San Francisco Planning Annual Report
FISCAL YEAR 2020/21
Mayor
London N. Breed

Board of Supervisors
Connie Chan (District 1)
Catherine Stefani (District 2)
Aaron Peskin (District 3)
Gordon Mar (District 4)
Dean Preston (District 5)
Matt Haney (District 6)
Myrna Melgar (District 7)
Rafael Mandelman (District 8)
Hillary Ronen (District 9)
Shamann Walton, Board President (District 10)
Ahsha Safai (District 11)

Planning Commission
Joel Koppel, Commission President
Kathrin Moore, FACIP, Commission Vice President
Deland Chan
Sue Diamond
Frank S. Fung
Theresa Imperial
Rachael Tanner

Historic Preservation Commission
Diane Matsuda, Commission President
Ruchira Nageswaran, Commission Vice President
Kate Black
Chris Foley
Richard S. E. Johns
Lydia So
Jason Wright

San Francisco Planning

SFplanning.org

FY 2020/21 Annual Report prepared by:
Rich Hillis, Director of Planning
Daniel A. Sider
Julian J. Bañales
Candace Soohoo
Gary Chen

This Annual Report fulfills the requirement of San Francisco City Charter Section 4.103 for both the Planning Commission and the Historic Preservation Commission.

Cover photo of 49 South Van Ness Avenue.
© Jason O’Rear

* FY 2020/21 covers the fiscal year period from June 1, 2020 – June 30, 2021
As the pandemic wanes and life slowly turns toward a more (new) normal path, we must reduce equity disparities and creatively reshape the City’s landscape.

Equitable housing opportunities and ensuring San Francisco becomes a healthy and livable city for all our residents remains our utmost priority. In 2021, we released the Draft 2022 Housing Element Update, San Francisco’s housing plan for the next 8 years (2022-2030) and the first one that will center on racial and social equity. With seven months of virtual community conversations about the City’s housing needs, our staff coordinated with community-based organizations to lead virtual conversations with groups that have historically been excluded from policymaking, including communities of color, immigrant communities, low-income communities, seniors, and youth. Their suggestions on how to make housing equitable for all San Franciscans will help us focus on developing housing policy solutions that will begin to repair the harm and address the past social, racial, and economic injustices faced by American Indian, Black, Asian, Latinx, and all communities of color.

We are also proud of our commitment to approving housing units suitable for households at all income levels, authorizing 2,129 projects with 22,588 residential units between 2016-2020, and approving 1,677 accessory dwelling units (ADUs) since 2014. Seventeen of these projects used Senate Bill 35 (with at least nine additional SB-35 projects in the pipeline), the 2017 legislation enacted in effort to increase housing production, and 86 projects, including projects under review, used the State Density Bonus Law, legislation intended to encourage and incentivize lower-income and transit-oriented housing. Recent multi-phase projects totaling more than 5,600 units throughout the City includes: 3333 California (744 units), Balboa Reservoir (1,100 units), Mission Rock (1,200 units), and the Potrero Power Station (2,600 units).
units). While we still have work to do, we’re moving in the right direction toward meeting the City’s severe housing shortfall.

We continue to see additional economic opportunities in the City, from voter-backed legislation to new ways to eat, drink, and socialize. In November 2020, SF voters approved Proposition H and the Small Business Recovery Act, calling upon the City to simplify the process to start a new business in San Francisco. In working with the Department of Building Inspection, Office of Economic and Workforce Development, Small Business Commission, Department of Public Health, and the Entertainment Commission, the City can now review and approve new small business permits within 30 days. This new process makes it easier to start a new business, and assists in the City’s recovery in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Outdoor dining and retail also played a major role in San Francisco’s recovery from COVID-19. In July 2021, the Board of Supervisors approved legislation introduced by Mayor Breed to make Shared Spaces a permanent program. The program offers a streamlined permit process for restaurants, arts and culture organizations, and retailers to use curbsides, sidewalks, full-street spaces, and open lots for local economic activities. We continue to work to make this program more sustainable in the long-term, and to better support sponsors upfront with design quality, accessibility, and safety. We are working with our City partners to approve Shared Spaces applications within 30 days, aligning with the same requirements under Proposition H.

The Department also continued to expand upon our important racial and social equity work. In response to the 2020 Commission Resolutions centering our work program on racial and social equity, the Department continues to prioritize its resources to identify and develop programs that will help address longstanding inequities within zoning and land-use in San Francisco and begin to empower underrepresented communities to share their stories and acknowledge their important contributions. This has been illustrated through our work in supporting legacy businesses and focused Historic Context Statements.

Through the 2020-2021 fiscal year, our staff continued to serve as Disaster Service Workers to help with the City’s response to COVID-19. Their day-to-day roles and responsibilities directly impacted the lives of all San Franciscans and we couldn’t be more appreciative of their dedication and service. As we continue to steer through the dynamic currents of COVID-19, we thank our phenomenally resilient staff and acknowledge their continued contributions, which will help guide the City’s efforts to sustain and revive local businesses and employment, mitigate the economic hardships already affecting the most vulnerable San Franciscans, and build a resilient and equitable future – resulting in a more normal cadence of life.

We hope you find this year’s annual report informative. We will continue to work in the next fiscal year to make the City more fair, equitable, and just, and to adapt to the changes necessary to move toward recovery.
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**Highlight: Small Businesses & Economic Recovery**

**Proposition H and the Small Business Recovery Act**

Proposition H, also known as the “Save our Small Businesses Initiative,” was put on the ballot by Mayor Breed and passed by the voters in November 2020. The Mayor’s companion “Small Business Recovery Act” was passed by the Board of Supervisors in Spring 2021. These two recovery programs streamline approvals for small businesses by making many neighborhood storefront uses eligible for an over-the-counter approval. These initiatives eliminate neighborhood notification for most storefront land use changes and provide existing businesses with greater flexibility to adapt their operations in response to the COVID-19 pandemic and the shifting retail landscape. By shortening the review and approval processes for most small business permits to 30-days, starting a new business in San Francisco has been dramatically streamlined -- assisting businesses as they move forward to the path of recovery.

**How Does Prop H and the SBRA Help Small Businesses?**

Under these simplified controls, businesses can move forward faster and enjoy expanded operational flexibility. Major changes of these two programs include:

» Most principally permitted uses no longer require a 30-day neighborhood notice.

» Many businesses in commercial and mixed-use districts no longer require Conditional Use Authorization.

» Temporary uses are more permissive, creating new potential for existing and new businesses.

» Pop-Up Retail (for non-Formula Retail uses) is now allowed in vacant commercial storefronts.

» Outdoor Activity Areas (e.g., patios behind restaurants) are more widely permitted.

» Retail workspaces (e.g., co-working facilities) are now permitted in conjunction with restaurant uses.
Highlight: Small Businesses & Economic Recovery

Review Process

The Planning Department led the City’s implementation of Proposition H and the SBRA, convening all involved agencies and creating a streamlined online application portal to implement the meaningful reforms created by these initiatives in the prescribed 30-day review window. The online application facilitates contactless permit submission and provides applicants an expedited, simultaneous review of their project by multiple permitting agencies. This has proven to be a popular and effective response at cutting bureaucracy for converting vacant commercial space and to make it simpler, faster, and less expensive for businesses to open, operate, and adapt.

Consolidated Small Business Website
sf.gov/step-by-step/get-your-small-business-permits-30-day-review

160+
Small businesses have used the new online system

127
change of use permits approved by Planning in less than 30 days
Highlight: 49 South Van Ness / Permit Center

After breaking ground in October 2017, the last fiscal year brought the move to and opening of 49 South Van Ness, a civic building with a conference center and multi-purpose training center for approximately 1,800 City employees, 14 City Departments, and a "one-stop shop" Permit Center. The new Permit Center centralizes and streamlines services that are essential to constructing housing, improving homes and properties, opening and running a business, and planning community events, allowing the public to interact with staff more easily across City agencies in one centralized location. This collective effort advances San Francisco as a safe, vibrant, and beautiful city, serving residents and businesses through physical and digital permitting for an improved customer experience and operational flow via a state-of-the-art queuing system.

The 16-story LEED Gold certified building includes a recycled water system, solar roof panels, and on-site electric vehicle charging. In addition to the locational and environmental benefits of the building, consolidation of City Departments into the City-owned building also safeguards public funds from future uncertainties in the office market. Lastly co-locating of multiple City agencies in one public building fosters collaborative synergies furthering the City's road to recovery.

The Permit Center includes:

- **39,000** Sq. Ft. Second Floor
- **90** Public Counters
- **15** Conference Rooms
- **7** Focus Rooms

Stationed at the Permit Center

- Building Inspections
- Fire Department
- Planning Department
- Public Works – Bureau of Streets & Maps
- Public Works – Bureau of Urban Forestry
- Public Utilities Commission
- Public Health – Environmental Health
- Recreation and Park Department
Highlight: 49 South Van Ness / Permit Center
Amidst the City’s response to the COVID-19 pandemic 53 Department staff were called to serve the City and County of San Francisco as Disaster Service Workers.

Who was deployed? Nearly one in four Department staff was deployed for assignments ranging from one week to one year with the average assignment lasting almost 12 weeks (see Planning Staff list on page 24). In total, the Department contributed almost 23,000 hours of staff time to the City’s COVID response. Staff were deployed from across the Department in job classifications ranging from administrative staff and planner techs to senior managers.

Where did we go? The majority of DSWs worked remotely from home or reported to the Covid Command Center at Moscone Center where masking and social distancing were observed in accordance with emergency mandates.

Some DSWs worked on location at Pier 30/32, Mission High School and various food banks, others were conducting field visits and donned safety vests and traversed the city posting notices, distributing supplies and interacting with members of the community. State and CDC protocols were followed to ensure public safety.

What did we do? Most DSWs staffed positions that contributed to the City’s COVID-19, from producing public meetings online and distributing information and supplies to contact tracing and outbreak response. Others joined existing teams at City departments including the departments of Public Health and Homelessness and Supportive Housing. Staff also played a critically important role in school reopenings, ensuring a safe and healthy return for students and staff.

### Highlight: Disaster Service Worker Deployment

| Total Planning Staff Deployed | 53 |
| Total Staff Hours of DSW Service | 23,000 |
| Average Deployment Length | 12 weeks |

Deployment length ranges from 1 week to 1 year

**Disaster Service Worker Roles**

- Food Bank Worker
- Outbreak Specialist
- City Greeter
- Feeding Unit Staff
- Flu / COVID Strategist
- Safe Sleeping Program Lead
- Community Field Representative
- Funeral Establishment Liaison and Testing Lead
- Outreach Worker
- Media Relations Analyst
- Pantry Coordinator
- School Assessment Supervisor
- Graphic Designer
- Documentarian
Highlight: Disaster Service Worker Deployment

Expanding Permanent Supportive Housing

In 2020, the state launched Project Roomkey to provide non-congregate shelter to persons experiencing homelessness. Under Project Roomkey, the City opened nearly 2,000 hotel rooms at over 25 shelter-in-place (SIP) sites to more than 2,200 guests.

Each guest requires rehousing to demobilize the SIP hotel sites, a transition aided by Project HomeKey* funds from the state. Nearly 2,000 of the guests became HSH clients eligible for placement into permanent supportive housing or market-rate units via a subsidy program, at a time when a significant number of HSH staff were deployed to the SIP hotel sites and the Covid Command Center. Five Planning Department staff were deployed to aid HSH in the effort.

The deployed staff worked alongside HSH staff to expand the City’s housing portfolio by locating and inspecting buildings for purchase or master lease. More than 60 inspections were conducted and two buildings, the Granada and the Diva hotels were acquired and leased up over the summer. Staff also worked with landlords to procure “flex pool units” in market-rate buildings, citywide. Staff also worked with 26 non-profit provider organizations to standardize and streamline the application process for Clients and housing navigators: ultimately producing a Universal Housing Application packet in an accessible format in English, Spanish, Chinese and Tagalog.

Planning Department staff brought their planning, analysis and project management skills to bear and enjoyed a great deal of camaraderie in these challenging assignments.

* LEARN MORE ABOUT PROJECT HOMEKEY
homekey.hcd.ca.gov
Project Highlights FY 2020/21

General Plan Virtual Outreach Sessions

The General Plan Virtual Events consisted of 17 virtual sessions and workshops between March 15 – 26, 2021. The events served as a coordinated outreach and engagement opportunity for multiple project teams working on the City’s General Plan. The General Plan creates a roadmap for the City’s growth and change over time. It consists of goals, objectives, and policies that will help the City address topics such as racial and social equity, housing, mobility, safety, climate resilience, and land use. Updates are underway for the Housing Element, Transportation Element, and Safety and Resilience Element; developing a new Environmental Justice Framework; and integrating policies for racial and social equity.

The General Plan Virtual Events provided information about forthcoming updates and explored the General Plan’s role, providing an opportunity to share ideas that San Francisco can take to achieve an equitable, livable, and sustainable future. There were two-types of events: capacity-building sessions and effort-specific workshops. The capacity-building sessions intended to be informational to those less familiar with the General Plan. The effort-specific workshops intended to be informational and consultative to those impacted and interested in the issues. All of the events were hosted over Zoom and livestreamed and recorded over YouTube. It also enabled the Department to inform the community and gather feedback on related projects, including the Department’s Racial and Social Equity Action Plan and Recovery Strategies.

COMPLETED MARCH 2021
sfplanning.org/general-plan-virtual-events

Islais Creek Southeast Mobility Adaption Strategy

The Islais Creek Southeast Mobility Adaption Strategy (ICSMAS) was led by SF Planning together with the Port, SFMTA, and SFPUC, and with an AECOM-led consultant team funded by a Caltrans grant. Conducted from October 2018 to August 2021, the effort included the City’s first combined flood hazard analysis, incorporating inland, precipitation-based stormwater flooding plus coastal storm flooding and sea level rise. The project team engaged the area’s environmental justice communities suffering disproportionate pollution, social, economic, health, and climate change burdens. Community stakeholders developed five goals for all resilience planning in the district around social equity, authentic and transparent governance and engagement, robust transportation, sustainable economy, and healthy environment and ecosystem. The final ICSMAS Strategy outlines comprehensive flood adaptation pathways at both the district and asset scale, centering on nine creek-side City assets that serve public transit, cargo operations, and jobs. Near- and longer-term strategies are organized by five geographic reaches to protect against flood hazards, today through 2080 climate projections (water levels rising 8 feet in elevation). Key project deliverables include the final ICSMAS Adaptation Strategy document, Implementation and Financing Report, and Economic Impacts Analysis.

COMPLETED AUGUST 2021
sfplanning.org/project/islais
Project Highlights FY 2020/21

Balboa Reservoir Development Agreement

The Balboa Reservoir Development Agreement (DA) Project was unanimously approved by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in May 2020 and August 2020, respectively. Mayor London Breed signed the legislation enacting the Development Agreement on August 28, 2020.

The 17.6-acre project site is one of the first slated for San Francisco’s Public Land for Housing Program, the goal of which is to utilize City-owned land to address the City’s most pressing housing issues. The Balboa Reservoir Project will build 1,100 dwelling units (including 550 affordable units dedicated to low to moderate-income households), a childcare center, a community room for public use, and 4 acres of public open space, including the approximately 2-acre “Reservoir Park”. The Project also promotes sustainable modes of transportation, creating safe and pleasant pedestrian and bicycle facilities and leveraging its proximity to the Balboa Park BART Station, City College terminal, and multiple Muni lines. Finally, the project piloted the Department’s Sustainable Neighborhood Framework to achieve a climate resilient, healthy, and biodiverse community, supporting the City’s larger environmental goals.

The City and the Project Sponsor team have engaged in a robust community outreach program since 2015. Community engagement included over 100 community engagement events including: 46 CAC meetings, public site tours, workshops, and presentations to interested neighborhood groups, office hours, and presentations to City College Board of Trustees.

Currently, the Planning Department is reviewing the project’s design review applications, and the construction of the first phase is expected to begin in 2023.

sfplanning.org/project/balboa-reservoir-and-community-advisory-committee-cac

Economic Recovery Working Group/Task Force

In summer 2020, Mayor London N. Breed and Board of Supervisors President Norman Yee created the COVID-19 Economic Recovery Task Force (ERTF) and charged it with guiding the City’s efforts through the COVID-19 recovery to sustain and revive local businesses and employment, mitigate the economic hardships already affecting the most vulnerable San Franciscans, and build a resilient and equitable future.

Planning Director Rich Hillis and Acting OEWD Director Anne Toupier co-chaired the Task Force’s Economic Recovery Working Group, convening a group of community advocates, workforce and economic development experts, and other stakeholders to develop recommendations focused on easing the process for small businesses, supporting arts and cultural institutions while they were subject to mandatory health closures, and fostering opportunities for workforce revitalization as the City emerges from the pandemic. The ERTF report was published in October 2020 (see link below).

COMPLETED OCTOBER 2020
www.onesanfrancisco.org/covid-19-recovery
Project Highlights **FY 2020/21**

10 South Van Ness Avenue

**APPROVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION, JUNE 2020**
New construction of a 55-story, 590-foot tall, mixed-use residential building with 966 units.

3601 Lawton Street

**APPROVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION, JULY 2020**
Demolition of an existing gas station and new construction of a 40-foot tall, five-story mixed-use residential building with 41 units using the HOME-SF authorization process.

853 Jamestown Avenue

**APPROVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION, JUNE 2020**
New construction of a 55-story, 590-foot tall, mixed-use residential building with 966 units.

901 16th Street / New Flower Mart

**APPROVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION, SEPTEMBER 2020**
Renovation and conversion of three existing buildings to the new Wholesale Flower Market totaling 125,000 sq. ft. and new construction of a two-story public parking garage.

555 Howard Street

**APPROVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION, SEPTEMBER 2020**
Demolition of three buildings and construction of a new 35-story hotel totaling 381,000 sq. ft. with 401 guest rooms and a privately-owned public open space (POPOs) on the rooftop.

555 Bryant Street

**APPROVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION, JUNE 2021**
New construction of a 160-foot tall mixed-use residential building with 500 units and 20,605 square feet of PDR space.
Sunset Forward

Sunset Forward is a community driven process to stabilize low- and moderate-income families and seniors in the Sunset and enhance community connection and quality of life for all. Together with Supervisor Gordon Mar, the District 4 Youth and Families Network, and community members, Planning will create a community plan that sets local priorities on housing, transportation, and neighborhood businesses and services in the Sunset.

The first phase of Sunset Forward was a Community Needs Assessment, an extensive outreach effort which gathered feedback from those who work, live, play, study, and worship in the Sunset. From April 2020 through January 2021, the project team spoke with thousands of Sunset community members through virtual meetings, town halls, focus groups, and listening sessions.

The Community Needs Assessment found that many Sunset residents are struggling to afford and secure housing that meets their current and future needs, have limited access to critical neighborhood services, and have seen a continual decline in the health of their neighborhood small businesses and commercial corridors through the years. This community feedback informed a set of draft strategies to address the Sunset’s needs and priorities in housing, small businesses and commercial corridors, and neighborhood services.

The second round of outreach is taking place between September through December 2021 to gather the community’s feedback on the potential Sunset Forward strategies.

STRATEGIES TO BE FINALIZED BY WINTER 2022
sunsetforward.com

Fillmore

Planning prioritizes work with Black communities to undo harms caused by past inequitable planning policies and practices. Currently, there are no active community planning initiatives or partnerships in place between Planning and the Black community in the Fillmore-Western Addition neighborhoods, and there are limited resources available. Planning will focus on two geographical areas, the Fillmore-Western Addition and Southeast San Francisco, to address the historic isolation and geographic separation of the Black community and further promote more cohesive City efforts to address their needs. This project will work to establish trust and a working relationship with residents, community institutions and leaders; build local capacity for active involvement in the planning process; and address neighborhood priorities identified by the community in a collaborative process.

Tenderloin Community Action Plan

The Tenderloin Community Action Plan is a neighborhood-driven collaboration between residents, community organizations, businesses, and City agencies to identify current needs for the neighborhood’s diverse culture and population and develop a collective vision for Tenderloin’s future. It will also develop an action plan for the priorities identified by the community: housing and houselessness, open space and parks, health and wellness, transit and mobility, economic opportunity, arts and culture, and environmental justice.
The Plan aims to meet the needs of the neighborhood’s diverse and vulnerable population including the Black, American Indian, Latinx, Asian Pacific Islander, Middle Eastern/Arab and other communities of color; low-income; people living with disabilities; seniors; families and youth; LGBTQ+; and unsheltered residents.

**DRAFT ACTION PLAN TO BE FINALIZED BY FALL 2022**
sfplanning.org/project/tenderloin-community-action-plan

**Housing Element 2022**

The Housing Element 2022 Update is San Francisco’s housing plan for the next 8 years (2022-2030) and the first that will center on racial and social equity. It will include policies and programs that express our collective vision and values for the future of housing in San Francisco. This update will determine what our housing needs are and how we will work to address them, defining priorities for decision making and resource allocation for housing programs, development, and services. It will also recognize the key relationships between housing and many forms of equity including resiliency, environmental justice, public health, and quality of life.

Working with communities, the update will recommend public policy and investments to guide tenant protections, affordable housing preservation and production, efforts to address homelessness, and types and places for more housing. This plan will serve the housing needs of all San Franciscans, advancing equitable outcomes particularly for American Indian, Black and other Communities of Color, as well as low-income populations and vulnerable groups. This means creating a Housing Element that supports racial and social equity; eliminating community displacement; affordable housing choices for everyone in all neighborhoods; and thriving neighborhoods resilient to climate and health crises.

**TO BE PRESENTED FOR ADOPTION IN SPRING 2022**
sfhousingelement.org

**Equity Council**

Like many cities across the country, San Francisco has had its share of discriminatory practices constraining the resources and well-being of American Indian and Black communities as well as other communities of color and low-income communities.

In 2020, San Francisco Planning Commission and Historic Preservation Commission adopted resolutions centering the Planning Department’s work program and resource allocation on racial and social equity. The Equity Council is a response to these resolutions and to the guidance from the Office of Racial Equity to ensure the representation of our diverse communities to address the current crisis and resolve historic inequities.

The Equity Council is a group of eleven San Francisco leaders advising City staff on racial and social equity priorities, policies, strategies, and investments. A critical part of the Equity Council’s work plan is to develop a platform and a process for deeper community engagement to ensure productive dialogues between city agencies and our community organizations, networks, and coalitions serving communities of color, low-income communities and other vulnerable populations.

The Council will focus on five priority tasks: Planning Department Budget and Priorities; Recovery Strategies; Housing Element and other General Plan Elements; Community Engagement; and the Racial and Social Equity Plan.
### Preservation Project Highlights FY 2020/21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landmark # 289</th>
<th>“History of Medicine in California” Frescoes, 533 Parnassus Avenue (within UC Hall)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Frescoes" /></td>
<td>Created by master artist and muralist, Bernard Zakheim, “The History of Medicine in California” mural is significant for displaying distinctive characteristics of New Deal-era frescos, intense saturated colors, figurative content, rounded forms, and overall stylistic influence of the Mexican mural movement of the 1920s. At the August 19, 2020 hearing the Historic Preservation Commission recommended its landmark designation. The Board of Supervisors voted to approve the designation on November 17, 2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landmark # 290</th>
<th>Royal Baking Company, 4767-4773 Mission Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Royal Baking Company" /></td>
<td>Recognized for its Storybook and Art Deco-style commercial architecture, Royal Baking Company is significant for the Italian-American community of San Francisco into the Excelsior District, and for its association with San Francisco’s important twentieth century macaroni and bread-baking industries. The Historic Preservation Commission recommended its landmark designation on May 6, 2020. The Board of Supervisors voted to approve the designation on June 26, 2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landmark # 291</th>
<th>Japanese YWCA/Issei Women’s Building, 1830 Sutter Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Building" /></td>
<td>Significant for its association with Japanese American (Nikkei) women, the African American civil rights movement, LGBTQ history and LGBTQ rights movement, the Japanese YWCA/Issei Women’s Building is as an important architectural example by master architect, Julia Morgan. At the October 21, 2020 hearing the Historic Preservation Commission recommended designation. The Board of Supervisors voted to approve the landmark designation on April 20, 2021.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landmark # 292</th>
<th>Lyon-Martin House, 651 Duncan Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="House" /></td>
<td>As identified in the Citywide Historic Context Statement for LGBTQ History, the Lyon-Martin House is significant for its association of the Daughters of Bilitis (DOB), the nation’s first lesbian-rights organization in 1955, and the home for Phyllis Lyon and Del Martin, pioneering lesbian-rights and feminist activists. The Historic Preservation Commission recommended its landmark designation on February 17, 2021, and the Board of Supervisors voted to approve the designation on May 11, 2021.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TO LEARN MORE & READ THE REPORTS:**

[sfplanning.org/project/designated-landmarks-and-landmark-districts](http://sfplanning.org/project/designated-landmarks-and-landmark-districts)
Preservation Project Highlights FY 2020/21

- **Landmark Designation**
- **Recommended Legacy Business Designation**

1. San Francisco Natural Medicine
2. Annie’s Hot Dogs
3. House of Nanking
4. JHW Locksmith
5. The Wok Shop
6. Ambiance
7. Farley’s
8. GLBT Historical Society
9. San Bruno Supermarket
10. Val De Cole Wine & Spirits
11. Washington Vegetable
12. Iyengar Yoga Institute of San Francisco
13. Munroe Motors
14. Don Ramon’s
15. Fior d’Italia
16. Bimbo’s 365 Club
17. Marcello’s Pizza
18. Surfaces by David Bonk
19. Giorgio’s Pizzeria
20. Japan Video & Media
21. Center Hardware
22. Pipe Dreams
23. Blade Runners Hair Studio
24. 24th Street Dental
25. G. Mazzei & Son Hardware
26. AJC Auto Body
27. San Sun Restaurant
28. UKO
29. Yadav Diamonds and Jewelry
30. Central Drug Store
31. Old Ship Saloon
32. SF Bay Times
33. Flowercraft Garden Center
34. Fanta Cleaners Inc.
35. Lyon-Martin Community Health Services
36. Finnegans Wake
37. Yankee Clipper Travel
38. ABS Seafood, Inc.
39. The Delicate Daisy – House of Flowers
40. Sue Fisher King Co.
41. Italian American Social Club
42. Sam’s Burgers
43. Rainbow Grocery

“History of Medicine in California” Frescoes
Royal Baking Company
Japanese YWCA/Issei Women’s Building
Lyon-Martin House

Historic Landmark Designations
Small Business Recommendations by HPC for Legacy Businesses Approval
### Between 2016-2020, the City had:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects Authorized</th>
<th>2,129</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects using SB 35 (with at least nine additional SB 35 projects in the pipeline)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects using the State Density Bonus Law, including pipeline projects</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Included with these projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Units</th>
<th>22,588</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units from recent multi-phase projects, including:</td>
<td>5,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3333 California (744 units)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balboa Reservoir (1,100 units)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Rock (1,200 units)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potrero Power Station (2,600 units)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Submittals & Approvals Map

12,836 Planning Cases & Permits Filed FY 2020/21

3,784 Planning Cases & Permits Approved FY 2020/21
Major Environmental Review Documents

- **Draft EIR**
- **Final EIR**
- **Community Plan Exemption**
- **Mitigated Negative Declaration**

---

**San Francisco County**

**San Mateo County**

---

1. 469 Stevenson Street*  
2. 450 O’Farrell Street  
3. Potrero Power Station  
4. SFPUC Southern Skyscraper Boulevard Ridge Trail Extension  
5. 447 Battery Street  
6. Potrero Yard (2500 Mariposa Street)

---

7. Muni Metro East Expansion  
8. 1500-1528 15th St  
9. 474 Bryant St / 77 Stillman St  
10. 321 Florida St  
11. 952-960 Howard St  
12. 350-352 San Jose Ave  
13. 224 Clara St  
14. 10 Heron St  
15. 531 Bryant St  
16. 1088 Howard St  
17. 1021 Valencia St  
18. 555 Howard St  
19. 1035 Howard St  
20. 3231-3233 16th St  
21. 986 South Van Ness Ave  
22. 1200 Van Ness Ave  
23. 530 Sansome  
24. 1125 Market St  
25. 1525 Pine St  
26. 319 Bayshore Blvd  
27. 1580 Pacific Ave  
28. San Francisco Botanical Gardens  
29. 554 Fillmore St

---

* 469 Stevenson Street EIR subsequently overturned on appeal.

---

**Not shown on map**

- **EIR Addenda**
- **MND Addenda**
- **Categorical Exemptions**

---

**FISCAL YEAR 2020/21 ANNUAL REPORT**
Planning Cases & Building Permits

5,076 Planning Cases Filed

CASE & PERMIT VOLUME TRENDS
FISCAL YEAR 2015/16 - 2020/21

FY 2020/21
FY 2015/16
FY 2016/17
FY 2017/18
FY 2018/19
FY 2019/20
FY 2020/21

Planning Cases
Building Permit: Alterations
Building Permit: New Construction

10,000
5,000
0

20,000

5,781
2,138

7,919 Building Permit ApplicationsFiled and Reviewed

BUILDING PERMITS

Permits reviewed over the counter
Permit intake / staff review

PLANNING CASES
FY 2020/21

Categorical Exemptions
Conditional Use Authorizations
Condominium Referrals
Discretionary Reviews
Enforcement
Environmental Review
Permit Referrals
Short Term Rentals

Planning Case Type
Total

CEQA Categorical Exemptions
325

Conditional Use Authorizations
167

Condominium Referrals
73

Discretionary Reviews
94

Enforcement
307

CEQA: Other Environmental Review
513

Permit Referrals from Other City Agencies
1,165

Preliminary Project Assessments
40

Project Review Meetings
327

Short Term Rentals
600

Transportation Demand Management
36

Variances
114

All other cases
1,315

23%
10%
6%
6%
2%
26%
12%
6%
1%
3%
1%
## Case & Permit Volume Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application/Fee Type</th>
<th>FY15/16</th>
<th>FY16/17</th>
<th>FY17/18</th>
<th>FY18/19</th>
<th>FY19/20</th>
<th>FY20/21</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Bonus (AHB)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>183%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominium Referral</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of Appropriateness</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission Review</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>350%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Zone Permit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Use Authorization</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citywide Planning</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>250%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Exceptions (309.1, 309.2, 309.3, 309.4)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Review - Mandatory</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Review - Public Initiated</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Agreements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>-44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical Exemptions (EEC and ECA)</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Review</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Neighborhood Exception (329)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Time and Materials (ETM)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>-21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Section (106)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Agreement Design Review</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevator Penthouse Height Exemption</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Advertising Sign Relocation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Advertising Sign Annual Inventory Maintenance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic Application w/o Hearing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Resource Assessment 5 or less units</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>-32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Resource Assessment 6 or more units</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>150%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Application-Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records Requests</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>150%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Station Conversion Determinations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subpoena</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Use Permits</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Hotel Conversions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic Letters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Amendments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Referral</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Case & Permit Volume Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application/Fee Type</th>
<th>FY15/16</th>
<th>FY16/17</th>
<th>FY17/18</th>
<th>FY18/19</th>
<th>FY19/20</th>
<th>FY20/21</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-Kind Agreement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Master Plan</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy Business Registry (LBR)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Line Adjustment</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Permit</td>
<td>2,341</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,049</td>
<td>2,206</td>
<td>1,525</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>-24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills Act</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Allocation (321)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Code Text Amendment</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Project Assessment</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Review Meeting</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit to Alter (Major, Minor)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Study (295)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation Survey</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Term Rental</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>-49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Section (106) / Subdivision Referral</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) - Statement of Eligibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Demand Management (TDM)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) - Certificate of Transfer</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) - Notice of Use</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Administrator (ZA) - Letter of Determination</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Administrator (ZA) - Notice of Special Restrictions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Administrator (ZA) - Verification</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>-21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Cannabis Dispensary</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 311</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block Book Notification</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>-28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permits (New Construction)</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permits (Existing Alterations)</td>
<td>7,929</td>
<td>8,297</td>
<td>8,850</td>
<td>8,028</td>
<td>6,689</td>
<td>7,767</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>17,806</td>
<td>17,718</td>
<td>17,610</td>
<td>16,669</td>
<td>14,072</td>
<td>12,995</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Permit Project and Tracking System for Planning Cases and DBI’s Permit Tracking System for Building Permits. Bldg. Permits: DBI Permit Tracking System data by fiscal year may vary slightly due to permit issuance timing.

GEN: includes GASP program, Records Requests, Temporary Use Permits (for FY10-11 and prior), and other applications.

MIS: includes referrals from other agencies, such as the Police and Fire Departments, Alcoholic Beverage Control, among others.

*PRJ: are project profiles and not counted towards planning volume cases.

*PRL: are over-the-counter profiles and not counted towards planning volume cases.
Financial Report: Revenues & Expenditures

**Total Revenues**

- **$60.4 M**
  - **FY 2020/21**
  - **General Fund Support** $5.9 M
  - **Fee Revenue** $45.8 M

**Revenue by Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fees / Charges for Services (see below)</td>
<td>$45,808,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants, Special Revenues, Impact Fees</td>
<td>$6,441,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure Recovery from Other Agencies</td>
<td>$2,224,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Support</td>
<td>$5,971,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$60,446,114</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fee Revenue by Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit Alterations</td>
<td>$25,021,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit New Construction</td>
<td>$4,355,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Review Fees</td>
<td>$6,123,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Short Range Planning Fees</td>
<td>$3,304,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Use Fees</td>
<td>$2,812,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance Fees</td>
<td>$714,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of Appropriateness Fees</td>
<td>$226,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Program &amp; Code Enforcement</td>
<td>$3,251,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fee Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$45,808,270</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Expenditures**

- **$60.4 M**
  - **FY 2020/21**
  - **Salaries & Benefits** $39.2 M
  - **Overhead** $965,663
  - **Non-Personnel Services, Materials & Supplies, Capital & Projects** $12,350,718
  - **Services of Other Departments** $7,888,174

**Total Expenditures**

- **$60,446,114**
Financial Report: Revenue Trends

DEPARTMENT TOTAL REVENUE TREND

FISCAL YEAR 2015/16 - 2020/21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Charges for Services (Fees)</th>
<th>Grants, Special Revenues, Impact Fees</th>
<th>Expenditure Recovery from Other Agencies</th>
<th>General Fund Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2020/21</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2019/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2018/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2017/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FISCAL YEAR 2015/16 - 2020/21

FEE REVENUE TREND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Building Permit Alterations</th>
<th>Environmental Review Fees</th>
<th>Building Permit New Construction</th>
<th>Variance Fees</th>
<th>Conditional Use Fees</th>
<th>Other Short Range Planning Fees</th>
<th>Sign Program &amp; Code Enforcement</th>
<th>Certificate of Appropriateness Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015/16</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016/17</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2017/18</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2018/19</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2019/20</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,500,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2020/21</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,500,000</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Financial Report

## Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charges for Services (Fees)</td>
<td>$35,504,019</td>
<td>$44,012,250</td>
<td>$43,828,367</td>
<td>$43,519,481</td>
<td>$43,208,666</td>
<td>$45,808,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants, Special Revenues, Impact Fees</td>
<td>$2,695,905</td>
<td>$4,539,531</td>
<td>$6,968,618</td>
<td>$4,516,802</td>
<td>$5,129,892</td>
<td>$6,441,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure Recovery from Other City Agencies</td>
<td>$583,713</td>
<td>$740,453</td>
<td>$1,120,332</td>
<td>$1,470,974</td>
<td>$1,813,777</td>
<td>$2,224,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Support</td>
<td>$2,475,487</td>
<td>$1,991,842</td>
<td>$2,584,044</td>
<td>$3,848,730</td>
<td>$5,513,149</td>
<td>$5,971,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$41,259,124</strong></td>
<td><strong>$51,284,076</strong></td>
<td><strong>$54,501,361</strong></td>
<td><strong>$53,355,987</strong></td>
<td><strong>$55,665,484</strong></td>
<td><strong>$60,446,114</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Fee Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Building Permit Alterations</td>
<td>$16,263,844</td>
<td>$18,455,090</td>
<td>$22,598,344</td>
<td>$20,896,872</td>
<td>$20,371,542</td>
<td>$25,021,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Building Permit New Construction</td>
<td>$2,794,709</td>
<td>$3,936,266</td>
<td>$5,464,284</td>
<td>$3,067,613</td>
<td>$2,971,799</td>
<td>$4,355,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Environmental Review Fees</td>
<td>$7,075,319</td>
<td>$9,829,289</td>
<td>$7,394,694</td>
<td>$7,666,887</td>
<td>$7,261,343</td>
<td>$6,123,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Other Short Range Planning Fees</td>
<td>$3,949,707</td>
<td>$5,476,761</td>
<td>$3,123,049</td>
<td>$4,826,135</td>
<td>$5,027,646</td>
<td>$3,304,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Conditional Use Fees</td>
<td>$2,859,789</td>
<td>$5,112,250</td>
<td>$2,876,820</td>
<td>$4,519,875</td>
<td>$4,405,479</td>
<td>$2,812,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Variance Fees</td>
<td>$691,759</td>
<td>$557,546</td>
<td>$697,187</td>
<td>$751,124</td>
<td>$737,810</td>
<td>$714,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Certificate of Appropriateness Fees</td>
<td>$106,746</td>
<td>$103,809</td>
<td>$261,265</td>
<td>$250,116</td>
<td>$244,212</td>
<td>$226,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Sign Program &amp; Code Enforcement</td>
<td>$371,419</td>
<td>$866,497</td>
<td>$1,412,724</td>
<td>$1,540,859</td>
<td>$2,188,835</td>
<td>$3,251,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fee Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$34,113,292</strong></td>
<td><strong>$44,337,508</strong></td>
<td><strong>$43,828,367</strong></td>
<td><strong>$43,519,481</strong></td>
<td><strong>$43,208,666</strong></td>
<td><strong>$45,808,270</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## General Fund Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Support</td>
<td>$2.5</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
<td>$2.6</td>
<td>$3.8</td>
<td>$5.5</td>
<td>$6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees &amp; Other Revenues</td>
<td>$38.8</td>
<td>$49.3</td>
<td>$51.9</td>
<td>$49.5</td>
<td>$50.2</td>
<td>$54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$41.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$51.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$54.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>$53.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>$55.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>$60.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Support %</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>$26,848,917</td>
<td>$32,344,832</td>
<td>$33,989,545</td>
<td>$35,895,959</td>
<td>$38,655,168</td>
<td>$39,241,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td>$509,668</td>
<td>$554,786</td>
<td>$774,176</td>
<td>$980,944</td>
<td>$656,755</td>
<td>$965,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Personnel Services, Materials &amp; Supplies, Capital &amp; Projects</td>
<td>$8,482,001</td>
<td>$11,735,231</td>
<td>$13,672,238</td>
<td>$10,042,863</td>
<td>$9,072,012</td>
<td>$12,350,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services of Other Departments</td>
<td>$5,418,538</td>
<td>$6,649,227</td>
<td>$6,065,402</td>
<td>$6,436,221</td>
<td>$7,281,549</td>
<td>$7,888,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$41,259,124</strong></td>
<td><strong>$51,284,076</strong></td>
<td><strong>$54,501,361</strong></td>
<td><strong>$53,355,987</strong></td>
<td><strong>$55,665,484</strong></td>
<td><strong>$60,446,114</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning Staff FY 2020/21

Administration
Reza Amindarbari
John Boldrick
Karen Carasi
Glenn Cabreros
Theodore Chen
Yi Chen
Alton Chinn
Thomas DiSanto
Scott Edmondson
Michael Eng
James Glik
Oscar Hernandez-Gomez
Lulu Hwang
Biling Jiang
Yvonne Ko
Judy Lam
Deborah Landis
Michelle Littlefield
Selina Liu
Anika Lyons
Ken Qi
Micheal Sanders
Jason Sherba
John Speer
Isabelle Vulis
Michael Webster
Barry Wong
Melissa Wong
Mike Wynne
Tony Yeung
Genta Yoshikawa
Karen Zhu

Citywide Planning
Robin Abad-Ocubillo
Allison Albericci
Svetha Ambati
Amnon Ben-Pazi
Benjamin Caldwell
Celina Chan
Paul Chasan
María de Alva
Susan Exline
Lisa Fisher
Julie Flynn
Dylan Hamilton
Anna Harvey
Seung Yen Hong
Doug Johnson
Lily Langlois
Jessica Look
Danielle Ngo
Sheila Nickolopoulos
Nicholas Perry
Patrick Race
AnMarie Rodgers
Ilaria Salvadori
Jeremy Shaw
Mathew Snyder
Joshua Switzky
Tam Tran
Reanna Tong
Adam Varat

Commissions Office
Josephine Feliciano
Jonas Ionin
Christine Lamorena
Brandi Robertson
Chanbory Son

Community Equity
Christy Alexander
Tameeka Bennett
Shelley Callagirone
Lisa Chen
Miriam Chion
Carla de Mesa
Claudia Flores
Kimia Haddadan
Paolo Ikezoe
Malena Leon-Farrera
Andrea Nelson
James Pappas
Gina Simi
Maia Small
Andre Torrey
Leslie Valencia
Aaron Yen

Current Planning
Kalyani Agnihotri
Laura Ajello
Linda Ajello-Hoagland
Claudine Asbagh
Rogelio Baezá
Ryan Balba
Julian Bañales
Luiz Barata
Melanie Bishop
Kurt Botn
Marcelle Boudreaux
Cathleen Campbell
Mathew Chandler
Michael Christensen
Stephanie Cisneros
Lorabelle Cook
Moses Corrette
Matt Dito
Kimberly Durandet
Charles Enchill
Carolyn Fahey
Claire Feeney
Shannon Ferguson
Veronica Flores
Nick Foster
Monica Giacomucci
Elizabeth Gordon-Jonckheer
Mary Jane Green
Trent Greenan
Gretel Gunther
Alessandro Hall
Jeffrey Horn
William Hughen
Sylvia Jimenez
Alexandra Kirby
Heidi Kline
Michelle Langlie
Pilar LaValley
Victoria Lewis
Xinyu Liang
Ashley Lindsay
Jennifer Lung
Christopher May
Frances McMillen
Elena Moore
Elizabeth Munyan
Planning Staff FY 2020/21

Edgar Oropeza
Gabriela Pantoja
Suzette Parinas
Susan Parks
Max Putra
Erica Russell
Joseph Sacchi
Rebecca Salgado
Ella Samonsky
William San
Maggie Smith
Jeffrey Speirs
Richard Sucre
Michelle Taylor
Samantha Updegrave
Jonathan Vimr
Delvin Washington
Elizabeth Watty
David Weissglass
Alex Westhoff
Katie Wilborn
David Winslow
Mary Woods
Elton Wu
Sharon Young

Environmental Planning
Lauren Bihl
Rhia Bordon
Vimaliza Byrd
Alana Callagy
Megan Calpin
Colin Clarke
Jorgen Cleemann
Rick Cooper
Florentina Craciun
Jenny Delumo
Debra Dwyer
Chelsea Fordham
Sherie George
Lisa Gibson
Justin Greving
Monica Huggins
Devyni Jain
Timothy Johnston (SFPUC)
Chris Kern
Ben Lamb
Kari Lentz
Don Lewis
Michael Li
Diane Livia
Laura Lynch
Jennifer McKellar
Sally Morgan
Julie Moore (SFPUC)
Joy Navarrete
Kristina Phung
Josh Pollak
Jeanie Poling
Jessica Range
Rachel Schuett
Ryan Shum
Tatyana Sheyner
Allison Vanderslice
Elizabeth White
Wade Wietgrefe
Daniel Wu
Kelly Yong
David Young
Kei Zushi

Zoning & Compliance
EvaMarie Atijera-Taylor
Chaska Berger
Peter Byrne
Josephine Chen
Kevin Guy
Ericka Jackson
Dario Jones
Justin Kran
Milton Martin
Omar Masry
Vincent Page
Andrew Perry
Adrian Putra
Rachna
Scott Sanchez
Tina Tam
Ada Tan
Corey Teague
Kelly Wong

Interns
Ryan Anderson
Lillias Arvanites
Jaxson Bie
Luis Caro
Jocelynn Cerda
Joleysha Cotton
Maya S Deshpande
Issac Fukumura-White
Anne Greening
Branden Gunn
Lauren Hiller
Lauren Hom
Nio Howa
Inosia Ierome
Janet Jin
Stanley Keopilavan
Alexandra Larman
Eugene Lau
Seolha Lee
Kaylie Li
Epiphany Loux
Izanie LoveNed
Alexis Lusk
Kelly Ngo
Jordan Noeuku
Melanie Olson
Angelina Perez
Amar Sheikh
Amiriana Sinegal
Neil Singh
Emi Takahara
Matthew Thompson
Lea Vogel
Jacob Wallace
Fatema Yasini
Fiona Yim
Shiwei Zhang

10
Staff Additions

15
Staff Departures

53
Served as Disaster Service Workers