Community Survey pretabulated data from American Factfinder

²⁴ <http://hoodline.com/2016/08/sf-home-match-program-aims-to-pair-low-income-renters-homeowners-with-extra-rooms>

CREATE MORE HOMES WITHIN EXISTING HOUSING STOCK

Existing San Francisco residential buildings have two largely untapped reserves: underutilized ground floors and underbuilt lots. Tens of thousands of houses and apartment buildings have ground floors that are given over to parking and storage. Such existing spaces can often be converted to housing that is friendly to families because it is on the ground floor (easy to get children and strollers in and out) and it can be open to rear yards for play. Properties that can provide horizontal and/or vertical additions and still respect neighboring development patterns may be considered “underbuilt” lots. Two policy areas are related to achieving a greater number of family-friendly homes within existing housing stock.

1. Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)

Underused spaces in existing residential buildings can be converted to new units. However, most residential properties in the city have been controlled by density limits that restrict the number of units per parcel. If those buildings already have the allowed number of units, or exceed it in the case of buildings constructed prior to current zoning, unused spaces could not be legally converted to a new unit. Also known as secondary units, ADUs are encouraged by State law.

Since 2014, the City has embarked on multiple efforts to allow accessory dwelling units to be added beyond the density limits. ADUs were initially only allowed in the Castro (Ordinance 30-15) and effective September 3, 2016 the City will allow ADUs citywide.²⁵ This is a major turning point from when the Planning Code imposed restrictions on creating new units in buildings through Rooms Down expansions.


The current construction costs of adding an ADU could break even with the rental market in about 4 to 5 years. The additional revenue would support the household financially with an increase in their disposable income.

ADUs offer many benefits to families with children. Families living together in one building, but independent units, could provide much needed support to each other. A young family with newborn children could significantly cut on childcare costs by having grandparents living in an ADU in the same building. Similarly, households can provide care to their elderly parents or disabled family members if they lived in an ADU only a flight of stairs away. A senior household can move into an ADU on their ground floor for easier accessibility (no stairs), and smaller

space. They can then rely financially on renting the larger original unit, potentially to a family with children, while still staying in the same building and the same community.

2. Junior Accessory Dwellings Units

The recent ADU program in the City only allows use of underused space in a building, and does not allow using space from an existing unit to be converted to a new unit. Another potential solution would be the development of junior ADUs. The junior ADUs are units created from turning an existing bedroom and some living space into a new unit. These would be a much less costly alternative to create an ADU from parking or storage space. By adding a wall and a small countertop kitchen, the junior ADU could provide additional revenue and all the lifestyle flexibility of an ADU mentioned above. Junior ADUs would then be easily removed to return the main unit into its original state.



²⁵ The legislation allows the unlimited construction of ADUs within buildings that are five units or more and will cap new units at no more than one unit in buildings that are four units or less. Each new unit constructed would be allowed to be built, or expanded, within a building's existing envelope. All ADUs would be rent-controlled rental properties, except for ADUs built in existing condominium buildings with no prior eviction history, which would also provide for new homeownership opportunities.


MODEL FOR A NEW OLD HOUSING TYPE, THE "MISSING MIDDLE"

San Francisco has a wide range of house types, including two- and three-family stacked flats, courtyard apartments, two- and three-story small apartment buildings, and larger buildings. The majority of these structures occupy one, or possibly two standard lots. Even our newer and low-rise neighborhoods like the Outer Sunset include rear-yard cottages and two story buildings (for example, between 46th and 47th Avenues, Judah and Kirkham Streets) and three-story buildings providing up to a dozen or more apartments (39th Avenue at Irving).

These building types are great for families. They are compact and include yards and kid-friendly communal space, as well as fairly easy pedestrian access to amenities. Outdoor play areas, in courtyards, front or back yards, are easily visible from living spaces. But in recent years, we are seeing very little of this housing type being built, and what little is built has a price tag out of reach for many families.

This housing type is coined the Missing Middle. Mid-size buildings are much less expensive than single family homes and fit in with the scale of our urban neighborhoods. They are likely to receive greater acceptance from neighbors than podium-style buildings. This building type represents not the skyscrapers we see in SoMa, but a range of buildings, like the three-story, six unit buildings in the Mission, the four-story courtyard apartments in the Sunset, or the three to five story apartments bordering Golden Gate Park.

Until current residential zoning codes were adopted, this diversity housing type was common in our city. But in the mid 1970s, new zoning limited these multifamily homes in favor of suburban style single family homes. The map on the next page illustrates how many older multi-unit buildings exist today in our single family (RH-1) and duplex (RH-2) zoning areas, demonstrating just how many properties exceed current zoning requirements. That is, current zoning would not allow these buildings to be built today, even though they are central to the character of our neighborhoods. Zoning for development of the Missing Middle would be a return to an older pattern of residential urban development.



MISSING MIDDLE EXAMPLES

Existing Missing Middle building types that provide easy, ground-level access while remaining compatible with neighborhood scale and character.

1. Two- and Three-Family Flats, Church Street. Photo from Google Earth.
2. Three-Story Apartments, Irving & 39th. Photo from Google Earth.
3. Outer Sunset Rear Yard Buildings. Photo from Google Earth.
4. Courtyard Apartments: Las Casitas, Bay Street. Photo by OpenHomesPhotography.com
5. Four-Story Apartments, Irving & 2nd. Photo from Google Earth.
6. Missing Middle Diagram, Opticos Design.



2


If the City were to incentivize this building type in outer neighborhoods like Bayview, Excelsior, Portola, the Richmond and the Sunset, these family friendly buildings would blend with the existing single family homes. Increased density can create the foot traffic to support local commercial corridors. But current density limits and neighborhood opposition deter developers from building much of anything in these areas of the city. For example, between 2001 and 2013, the Sunset added a meager 41 buildings with more than three units -- that's not quite three buildings a year.

Two-and three-story older housing stock of San Francisco blends well (even though it can be a jump in scale or character) while providing housing that is sized and priced more affordably for families. Most San Francisco neighborhoods already have this successful mix of scales. Reintroducing these scales would bring new architectural styles into older neighborhoods and the Planning Department's Residential Design Guidelines would help guide the introduction of new construction into existing residential areas.

Unlike many recent apartment and condo buildings, most or all units in older buildings have individual front doors at the sidewalk and many buildings have rear yards for play and family activities. When combined, it makes neighborhoods of variety and character that are harmonious in scale.



4



Mixed-Middle-Housing.com is presented by Andres Broun. Illustration © 2015 Andres Broun, Inc.



6

BARRIERS TO CREATING MORE OF THE "MISSING MIDDLE"

Data of San Francisco's existing housing stock shows that approximately 20% of units are within single, detached homes. The attached single family home, or rowhouse, comprises 13% of the stock; 10% of our units are in two unit apartment buildings; and 12% are in three to four unit buildings (see chart below).²⁶ While this style of attached multi-unit housing was prevalent throughout the history of the City, this style of housing is no longer being built. Between 2011 and 2015 88% of the new housing being built is in buildings with 20 or more units.²⁶

One reason that the Missing Middle is no longer being built is because of our zoning restrictions. Current zoning restricts 72% of our privately owned parcels to single-family homes and duplexes, putting the burden of population growth, for both jobs and housing, on the remaining 28%. In the adjacent zoning map, all of the yellow is currently zoned only for single family homes and duplexes (RH-1 and RH-2).

Larger lots are frequently found in the eastern part of San Francisco where podium-style and even tower housing can be built, but the City has a limited number of lots large enough to host this scale of building. Small-lot, three to five story, family-friendly housing would be entirely in keeping with our western neighborhoods, where relatively few households occupy comparatively large swaths of our city's land.

The "Missing Middle" is housing that could be more more affordable for families and fit in well with our historic tradition of different types of housing throughout our neighborhoods. These housing types could provide the much-needed family housing that is no longer being built.


The zoning for the majority of San Francisco, like in other many cities, regulates density (the number of units permitted on a parcel, independent of height, bulk, and mass). On a lot that is zoned for single-family housing, only a single-family home can be built. The mixed housing in neighborhoods like Bernal Heights, the Haight, or parts of the Sunset and Richmond, is there because it was built before current zoning regulations were put into place. These neighborhoods could not be built under today's regulations. Today's zoning regulations in western and southern San Francisco zone solely based on the number of units. In a single-family home neighborhood you can have one very large home under current zoning laws, but not two or three appropriately sized units.

One tool to change this restriction is to allow neighborhoods to be zoned by the form that the building takes, also known as form-based zoning. This tool allows the City to regulate based on the appearance, the height, the bulk, etc. and not simply based on the number of units. Regulations can still ensure that lot size is considered and that there are a maximum number of total units and/or a minimum number of larger two and three bedroom units to ensure that this type of housing remains family-friendly housing. In a recent feasibility analysis conducted for the Planning Department, limited increase in density allowed made certain projects feasible, thus increasing the number of units that could be built for families throughout our neighborhoods.²⁸

Density controls are laws that limit the number of housing units allowed on a parcel. One way is to limit the number of units regardless of parcel size, the other is to limit the number of units in ratio to the lot size. One alternative to density controls is what is often referred to as form-based code, which controls the height and bulk of a building, but not the number of units in the building.

²⁶ 5-year American Community Survey, 2010-2014 ²⁷ http://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/2015_Housing_Inventory_Final_Web.pdf ²⁸ http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/plans-and-programs/planning-for-the-city/ahbp/ahbp_seifel_AffordableHousingBonusProgram_FinalDraft.pdf

Buildings that couldn't be built under existing zoning
Parcels that exceed density in RH-1 and RH-2



NEXT STEPS

This briefing outlines the need for housing for families with children across the economic spectrum and provides a number of considerations for modifying or expanding existing housing stock, as well as family-friendly design considerations for new housing. A new model for mid-scale family oriented housing, “the missing middle,” offers a new approach to family housing.

This briefing is the first step in opening up a conversation between agencies, policymakers, and communities about possible solutions to the dearth of family friendly housing in San Francisco. The next step is to dig deeper into a handful of specific topics and explore the challenges and possible solutions, with particular attention to maintaining economic diversity and supporting those most impacted by our current housing crisis.

- ① **Explore additional tools to make existing housing more family friendly.** Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) and Junior ADUs give families the flexibility to adapt their housing to their needs over time—from having young children to caring for aging parents. Other creative policies may help make existing housing more family friendly. In addition, process changes can make adding a bedroom or additional living space less costly and time consuming and provide options for families to stay in their homes.
- ② **Consider adopting a definition of family-friendly unit and family-friendly building into the General Plan.** A clear definition of what the family friendly unit and building should contain could encourage and create policy and programs for family friendly housing. The definition of a family friendly unit should include at least two or more bedrooms. The building definition could include any number of amenities, like easy access to outdoor space, storage space, etc. The inclusion of many amenities would necessitate a trade-off with affordability and would require further study.
- ③ **Look for solutions to overcrowded living conditions.** Too many families with children live in overcrowded Single Room Occupancy hotels and studios. The City should continue to work with affordable housing developers and community groups, such as the SRO Collaborative, to determine what policies and programs could support these families in moving into appropriate housing and what resources we could provide these families until they are able to relocate.
- ④ **Learn more about residents in existing larger units.** Only 30% of 3+ bedroom units are occupied by families. Research into why 70% of these larger units are occupied by others could help identify policies that could make this existing housing stock more available to families and better meet the needs of the rest of San Francisco’s residents.
- ⑤ **Talk with stakeholders about design questions.** This paper asks a number of questions about the design of new market rate housing and how to create new models for affordable family housing, spanning all housing types: small scale, mid-rise, and high rise. Through stakeholder outreach, discussions, and forums, the City can determine which design characteristics need further research and discussion, which might be able to move forward easily, and which might not be viable. This will help identify which tools are appropriate in accomplishing family friendly design characteristics.
- ⑥ **Consider supports for building for the Missing Middle, a mid-scale family oriented building typology.** In our current building boom, we are seeing very little housing that is right-sized and affordable for middle income families. There is ample land capacity, without removing existing housing, to build small-scale multi-unit buildings in family-friendly neighborhoods. There is a lot to consider about the Missing Middle, including what it could look like, how it can be integrated into our neighborhoods, and how to encourage its construction.



APPENDIX: WHAT OTHER CITIES ARE DOING

The challenge of retaining or attracting families to urban areas is not unique to San Francisco. Other cities have explored family-friendly design and developed tools including guidelines, requirements, and examples to encourage housing for families. Vancouver, Emeryville, Portland, and Seattle have had similar struggles and developed strategies applicable to San Francisco. For example, Seattle and Portland are actively seeking to boost the stock of affordable family units through guidelines and design competitions to create family housing. This chapter summarizes our research into how other cities have developed design guidelines to encourage new construction that values families.

	TOOL	FOCUS
VANCOUVER, CAN	High-Density Housing for Families with Children Guidelines, 1992	Guest suites, indoor and outdoor open space; 25% family-units; considering increase to 35% with 10% of units 3+ bdrms
PORTLAND, OR	Courtyard Housing Competition, 2007	Block-level interior courtyards and open space
SEATTLE, WA	Family-Sized Housing: Whitepaper & Action Agenda, 2014	Adopted a definition of family-friendly
EMERYVILLE, CA	Family Friendly section in Residential Design Guidelines, 2012	Attract families into larger units instead of unrelated adults; 15% 3 bdrms, 35% 2 bdrms, maximum 10% studios in all 10+ unit developments

VANCOUVER, BRITISH COLUMBIA

Vancouver is considered a leader in attracting families to their downtown. Around one-third of the households in Vancouver have children and this population has stayed consistent even while the prices of their homes continue to soar.²⁹ This work began in 1992, when the city created High-Density Housing for Families with Children Guidelines, which required two or more bedroom units, project-level amenities including indoor common space, laundry on-site, guest suites, and improved outdoor open space, to name just a few.

Vancouver requires a minimum of 25% family units in new developments, which they define as two or more bedrooms. Recent efforts in Vancouver have focused on the production of larger units with three bedroom or more because the market is producing very few of these units (only 5% new units built in 2012-2013 were three or more bedrooms).

At the same time, their single-family housing prices have increased tremendously. Recent data indicates that the median housing price for a detached home went up 30% in the last year. Based on a recently completed a feasibility study, Vancouver is recommending that the requirement for two bedroom units increase from 25% to 35% and that there be a minimum of 10% three or more bedrooms. This recommendation may also include siting these units to encourage their affordability, such as allowing the third bedroom to use borrowed light (a room with indirect access to a window or light well) or requiring units to be located on lower levels of the building. (The San Francisco Building Code already allows borrowed light for all bedrooms.) Vancouver is also revisiting their design guidelines and are seeing positive results from requirements for unit size, guest suites, and indoor/outdoor common space.

29 http://www.huffingtonpost.ca/2016/05/13/vancouver-real-estate_n_9951196.html 30 <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/vancouver-real-estate-house-prices-1.3564528>

EMERYVILLE, CALIFORNIA

For the past two decades, Emeryville has undertaken a transformation from an industrial town to an urban town with a mix of residential, commerce, and office. Emeryville has focused on attracting families during their significant growth in recent years. It was one of the first cities in the country to require developments to include three bedroom units (15% must be three bedrooms). But the city has found that occupancy of those units is primarily by unrelated individuals and so to encourage more family-friendly units rather than roommate situations, they prohibited bathrooms from being en suite to bedrooms. The impact of this requirement is unclear and future monitoring will determine if the outcome is as intended.

Emeryville has Family Friendly guidelines within their Residential Design Guidelines, including additional safety measures, pedestrian circulation, and entrance location. The Guidelines detail the access and relationship of living areas, bathrooms, bedrooms, and kitchens to each other. Where design guidelines apply to the unit, design review with developers has been difficult for Emeryville planning staff.³¹ Emeryville requires that 50% of all units in developments with ten or more units have a minimum of two or more bedrooms and a maximum of 10% studios. As the program is in its early stages, they will continue learning about its impacts through further data collection on the households that are occupying these units. There may be lessons for San Francisco in Emeryville's challenges with design review and applying guidelines at a unit level. It will be interesting to see how the requirement for 2+ bedrooms impacts the number of families.

31 Discussion with Miroo Desai, Senior Planner Emeryville

PORTLAND, OREGON

Another leader in attracting families to urban areas is Portland, Oregon. Portland's population of children under 18 is 25%, far exceeding San Francisco's 18%.

Two different issues are arising in Portland between Inner and Outer City neighborhoods. Most development in Inner Portland neighborhoods is not geared toward families. These units are small, expensive, and have fewer bedrooms per unit. Outer Portland neighborhoods have overcrowded schools and multifamily developments lack adequate yards and open spaces, leaving kids to play in parking lots. Most of Portland's housing stock is single family homes with yards, so part of Portland's program goal was to help families reimagine what family-friendly is--that it can be a multi-family unit large enough for families with children. Portland focused on creating more open space and courtyards to encourage higher-density housing better suited to meet the needs of families, many of whom live in higher density housing that often includes little usable outdoor space.

Portland planning staff worked with design professionals and other cities working on family-friendly efforts to develop Principles of Child Friendly Housing. These principles include: versatile courtyards, functional homes, sustainable solutions, interior/exterior relationships, affordable designs, and contextual responses. In 2007, the Portland Courtyard Housing Competition³² challenged designers to improve the design of multi-dwelling and rowhouse development. Portland created a best practices catalogue with competition winners, which is used to encourage dialogue between the community and developers, and to inspire new development with the winning designs.³³

Since the catalogue was created, several new developments have incorporated some of these features. As well, the City is re-evaluating its outdoor requirements and how the urban design guidelines can integrate site design. While the competition concentrated on one aspect of housing, courtyard open space, it covered one of the main concerns the city was hearing from families in multi-unit buildings: that there was not enough open space provided. This type of catalogue could be useful in San Francisco to assist in a productive discussion about design and development amenities between City staff, community, architects, and project sponsors.

32 <http://www.courtyardhousing.org/> 33 Conversation with Bill Cunningham, Planner for the City of Portland Bureau of Planning

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

Seattle is seeing an influx of a younger generation. Their 2011 Housing Seattle Report³⁴

revealed gaps and disparities in how well the current housing market serves low and middle income families. In June 2014, the city published “Family Sized Housing: An essential ingredient to attract and retain families with Children in Seattle,” which includes incentives, requirements, and partnerships with family-friendly focused organizations in the city. Seattle is in the early stages of these efforts, but the action agenda presents a variety of possibilities that San Francisco can consider for examples where family-friendly housing issues fit in amongst different agencies. The whitepaper set forth the following benefits of supporting families in cities and urban neighborhoods: reduced costs for households (primarily transportation costs), public health benefits (being able to walk, bike, and take transit), more family time (shorter commutes for parents), greater economic competitiveness (availability of a greater pool of talent), reduced environmental footprint, furthering the City’s Race and Social Justice Initiative, and a city that is good for children is good for all.

As in San Francisco, new market rate apartments are not built for families with children. Only 2% of the market-rate apartment units in 2009 have three or more bedrooms, and half of that fraction is affordable to low-income families. In addition, rents have increased substantially since 2009. To increase the number of affordable family-sized units, Seattle is considering a variety of tools and resources across both low and high density neighborhoods. The following actions are laid out in the City’s white paper.

1. Allow added flexibility in single-family zoned areas with frequent, reliable transit, and in other selected areas.
2. Foster a larger supply of family-friendly low-rise and midrise multifamily housing.
3. Ensure bonus development provisions and incentive zoning programs work to encourage family-sized units.
4. Advance the creation of residential cores with ground-related housing.
5. Ensure the Multifamily Tax Exemption (MFTE) Program encourages the production of 2+ bedroom units.
6. Encourage the creation of more family-friendly housing through innovative design and construction.

7. In affordable housing programs, include a strong priority for families with children.
8. Strengthen partnerships to align School District planning and capital investments.
9. Institute a family-oriented lens in updating Seattle’s Comprehensive Plan.
10. Devote resources needed to further inform this Action Plan and steward its success.

These specific actions provide a clear direction for Seattle’s work and introduce valuable partnerships citywide to make the city a more family friendly place. San Francisco can evaluate this action plan for potential next steps that relate to our city, neighborhoods, and schools.

³⁴ <http://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/SeattlePlanningCommission/HousingSeattleReport/HousingSeattleweb.pdf>

MELBOURNE, AUSTRALIA

Apartment living in Melbourne is becoming more popular than ever before; more than one third of all dwelling starts in 2014 were apartments. To respond to this influx of urban living, Melbourne created the Better Apartments project to focus on the internal amenities and policy objectives to allow a more diverse range of households. Higher Density Housing Guidelines already exist in Melbourne, but they were not detailed enough to require architects and developers to comply. The first step in their Better Apartments project was creating a discussion paper to encourage a housing type mix and an approach for multi-family buildings.

To begin, the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning identified 14 issues that spanned different scales of an apartment, from unit to building to site, such as daylight, noise, and landscaping. The community ranked these issues on importance for families. They surveyed focused strictly on apartment living quality, so Melbourne was able to identify specific priorities for internal design. Of course, contextual factors also impact a resident's choice to live somewhere, and the community survey did report that the majority of the respondents selected close proximity to all amenities, cheaper transport costs and low maintenance as leading benefits to living in apartments.

The discussion paper addressed each ranked issue, potential impact, and relevant factors. The relevant factors broke out the main issue i.e, daylight, into further design strategies. Then, the paper posed questions back to the community on whether particular design strategies would enhance apartment living. Extensive engagement included an online survey of people living in apartments, and public survey submissions to create a spread of responses that the city is using to begin a discussion with a design consultant and internal reference group to begin drafting design guidelines. Melbourne will continue their public engagement process to prepare a draft of design guidelines and mechanisms, and work towards implementation and monitoring of the satisfaction of those living in apartments. In concert with the discussion paper and design guidelines, Melbourne will do a cost-benefit analysis with the Better Apartments project to understand the guidelines' impact on affordability and overall community benefit.

Melbourne's focus on changing the mindset of what it means to live in an apartment goes back to the basic human needs when looking for a quality place to live. By focusing their efforts and engaging the community that will be, or already is, living in apartments, Melbourne creates a model that is transferable to many cities. We know that families consider many factors when choosing a place to live, but the basis of a quality home is an important place to start.

Project Sponsor Submittal

Case Number 2017-013406CUA
Conditional Use Authorization
Dwelling Unit Merger
1177 California Street

APPLICATION FOR Conditional Use Authorization

1. Owner/Applicant Information

PROPERTY OWNER'S NAME: Stanley Landfair	
PROPERTY OWNER'S ADDRESS: 1177 California Street, #1014 and #1015 San Francisco, CA 94108	TELEPHONE: (415) 267-4170
	EMAIL: stan.landfair@dentons.com

APPLICANT'S NAME: <div style="text-align: right;">Same as Above <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></div>	
APPLICANT'S ADDRESS: 	TELEPHONE: ()
	EMAIL:

CONTACT FOR PROJECT INFORMATION: Dera-Jill Pozner <div style="text-align: right;">Same as Above <input type="checkbox"/></div>	
ADDRESS: Pozner Architecture and Design 1634 Hayes Street San Francisco, CA 94117	TELEPHONE: (415) 871-5355
	EMAIL: derajill@gmail.com

COMMUNITY LIAISON FOR PROJECT (PLEASE REPORT CHANGES TO THE ZONING ADMINISTRATOR): Stanley Landfair <div style="text-align: right;">Same as Above <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></div>	
ADDRESS: 	TELEPHONE: ()
	EMAIL:

2. Location and Classification

STREET ADDRESS OF PROJECT: 1177 California Street, #1014 and #1015	ZIP CODE: 94108
CROSS STREETS: Jones and Taylor	

	ASSESSORS BLOCK/LOT:	LOT DIMENSIONS:	LOT AREA (SQ FT):	ZONING DISTRICT:	HEIGHT/BULK DISTRICT:
Unit 1014	0253A / 096	n/a	1399	RM-4	65-A
Unit 1015	0253A 097	n/a	795	RM-4	65-A

3. Project Description

(Please check all that apply)		PRESENT OR PREVIOUS USE:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Change of Use	<input type="checkbox"/> Rear	Dwelling unit	
<input type="checkbox"/> Change of Hours	<input type="checkbox"/> Front	PROPOSED USE:	
<input type="checkbox"/> New Construction	<input type="checkbox"/> Height	Dwelling unit	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alterations	<input type="checkbox"/> Side Yard	BUILDING APPLICATION PERMIT NO.:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Demolition	Unit merger	2017 10171460S	DATE FILED:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Please clarify:			10.17.17

4. Project Summary Table

If you are not sure of the eventual size of the project, provide the maximum estimates.

	EXISTING USES	EXISTING USES TO BE RETAINED	NET NEW CONSTRUCTION AND OR ADDITION	PROJECT TOTALS:
PROJECT FEATURES				
Dwelling Units	2	1	0	1
Hotel Rooms	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Parking Spaces	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Loading Spaces	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Number of Buildings	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Height of Building(s)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Number of Stories	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Bicycle Spaces	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
GROSS SQUARE FOOTAGE (GSF)				
Residential	2194	2194	0	2194
Retail	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Office	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Industrial/PDR <small>Production, Distribution, & Repair</small>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Parking	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other (Specify Use)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
TOTAL GSF	2194	2194	0	2194

Please describe any additional project features that are not included in this table:
(Attach a separate sheet if more space is needed)

Please see attached.

5. Action(s) Requested (Include Planning Code Section which authorizes action)

Approval of a conditional use authorization application to merge 2 units,
pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 317.

Conditional Use Findings

Pursuant to Planning Code Section 303(c), before approving a conditional use authorization, the Planning Commission needs to find that the facts presented are such to establish the findings stated below. In the space below and on separate paper, if necessary, please present facts sufficient to establish each finding.

1. That the proposed use or feature, at the size and intensity contemplated and at the proposed location, will provide a development that is necessary or desirable for, and compatible with, the neighborhood or the community; and
2. That such use or feature as proposed will not be detrimental to the health, safety, convenience or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity, or injurious to property, improvements or potential development in the vicinity, with respect to aspects including but not limited to the following:
 - (a) The nature of the proposed site, including its size and shape, and the proposed size, shape and arrangement of structures;
 - (b) The accessibility and traffic patterns for persons and vehicles, the type and volume of such traffic, and the adequacy of proposed off-street parking and loading;
 - (c) The safeguards afforded to prevent noxious or offensive emissions such as noise, glare, dust and odor;
 - (d) Treatment given, as appropriate, to such aspects as landscaping, screening, open spaces, parking and loading areas, service areas, lighting and signs; and
3. That such use or feature as proposed will comply with the applicable provisions of this Code and will not adversely affect the Master Plan.

Please see attached.

Priority General Plan Policies Findings

Proposition M was adopted by the voters on November 4, 1986. It requires that the City shall find that proposed projects and demolitions are consistent with eight priority policies set forth in Section 101.1 of the City Planning Code. These eight policies are listed below. Please state how the project is consistent or inconsistent with each policy. Each statement should refer to specific circumstances or conditions applicable to the property. Each policy must have a response. IF A GIVEN POLICY DOES NOT APPLY TO YOUR PROJECT, EXPLAIN WHY IT DOES NOT.

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;

Please see attached.

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

Please see attached.

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

Please see attached.

4. That commuter traffic not impede Muni transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

Please see attached.

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

Please see attached.

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

Please see attached.

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved; and

Please see attached.

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

Please see attached.

Estimated Construction Costs

TYPE OF APPLICATION:

Conditional Use Authorization

OCCUPANCY CLASSIFICATION:

R-2

BUILDING TYPE:

Type 1 Fire Resistive

TOTAL GROSS SQUARE FEET OF CONSTRUCTION:

10sf

BY PROPOSED USES:

**One wall to be demolished and resultant
exposed floor, walls and ceiling to be patched.**

ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COST:

\$8000

ESTIMATE PREPARED BY:

Pozner Architecture and Design

FEE ESTABLISHED:

\$1982

Applicant's Affidavit

Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:

- a: The undersigned is the owner or authorized agent of the owner of this property.
- b: The information presented is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.
- c: The other information or applications may be required.

Signature:



Date:

10/15/2017

Print name, and indicate whether owner, or authorized agent:

Stan Landfair

☒ Owner / ☐ Authorized Agent (circle one)

APPLICATION FOR

Dwelling Unit Removal Merger, Conversion, or Demolition

1. Owner/Applicant Information

PROPERTY OWNER'S NAME: Stanley Landfair	
PROPERTY OWNER'S ADDRESS: 1177 California Street, #1014 and #1015 San Francisco, CA 94108	TELEPHONE: (415) 267-4170 EMAIL: stan.landfair@dentons.com

APPLICANT'S NAME: <div style="text-align: right;">Same as Above <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></div>	
APPLICANT'S ADDRESS: 	TELEPHONE: () EMAIL:

CONTACT FOR PROJECT INFORMATION: Dera-Jill Pozner	
<div style="text-align: right;">Same as Above <input type="checkbox"/></div>	
ADDRESS: Pozner Architecture and Design 1634 Hayes Street San Francisco, CA 94117	TELEPHONE: (415) 871-5355 EMAIL: derajill@gmail.com

COMMUNITY LIAISON FOR PROJECT (PLEASE REPORT CHANGES TO THE ZONING ADMINISTRATOR): Stanley Landfair	
<div style="text-align: right;">Same as Above <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></div>	
ADDRESS: 	TELEPHONE: () EMAIL:

2. Location and Classification

STREET ADDRESS OF PROJECT: 1177 California Street #1014 and #1015	ZIP CODE: 94108
CROSS STREETS: Jones and Taylor	

	ASSESSORS BLOCK/LOT:	LOT DIMENSIONS:	LOT AREA (SQ FT):	ZONING DISTRICT:	HEIGHT/BULK DISTRICT:
Unit 1014	0253A / 096	n/a	1399	RM-4	65-A
Unit 1015	0253A 097	n/a	795	RM-4	65-A

3. Project Type and History

(Please check all that apply) <input type="checkbox"/> New Construction <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alterations <input type="checkbox"/> Demolition <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Please clarify: <u>Unit merger</u>	ADDITIONS TO BUILDING: <input type="checkbox"/> Rear <input type="checkbox"/> Front <input type="checkbox"/> Height <input type="checkbox"/> Side Yard	BUILDING PERMIT NUMBER(S): 2017 10171460S	DATE FILED: 10.17.17			
		DATE OF PROPERTY PURCHASE: (MM/DD/YYYY) #1014: 08/04/2004 and #1015: 08/30/2006				
		ELLIS ACT Was the building subject to the Ellis Act within the last decade?			YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

4. Project Summary Table

If you are not sure of the eventual size of the project, provide the maximum estimates.

	EXISTING USES:	EXISTING USES TO BE RETAINED:	NET NEW CONSTRUCTION AND/OR ADDITION:	PROJECT TOTALS:
PROJECT FEATURES				
Dwelling Units	2	1	0	1
Hotel Rooms	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Parking Spaces	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Loading Spaces	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Number of Buildings	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Height of Building(s)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Number of Stories	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Bicycle Spaces	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
GROSS SQUARE FOOTAGE (GSF)				
Residential	2194	2194	0	2194
Retail	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Office	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Industrial/PDR <i>Production, Distribution, & Repair</i>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Parking	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other (Specify Use)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
TOTAL GSF	2194	2194	0	2194

5. Additional Project Details

UNITS	EXISTING:	PROPOSED:	NET CHANGE:
Owner-occupied Units:	2	1	1
Rental Units:	0	0	0
Total Units:	2	1	1
Units subject to Rent Control:	0	0	0
Vacant Units:	0	0	0

BEDROOMS	EXISTING:	PROPOSED:	NET CHANGE:
Owner-occupied Bedrooms:	3	3	0
Rental Bedrooms:	0	0	0
Total Bedrooms:	3	3	0
Bedrooms subject to Rent Control:	0	0	0

6. Unit Specific Information

	UNIT NO.	NO. OF BEDROOMS	GSF	OCCUPANCY	ADDITIONAL CRITERIA (check all that apply)
EXISTING	1014	2	1399	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OWNER OCCUPIED <input type="checkbox"/> RENTAL	<input type="checkbox"/> ELLIS ACT <input type="checkbox"/> VACANT <input type="checkbox"/> RENT CONTROL
PROPOSED	1014	2	1399	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OWNER OCCUPIED <input type="checkbox"/> RENTAL	
EXISTING	1015	1	795	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OWNER OCCUPIED <input type="checkbox"/> RENTAL	<input type="checkbox"/> ELLIS ACT <input type="checkbox"/> VACANT <input type="checkbox"/> RENT CONTROL
PROPOSED	1015	1	795	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OWNER OCCUPIED <input type="checkbox"/> RENTAL	
EXISTING				<input type="checkbox"/> OWNER OCCUPIED <input type="checkbox"/> RENTAL	<input type="checkbox"/> ELLIS ACT <input type="checkbox"/> VACANT <input type="checkbox"/> RENT CONTROL
PROPOSED				<input type="checkbox"/> OWNER OCCUPIED <input type="checkbox"/> RENTAL	

7. Other Information

Please describe any additional project features that were not included in the above tables:
(Attach a separate sheet if more space is needed)

Please see attached.

Priority General Plan Policies – Planning Code Section 101.1

(APPLICABLE TO ALL PROJECTS)

Proposition M was adopted by the voters on November 4, 1986. It requires that the City shall find that proposed alterations and demolitions are consistent with eight priority policies set forth in Section 101.1 of the Planning Code. These eight policies are listed below. Please state how the Project is consistent or inconsistent with each policy. Each statement should refer to specific circumstances or conditions applicable to the property. Each policy must have a response. If a given policy does not apply to your project, explain why it is not applicable.

Please respond to each policy; if it's not applicable explain why:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;

Please see attached.

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

Please see attached.

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

Please see attached.

4. That commuter traffic not impede Muni transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

Please see attached.

Please respond to each policy; if it's not applicable explain why:

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

Please see attached.

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

Please see attached.

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved; and

Please see attached.

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

Please see attached.

Dwelling Unit Merger

(SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION)

Pursuant to Planning Code Section 317(e), the merger of residential dwelling-units not otherwise subject to a Conditional Use Authorization shall be either subject to a Mandatory Discretionary Review hearing or will qualify for administrative approval.

Administrative review criteria only apply to those Residential Units proposed for Merger that are not affordable or financially accessible housing, (valued by a credible appraisal within the past six months to be greater than 80% of combined land and structure value of single-family homes in San Francisco).

The Planning Commission shall not approve an application for Merger if certain eviction criteria apply. Please see the implementation document *Zoning Controls on the Removal of Dwelling Units*, Planning Code Section 317, and Administrative Code Section 37.9(a) for additional information.

Please answer the following questions to determine how the project does or does not meet the Planning Code requirements:

DWELLING UNIT MERGER CRITERIA:		YES	NO
1	Does the removal of the unit(s) eliminate only owner-occupied housing? If yes, for how long was the unit(s) proposed for removal owner-occupied? <u>???</u> months or years (circle one)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Is the removal of the unit(s) and the merger with another intended for owner occupancy?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Will the removal of the unit(s) remove an affordable housing unit as defined in Section 415 of the Planning Code or housing subject to the Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance? If yes, will replacement housing be provided which is equal or greater in size, number of bedrooms, affordability, and suitability to households with children to the units being removed? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4	Will the removal of the unit(s) bring the building closer into conformance with the prescribed zoning?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	Will the number of bedrooms provided in the merged unit be equal to or greater than the number of bedrooms in the separate units?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	Is the removal of the unit(s) necessary to correct design or functional deficiencies that cannot be corrected through interior alterations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Applicant's Affidavit

Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:

- a: The undersigned is the owner or authorized agent of the owner of this property.
- b: The information presented is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.
- c: Other information or applications may be required.

Signature: _____

Date: 10/15/2017

Print name, and indicate whether owner, or authorized agent:

STANLEY W. LANDRAIR
Owner / Authorized Agent (circle one)

Dwelling Unit **Merger** Application Submittal Checklist

(FOR PLANNING DEPARTMENT USE ONLY)

Applications submitted to the Planning Department must be accompanied by this checklist and all required materials.

APPLICATION MATERIALS	CHECKLIST
Original Application, signed with all blanks completed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Prop. M Findings (General Plan Policy Findings)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Supplemental Information Pages for Dwelling Unit Merger	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Notification Materials Package: (See Page 4)	<input type="checkbox"/> *
Notification map	<input type="checkbox"/> *
Address labels	<input type="checkbox"/> *
Address list (printed list of all mailing data or copy of labels)	<input type="checkbox"/> *
Affidavit of Notification Materials Preparation	<input type="checkbox"/> *
Set of plans: One set full size AND one reduced size 11"x17"	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Site Plan (existing and proposed)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Floor Plans (existing and proposed)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Elevations (including adjacent structures)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Current photographs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Historic photographs (if possible)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Check payable to Planning Dept. (see current fee schedule)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Letter of authorization for agent (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Pre-Application Materials (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Other: Section Plan, Detail drawings (ie. windows, door entries, trim), Specifications (for cleaning, repair, etc.) and/or Product cut sheets for new elements (ie. windows, doors)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

NOTES:

☐ Required Material. Write "N/A" if you believe the item is not applicable, (e.g. letter of authorization is not required if application is signed by property owner.)

☒ Typically would not apply. Nevertheless, in a specific case, staff may require the item.

☐ * Required upon request upon hearing scheduling.

Some applications will require additional materials not listed above. The above checklist does not include material needed for Planning review of a building permit. The "Application Packet" for Building Permit Applications lists those materials.

No application will be accepted by the Department unless the appropriate column on this form is completed. Receipt of this checklist, the accompanying application, and required materials by the Department serves to open a Planning file for the proposed project. After the file is established it will be assigned to a planner. At that time, the planner assigned will review the application to determine whether it is complete or whether additional information is required in order for the Department to make a decision on the proposal.

For Department Use Only

Application received by Planning Department:

By: _____

Date: _____

**APPLICATION for
CONDITIONAL USE AUTHORIZATION and
DWELLING UNIT MERGER**

1177 CALIFORNIA STREET, UNITS 1014 AND 1015

PROPOSED PROJECT

The Proposed Project is the merger of two adjacent owner-occupied units in an eighteen-story condominium apartment building at 1177 California Street (the Building) by the removal of a fifteen-foot section of drywall from a common, non-loadbearing wall. The purpose of the merger is to make a combined unit suitable for a family dwelling, because neither of the units now is large enough to accommodate a family. The effect will be to improve the unit mix of the building, which is overwhelmingly skewed toward single-bedroom units. The units to be merged are Unit 1015, parcel 0253A/097 (795 sq. ft.) and Unit 1014, parcel 0253A/096 (1399 sq. ft.), resulting in a three bedroom apartment with three bathrooms and a guest half-bath, suitable for use as a family residence.

The owner, who currently occupies both of these adjacent dwellings as his only residence, is engaged to be married and also is approaching retirement,. He contemplates that he will be able to spend more time at home with his family and extended family, who include his wife-to-be, his children, grandchildren and parents. The combination of the units will allow for a home office/study/spare bedroom. In future years, that space may accommodate a caregiver. In sum, the Proposed Project will allow the Applicant, a long-term citizen, homeowner, tax-payer and leader in his neighborhood, to remain in the City with this as his only residence during his retirement years, rather than be compelled to go elsewhere.

PROJECT SITE

The Building is located at the southeast corner of California and Jones Streets. The Building was constructed in approximately 1972, and rests on approximately 15,000 sq. ft. of lot area. The Building is an L-shaped high-rise tower with a courtyard that fronts on California Street, next-door to the Masonic Auditorium and across California Street from Grace Cathedral. Portions of the building extend on a common base from the courtyard at the front, opening to California Street. The rear of the building consists largely of a garage door at the exits to Pine Street.

The Building was designed for use as a 450-room hotel over 160' in height with commercial uses at the ground level. The plans were revised before the hotel was completed, and the design was converted for a 273-unit apartment building, with 1-car parking for each unit. (Approximately 20 of the units planned for in the original design were converted to other uses. With that and some mergers that have occurred over the past 45 years, there are now approximately 248 residential units in the Building.)

As a result of the Building's initial division into hotel-room modules, the Building has an inappropriate unit mix, with a severe imbalance of units that are one-bedroom or smaller, and lack of units suitable for family dwellings. Specifically, the Building has 205 units that provide only single-bedroom housing. Of those units, there are 40 studio apartments; 69 junior one-bedroom units; and 94 one-bedroom units. There are 36 two bedroom

**APPLICATION for
CONDITIONAL USE AUTHORIZATION and
DWELLING UNIT MERGER**

units. There are only nine family-sized units: eight three-bedroom units and one four-bedroom unit.

The Building was constructed with a density of approximately one unit per 55 square feet of lot area. The maximum allowable density in Zone RM-4 calls for one unit per 200 square feet, however. The Building has a history of at least five unit mergers, which corrects this disproportion somewhat, but still leaves a predominance of one-bedroom and studio units, and approximately one unit per 60 square feet of lot area.

There are several schools and churches in the immediate neighborhood, including t Grace Cathedral and the Grace Cathedral School for Boys, located across California Street; the Notre Dame Church and Ecole Notre Dame de Victoires, located at 659 Pine Street; the Nam Kue School, located at 755 Sacramento Street; and the Cumberland High School at 865 Jackson Street. There also is a children's playground and a park (Huntington Park) located in front of Grace Cathedral. Notwithstanding the proximity to these and other family-friendly facilities in the neighborhood (hospitals and grocery stores and pharmacies, *etc.*) the Building has few families, due to the fact that there are so few housing units of suitable size and bedroom space.

THE PROJECT APPLICANT

The Applicant, Stanley Landfair, is the long-term owner-occupant of both Units. He is a sixty-three year old attorney who has resided at the Building since 2002 and in the neighborhood since 1999. The Applicant is active in Neighborhood and City affairs, being engaged with both as the Secretary of the Nob Hill Association and the Nob Hill Foundation (which supports Huntington Park), among other activities.

Mr. Landfair purchased Unit 1014 in 2004 and has lived in it as his only residence since that time. He purchased Unit 1015 when it became available in 2007, intending that he would combine the two units when family circumstances would permit or require. He presently occupies both units (at the time of this application, a non-tenant guest from abroad is staying in 1015), but with the impediment of a wall between the two. The Applicant is engaged to be married and would like to remain in the City, particularly as he likely will retire within the next few years and will need additional room for his wife; for visits by his children, grandchildren and parents; and for a home office or study.

The Applicant looks forward to enjoying his remaining work years and his retirement years in the combined Units. The Building provides handicapped-accessible living, which accommodates current physical disabilities of Mr. Landfair's family members (his parents). And, although no one looks forward to disabilities in the future, Mr. Landfair acknowledges that he or Mr.-and-Mrs. Landfair must plan for that as seniors in the future. Considering one's housing needs over the complete life-cycle needs, the merged unit will accommodate Mr. Landfair's present needs for him and his family and potential needs in the future for a caregiver, nursing and hospice care.

**APPLICATION for
CONDITIONAL USE AUTHORIZATION and
DWELLING UNIT MERGER**

CONDITIONAL USE FINDINGS

Pursuant to Planning Code Section §303(c), the project meets the findings described below.

1. *The proposed use or feature, at the size and intensity contemplated and at the proposed location, will provide a development that is necessary and desirable for, and compatible with, the neighborhood or the community.*

Merger of the two units will improve the unit mix in the Building and the neighborhood by creating a three-bedroom unit. This is necessary and desirable for, and compatible with, the neighborhood, which is zoned for both residential and mixed residential-commercial uses. As noted above, the unit mix in the Building and the neighborhood is presently inadequate to promote the needs of families. The lack of multi-bedroom housing make it difficult for families and especially families with children to find housing. This has a collateral, self-perpetuating effect, causing families to leave for the suburbs, thus causing schools and other neighborhood facilities that support family living to decline, and for those conditions to spiral further. Many urban planners advocate for the creation of family-sized units to correct those factors.

Given the size of the Building and the number of units in it, the Project will have virtually no effect on neighborhood density, and certainly no adverse effect. There is no building nearby with a density similar to that of the Building. To the extent that the Project has any effect on neighborhood density, reducing the number of units in the Building from 248 to 247 units will be slightly *more* compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. It will be extremely attractive from the perspective of apartment dwellers who need three bedrooms, moreover, whose only choices now are to leave the neighborhood, most likely for the suburbs. Presently, only nine units in the 248-unit Building have three bedrooms or more. The percentages of one- two- and three-bedroom units in the Building are approximately 81, 14.5, and 3 per cent. The proportion in the neighborhood is unknown but is likely to be skewed even more in favor of one-bedroom units, because the neighborhood consists primarily of high-rise apartment buildings.

2. *The proposed use or feature will not be detrimental to the health, safety, convenience or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity, or injurious to property, improvements or potential development in the vicinity, with respect to aspects including but not limited to the following:*

- a) *The nature of the proposed site, including its size and shape, and the proposed size, shape and arrangement of structures;*

The Proposed Project is limited in scope to removing one non-load bearing interior common wall between two adjacent apartments. The Proposed Project will not alter the size, shape, or arrangement of the Building exterior or Site.

**APPLICATION for
CONDITIONAL USE AUTHORIZATION and
DWELLING UNIT MERGER**

- b) The accessibility and traffic patterns for persons and vehicles, the type and volume of such traffic, and the adequacy of proposed off-street parking and loading;*

The Proposed Project will not affect or alter accessibility to or traffic patterns of adjacent streets by pedestrians or vehicles. Removal of the common wall can be accomplished with very little manpower and very little equipment. Debris can be removed from the Building and the neighborhood easily by a vehicle no larger than a van or pick-up truck. Thus, merger of the two units will not add to the type or volume of existing traffic, or impact the availability of on-street or off-street parking, or loading. The Building has its own facility for off-street loading and a dedicated curb for on-street commercial loading.

- c) The safeguards afforded to prevent noxious or offensive emissions, such as noise, glare, dust and odor;*

Removal of the non-load bearing common wall will be accomplished during normal working hours, pursuant to a permit to be issued by the Building's homeowner association during hours that are agreeable to the HOA management. Dust and odor control is also regulated by the Building during construction. The work likely will not take more than a few days, if that. Because the wall to be removed is interior to both of the two apartments, and because there are concrete floors in the apartments and the units above, little noise and no dirt or dust should be contemplated outside the two apartments. In fact, the only signs of this project to persons in the building will be the entry and exit by a carpenter, drywall technician and an electrician, once or twice a day for two or three days. The Project will not bother or inconvenience anyone.

- d) Treatment given, as appropriate, to such aspects as landscaping, screening, open spaces, parking and loading areas, service areas, lighting and signs; and The number of off-street parking spaces and loading and service areas will remain the same.*

There is no exterior work proposed. Therefore, there is no change or impact to site design or parking. Each of the units has its own dedicated residential parking space already, so there will be no effect on the availability of on-street parking.

3. *That such use or feature as proposed will comply with the applicable provisions of this Code and will not adversely affect the General Plan.*

- a) Pursuant to Planning Code Section §209.2, the merger brings the building closer to conformity with the maximum allowable density in Zone RM-4. As noted above, there is a shortage of multi-bedroom and family housing in the neighborhood. By providing a three-bedroom unit in the neighborhood, the merger will support the mission of an RM District to provide unit sizes and types*

**APPLICATION for
CONDITIONAL USE AUTHORIZATION and
DWELLING UNIT MERGER**

suitable for a variety of households. There are no other impacts of the merger applicable to the Planning Code.

- b) *General Plan Housing Element Objective 2 – Retain existing housing units, and promote safety and maintenance standards, without jeopardizing affordability.*
Policy 2.2 – Retain existing housing by controlling the merger of residential units, except where a merger clearly creates new family housing.

The purchase price of Apartment 1014 was \$1,025,000 in 2002; Apartment 105 was \$723,000 in 2004.) A May 2017 appraisal of both units shows a combined value of \$2,610,000. This is significantly lower than the price of the few comparable three-bedroom units available for purchase. Mr. Landfair is sixty-three years old, and likely will retire from active practice within the next two or three years. A comparable 3-bedroom unit would not be affordable and the inability to merge these units likely would force him to leave the neighborhood.

- c) *General Plan Housing Element Objective 4 – Foster a housing stock that meets the needs of all residents across lifecycles.*
Policy 4.1 – Develop new housing, and encourage the remodeling of existing housing for families with children.

The proposed unit merger will create one dwelling unit that will provide sufficient space for a family. According to the 2014 General Plan (Table I-21 Housing Characteristics, San Francisco 2010-2012), the number of 3-bedroom units rose by 1.8%. This was the largest increase of all numbers of bedrooms per unit, indicating the largest demand for unit size in the City is for a 3-bedroom unit.

- d) *General Plan Housing Element Objective 4 – Foster a housing stock that meets the needs of all residents across lifecycles.*
Policy 4.3 – Create housing for people with disabilities and aging adults by including universal design principles in new and rehabilitated housing units.

The Building provides handicapped-accessible living, which accommodates current physical disabilities of Mr. Landfair's family members (his parents) and his own potential needs as a senior in the future. Considering the housing needs of an individual over the full life-cycle, the merged unit also can provide living space for a caretaker, or for nursing and hospice care.

Additionally, as a part of the Downtown Planning District, the neighborhood has benefitted from a 20.9% increase in housing, the second largest district in the city. (2014 General Plan Table I-25 Net Change in the Housing Stock by Planning District, 2010–2013). The benefit of creating housing for families and seniors, balanced within an area of one of the city's highest increase of units, provides an overall benefit to the neighborhood and city.

**APPLICATION for
CONDITIONAL USE AUTHORIZATION and
DWELLING UNIT MERGER**

PRIORITY GENERAL PLAN POLICIES FINDINGS

The Proposed Project will be in conformity with the following General Plan objectives and policies:

1. *That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced.*

The Project does not involve any change to existing commercial space in the building. The combination of two residential units within this residential building will have no adverse effects on retail uses. The addition of a bedroom, usable for home-office purposes, will facilitate work at home for the Applicant and his wife, allowing a long-time resident of the City to remain here.

2. *That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods.*

The merger of two residential units within an eighteen-floor residential building of approximately 248 units will have no adverse effect on the character of the neighborhood. Rather, it will conserve and protect the neighborhood, since the building greatly exceeds the allowable building density for the neighborhood. The merger also will protect the diversity of the neighborhood, since it will allow a family in need of a three-bedroom unit to remain in the City in their existing neighborhood, which consists primarily of singles and childless couples. The conversion of two housing units into one will not decrease the number of bedrooms or capacity for housing; rather it will create a unit that is still capable of housing the same number of persons in one family-sized unit, rather than singles or childless couples in two separate units.

3. *That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced.*

The Project will not cause any changes to the City's supply of affordable housing. Neither of the units constitutes affordable housing in itself. Unit 1015, the one-bedroom apartment to be merged, was appraised within the last two months for refinancing at approximately \$950,000. The rent for similar units in the building are approximately \$4000-5000 per month, depending on the floor and improvements to the unit. The two units to be merged are owned and occupied by the same persons now who will continue to occupy them afterward. Thus, there will be no net change to the number of units available for rent in the City.

4. *That commuter traffic not impede Muni transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking.*

The Project will have no impact on commuter traffic or Muni transit serve and will not burden streets or neighborhood parking. As noted above, the two units to be

**APPLICATION for
CONDITIONAL USE AUTHORIZATION and
DWELLING UNIT MERGER**

merged are owned and occupied by the same persons now who will continue to occupy them afterward. Thus, there will be no net change to the number of units available for rent in the City.

5. *That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced.*

The Building is located in an RM-4 zoning district, which does not allow industrial, service sector, or commercial uses. Therefore, the policies of this section are not applicable.

6. *That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.*

The Proposed Project does not alter the structural or life safety elements of the Building. Therefore, the Proposed Project is consistent with the policies of this section.

7. *That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved.*

The Building is not a landmark building or a historic resource, is not located in a historic district, and does not include exterior building work. Therefore, this section is not applicable.

8. *That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.*

There are no proposed changes to the building exterior or site. Therefore, the Project will have no effect on the sunlight access of any parks or open space or impair the view from any public vistas.

Reduced Plans

Case Number 2017-013406CUA
Conditional Use Authorization
Dwelling Unit Merger
1177 California Street

ABBREVIATIONS

ADJ	ADJUSTABLE	(N)	NEW
ALUM	ALUMINUM	NIC	NOT IN CONTRACT
ARCH	ARCHITECTURE	NO OR	NUMBER
ASPH	ASPHALT	#	
BD	BOARD	O/	OVER
BDLG	BUILDING	OC	ON CENTER
BLK	BLOCK	OD	OUTER DIAMETER
BLKG	BLOCKING	OFCL	OWNER FURNISHED,
BM	BENT		CONTRACTOR
B.O.	BOTTOM OF		INSTALLED
BU	BUILT-UP	OFOI	OWNER FURNISHED,
			OWNER INSTALLED
		OPNG	OPENING
CLG	CEILING		
CLR	CLEAR	PL	PLATE
CNTL	CONTROL	PLYWD	PLYWOOD
CONC	CONCRETE	PT	PRESSURE TREATED
CONT	CONTINUOUS		
CTR	CENTER	R	RADIUS
		RA	RETURN AIR
DBL	DOUBLE	RDWD	REDWOOD
DF	DOUGLAS FIR	REF	REFERENCE
DIM	DIMENSION	REG	REGISTER
DN	DOWN	REQ	REQUIRED
DP	DOUBLE POLE	RET	RETURN
DS	DOWNSPOUT	RM	ROOM
DWG	DRAWING		
		S	SOUTH
(E)	EXISTING	SA	SUPPLY AIR
E	EAST	SAD	SEE ARCHITECTURAL
EA	EACH	DRAWING	
ELEC	ELECTRICAL	SED	SEE ELECTRICAL
ELEV	ELEVATION		DRAWING
EQ	EQUAL	SF	SUBFLOOR
EXP	EXPOSED	SHT	SHEET
EXT	EXTERIOR	SHTG	SHEATHING
		SKD	SEE KITCHEN
			DRAWING
FDN	FOUNDATION	SLD	SEE LIGHTING
FF	FINISH FLOOR		DRAWING
FIN	FINISH	SMD	SEE MECHANICAL
FL	FLOOR		DRAWING
FL	FLOOR	SP	SINGLE POLE
FOF	FACE OF CONCRETE	SPD	SEE PLUMBING
FOF	FACE OF FINISH		DRAWING
FOS	FACE OF STUD	SS	SQUARE
FOP	FACE OF PLYWOOD	SQ	SINGLE SHELF
FURN	FURNACE	SSD	SEE STRUCTURAL
			DRAWING
GA	GAUGE	STD	STANDARD
GALV	GALVANIZED		
GND	GROUND	T&G	TONGUE AND
GYP BD	GYPSTUM BOARD		GROOVE
		TO	TOP OF
		TOFF	TOP OF FINISH FLR
HB	HOSE BIB	TOP	TOP OF PLATE
HC	HOLLOW CORE	TOS	TOP OF SLAB
HDR	HEADER	TOW	TOP OF WALL
HR STL	HOT-ROLLED STEEL	TP	TOILET PAPER
HVAC	HEATING, VENTILATING, AND AIR CONDITIONING		HOLDER
HW	HOT WATER HEATER	TR	TOWEL RACK
		TRY	TYPICAL
		UON	UNLESS OTHERWISE
ICPV	INTEGRAL COLOR		NOTED
	PLASTER VENEER		
INSUL	INSULATION	VERT	VERTICAL
INT	INTERIOR	VIF	VERIFY IN FIELD
LAM	LAMINATE	W	WEST
LT	LIGHT	W/	WITH
		W/O	WITHOUT
MANUF	MANUFACTURER	WC	WATER CLOSET
MAX	MAXIMUM	WO	WOOD
MC	MACHINE CHEST	WIND	WINDOW
MECH	MECHANICAL	WP	WATERPROOF
MEMB	MEMBRANE		
MIN	MINIMUM		
MTL	METAL		

SYMBOLS

	1HR RATED FULL HEIGHT WALL		DETAIL, SECTION, ELEVATION MARKER
	2HR RATED FULL HEIGHT WALL		INTERIOR ELEVATION MARKER
	(N) INTERIOR PARTITION WALL		INTERIOR ELEVATION MARKER
	LANDLORD PARTITION WALL		GRID LINE MARKER
	CLR. INDICATING CLEAR DIMENSION TO FINISHED FACE OF WALL INCLUDING MATERIALS.		ELEVATION POINT MARKER
	CLR. INDICATING CLEAR DIMENSION TO FINISHED FACE OF WALL INCLUDING MATERIALS.		DATUM POINT MARKER
	LINE BELOW OR HIDDEN LINE		DOOR TAG
	LINE ABOVE		WINDOW TAG
	CENTER LINE		ROOM ID TAG
	PROPERTY LINE		KEYNOTE TAG
	DIMENSION TO FACE OF STUD		REVISION NUMBER TAG
	ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TO FACE OF STUD U.O.N.		
	DIMENSION TO CENTERLINE		

PROJECT DIRECTORY

OWNER
STANLEY LANDFAIR
1177 CALIFORNIA ST, #1014 + 1015
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108

ARCHITECT
POZNER ARCHITECTURE + DESIGN
DERA-JILL POZNER
1634 HAYES ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94117
Tel. 415.871.5355

PROJECT INFORMATION

PROJECT ADDRESS:	1177 CALIFORNIA ST. #1014 + 1015 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108
TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION:	I
OCCUPANCY TYPE:	R-2
CONSTRUCTION AREA:	10 SF
APPLICABLE CODES:	2016 CALIFORNIA + SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODES 2016 CALIFORNIA + SAN FRANCISCO ELECTRICAL CODES 2016 CALIFORNIA + SAN FRANCISCO MECHANICAL CODES 2016 CALIFORNIA + SAN FRANCISCO PLUMBING CODES 2016 CALIFORNIA + SAN FRANCISCO GREEN BUILDING CODES 2016 CALIFORNIA ENERGY CODE 2016 SAN FRANCISCO HOUSING CODE
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:	REMOVE A COMMON WALL BETWEEN 2 ADJACENT DWELLING UNIT CONDOMINIUMS TO USE AS 1 DWELLING UNIT.

SHEET INDEX


ARCHITECTURAL

A0.00 PROJECT DATA, SITE PLAN

A2.00 EXISTING AND DEMOLITION FLOOR PLAN

A2.01 PROPOSED FLOOR PLAN

VICINITY MAP




EXISTING SITE PLAN - NO WORK

$$1/32'' = 1'-0''$$


P O Z N E R
ARCHITECTURE
+ D E S I G N

1634 HAYES STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA
415.871.5355



PROJECT NAME
LANDFAIR RESIDENCE
177 CALIFORNIA ST
1014 and #1015
SAN FRANCISCO, CA


ISSUED	DESCRIPTION
10.16.17	PERMIT SET
17	17
18	18
19	19
20	20
21	21
22	22
23	23
24	24
25	25
26	26
27	27
28	28
29	29
30	30
31	31
32	32
33	33
34	34
35	35
36	36
37	37
38	38
39	39
40	40
41	41
42	42
43	43
44	44
45	45
46	46
47	47
48	48
49	49
50	50
51	51
52	52
53	53
54	54
55	55
56	56
57	57
58	58
59	59
60	60
61	61
62	62
63	63
64	64
65	65
66	66
67	67
68	68
69	69
70	70
71	71
72	72
73	73
74	74
75	75
76	76
77	77
78	78
79	79
80	80
81	81
82	82
83	83
84	84
85	85
86	86
87	87
88	88
89	89
90	90
91	91
92	92
93	93
94	94
95	95
96	96
97	97
98	98
99	99
100	100


SHEET TITLE

PROJECT DATA
SITE PLAN

FILE	LANDFAIR-A0.00.dwg
BY	DJLP
SCALE	SEE DWG
SHEET	

A0.00








PROJECT NAME
LANDFAIR RESIDENCE
1177 CALIFORNIA ST
#1014 and #1015
SAN FRANCISCO, CA

ISSUED	DESCRIPTION
10.16.17	CONDITIONAL USE APP
---	---
---	---
---	---
---	---
---	---
---	---
---	---
---	---
---	---
---	---
---	---
---	---
---	---
---	---

SHEET TITLE
EXISTING FLOOR PLAN
AND
DEMOLITION PLAN

FILE Landfair-A-2.00.dwg
BY DJP
SCALE 1/8" = 1'
SHEET





PROJECT NAME
LANDFAIR RESIDENCE
1177 CALIFORNIA ST
#1014 and #1015
SAN FRANCISCO, CA

ISSUED	DESCRIPTION
10.16.17	CONDITIONAL USE APP
---	---
---	---
---	---
---	---
---	---
---	---
---	---
---	---
---	---
---	---
---	---

SHEET TITLE
PROPOSED FLOOR PLAN

FILE	Landfair-A-2.00.dwg
BY	DJP
SCALE	1/8" = 1'
SHEET	

