

**Excelsior & Outer Mission Neighborhood Strategy**  
Working Group  
Land use & Housing Subgroup

**Date:** Tuesday September 12, 2017

---

**Staff Facilitators:** Rachael Tanner, San Francisco Planning Department

**Notes taken by:** Rachael Tanner, San Francisco Planning Department

---

Attendance:

***Working Group Participants***

Faye Lacanilao

Edward Parillon, BRIDGE Housing

***Partner Agencies & Organizations***

Stephanie Cajina, Excelsior Action Group

Cindy Heavens, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development

James Pappas, Planning Department

Jorge Rivas, Office of Economic and Workforce Development

**Members of the Public**

Theodore Randolph

**Notes**

**Review Affordable Housing Tour**

- What stuck out for those who attended the housing tour?
  - Really good projects, well designed.
  - Good common spaces. They were unused, but it was also the middle of the day when we visited.
  - Low and/or no parking at each site.
  - Transitional Aged Youth Program –
    - Targeting specific groups and populations to provide them with a needed service.
    - It's really great service for those youth.
  - 1100 Ocean –
    - Retail
      - I was very impressed with the retail leases there; they were fully leased and with local/small businesses. It may be because they have a specific retail practice at Mercy Housing that focuses on retail space.
      - There are so many places in the city where retail spaces are just empty.
      - All of the places there were restaurants/food based; does that mean food is the only viable commercial use there?
      - Sometimes housing is primary and commercial is just an afterthought.
    - Services

- Could these be places for service providers to locate? And be located on the main corridor?
- Places for family, service and recreation not just traditional retail?
- Vehicle ownership
  - Vehicle ownership at 1100 Ocean was a bit high.
  - Can we encourage more car sharing in the development?
    - It can work, but is expensive and not always affordable.
    -

## Housing Capacity

### *Do we need more housing capacity?*

- Yes, especially low and moderate income housing.
- CUHJ has the “better neighborhood, same neighbors” report. The report and that idea—better neighborhood, same neighbors—really captures our ideas about housing.
- I think about townhome designs. They seem to be a shape and form that might provide enough space for multi-generational families.
- Challenge: small units won’t be built through LIHTC (low income housing tax credits), vouchers or other programs. How to make smaller-scale housing affordable is a challenge.
- Could develop more housing if single-family lots were built to their full 40 feet capacity.
- We could explore changing single-family zoning on the main corridors and along bus lines.
- I would recommend getting rid of all RH Zoning; it means much of the land in San Francisco is dedicated to just 1 family unit.
- Value of a single family home, though, is so high that even if there was the ability to have a 3 family home, it might not happen because the cost of the single family home is so high.

### *How do we talk about housing capacity?*

- Sometimes, there can be a tension between design of new buildings that might not be as charming. The modern looks might not appeal to everyone.
- Portland had a similar problem. They created a “permit-ready” design book to show how housing might look. We could do a similar project in SF to show how a 40 foot and 3 unit home might look.
  - This could also encourage designers to fit into the neighborhood character.
- Perhaps there could be a program level environmental impact report that would help to look at the impacts of this
  - This could reduce uncertainty for neighbors and property owners
  - And facilitate more housing
  - There might be complicated financing though.

## Built Form – Heights

- The group looked at the survey results from Survey Monkey. The results showed that a majority of respondents found 3 – 4 story buildings to be appropriate or highly desirable. As the building heights increased, more respondents found the buildings inappropriate or highly undesirable.

- Given that survey respondents were not in favor of buildings more than 6 stories, yet the discussion tonight favors finding capacity for more people to live in the neighborhood, what are the boundaries of the capacity we should consider?
- Some proposals considered:
  - Make all parcels on the corridor 6 stories. Currently 6 stories are already allowed in several parts of the commercial corridor.
  - Have building heights of 65 feet on Mission from Ocean Avenue to Geneva.
  - Add height, and ensure the bulk of the building still allows the sun to penetrate.
  - Keep the height limits as they are now; remove “density” controls so that the same building can contain more housing units.
  - Increase housing capacity on Geneva to greater than 1 unit per lot.
  - Increase housing capacity on the east side of Alemany to more than 1 unit per lot.
  - Increase housing capacity on bus corridors to greater than 1 unit per lot.

### **Commercial Capacity**

- Do we want to have additional commercial space, considering that there are already vacant store fronts? Need to continue discussing this question.
- Address the current vacancies
- Consider allowing a greater variety of uses on the corridor

### **Pause**

- While we continue to explore these changes, should we consider putting a pause on certain businesses opening right now? Changes could come out of this process, and business owners/entrepreneurs applying right now might end up suffering if things change and they’ve spent time applying
  - We need to learn more about who would be impacted by changes.
  - Wouldn’t want the pause to negatively impact small businesses and low-income business owners.
  - Perhaps we can see what is in the pipeline right now.