



West of Twin Peaks Central Council

A Resource for Neighborhood Organizations West of Twin Peaks in San Francisco since 1936

PO Box 27112
San Francisco, CA 94127

<http://www.westoftwinpeaks.org/>

Meeting Minutes

Date: Monday January 25, 2016

Time: 7:30pm – 9:00pm

Location: **Forest Hill Clubhouse**
381 Magellan Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94127

| | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|
| Associations: | Those Present shown in bold | |
| Balboa Terrace | Roger Ritter | Monterey Heights Marco Magallon Susan Zurinaga Paul Anderson Steve - ?? |
| Forest Hill | Dena Aslanian William Gus Guibert | Mount Sutro Homeowners |
| Forest Knolls | Herbert Dunmeyer Kristine Zaback | Pine Lake Park David Golden |
| Ingleside Terrace | Paul Conroy Carolyn + Bob Karis Mark - ?? | Saint Francis Woods Carolyn Squeri, Paul Hill |
| Golden Gate Heights | Sally Stephens | Sherwood Forest |
| Greater West Portal | Avrum Shepard Matt Chamberlain Lee Hsu | Sunnyside Lisa Spinali Estelle Smith |
| Lakeshore Acres | Barbara Chionsini Bill Chionsini, | The Woods Judy Clarke |
| Lakeside Property Owners | Joyce Richardson, | Twin Peaks Denise LaPoint |
| Merced Manor | Mike Garcia | Westwood Highlands Bhushan Mudbhary Dave Bisho |
| Midtown Terrace | George Wooding | |
| Miraloma Park | Karen Breslin | |
| Officers Present: | President – Roger Ritter Vice President- Sally Stephens | Treasurer- Carolyn Squeri Secretary – David Golden Parliamentarian - Lee Hsu |

| | | |
|------------------------|--|--|
| Guests Present: | | |
|------------------------|--|--|

Roll Call and Minutes Review:

Meeting called to order: 7:38PM

This is our 80th year

Roll Call: 12 Member associations present, we do not start with a quorum.

Minutes: Karen moves, George Seconds minutes approved.

Officer Reports:

President / Roger Ritter:

This is our 80th anniversary. We would like to encourage absent organizations to attend. We would like to have a party at our June Meeting to celebrate. We generally do a candidates forum for District 7, and State senate candidates. (District 4 does not have an election.) For April we would need to relocate to another venue. President would welcome suggestions.

Vice President / Sally Stephens: Nothing

Secretary / David Golden: Nothing

Treasurer / Carolyn Squeri: Not Present

Parliamentarian / Lee Hsu: Not Present

Committee Reports:

Planning and Land Use / Estelle Smith: Not Present

Technology / Avrum Shepard:

Public Health / George Wooding: At capital planning meet Sally and I attended the city introduced \$350 million Health bond. Fix Zuckerberg SF General Hospital, Upgrade Clinics, SF Fire Department deployment facilities, also includes animal control other measures. George was concerned by “underhanded” prior agreement, made the Friday before. There was suggested to include \$54million for animal care shelters was swapped with funds for mental health and homeless shelters and clinics. What was unusual was how late the process this change was swapped out. Animal care facility was included in handouts. The future of the animal care facility becomes uncertain. Existing shelter is not seismically safe. Sally was concerned that the issue was portrayed as animals vs. people. That is not accurate, animals often have positive human benefit, to the homeless and often they play a role in domestic violence issues. George speculated that the bond was modified by Mayor’s office, who may have thought the bond without the animal care facility would have a better chance of passing. City’s officers who were present did say the mayor’s office continues to actively support the animal care facility.

Open Space & Parks / Sally Stephens: Two issues-

Supervisor Farrell Bond Measure: Is proposing a ballot measure that provides a more sustainable source of funding for Rec. and Park. There is a concerned about how funding will be spent, and that it will be targeted to the programs people want.

Commission on Environment: Looking to adopt new policy to limit herbicides. The unit that returns land more native plants has an exemption

Transportation / Avrum Shepard: Nothing.

Public Safety / Barbara Chionsini: Nothing.

8:00 pm Committee Reports (20 min)

Balboa Reservoir Update (Speaker TBD): CAC is the focused group attempting to consolidate public input. The committee meets once a month. We have had a survey and neighborhood meetings, formed in Sept 2015. We have been flushing out parameters to inform an RFP which will flush out the requirements for selection. Will remove 1000 spots, and replace it with housing. There is concern about the added load to major arteries. The land is being sold by the PUC. They are required by law to get “full market value” for land. The goal is to meet the requirements of Prop K, while maintaining neighborhood character, maintaining parking for City College, and not increasing congestion on Ocean Ave. We have accepted the basic requirement to add more “affordable” housing. We are still looking at mix of housing, what level of affordability are we seeking. Urban design and neighborhood character are being incorporated. . We are looking at 4 acres of open space. Transportation memo and sustainability. Traffic demand management study will be included as part of this project.

Question: What would be the ideal development- **Answer:** Mostly accept the idea that the site must include housing, but we must work out the details of the type of housing.

Question: When will this take place? **Answer:** 5 years or more.

Question: Can it remain as is? **Answer:** No, City College would need to buy the parcel, which is currently valued at over \$27 million, but I don't know where that figure can't come from.

Question: What happens if the public transportation is over loaded. **Answer:** We would need to work out the impacts with all interested parties to a point that works.

Question: 50/50 affordability would be more acceptable to the city, but less attractive to a developer. BART is putting together a bond measure to help improve the system, maybe this should be part of that. The plan may include a parcel tax

Question: City bond measures will have an impact on the development. First, the 50% affordable units requirement. Market value of the site is zero, because it is public land. Speaker believes that the issue of it can't be maintained as public land is not valid. The market price is determined by what the city will allow a developer to build. The speaker believes that there are other options to private development. The number of affordable housing will discourage a private developer. Could drive the unit size to be very small.

Question: Does this need to go the voters: **Answer:** No, only planning and the board of supervisors would need to approve.

Affordable Housing Bonus Program Pro-and-Con:

We asked for a speaker from the mayor's office or planning department to speak in favor of the measure. Per George, he does not believe the planning departments is open to participating in these sorts of open forms, so no

Calvin Welch Speaking Against the Bonus Program:

How many of you have heard of the "bonus" program? Several people raise their hands.

Calvin is chairing a committee that is organizing to speak against the measure. The Planning Department only has a fixed period of time to review. It will go to the Supervisors who will ultimately decide the measure. Calvin does not believe that the public planning forums will be of much use. The measure was formed late last year without much input

This is the largest rezoning in the City's history since 1980. In 1980 every property owner received a notice, but for this notice no notices have been provided to the city property owners. Many properties will be subject to the "density bonus", over 30,000 parcels. The density bonus has been law for many years. The proponents argue that the Courts made an interpretation that is driving this revision to the planning code. Per Calvin, these density bonus changes are not mandating a change. We currently have a series of density thresholds governed by the "FAR." How much floor area can be built on a site. In single family neighborhoods, units are limited to 1 unit and 40 height limit. Other neighborhoods have different definitions which have different limits and more units, and higher buildings. San Francisco is the "second" densest city in the US. We only have 26 sq. miles. Zoned for residential. San Francisco is second only to New York City. If density were the formula for affordability, then New York and San Francisco would be the most affordable cities in the country. The only way to get affordability under a dense model is to require it by law. Calvin argues that they are making much too much density, and not requiring enough affordability in the trade. R-1 districts are exempt within ¼ mile from commercial district. The law changes the formula away from the FAR system in place, but gives the planning departments, discretion to make smaller units. The law would take away the minimum 400sf limit that is currently in place. The city could negotiate privately with the developer how many units are added. Four additional changes. There will no longer be a 1 for 1 parking requirement. There is no longer a 60% limit it will be raised to 80% coverage for a lot (within 15'). Shadows and wind will only be impacted on "public" right of ways. The impacts to adjacent land owners will not be considered and there will be no public hearing. Per Calvin, a land owner would lose their CEQA rights to understand the environmental impacts on adjacent properties. The logic of this authority is based on the rights afforded to those trying to meet residential density. Calvin notes that it is hard to put "into words" the extent to which this new law will change current building zoning. Approving the definition of affordable housing to 140% median. As an example a 2 teacher household, would need to work 12 years, to pay 140% of median income. A single teacher starts at \$48K rises after 13 years to 57 years. Calvin notes that if you were starting out here as a teacher, you would never catch up to the threshold requirement for this housing. Calvin notes these units are out of reach for 60% of current San Francisco households. We are asking the Supervisor to vote it down, and start over with real neighborhood input.

Question: Your specific opposition is based on the affordability? Answer: Yes, this will have significant adverse impacts on the affordable housing stock in Height Ashbury. Follow-up Question: How will this affect the neighborhoods in WoTPCC? Answer: All the exceptions your neighborhoods have negotiated to protect the unique quality will be superseded by this new law, giving developers new freedom to make changes to that you may not like. Gives the example of drive through banks.

Question: How is the ¼ mile defined, is it as the crow flies? **Answer:** Yes, it will affect the entire zone ¼ mile as looked at in plan. **Follow-up Question-** Could this effect the blocks around West Portal? **Answer:** Yes, if the new owner applies for affordable density bonus, the law would give the developer rights to make a higher density development.

Question: What is the stand of the current board members? **Answer:** The city believes we can “build” our way out of our “housing crises” City Hall believes all the new development is in the East, and the West has to “do its share.” Calvin believes we can do it in a way that is far less impactful than currently envisioned in this plan. City’s plan states between 2015 and 2020, we need to build 20,000 more affordable units. Calvin sees this proposal as a “bait and switch” the numbers are not accurate, that too many of the units will be out of reach to most current city residents.

Question: Its not city resources, its developer resources? **Answer:** The developers are being given a huge handout. The City is running a huge deficit, even though we are in the biggest building boom in the City’s history. There are huge city costs to adding more housing. The taxes are not covering the costs

Affordable Housing Bonus Program Proposed Resolution (attached)

George made the motion, Kristine seconded. Discuss making minor modifications to the letter. There is great deal of concern expressed about the measure, in particular the potential to expand the impact of not only the NCD’s (Neighborhood Commercial District). Roger will circulate the changes. Suggest sending it to the planning department and board.

11 in favor, 1 abstention. Motion Carries.

9:00 pm Adjourn + Social

Karen motions to Adjourn. We are adjourned.

Adjourned.

Minutes by David Golden, Secretary