

INTRODUCTION

San Francisco's economic and social vitality depends on having a range of housing types and prices for all its inhabitants. The Residence Element sets forth the objectives, policies, and programs that address broadly defined housing needs over the next five years.

The Residence Element consists of three parts. Part II appears after this introduction. Parts I and III are published separately. Part I contains the background data and needs analysis. Part III describes the programs to be carried out over the next five years to implement the objectives and policies in Part II.

Data and Needs Analysis

Part I contains background information for policy formulation. This part describes and analyzes changes in San Francisco population, households, and housing stock characteristics. It analyzes existing and projected housing needs resulting from job growth and population and household projections. It identifies the needs of special user groups such as the homeless, physically disabled, elderly, minorities, families with children, and artists, and specifies the housing affordability levels needed by these households. Part I also contains an inventory of land suitable for residential development, and examines potential constraints to meeting the City's housing needs. It notes that meeting the estimated housing need will require a rate of housing production many times greater than what has been achieved in previous years.

Objectives and Policies

Part II contains a comprehensive set of housing objectives and policies which are the framework for decision making, priority setting, and program implementation. It continues many existing City housing policies and adopts a number of new policies which emphasize affordable housing production, permanent affordability, and protection of the existing housing stock. New housing policies strive to expand land, financing, coordination, and other resources needed for the production of affordable housing. Other new policies aim to upgrade seismically unsafe residential buildings and to provide a comprehensive program to house the homeless.

Two policies are to be given priority and are to be the basis upon which inconsistencies in this Element and other parts of the Master Plan are resolved. They are:

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

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

Implementation Programs

There are a broad range of proposed housing programs to implement the Master Plan housing objectives and policies. These include many ongoing programs as well as newly required efforts. These programs are described in detail in Part III of the Residence Element.

Implementation of these programs involves various city agencies and includes the Mayor's Office of Housing, the Board of Supervisors, the City Planning Department and Commission, the Redevelopment Agency, the Housing Authority, the Bureau of Building Inspection, the City Attorney's Office, the Rent Stabilization Board, and the Human Rights Commission. Implementation of city housing policies also depends on the support and coordination with community housing organizations, non-profit and for-profit housing sponsors, and the general citizenry.

OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

SUPPLY OF NEW HOUSING

OBJECTIVE 1 TO PROVIDE NEW HOUSING, ESPECIALLY PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING, IN APPROPRIATE LOCATIONS WHICH MEETS IDENTIFIED HOUSING NEEDS AND TAKES INTO ACCOUNT THE DEMAND FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING CREATED BY EMPLOYMENT GROWTH

New housing, particularly permanently affordable housing is required to help meet the City's housing needs, as identified in Part I. New housing is needed to reduce homelessness, to accommodate projected new population growth, to improve the jobs/housing balance so that fewer holders of new San Francisco jobs will have to live outside the city and commute to work, to increase the vacancy rate and thereby reduce

the pressure on rents, and to meet the needs of particular existing population groups not adequately housed in the existing stock.

New residential development must be of a character and stability that preserves the city's neighborhoods and maintains the quality of life for existing and future residents. The issue centers on how to accommodate new residential development without jeopardizing the very assets that make living in San Francisco desirable.

To insure balance in development and change in San Francisco, the City should apply various growth management techniques to encourage residential development in areas where it can be accommodated and discourage it where it cannot. The City should use its zoning and related land use controls, and guidelines, environmental review processes, policies of the Master Plan and area plans, the capital improvements program and various financial programs to deal with issues of how much and where residential development should occur.

Over the last fifteen years, the City's employment growth has far exceeded the supply of affordable housing and thus created a significant jobs/housing imbalance within the City. In essence, not enough new affordable housing has been constructed in the City to meet the needs of the expanding workforce. On the other hand, a modest surplus in the most expensive housing has occurred.

The jobs/housing imbalance has particularly harmed lower-income households who are unable to compete in the housing market as demand for, and the cost of, housing has escalated. The most serious aspect of the jobs/housing imbalance is the unavailability of housing in the City for those households which are defined as low and very-low income.

Although San Francisco will maintain an overall jobs/housing imbalance because it has historically developed as an employment center, the City must make new efforts to balance future employment growth and the supply of housing. In particular the City should meet the housing goals proposed by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) which have been adopted as part of this Element. These goals require that the City absorb a greater percentage of new workers in San Francisco than has been the trend for the last fifteen years. The ABAG goals call for new housing of suitable affordability which would reduce by half the number of new workers who would have to live outside the City and commute to work because of the housing shortage in the City.

The primary means by which the City has addressed the jobs/housing balance in the past have been through housing mitigation under the Office Affordable Housing Production Program and through efforts to increase employment of San Franciscans in newly-created jobs as provided by Section 164 of the Planning Code. To the extent that these programs do not meet the jobs/housing balance goals of this element, the City should adopt new programs to meet the housing needs. As a first step, the City should aggressively carry out the intent of Section 164.

POLICY 1.1

Promote development of permanently affordable housing on surplus, underused and vacant public lands.

The opportunities for development of housing, particularly permanently affordable housing, on public property should be aggressively pursued. The City owns a number of sites which are underused. In some cases the air rights of these sites may be made available for housing without interfering with their current public use. Housing over public parking, transit facilities or water storage facilities are examples of such joint use. When City property is no longer needed for the purpose for which it was acquired and if it is not needed for some other public purpose (such as open space and recreation land); it should be rezoned and sold or leased for development of permanently affordable housing. The City may also be able to make some of its properties outside City and County limits available for housing. The City can also acquire surplus federal and state property to be disposed of by sale or lease, if funds are available. Development of publicly owned or controlled sites in redevelopment areas designated for housing should be expedited.

POLICY 1.2

Facilitate the conversion of underused industrial and commercial areas to residential use, giving preference to permanently affordable housing uses.

Opportunities exist for major new residential development in certain areas close to downtown. New housing can be provided there without significant displacement of existing residential units or commercial or industrial activity. In some areas entire new residential neighborhoods can be created or are in the process of being created. In others, housing can be introduced on vacant or underused sites adjacent to sites which are and will remain in active commercial or industrial use. Live-work space for artists

may be a particularly appropriate use to provide a buffer between commercial or industrial space and residential areas. Map 3 identifies a number of such areas where partial or total conversion to residential use would be appropriate.

POLICY 1.3

Create incentives for the inclusion of housing, including permanently affordable housing in commercial developments.

Mixed residential/commercial building development near the heart of downtown would provide needed housing and add vitality to an area that lacks life at night and on weekends. Existing incentives should be maintained and new ones created to encourage housing and live-work space in the downtown area except in the retail and financial districts.

POLICY 1.4

Locate infill housing on appropriate sites in established neighborhoods.

In established neighborhoods new housing construction should be located:

- On vacant sites which are not designated for open space.
- On sites where nonconforming uses have been terminated.
- On transportation corridors.
- Above lower level retail uses in neighborhood shopping districts.
- On sites with buildings that cannot feasibly be rehabilitated or brought to acceptable levels of seismic safety.

POLICY 1.5

Allow new secondary units in areas where their effects can be dealt with and there is neighborhood support, especially if that housing is made permanently affordable to lower income households.

Secondary units ("in-law" or "granny" units) are smaller dwelling units within a structure containing another much larger unit, frequently in basements, using space that is surplus to the primary dwelling. Secondary units represent a simple and cost-effective method of expanding the housing supply. Such units could be

developed to meet the needs of seniors and others who, because of modest incomes or lifestyle, prefer or need small units at relatively low rents.

Neighborhood acceptance of secondary units should be encouraged in areas where off-street parking can be provided (it could be tandem parking) and where the secondary unit can be installed without adversely affecting the exterior appearance of the building, or, in the case of new construction, can be accommodated within the permitted building envelope. Secondary units should also be limited in size to control their impact.

POLICY 1.6

Discourage development of new housing in areas unsuitable for residential occupancy, or on sites containing existing housing worthy of retention.

Certain sites, because of their location or existing use, are not appropriate for new residential development. The City should discourage, and, in some instances, prohibit the development of new housing:

- In sites which should be acquired for open space.
- In areas of severe geological hazard (as indicated in the Community Safety Element) unless the hazard can be compensated for through building design and construction.
- In areas where prior use has contaminated the soil, unless the hazard can be economically mitigated.
- In areas of high transportation noise levels (as indicated in the Environmental Protection Element) unless the noise can be compensated for through building siting and design.
- On sites where the use of adjacent properties is incompatible with residential use.
- On sites which should be reserved for future "high-job-yield" uses. As proposals are made to rezone such sites or to approve residential uses, consideration will be given to the land needs of existing and future uses

which provide economic vitality and employment opportunities, while satisfying the City's need to accommodate additional housing.

- On sites where the development would require demolition of an historically significant building.
- On sites where the development would require demolition of existing sound or rehabilitable residential units, particularly units suitable for households with children or lower income level households.

POLICY 1.7

Obtain assistance from office developments and higher educational institutions in meeting the housing demand they generate, particularly the need for affordable housing for lower income workers and students.

New or expanding commercial activities in the city increase the city's employment base. These new jobs are important to the residents of the city and of the Bay Area, and contribute to the continued economic vitality of the region. The workers filling these jobs need housing. Similarly, educational institutions provide needed services and contribute to the intellectual and cultural life of the city. At the same time, their non-resident student body must be housed. Both office developments and educational institutions should assist in meeting the City's housing needs by contributing in some manner to the provision of additional housing.

POLICY 1.8

Encourage construction of new single room occupancy residential hotels.

San Francisco has a relatively large stock of older residential hotels, but little experience in new construction. Other cities have demonstrated that it is possible to provide small but good quality units for single persons. Existing regulations with respect to densities, provision of kitchen facilities and parking do not facilitate the creation of SRO hotels. The regulations should be modified and appropriate sites and sponsors for SRO hotels should be developed.

HOUSING DENSITY

OBJECTIVE 2

TO INCREASE THE SUPPLY OF HOUSING WITHOUT OVERCROWDING OR ADVERSELY AFFECTING THE PREVAILING CHARACTER OF EXISTING NEIGHBORHOODS.

In order to maintain the city's livability, new housing developments should, as a general rule, reflect the predominant intensity level of the surrounding neighborhood. The lot pattern and building bulk should relate to surrounding properties, and the potential number of residents and amount of activity generated should not overly congest the surrounding area. In cases where a density bonus is granted to facilitate the provision of affordable housing, the new housing should use design and other techniques to improve compatibility with its surroundings. Neighborhood groups, the developers and the City should work together to create acceptable design.

POLICY 2.1

Set allowable densities in established residential areas at levels which will promote compatibility with prevailing neighborhood scale and character.

In establishing allowable residential densities, consideration should be given to the prevailing building type in the surrounding area, so that new development is not incompatible with existing scale and character. Established architectural characteristics should be respected. Prevailing densities should be exceeded only when it is clear that, because of the specific location and design of the project, the existing scale and character of the neighborhood will not be disrupted.

POLICY 2.2

Encourage higher residential density in areas adjacent to downtown, in underutilized commercial and industrial areas proposed for conversion to housing, and in neighborhood commercial districts where higher density will not

have harmful effects, especially if the higher density provides a significant number of units that are permanently affordable to lower income households.

Moderate to high densities presently exist in established residential areas adjacent to downtown and should be maintained. As areas adjacent to downtown and commercial and industrial areas are rezoned for housing densities should be established which are consistent with this policy.

Some neighborhood commercial districts, which already contain substantial amounts of housing, may be able to handle increased residential density without generating additional traffic and parking problems if (i) they have a reduced need for auto ownership because their proximity to transit, work, shopping, and other services can attract residents who do not use automobiles, or (ii) anticipated parking demand can be accommodated on-site in new development or in community parking facilities. In these cases increased density should be encouraged.

POLICY 2.3

Allow flexibility in the number and size of units within permitted volumes of larger multi unit structures, especially if the flexibility results in creation of a significant number of dwelling units that are permanently affordable to lower income households.

Traditionally in San Francisco housing density standards have been set in terms of numbers of dwelling units in proportion to the size of the building lot. For example, in an RM-1 district, one dwelling unit is permitted for each 800 square feet of lot area. This limitation generally applies regardless of the size of the unit and the number of people likely to occupy it. Thus a small studio and a large four-bedroom apartment both count as a single unit. This method of calculating density encourages larger units and is particularly appropriate for lower density neighborhoods consisting primarily of one or two-family dwellings.

In other areas, which consist mostly of taller apartments and which are well served by transit, the density might more appropriately be controlled by the

volume of the building rather than number of units. Here the building envelope, as established by height, bulk, set back, parking and other Code requirements, would fit the maximum residential square footage which could be sub-divided into a greater number of smaller units or a smaller number of larger units.

POLICY 2.4

Adopt specific zoning districts which conform to a generalized residential land use and density plan and the Master Plan.

Applying policies under this Objective 2 results in land use and density patterns shown on the accompanying Generalized Residential Land Use Plan and Density Plan Maps. Specific zoning use districts should conform generally to these maps, although minor variations consistent with the general land use and density policies may be appropriate. They should also conform to the other objectives and policies of the Master Plan.

The Generalized Residential Land Use Plan provides for five density Categories:

TABLE HERE:

MAPS HERE

RETENTION OF EXISTING HOUSING

OBJECTIVE 3

TO RETAIN THE EXISTING SUPPLY OF HOUSING.

The existing housing stock is the city's major source of inexpensive housing. It is virtually irreplaceable given the cost of new construction and smaller public budgets. Priority should be given to retention of existing units as a primary means to provide affordable housing.

POLICY 3.1

Discourage the demolition of sound existing housing.

Demolition of existing housing generally results in the loss of lower-cost rental housing units. Even if the existing housing is replaced, the new units are

generally more costly and are frequently condominiums rather than rental units. Demolition often results in displacement of residents, causing personal hardship and relocation problems. The City should take appropriate steps to discourage demolition of existing housing that is sound or capable of rehabilitation, particularly where those units provide an affordable housing resource.

POLICY 3.2

Control the merger of residential units.

The merger of units - combining two dwelling units into one - occurs rather infrequently and has not resulted in a substantial reduction of the housing supply. Mergers should be considered on a case by case basis and approved or rejected on their individual merits.

However, because of the critical shortage of affordable housing, the merger of units should not be approved if it would change the rent-control status of a building. If an existing tenant household is displaced, relocation benefits and moving expenses should be provided.

POLICY 3.3

Consider legalization of existing illegal secondary units where there is neighborhood support and the units can conform to minimum Code standards of safety and livability and the permanent affordability of the units is assured.

It has been estimated that there are in excess of 20,000 housing and live-work units built without permit. They often exceed allowable densities, do not provide for requisite parking, and do not meet minimum standards of safety and livability. Nevertheless these units constitute a major source of affordable housing and their loss would cause great hardship.

Proposals to allow legalization of secondary units under certain conditions and for certain occupancies have been made over the years, but have not been adopted because of neighborhood opposition. In the meantime units are eliminated through abatement proceedings (largely originated by complaints) and additional units are created without permit. Efforts should continue to develop an

approach with the affected neighborhoods to deal with the problems created by these units, without substantially reducing their number or adversely affecting their affordability.

POLICY 3.4

Restrict the conversion of rental housing to condominiums or other forms of tenure or occupancy.

Conversion of existing rental apartment buildings to condominiums, stock cooperatives or tenant in common ownership depletes the supply of the City's most affordable housing stock. It also brings into conflict two desirable goals — expansion of homeownership opportunities and preservation of the existing rental housing stock. Conversions expand the number of units available for purchase but they do so by reducing the number of units available for rent once owners wishing to occupy evict existing tenants. In the process, existing and future tenants who cannot or do not wish to buy can be deprived of housing opportunities. Conversions should not result in a shift in the balance between ownership and rental housing. During periods when the demand for rental housing is high yet new market rate construction of rental units is relatively low, new construction should provide the majority of homeownership opportunities in multi-unit buildings. Condominium conversions should be regulated by ordinance in such a way as to:

- Preserve a reasonable balance between ownership and rental housing in San Francisco by providing for an annual limitation on the number of units which may be converted in any one year;
- Promote the meaningful expansion of homeownership opportunities for existing tenants and prevent the displacement of existing tenants by requiring a high degree of tenant intent to purchase their rental unit as a condition of approval;

- Reduce the impact of such conversions on non-purchasing tenants who may be required to relocate by providing procedures for relocation, and providing for the reimbursement of costs resulting from such relocation;
- Prevent the displacement of elderly and disabled tenants by assuring them of extended leases to remain in their units subsequent to conversion;
- Assure that purchasers of converted housing have been properly informed as to the physical condition of the structure offered for purchase;
- Prevent the effective loss of the City's low and moderate income housing stock by requiring sales price limitations on those units proposed for conversion which are found to be part of the low or moderate income housing stock;
- Expand the supply of the City's affordable housing stock by providing that a minimum of ten percent of the units in any condominium conversion subdivision be made permanently affordable, allowing construction of an equivalent number of such units elsewhere or in-lieu payments into a City Housing Development Fund.
- Provide for continuing affordability requirements on resales of units sold at below market prices.

Rental apartment buildings are also converted to owner occupancy through tenant-in-common purchases of the building and eviction of the tenants, which is permitted for owner occupancy. Regulations similar to the condominium conversion regulations should be adopted to deal with tenant-in-common purchases.

POLICY 3.5

Prohibit the conversion of rental housing to time share, corporate suite or hotel use.

Use of large older apartment buildings for time sharing or corporate suites in effect converts these units to something more like a hotel than an apartment for

permanent occupancy. There has also been a trend to convert small apartment units near downtown to hotels. Use of apartments in this way should be prohibited so that these rental units are not lost as a housing resource for San Francisco residents.

POLICY 3.6

Restrict the conversion of housing in commercial and industrial areas.

Many parts of San Francisco were developed before there were zoning regulations which strictly separated various types of land uses. As a result there were many thousands of housing units built in areas which also contain industrial and commercial uses and which have since been zoned industrial or commercial. Most of these housing units are sound or rehabilitable and are relatively inexpensive. They represent a significant portion of the city's affordable housing supply and would be very difficult to replace. Yet, in many of the areas in which such housing is located, it would be profitable to convert to a non-residential use.

In neighborhood shopping areas, conversions of upper floor housing units to non-residential use should be subject to conditional use review. Under such review, the desirability of retaining the housing can be weighed against the public benefits to be gained by the alternative use. As a general rule, conversion should be allowed only for needed neighborhood serving commercial activities that cannot reasonably locate elsewhere in the commercial district. Similarly, in Downtown commercial districts conversion to non residential use should be subject to conditional use review.

Enclaves of housing within industrial areas of the city should be protected by residential zoning so that conversion cannot take place. However, the continuation of residential uses on scattered and isolated lots within developed industrial areas may be in conflict with legitimate industrial needs. Here conversion should be a conditional use so that the specific industrial need can be weighed against the need to conserve housing.

POLICY 3.7

Preserve the existing stock of residential hotels.

Residential hotels represent a unique and often irreplaceable resource for many thousands of lower income elderly and disabled households. Most of these hotels are close to downtown and many are subject to strong economic pressures leading to conversion or demolition. As San Francisco has grown as a tourist center many of these hotels have been converted to tourist use, either permanently or during the tourist season. Some hotels have been demolished and replaced with other uses. The retention of these units as housing for permanent residents should be encouraged.

Residential hotels located in predominantly residential areas should be protected by zoning which does not permit commercial or tourist use. In non-residential areas, conversion of units to other uses should not be permitted or be permitted only where a residential unit will be or has been replaced with a comparable unit elsewhere.

For those hotels which are operated as mixed tourist/permanent resident hotels, better enforcement is needed to assure that the availability of the hotel for permanent residential occupancy is not diminished.

SEISMIC SAFETY

OBJECTIVE 4

TO REDUCE THE RISK OF BODILY HARM AND LOSS OF HOUSING IN AN EARTHQUAKE.

POLICY 4.1

Build new replacement housing to compensate for the affordable housing rendered uninhabitable by the October, 1989 earthquake.

Replacement of the affordable housing units lost as a result of the Loma Prieta earthquake, at comparable rental levels, should be pursued aggressively.

POLICY 4.2

Reduce seismic hazards in unreinforced masonry buildings without reducing the supply of affordable housing.

San Francisco has 21,000 residential units in 770 unreinforced masonry buildings. Because of the way these buildings were constructed (the walls are not adequately reinforced and the floors are not adequately tied to the walls) they are very vulnerable to damage or collapse in an earthquake. Most of these buildings are located South of Market, in the Tenderloin, Chinatown, and along the Bush Street and Van Ness Avenue corridors. Half of the units are in residential hotels which are predominantly occupied by persons of relatively low incomes.

The City should set standards for improving the safety of these buildings which will reduce loss of life in an earthquake while minimizing financial hardship and dislocation to owners and residents. and set a timetable for meeting the standards.

The potential magnitude of displacement depends on the level of seismic upgrading to be required. The risk of bodily harm has to be balanced against financial hardship and the hardship of displacement and the loss of affordable housing.

The new regulations should provide incentives for retention of existing housing. Safeguards and financial assistance should be provided to avoid displacement of existing tenants. Where relocation is unavoidable financial and other assistance should be provided. When demolition is required, the City should assure provision of new replacement housing at rents comparable to previous levels in numbers necessary to maintain the affordable housing supply.

POLICY 4.3

Improve the seismic stability of existing housing.

In addition to unreinforced masonry buildings, there are many other residential buildings which are also vulnerable to damage in an earthquake. In many cases,

relatively inexpensive measures such as bolting frames to foundations and installing shear walls when needed can be undertaken by property owners. The City should take steps to facilitate these safety precautions.

HOUSING CONDITION

OBJECTIVE 5

TO MAINTAIN AND IMPROVE THE PHYSICAL CONDITION OF HOUSING WHILE MAINTAINING EXISTING AFFORDABILITY LEVELS.

Over two thirds of San Francisco housing is more than fifty years old. As the city's housing stock ages it becomes increasingly important to maintain it in sound physical condition. Slum clearance projects of the past were in part necessitated by failure to keep up the quality of housing. Much private reinvestment in and renovation of the city's older housing, particularly of Victorians, in recent years has replaced the need for some of the kinds of direct public intervention that were required in the past. Even so there is a continuing need for housing rehabilitation. In addition, care must continue to be taken to detect incipient decline in housing quality and to take steps to arrest it once detected. The City should monitor those areas of the city where a decline in housing quality might be expected to occur and take appropriate remedial steps where necessary.

POLICY 5.1

Assure that existing housing is maintained in decent, safe sanitary condition at existing affordability levels.

The City should ensure that residential units continue to meet the standards of the housing code by periodic inspection of apartments and hotels and response to complaints. Code compliance activities should be designed to minimize the financial hardship which required rehabilitation may impose on those unable to pay increased rent. Low interest and deferred payment loan programs should be targeted to benefit low and moderate income tenants. Rent regulations should provide sufficient incentive to the owner to maintain a building in good condition.

POLICY 5.2

Promote and support voluntary housing rehabilitation which does not result in the displacement of lower income occupants.

Land use regulations should maintain their strong preservation orientation and act as an incentive to rehabilitation of existing housing, as well as a guide to new development. The City should establish other means, such as provision and maintenance of public improvements, to act as incentives for housing maintenance and rehabilitation. Neighborhood conditions should be monitored and in areas where housing is being under-maintained, appropriate measures, such as counseling and provision of loan funds, should be taken quickly to arrest deterioration.

POLICY 5.3

Assure correction of serious continuing code violations and loss of housing.

Where there is a refusal to correct serious but remediable violations, the City should make the repairs and recover the costs by liening the property. In aggravated cases the buildings should be placed in City receivership. Public assistance should be provided to maintain affordability levels.

With respect to Code enforcement in hardship cases compliance with full requirements should be deferred to the extent legally permissible if all life safety hazards are abated. In particular, the City should extend the period allowed for code compliance to avoid potential displacement of low- or moderate-income households until replacement housing can be found.

POLICY 5.4

Maintain and improve the existing supply of public housing.

The San Francisco Housing Authority is the largest landlord in San Francisco and is one of the few sources of permanently affordable housing for low income households. Operating subsidies and modernization funds provided by the Federal government have not been adequate to keep this housing in sound condition. Increased Federal support, innovative local financing techniques, cost

reduction measures (such as weatherization to reduce fuel costs), and creative management are all required to maintain and improve this valuable supply of affordable housing.

A nonprofit "Friends of Public Housing" should be established to seek grants for innovative renovation and management programs.

Long-range plans for public housing should be developed including identifying opportunities for potential mixed income infill development where consistent with overall social goals.

POLICY 5.5

Preserve landmark and historic residential buildings.

A priority policy of the Master Plan is that landmarks and historic buildings be preserved. Preservation of these buildings is important to the character and quality of the city's neighborhoods. They also are important housing resources. Many have larger units particularly suitable for families with children. More specific policies for these buildings are contained in the Historic Preservation Element.

AFFORDABILITY

OBJECTIVE 6

TO IMPROVE THE CITYWIDE AFFORDABLE HOUSING DELIVERY SYSTEM.

POLICY 6.1

Reorganize and coordinate governmental activity related to affordable housing

In order to insure that the City's housing policies and programs are effectively coordinated to generate the maximum results in addressing San Francisco's housing problems, a Housing Coordinating Group should be established under the direction of the Deputy Mayor for Housing and Neighborhoods. It should include all of the various City agencies involved with housing, including: the Mayor's Office of Housing; the City Planning Department; the Redevelopment Agency; the Housing Authority; the Bureau of Building Inspection; the City

Attorney's Office; the Rent Stabilization Board and the Human Rights Commission.

A centralized process should be established under the Deputy Mayor for the application and evaluation of all housing development proposals requiring financial assistance. Consolidation of technical staff to achieve coherence and eliminate duplication of activity should be considered.

POLICY 6.2

Expand affordable housing capacities of community based non-profit organizations.

Community- and constituency-based nonprofit housing development corporations have proven to be effective vehicles for development of affordable housing. The City should provide them with the technical and financial means to increase their production capacity. New community-based nonprofit housing development corporations should be established in areas which are underserved.

POLICY 6.3

Improve the planning review and approval process and give priority to permanently affordable housing projects.

The planning review and approval of affordable housing projects should be improved. Delays are costly and frustrating. Without diminishing public participation, the administrative processing and approval of affordable housing should be expedited through administration action, local legislation and if necessary State legislation including:

- Shortening of time periods for environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA);
- Preparing program EIRs for area plans and rezonings in sufficient detail to eliminate the need for subsequent project EIRs on residential projects.
- Streamlining and consolidating the public hearing process and avoiding duplicative discretionary hearings and appeals;

- Prioritizing plan check and other administrative processing through the Planning Department, Bureau of Building Inspection, Redevelopment Agency and other public agencies with respect to applications for affordable housing projects;
- Adopting neighborhood dispute resolution methods to minimize administrative appeals and judicial challenges of projects, and consequent time delays, and to mitigate neighborhood resentment and opposition to affordable housing projects;

Priority in processing should be given to projects that include affordable housing.

POLICY 6.4 Create greater public awareness of the affordable housing problem and support for affordable housing.

Affordable housing projects are frequently stalled or killed because of community opposition. Greater public awareness of the affordable housing problem and potential solutions is needed to gain public support. Past affordable housing developments should be evaluated and their actual achievements documented and publicized. Any continuing problems these developments have created should be analyzed and appropriate corrections made in future developments. Neighborhood based affordable housing and implementation should be initiated as a means to gain public acceptance.

OBJECTIVE 7

TO INCREASE LAND AND IMPROVE BUILDING RESOURCES FOR PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

POLICY 7.1

Create more housing opportunity sites for permanently affordable housing.

Publicly owned land represents a major potential source of sites for affordable housing. Except where required for other public purposes, public land in conjunction with other financial subsidies should be committed to permanently affordable housing

development. Sites which are suitable and can be made available for residential development should be identified. The evaluation should include options for joint development or relocation of current facilities to other sites. Zoning controls should be established for the sites which will maximize affordable housing on them. Priority should be given to immediate development of those public sites where 100% permanently affordable housing is achievable.

Large and privately held land parcels should also be identified and actively promoted for affordable housing. New programs should be established to acquire land and appropriate buildings for land and building "banking" in advance of specific project proposals.

Underutilized nonresidential land primarily on the eastern side of the City should be rezoned to residential use, with requirements, incentives and bonuses which are consistent with appropriate height and bulk for the areas to achieve affordable housing. In the rezoning of nonresidential land to residential use the goal should be to achieve the provision of a minimum of 10% permanently affordable units for all residential development containing more than 10 units. Program EIRs should be developed for those areas with sufficient detail to eliminate need for subsequent project EIRs on residential projects.

Strategic housing development areas should be identified where city initiatives, similar to that taken on the Sixth Street corridor, may be required. Mixed use or multiple site development can accomplish neighborhood improvement through balanced housing and economic development. These areas might include, for example:

- Select public housing sites
- Farmer's Market area
- Bayview/Third Street Corridor
- Various commercial districts along transportation corridors

POLICY 7.2

Include affordable units in larger housing projects.

Inclusion of affordable housing should be required as a condition of approval of housing projects containing 10 or more units which seek Planning Commission approval as

conditional uses or planned unit developments. As a general guideline, a minimum of 10% of the units should be affordable. The exact number of units should be determined on a case-by-case basis depending on the amount of private benefit conferred to the developers as a result of the discretionary approval. Approvals conferring large benefits would be conditioned on a greater housing affordability component. Less significant approvals would be conditioned on lower housing affordability requirements.

As an alternative to providing affordable units on site, the units could be provided, at the City's discretion, in another project in the same general area or an in-lieu cash contribution could be made to the City's affordable housing fund. The in-lieu contribution should be based on the amount of subsidy determined by the Mayor's Office of Housing to be required to produce a unit meeting the affordability standards .

POLICY 7.3

Grant density bonuses for construction of affordable or senior housing.

A response should be developed by the City to the State Law which calls for adoption of an ordinance permitting a 25% density bonus for projects which provide 20% of the units for lower-income households, 10% of the units for very-low-income households, or 50% of the units for senior citizens.

POLICY 7.4

Promote more economical housing construction to achieve affordable housing

The planning, building and other construction-related codes influence the price of new housing and the cost of maintaining existing housing. The City's codes should be reviewed regularly to ensure that standards and requirements do not unduly restrict needed housing development or unnecessarily increase the cost of housing. In administering codes, departments should regularly evaluate whether standards can be modified, without sacrificing quality and safety, to aid in lowering the cost of new housing. In particular, economies of construction could be improved by maximizing the ability to construct medium density housing in wood frame construction, up to five stories in height, in areas where the height limit would allow it.

POLICY 7.5

Encourage energy efficiency in new residential development and weatherization in existing housing to reduce overall housing costs.

Energy saving features such as orientation or window placement to optimize passive solar heating and use of natural daylight, can be "designed in", at little or no additional cost. Often features which add to the initial cost of a structure are highly cost-effective in terms of the life cycle or operating costs of the residential unit. For example, weatherization of existing housing can usually pay for itself in a short time, resulting in lower utility bills and lower overall housing costs. These approaches should be pursued.

POLICY 7.6

Encourage industrialized housing production techniques where such techniques result in compatible quality of design at lower cost.

At its best industrialized housing uses high technology and mass production techniques to reduce costs without sacrificing quality of design. Industrialized wood construction techniques used in lower density housing and light-weight prefabricated, pre-stressed concrete construction in moderate and high density housing have the potential of producing great savings in construction time and cost. The use of these and similar techniques should be encouraged.

POLICY 7.7

Allow construction of unconventional housing types that reduce cost, if quality can be maintained.

Prefabricated mobile homes can be a valuable source of low cost housing. Their use as temporary, emergency or transitional shelter on otherwise unutilized sites should be explored.

Reduction of minimum lot size requirements which would allow smaller structures on smaller lots should also be considered as a means of providing low-cost housing.

OBJECTIVE 8

TO EXPAND FINANCIAL RESOURCES FOR PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING

POLICY 8.1

Enhance existing revenue sources for permanently affordable housing.

Existing financial programs, including Federal and State low-income tax credits and various HUD programs should be maintained at maximum levels. Extensive lobbying

efforts at State and Federal levels need to be carried out to protect the existing programs and create new ones. Joint metropolitan/statewide efforts to allow more creative revenue resources should be supported.

A comprehensive City financial and debt management system to raise additional funds or reduce debts for affordable housing should be established.

POLICY 8.2

Create new sources of revenue for permanently affordable housing.

New revenue sources are needed if the City is to make a significant dent in the need for affordable housing. There are a number of potential sources.

Incremental tax revenues in Redevelopment project areas can be used for affordable housing. The Redevelopment Agency has a policy of allocating at least 50% of its increment funds for low and moderate income housing construction or renovation.

A major source of new revenue to the City which could be allocated to affordable housing is the real estate transfer tax. The current tax rate is much lower than some other counties in the Bay Area. Increasing this tax and devoting much of the increased revenue to preservation of affordable housing (see Objective 10) and to new affordable housing development should be given high priority.

The Seismic Rehabilitation Program funds should be supplemented with locally generated funds for seismic and code related rehabilitation. A general obligation bonds issue may be warranted. Technical assistance should be given to building owners in packaging tax credits and utilizing other State and Federal financial programs.

The requirements of the Office Affordable Housing Production Program, whereby new office development is obligated to assist in the production of housing, should be reassessed periodically to determine their adequacy and appropriate adjustments should be made.

POLICY 8.3

Provide new mechanisms to assure long-term financing for permanently affordable housing.

Voter approval should be sought for a guaranteed annual commitment to an affordable housing fund similar to the commitment that has been made to the Open Space

Acquisition Fund for development and maintenance of open space. A commitment of \$30,000,000 per year, for a period of 12 years would be desirable.

The feasibility of establishing a Housing Finance Agency with the ability to raise revenue from various sources for exclusive use for affordable housing and land banking, should also be explored.

POLICY 8.4

Develop greater investment in and support for affordable housing programs by corporations, churches, unions and financial institutions.

Greater corporate investment in and support for affordable housing should be developed. Churches are an untapped source of funding, as are dozens of local foundations. The AFL-CIO is seeking ways to use pension funds to invest in new housing developments built by union labor. The San Francisco Development Fund is working with the Federal Reserve Bank to create a local affordable housing mortgage pool, similar to SAMCO which operates statewide. The Mayor's office should serve as a coordinator, mobilizing the efforts of private and non-profit sectors.

Financial institutions are required by the federal government to have community reinvestment programs. This provides a potential source of financing for non profit sponsored low and moderate income housing development.

OBJECTIVE 9

TO IMPROVE THE FOCUS OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROGRAMS

POLICY 9.1

Employ uniform definitions of permanent affordability.

The following definitions of affordability should be used uniformly for all developments providing affordable housing and existing ordinances with different standards should be brought into compliance.

Median income figures are reported by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development for the three county area comprised of San Francisco, Marin and San Mateo counties, referred to as the Central Metropolitan Statistical Area or (CMSA). Average incomes are higher in Marin and San Mateo than they are in San Francisco, thus giving an upward bias to the numbers. The City should develop median income

figures for San Francisco alone. Until that can be done a compensating factor should be built into the city's programming for affordable housing. This has been done, for example, in rental projects in which the city is providing subsidy (land or financing or both) where the affordable rental units are required to average 60% and not exceed 80% of the CSMA median.

Maximum Income	Goal for Average Incomes	
Rental Programs Low Income Very Low Income Ownership Programs	80% of Median 50% of Median 120% of Median	60% of Median 100% of Median
Using HUD income categories the maximum rental and ownership amounts for each income category are to be computed annually.		

POLICY 9.2

Make affordable housing permanently affordable.

Affordable housing units which are created by various city actions should be required to remain affordable for as long a period as is legally permissible. The necessity of such requirement is underscored by the magnitude of the potential loss of existing HUD-financed affordable rental units which had a 20 year period for continuance of below market rents. In the past, locally assisted units have been required to remain at affordable rental rates or sales prices for periods as short as ten years. As the

experience with expiring HUD contracts indicates, expiration dates arrive all too soon and a problem thought to be solved becomes a problem again. Most recently, 50 year terms have been imposed by the City. If legally permissible, an even longer term should be required.

POLICY 9.3

Establish affordable housing priorities which emphasize the needs for very low income housing.

In order to assure that the best use is made of limited affordable housing tools and resources, the following priorities for their use should be established and followed.

Priorities:

- Resources should be allocated on a priority basis to the preservation and improvement of the existing financially subsidized affordable housing stock.
- An increase in the construction of new affordable housing should be pursued.
- The development of mixed income housing and integration of special user housing into conventional housing should be promoted to achieve social and cultural diversity.
- A minimum threshold of local financial assistance should be maintained to address the most urgent housing needs as follows:
 - Transitional and permanent housing for the homeless.
 - Renovation and improvement of Public Housing.
 - Unreinforced masonry buildings housing very low income households.
 - Adequate programs in cooperation with State and Federal agencies need to be developed to assist HUD sponsored housing with expiring subsidies.
- Goals for development of housing resources to meet the needs of special users should be established. (See Objective 13, Policy 3.)
- The application of physical accessibility standards to as many affordable housing developments as is feasible should be promoted.

- Occupancy criteria should be developed which insure that special housing unit types are occupied by the intended user group. Preference should be given to households with dependent children in rental or sale of multiple bedroom units.
- Co-development of appropriate support facilities, along with affordable housing should be promoted. Childcare facilities at or near location of multifamily developments and in conjunction with upgraded public housing should especially be promoted.

OBJECTIVE 10 TO PROTECT THE EXISTING AFFORDABILITY OF HOUSING.

POLICY 10.1

Preserve affordability of existing affordable units.

Over the years, the city has in certain instances required the provision of affordable housing units as a condition of approval of a project. However, aggressive monitoring and enforcement are needed to assure the continued availability of these units. An affordable housing monitoring program with an adequate fee system to financially support all monitoring costs should be established. Monitoring of all affordable housing conditions should be centralized. Standard affordability restrictions which allow for effective monitoring and enforcement should be developed. Stiff penalties for non-compliance should be created to provide strong economic disincentives against loss of required affordable housing units. City housing agencies and the City Attorney's Office should devote adequate resources to monitor compliance and administer sanctions against non-compliance. Adequately funded new programs are needed for enforcement of violations which are removing affordable housing units.

POLICY 10.2

Protect existing buildings at risk of losing their subsidies or being converted to market rate housing.

A number of subsidized housing projects were created with federally supported programs with fixed terms, which are about to expire or be subject to early terminations. There are problems both with termination of mortgages and with termination of Section 8 rent subsidies. Twenty seven low income rental projects have been identified as being subject to termination of federal mortgage and/or rent subsidies through 1995. These projects contain 3,725 housing units. Federal legislation is currently pending which

would extend Section 8 subsidies affecting up to 2,000 of these units. Such legislation has been focussed on short term extensions, making local action necessary.

In order to prevent the loss of affordable housing resulting early termination of HUD mortgages, a residents and/or non-profit ownership and management program to acquire existing "at risk" buildings should be created. The City can facilitate such acquisition through technical and financial assistance, and by potential regulation of fair return price, and establishment of right of first refusal by qualified tenant associations or non profits. In terms of tenants who lose Section 8 subsidies, the City should establish priorities for their relocation in new locally assisted developments.

Regulatory measures should require sufficient notice to tenants on intended prepayment and/or termination of HUD mortgages of assisted housing developments to allow consideration of tenant purchase. Public hearings should be required on owners' plans, number of affected units, current and proposed rents and schedules. Findings on these issues should be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors. Other appropriate measures to be taken include legislative advocacy both at a State and Federal level to preserve subsidies and mitigate losses, educational and information efforts and active monitoring by the City of projects where owners have indicated intent to convert.

Given the magnitude of the cost to preserve existing subsidized housing, the success of a local strategy will be dependent upon federal resources and regulatory requirements.

POLICY 10.3

Ensure equal access to, protection for, and affirmative marketing of affordable housing.

The enforcement of Fair Housing Access laws should be supported to prevent discrimination against minorities, special users, the poor, immigrants, and non-traditional households. Periodic reporting on the composition of resident populations in various publicly supported housing projects and affordable units required as a condition of permit approval should be required to facilitate compliance monitoring. Counselling and education to maintain housing rights should be promoted.

The State and Federal Housing Requirements regarding displacement prohibitions, and other restrictions where affordable housing rehabilitation or construction might impact the community should be adopted as City policy. An Affirmative Action Fair Marketing Plan should be adopted such as the H.U.D. program to advertise available affordable

housing in multilingual media. The City should monitor and strictly enforce these requirements. Sufficient evidence should be required from applicants to prevent affordable housing units from being occupied by undeserving parties. Community forums including the Human Rights Commission should be provided in order to diffuse unwarranted opposition to affordable housing.

POLICY 10.4

Safeguard tenants from excessive rent increases while assuring landlords fair and adequate rents.

In recent years various pressures on the limited housing supply have resulted in substantial increases in rent levels causing displacement and economic hardship to those unable to pay those rent increases. As long as these pressures continue, a regulatory process should be maintained which stabilizes rent levels and protects tenants from excessive rent increases and arbitrary eviction while at the same time allowing the landlord a fair rent and sufficient incentive to maintain housing quality. This regulatory process should include provisions that prevent excessive rent increases when units become vacant, thereby reducing the incentive for landlords to pressure tenants to vacate so rents may be raised.

OBJECTIVE 11

TO ACHIEVE AFFORDABILITY THROUGH VARIOUS FORMS OF OWNERSHIP .

POLICY 11.1

Encourage non-profit and limited equity ownership and management of housing.

Housing owned by non-profit corporations whose specific purpose is to provide decent shelter to low and moderate income households can be an effective means of providing affordable housing. Similarly, conversion of buildings by their tenants to limited equity cooperatives and condominiums can stabilize and, as general housing prices increase over time, can lower housing costs. The City should encourage these forms of ownership.

POLICY 11.2

Support new affordable ownership programs.

The American dream of homeownership is beyond the reach of most San Francisco households. The City should take steps to deal with this problem. For example, first-

time homebuyer programs, including development of a second mortgage loan pool or other appropriate mechanisms to assist buyers meet down-payment requirements, should be broadened.

NEIGHBORHOOD ENVIRONMENT

OBJECTIVE 12

TO PROVIDE A QUALITY LIVING ENVIRONMENT.

Housing quality involves not only the physical condition of housing structure itself but also the condition of the surrounding neighborhood and the adequacy of its amenities, facilities, and services. Proper housing development must also address these matters.

POLICY 12.1

Assure housing is provided with adequate public improvements, services and amenities.

Many factors add to neighborhood livability, including the quality of schools, the availability of quality, affordable child care, the effectiveness of police and fire services, and access to open space and recreational opportunities. Regular maintenance of streets and sidewalks, provision of street trees, and protection of residential areas from excessive traffic, are also important to neighborhood life. Good design of buildings can add amenity to the neighborhood. All of these factors should be addressed by the City in providing its residents a quality living environment.

POLICY 12.2

Allow appropriate neighborhood-serving commercial activities in residential areas.

Certain nonresidential uses are desirable and appropriate in residential areas. For example, small pedestrian-oriented grocery stores and other convenience shops, can meet frequent and recurring needs of residents without disrupting the residential character of the area. On the other hand, other types of non-residential uses are noisy, or unattractive, or generate excessive traffic, and therefore would be undesirable in residential areas.

Commercial uses should be allowed in residential areas only if they meet the following criteria:

- The use is primarily pedestrian-oriented.
- The use serves the needs of the immediate residential neighborhood and does not draw significant trade from outside the neighborhood.
- The use does not displace a unit suitable for residential occupancy.
- The use does not disrupt or detract from the livability of the surrounding neighborhood.
- There are no suitable locations in immediately adjacent neighborhood commercial areas.
- The design of the building is in keeping with the established residential character of the area, and all signs are carefully regulated.
- Truck traffic servicing the use is minimized, and truck delivery hours are restricted.

Community services such as child care centers are particularly appropriate in residential areas, even though they may draw from a larger area and may not be primarily pedestrian-oriented.

Non-residential use, if essential to the preservation of a landmark building, could be also be permitted if the specific use is compatible with the surrounding environment.

POLICY 12.3

Minimize disruption caused by expansion of institutions into residential areas.

The expansion needs of institutions often conflict with efforts to preserve and protect the scale and character of residential neighborhoods. Large educational, religious, and medical institutions attract people from outside a neighborhood, aggravating traffic and parking problems. Institutional buildings also tend to be larger in scale and more intensely used than surrounding residential buildings. In addition, institutional expansion often requires removal of housing and displacement of residents.

To minimize the disruption caused by expansion of large institutions, the City should carefully review expansion plans. The needs of adjacent residential areas for housing,

on-street parking and safe, quiet streets should be considered, in addition to the needs of the institution. Educational and medical institutions should be required to develop and submit master plans to the City, before the City reviews any specific expansion requests. Such a master plan should define long-term and short-range development plans of the institution. Early review of institutional development plans will permit exploration of alternate ways to address the needs of the institution in order to minimize potential conflicts with the residential area.

POLICY 12.4

Promote construction of well designed housing that conserves existing neighborhood character.

Residents of San Francisco should be able to live in well designed housing suited to their specific needs. To ensure that housing provides quality living environments and complements the design character of the surrounding neighborhood, the following general design and amenity guidelines should be applied in evaluating new residential developments and alteration of existing buildings.

RESIDENTIAL PROJECTS

Exterior Appearance

- Design new and substantially altered buildings in a manner which conserves and protects neighborhood character (See "Residential Design Guidelines", Department of City Planning, November 2, 1989 for more specific guidelines and illustrations.)
- Relate the form and architectural character of new and substantially altered buildings to the general scale and character of surrounding buildings.
- Orient dwelling units and dwelling unit entrances to the street.
- Encourage articulation of the building facade through use of set backs, bay windows, cornice details, entry details and other variations in horizontal or vertical planes.
- On wide frontages, provide architectural variety by breaking up the facade into modules whose widths are in keeping with surrounding buildings. Make each module architecturally distinctive through such techniques as changes in facade

articulation, in roof forms or cornice treatments, in the shape and location of garage and residential entries, in window forms and patterns, and in materials and ornamentation.

- Finish the rear facade and all visible sides of the building in materials similar in quality and appearance to those of the front facades.
- Relate set backs to the set backs of nearby buildings.
- Avoid disruptive intrusion into a well defined interior block open space.
- Incorporate "good neighbor" gestures - minor changes in building form that reduce loss of light, views and privacy.
- Minimize the number and width of garage doors and curb cuts.
- Enclose parking and screen it with solid garage doors, active uses (such as unit entries and occupied rooms), solid walls and landscaping. Minimize openings for ventilation and locate so that driveways and maneuvering and parking areas within the structure, and their light sources, are not visible from the street and to the extent possible from nearby buildings.
- Landscape set backs and relate the type of landscaping to that of adjacent properties.
- Install street trees, if none exist.

Recreation/Open Space

- Provide adequate on-site usable open space.
- Relate the type, amount and location of open space to the types of households expected to occupy the building. (See Figure 9, "Residential Open Space Guidelines" in the Recreation and Open Space Element, Page 1.3.49 for more specific guidelines.)
- Provide convenient access from interior living areas to the open space.

Facilities

- In larger projects, include needed facilities such as storage facilities, laundry facilities, community rooms for provision of day care and group activities, and facilities for recycling of waste materials.

Environmental Factors

- (Sunlight, topography, noise, and climate.)
- Expose all units to natural light.
- Insulate units from the intrusion of exterior and interior noise.
- Relate building construction to the topography, geology and climate of the area.
- Apply energy conservation measures in the design of the building.
- Protect the access of nearby parks and open space to sunlight and vistas.

Security

- Incorporate concepts of security in the design of the building, especially in the number of units per entrance, sense of personal space and ability of the residents to effect self-policing of the grounds and immediate surroundings.
- Provide adequately lit unit numbers (addresses) which are easily read from the street or circulation ways.

Art Work

- In larger projects, incorporate art work in the exterior of the building or its common open space.

Lot Layout

- (Larger subdivisions and planned unit developments.)
- Provide a lot layout and pattern that integrates well with the urban fabric of the surrounding area.
- Create a street pattern which ties into surrounding streets.
- Avoid creating dead end streets and cul de sacs where it is possible to create through streets.

- On wide blocks, create midblock lanes that function as public streets.
- Create pedestrian passageways to provide convenient circulation within the project and convenient connections to areas outside the project.
- Create a lot or building pattern that orients the fronts of buildings to, and creates multiple building entries from the street.
- Avoid perimeter walls and driveways around projects.
- Avoid creating overly wide streets and sidewalks. Provide sidewalks wide enough to accommodate street trees.
- Underground utilities.
- Provide sites for convenience shopping facilities to serve the residents of the immediate vicinity if such facilities do not exist nearby.
- Provide sites for childcare facilities to serve residents of the immediate vicinity if such facilities do not exist nearby, or if nearby facilities are at or near capacity.

POLICY 12.5

Relate land use controls to the appropriate scale for new and existing residential areas.

In recognition of the special character of single and two family neighborhoods, zoning envelopes should be tailored to the prevailing built pattern to maintain the low density character. In all other new and existing residential areas, the zoning envelope should be of an appropriate scale and form to encourage residential development and diversity of housing choice.

POLICY 12.6

Modify proposed developments which have substantial adverse environmental impacts or otherwise conflict with the Master Plan.

Proposed new developments receive environmental evaluation which analyzes their likely environmental impacts. Projects with substantial adverse environmental impacts should be considered in conflict with the Master Plan, in the absence of substantial and overriding social or economic factors. The environmental review and project review processes should be closely coordinated to result in development plans with no substantial adverse environmental impacts or other Master Plan conflicts.

ACCESSIBILITY

OBJECTIVE 13

TO PROVIDE MAXIMUM HOUSING CHOICE.

Population diversity is one of San Francisco's important assets. To retain this diversity, a variety of housing opportunities should be available. Households should be able to choose the form of tenure most suitable to their needs, from either a rental or an ownership housing stock. A variety of unit sizes is also important, so that both larger and smaller households can be accommodated in adequate numbers. Units of varied costs are necessary to provide opportunities for households of different income levels. Finally, there should be units with special features suitable for households with special needs.

Social and economic factors can discriminate against certain population groups and limit their housing opportunities. Racial minorities face constraints as to where they can live, leading to patterns of economic and racial segregation. Families with children are constrained by the types and sizes of units available to them; suitable units tend to be limited by erosion of the older housing stock and discriminatory rental practices.

Standard housing units with special features for elderly and handicapped persons are in short supply as is space for artists who live and work in the same unit. If San Francisco is to retain its economic, racial and cultural diversity, opportunities should be expanded for population groups for whom affordability and accessibility are crucial.

POLICY 13.1

Prevent housing discrimination based on age, race, religion, sex, sexual preference, marital status, ancestry, national origin, color, disability, health (AIDS/ARC), source or amount of income, citizenship or employment status as a family day care provider.

To insure housing opportunities for all people, the City should assist in the implementation of fair housing and anti-discrimination laws. In particular, the Human Rights Commission should immediately implement the 1987 amendments to the City's Fair Housing Law by promulgating appropriate regulations to handle complaints of housing discrimination. Moreover, residential apartment owners should be prohibited from using arbitrary income requirements which unnecessarily exclude lower income

families. The City should make use of opportunities in its interaction with community groups, businesses, and other agencies to eliminate housing discrimination.

POLICY 13.2

Promote adaptability and maximum accessibility of residential dwellings for disabled occupants.

Disabled San Franciscans are less able to compete for scarce housing units, in part because so many are not physically accessible to them and in part because the disabled often have lower than average incomes. The City should take an active role in expanding the availability of units suited to households with special needs. Congregate housing with central eating facilities is an appropriate form of housing for some elderly households. In accordance with local policy and applicable law, new housing should be made accessible or adaptable to the disabled. "Accessible" means that the housing presents no physical barriers to handicapped people. "Adaptable" means housing whose entry and circulation are designed and constructed so that the unit can be made fully accessible by making relatively minor adjustments and additions rather than structural changes.) The goal should be that at least 10% of all new units are made fully accessible.

POLICY 13.3

Increase the availability of units suitable for special user groups with special housing needs including large families, the elderly, and the homeless.

In addition to the disabled, other households with special needs have difficulty finding suitable housing in San Francisco. Many large families, newly immigrated to the United States, are crowded into units designed for much smaller households. The large number of single parent and two working parent households makes the provision of childcare facilities an important component of family housing developments. New housing construction should include units to accommodate large families, which should be the subject of affirmative marketing efforts by the developer. Many of the City's elderly citizens occupy housing which is not designed to meet their special needs. Shelters and transitional housing facilities are not available in sufficient numbers to meet the needs of the city's homeless population. The psychiatrically disabled need housing with additional support services. The City should take an active role to encourage the

expansion of the availability of housing units suited to needs of these groups including physical design features and ancillary social and medical service facilities.

The City should adequately support efforts by potential sponsors to identify and develop sites and buildings for special users and promote cooperative effects between social service agencies and housing providers to develop special user housing. The City should also seek to reduce institutional barriers to development of innovative forms of housing.

When units are constructed or rehabilitated to meet the needs of special user groups and have received City support or waivers, there should be monitoring to assure that such units continue to be occupied by the intended group.

The City should encourage and support development of unique (unconventional) housing types which meet the particular needs of various user groups. For example, live work units in industrials areas, with large work spaces and loft sleeping facilities are particularly suited to the needs of some artists and artisans.

POLICY 13.4 Eliminate discrimination against households with children.

Households with children often have difficulty in finding suitable housing because many landlords do not want children as tenants. The City should prohibit discrimination against children and encourage the construction of units suitable for families with children. In assisted housing, households with dependent children should have preference in rental or resale of multiple bedroom units. The City should implement the 1987 ordinance prohibiting residential apartment owners from discriminating against families based on household size unless occupancy of the dwelling by a family of that size is not permitted by the Housing Code.

POLICY 13.5

Encourage economic integration in housing by ensuring that new permanently affordable housing is located in all of the City's neighborhoods, and by requiring that all new large market rate residential developments include affordable units.

Patterns of economic segregation are evident in San Francisco. Although housing opportunities for low- and moderate-income households are available in many areas of the city, they tend to be concentrated in a few areas. Special efforts should be made to expand housing opportunities for households of lower-income levels in other areas of the

city. The affordability of housing is a city wide problem. All neighborhoods of the city should be expected to accept their fair share of affordable housing.

Private reinvestment in many areas of the city, in a process of economic gentrification, is resulting in displacement of low- and moderate-income households by higher income groups. Special efforts should be made to maintain the economic diversity of these areas.

POLICY 13.6

Provide adequate rental housing opportunities.

Since approximately two-thirds of San Francisco's residents are renters, the availability of sound rental housing is of major importance, especially for the young and elderly population, who tend to rent, rather than own, their residence. Low vacancy rates and high rents are indicators of a continuing demand for rental housing.

The public sector should make a concerted effort to do what is within its control to encourage the development of affordable rental housing and to ensure that there is an adequate supply.

POLICY 13.7

Expand opportunities for home ownership without significantly diminishing the supply of rental housing.

The City should work to expand opportunities for owner-occupancy of housing and develop special programs to facilitate home ownership for households of varied income levels.

It is important that households be ready and able to assume the financial and management responsibilities of home ownership. To protect housing purchasers, the City should explore establishing such safeguards as presale inspections for all property transfers and should encourage home ownership counseling services.

POLICY 13.8

Amend regulations relating to group housing to ensure a distribution of quality board and care, adult day care facilities and single room occupancies.

Older large buildings and formerly commercially occupied spaces may be suitable for conversion to group housing. Because of the availability of certain types of residential

buildings and services in certain parts of the city, board and care and adult day care facilities have tended to become concentrated in those areas. Applications for new facilities may continue to reinforce these concentrations unless they are carefully reviewed. It is desirable that group housing and board and care homes be distributed throughout the city so that people are offered a choice of locations and over-concentration of facilities in particular neighborhoods is avoided. However, the Federal fair housing laws prohibit limitations on board and care facilities and group homes to the extent that these limitations diminish housing opportunities for disabled persons and families with children. Adult day care facilities which allow disabled or elderly persons to live at home but receive daily support, should be located close to their clients. In reviewing applications for board and care homes and adult day care facilities, the following factors should be among those evaluated:

- In the case of day care facilities, proximity to clients' residences
- Accessibility to recreational facilities and open space.
- Proximity to commercial areas and shopping.
- Proximity to community services.

DISPLACEMENT

OBJECTIVE 14

TO AVOID OR MITIGATE HARDSHIPS IMPOSED BY DISPLACEMENT.

Because of the economic and social hardships involved when a household is forced to move, and the difficulty of funding replacement housing at comparable rents, every reasonable effort should be made to minimize the need to displace residents, particularly those with lower incomes or families with children, from their homes.

POLICY 14.1

Minimize relocation hardship and displacement caused by the public or private demolition or conversion of housing.

Private demolition of housing can cause particular hardships because of the absence of relocation assistance programs for displaced households. Property owners should provide assistance in finding suitable relocation housing if any lower-income households are to be displaced. Property owners should inform tenants at the earliest possible date

of any proposed demolition plans and should arrange for counseling assistance for the displaced households. Owners should not be permitted to demolish existing housing units until efforts have been made to assist tenants in obtaining relocation housing.

POLICY 14.2

Permit displaced households the right of first refusal to occupy replacement housing units of comparable in size, location, cost and rent control protection.

To minimize displacement and help protect the population already residing in an area, persons temporarily or permanently by publicly sponsored or assisted rehabilitation or new construction should be restored to their previous position to the maximum extent feasible. In cases of existing units converted to condominium or cooperative ownership, existing tenants should be given the right of first refusal to purchase the converted units.

POLICY 14.3

Provide relocation services where publicly funded or private actions cause displacement.

When displacement does occur as a result of public actions, uniform relocation services (counseling, locating replacement housing, and moving expenses) should be provided regardless of whether the displacement is caused by federal, state or locally funded activities. In the case of privately funded displacement, the developer should be requested to provide such services.

HOMELESSNESS

OBJECTIVE 15

TO DEAL WITH THE ROOT CAUSES OF HOMELESSNESS, RECOGNIZING THE SOLUTION IS MORE THAN THE PROVISION OF EMERGENCY SHELTER.

Homelessness has grown to a scale unprecedented in the United States since the 1930s. The legacy of the 1980s that has regarded temporary shelter as an adequate response to homelessness should be overcome. Shelters are not an acceptable alternative to decent, affordable housing. While the City should not relax its commitment to offering shelter to anyone who would otherwise be forced to live in streets, parks and doorways, the vision and the overall direction should remain fixed on the goal of creating

and preserving low-cost housing, jobs and job training programs and the necessary health and social support services that enable people to live with the greatest degree of independence possible. Such services for the homeless should be provided in a multilingual and multicultural context where appropriate.

It is critical that San Francisco and other cities begin to develop a regional approach to homelessness in the Bay Area and that increased state and federal support be provided if local efforts are to succeed.

POLICY 15.1

Shift focus from provision of temporary shelter to provision of permanent affordable housing.

The creation of new low-cost housing will be the best measure of the degree and rate of success in efforts to address homelessness. Creation of new units of permanently affordable housing for the very low income should be a high priority. Existing low cost housing should be preserved so that those with very low incomes do not risk becoming homeless. To this end, the Residential Hotel Conversion rules have recently been strengthened. There should be more aggressive enforcement of all laws protecting low-cost housing.

POLICY 15.2

Develop strategies to deal with root causes of homelessness including lack of financial resources, employment and health services.

Measures that go beyond shelter are needed to address the root causes of homelessness. These include stable sources of income from jobs or through federal, state or local entitlement programs and health and social support services for short or long periods of time to assist people with special needs in regaining their capacity to live with the greatest degree of independence possible.

POLICY 15.3

Provide emergency assistance programs including emergency access to food, clothing and shelter, improve coordination of services in existing shelter programs and expand health care outreach services.

While the emphasis should be on provision of permanent housing, the City should provide an emergency shelter program which provides temporary shelter and links

homeless people to more comprehensive services. By combining a drop-in center with a multi-service program, a multiplicity of needs can be addressed in one location.

Although there are shelter programs that target different populations (men, women, youth, seniors, physically disabled people, undocumented, etc.), or programs for people with mental health or substance abuse problems, there is no central intake capacity to help people reach the appropriate service provider. There is need for a central intake and multi-service centers that can be points of entry to the service system for people who would otherwise be in the streets. While an intake facility should initially target the section of the city with the highest concentrations of homeless people, there should also be satellite facilities that target other neighborhoods where homeless people whose needs are not being met by the multiservice center are present.

Homeless people often have difficulty gaining access to the health care system, whether it is because the multiplicity of problems they experience overwhelms health care providers, their behavior or appearance makes them unwelcome or they themselves regard health care as low on the survival priority list. There is need for outreach services to provide health care in locations where homeless people are, in a manner that gains their trust and with a goal of integrating them into the larger health care system.

POLICY 15.4

Facilitate childcare and education for children or homeless families.

Homeless families, just like other families, require a broad variety of child care programs to meet their particular needs. For some, the need is for developmentally appropriate, well-equipped spaces which offer privacy, enabling families an opportunity to interact and play with their children. For other parents, who may need time for respite, to participate in job training, or to look for work or run errands, the need is for a drop-in on-site or near-site child care program. In other instances the need may be for an on-site licensed childcare programs that serves the special needs of these children, such as the need to be near their parent, to be in care with siblings in mixed age groups, and the need to be safe in yet another temporary setting. Homeless children also need access to off-site non-temporary child care programs which can meet their developmental needs.

POLICY 15.5

Adopt measures that prevent homelessness.

The success of new assistance programs for the homeless becomes less likely as more and more people continue to become homeless. It is, therefore, critical to adopt preventative measures at the same time new programs are being designed and implemented. Prevention initiatives and programs are needed to assist people in maintaining their current housing and to protect the existing stock of low-cost housing. People who currently live in low-cost housing and who depend upon public assistance or minimum wage jobs are at particularly high risk of losing their homes if faced with sudden job loss, medical problems or other unanticipated expenses. Assistance for people who are facing eviction is a critical component in preventing homelessness.

A publicly funded renter's emergency assistance pool should be established to prevent homelessness, modelled on the privately funded AIDS Emergency Fund. The pool should be used to augment existing State programs which provide one month's rent, but do not provide last month's rent or the security deposit.

STATE AND REGIONAL COORDINATION

OBJECTIVE 16

TO ADDRESS AFFORDABLE HOUSING NEEDS THROUGH A COORDINATED STATE AND REGIONAL APPROACH.

Housing is a regional concern. Problems such as the inability of large numbers of people to afford decent housing, inequities and discrimination in the housing market, and the inadequacy of public resources cross the boundaries of local jurisdictions and cannot be addressed solely on a local level. Region-wide strategies are needed. Investment decisions made by the private sector are rarely confined to the limits of single governmental jurisdictions — broader housing market areas are considered. A strategy dealing with housing problems in the Bay Area must therefore involve a regional approach. Furthermore, effective solutions to housing problems in the Bay Area can be developed only if all agencies and organizations dealing with housing in the Bay Area coordinate their activities.

POLICY 16.1

Encourage the balancing of regional employment growth with the development and growth of affordable housing in the region.

San Francisco is part of the larger regional economy of the Bay Area and economic decisions made by one community often affect other communities in the region. Thus decisions made by some cities to limit commercial or residential growth impact other cities in the region. Efforts should be made to balance employment and housing growth within the region. Aggregated together, current local government development policies will not house the labor supply needed for jobs currently projected for the region. If these policies remain unchanged, housing must be provided outside the region extending commute patterns, or regional job growth will be curtailed, or both.

The Association of Bay Area Governments has established a regional goal to house within the region up to 50% of the difference between the projected growth in Bay Area jobs and the growth in the region's labor supply. To reduce the jobs-housing imbalance in the region by that amount by 1995, almost 50,000 additional housing units are needed within the region.

POLICY 16.2

Encourage development of housing in the bay area which will meet regional housing needs and contribute to the quality of life in the region.

New residential development and rehabilitation of existing housing should be planned to conserve open space and to take advantage of the availability of employment opportunities, public transit systems, and community services. San Francisco should take an active role in promoting quality new housing development in the Bay Area in areas where adverse impacts on the environment will not be generated and the use of public transit will be enhanced.

POLICY 16.3

Encourage the distribution of affordable housing throughout the Bay Area without diminishing efforts to expand such housing in the City.

Local communities throughout the Bay Area should accept responsibility for housing families of all income levels. At the present time, most of the region's subsidized housing for low- and moderate-income households is concentrated in the central cities, including

San Francisco. Housing opportunities for low- and moderate-income households should be available throughout the region, and all localities in the Bay Area should provide their fair share of such housing. Responsibility should be shared by the public and the private sector.

State law allows joint exercise of powers between jurisdictions which enable entrepreneurial action at a larger-than-local scale. There is substantial opportunity for expanding the resources of affordable housing by cooperative efforts between localities themselves and the localities in relation to the State. For example, the risk factor for bonding can be reduced through joint bond issues with potential state participation and by state insurance of joint bond issues.

POLICY 16.4

Encourage the State of California to develop and implement an affordable housing plan.

With the continuously decreasing level of federal support for housing programs, the financial powers of the State become critical. A number of recent housing bond proposals have been enacted at a state level, but there also needs to be a long range plan for affordable housing and a clearer articulation of the State's role.