

CSFN WEIGHS IN ON CROWDED BALLOT

Faced with reviewing the largest number of local initiatives in recent history, the CSFN Government and Elections (G&E) Committee met four times over three months to determine positions on proposed ballot initiatives. At one point, thirty nine measures had surfaced. By the final qualification date, twenty four remained, with fourteen presented for pro and con arguments at CSFN General Assembly meetings on August 8 and August 16.



Why is this November ballot so overcrowded? Here's one point of view from BeyondChron (*Randy Shaw, 8/2/16*)

"First, it's easier to pass revenue measures in large turnout elections. That's why the November ballot has a sales tax measure to raise money for transportation and homelessness, a Community College parcel tax, a School bond, a measure reallocating hotel tax funds and an initiative to set aside money in the budget for senior and disabled services.

Second, supervisors sought to tap into a broader zeitgeist. The combination of Black Lives Matter and local shootings led to the Mail Cohen-London Breed backed- initiative for police reform. Bernie Sanders call for free public college tuition (later embraced by Hillary Clinton) led to Jane Kim's measure to raise the real estate transfer tax on properties over \$5 million to pay for this benefit. Scott Wiener sought to tap into rising neighborhood concern about greening and sidewalk maintenance by backing an initiative that requires the city to maintain street trees.

A third reason for the explosion of ballot measures is—surprise—politics. Kim and Wiener are running against each other for State Senate, and each wanted to be associated with a popular ballot initiative as part of their sales pitch to voters.

Mark Farrell's anti-camping measure would actually weaken the city's camping restrictions but it will be framed by media and perceived by voters as a crackdown on camping. Many believe Farrell has put forth the measure to as a strategy for his future mayor's race.

The Board's six progressives are backing multiple measures to reduce the power of Mayor Lee. One imposes a Housing Development Commission over the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) and Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD). Another eliminates the mayor's power to make supervisor appointments in case of a vacancy (which will happen

Cont. p. 2

Ballot Measures Considered by CSFN

Prop C: General Obligation Bond election amending earthquake loan bond program to finance "Acquisition & Rehabilitation of Affordable Housing." **Support.**

Prop D: Charter Amendment to limit the terms of interim Supervisors appointed to fill vacancies on the Board of Supervisors. **Support.**

Prop H: Charter Amendment to create the office of a Public Advocate. **Support.**

Prop J: Charter Amendment to set aside funds for Homeless and Transportation Services. **Oppose.**

Prop K: General Sales Tax increased to 9.25%. **Oppose.**

Prop L: Charter Amendment to change MTA Director Selection & Budget Vote. **Support.**

Prop M: Charter amendment to create a Housing & Community Development Commission. **Support.**

Prop O: Waiver for the Prop M annual cap on the square footage of new office space for Candlestick Park developer. **Oppose.**

Prop P: Competitive Bidding on Affordable Housing Projects on City Owned Properties. **Oppose.**

Prop S: Reallocation of SF Hotel Tax Funds. **Support.**

Prop T: Expanding the Registration of "Expenditure Lobbyists". **Support.**

Prop U: Lower Affordable Housing Rates in Market Rate Projects. **Oppose.**

Prop W: Amend the Business and Tax Regulations on Luxury Properties. **No Position.**

Prop X: Replacement of PDR, Arts and Community Spaces in the Eastern Neighborhoods. **Support.**

Submitted by Charles Head (SHARP)

Presidents Message

CSFN IS DOING A GREAT JOB!

by George Wooding

Congratulations to the Government and Elections Committee for doing exceptional work. Led by Committee Chair Charles Head, 14 out of 24 ballot City ballot measures were reviewed and submitted to the General Assembly. Four ended up being submitted as paid arguments in the Voters Information Pamphlet and nine were sponsorships of other ballot arguments. CSFN will be well represented in the November 8th voters guide.



CSFN has been very active on other fronts. The Land Use Committee is currently working with the Planning Department on changes to Article 7 and Urban Design Guidelines as you can see in this newsletter.

Cont. to page 2

President's Report *Cont. from p. 1*

The San Francisco Planning Department has recently completed a revised draft of the proposed Urban Design Guidelines (UGD), a document intended to provide a common language to guide design of buildings throughout the City; establishing a consistent set of expectations, goals, and standards by which projects are evaluated. Will see.

The Recreation and Park Department just issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the lease and operation of Lake Merced West (520 John Muir Drive) in January of this year. This should be watched closely.

Mayor Lee's Patronage Jobs ATM

Did you know that almost half—\$4.7 billion—of the City's bloated \$9.6 billion budget is spent on City employees? And our city government's size is defined by the number of hours City employee's work. Who knew?

The number of City employees — measured by a generally accepted and IRS accounting principle known as FTE, for "full-time equivalents" — is of concern to all San Franciscans.

Those who work 40 hours per week, or 2,080 hours annually, are considered full-time - 1.0 FTE. Part-time employees who work 20 hours weekly, or 1,040 hours annually, are 0.5 FTE's. Government agencies and businesses combine multiple part-timers into full-time "equivalents" for tax and other reasons.

Under the Affordable Care Act, employers are required to offer health coverage only to full-time employees and their dependents, but not to less than FTE's. In San Francisco, the City doesn't pay healthcare or retirement benefits to employees who work less than 20 hours a week, unless they accumulate 1,040 hours during a rolling 12-month period, saving the City a lot of money. A reasonable question is: Is the practice of hiring more part-time employees being abused?

Since Mayor Lee assumed office in January 2011 inheriting former Mayor Newsom's final FY 2010–2011 budget, Lee has developed and introduced seven additional budgets, including a proposed budget for FY 2017–2018 that will be finalized in June 2017. Over his seven budget submissions, he's added 4,794 budgeted FTE positions. San Francisco now has (or will in FY 2017–2018) 30,902 FTE's, which will grow further with Lee's final FY 2017–2018 budget submission.

The 4,794 FTE's Lee added is deceptive. They translate into 6,414 additional full- and part-time employees through June 30, 2016, but we won't know how the planned 1,073 new FTE's in the current budget (FY 2016–2017) will translate into full- and part-time employees until the year-end close on June 30, 2017. Through June 30, 2016 the City has 40,397 full- and part-time employees, not including the 1,073 new FTE's.

Lee's 6,414 new employees increased the City's total payroll by a whopping \$665.7 million dollars, excluding fringe benefits and retirement costs. Half of the 6,414 new hires earn more than \$100,000, gobbling 79% of the payroll increase. They all work full-time. The other half split the 21.0% remaining payroll increase.

Lee's hiring binge involves significant income disparity inequalities.

Heather Knight at the San Francisco Chronicle wrongly reported on August 27 that the average City salary is \$108,774. That's untrue; average salaries for all 40,397 actual employees are just \$78,401 in

total pay, which varies by salary ranges.

The median salary in total pay is actually \$75,000, slightly lower than average salary. Over two-thirds of City employees earn less than \$100,000, averaging just \$49,532 in salary. Almost one-third of City employees earn less than \$50,000, averaging \$17,771 in salary. Half of City employees earn less than the median salary and average \$35,523 in salary.

By contrast, the nearly one-third of City employees earning more than \$100,000 have average salaries of a staggering \$142,414. Two percent of City employees are paid more than \$200,000, and have \$225,710 in average salaries. Lee added 655 employees earning more than \$200,000. There are now 922 who do.

Significantly, employees earning more than \$100,000 and working full-time rose from 41.4% in Newsom's final budget to 72.8% in Lee's FY 2015–2016 budget, while those working between half-time and full-time plummeted from 58.6% to just 27.0%. Only 39 employees (three-tenths of one percent) earning over \$100,000 work half-time or less.

By contrast, since inheriting Newsom's budget, Mayor Lee reduced full-time employees for those earning less than \$100,000 from 27.1% to just 6.0%, eliminating 4,982 employees who previously worked full-time. He increased those earning less than \$100,000 working between half-time and full time by 5,364 employees (a 12.4% increase), and increased those working less than half-time by 2,425 (a 5.2% increase), increasing the number of employees who don't earn healthcare or retirement benefits.

As of June 30, 2016, the highest-paid salaried City employee now earns \$512,485, after receiving a \$205,810 raise from the year before. That's Bill Coaker, Chief Investment Officer at the Employee's Retirement System; he'll become a new millionaire from the City's payroll every two years, news Ms. Knight apparently missed.

The second highest-paid salaried employee — John Martin, running SFO — is paid \$180,526 less.

The man behind the curtain for City Hall's patronage jobs pushing ATM buttons is Mayor Lee.

Crowded Ballot *Cont. from p. 1*

in D6 or D8 due to the Kim-Wiener race). A third splits the mayor's appointments to the SFMTA Board with the supervisors and a fourth reduces the mayor's powers by transferring key responsibilities to a new Public Advocate office."

CSFN G&E Committee member Paul Webber's (THD) analysis of the CSFN vote on the November ballot measures provides an interesting perspective as well:

Control of Action of Government (D,H,L & T) **Supported all four.**

Tax & Financial Matters (C,J,K,S & W) **Supported two (C & S)**

Opposed two (J & K) No position on one (W).

Land Use (O, U & X) **Supported one (X) Opposed two (O & U).**

Measures Sponsored by Developers (O,P,U) **Opposed all three.**

Measures Sponsored by the Mayor, Moderate Supervisors and/or Developers (J,K,O,P&U): **Opposed all five**

Submitted by Marlayne Morgan (CHNA)

Article 7 - Letter to Commission

September 4, 2016

To: Rodney Fong, President, SF Planning Commission

From: George Wooding, President, CSFN

Re: Article 7 of the Planning Code, City and County of San Francisco

Dear Commissioners,

This supplements our letter dated August 18, 2016 (the "First Letter") regarding the Reorganization therein described. All terms defined therein shall have the same meaning when used herein.

In the First Letter we indicated that we would take a sampling of Commercial Use Districts and Use Characteristics to see if they remained substantively the same. Accordingly, we have undertaken the following steps:

Table 145.4

Reviewed Table 145.4 in the proposed Reorganization legislation with regard to specified new or modified Uses, and compared them with their sources, as specified on a "key/cheat sheet" ("Key") chart supplied to us by the Staff, and found them to be substantially in agreement except as follows:

Table 145.4, Page 14, Line 17: There also needs to be some work done on "Amusement Game Arcade," which has a cross-reference to Article 8 which has not been published yet and the controls have been changed from "C/NP/NP" to "C/C/C" for arcade floors in NC-3 for example. This appears to be substantive and we are unclear as to why this change was made.

Table 145.4, Page 16, Line 3 introduces a category called "Sales and Services, General Retail," and leaves intact 2 other categories, "Sales and Services, Other Retail" and "Sales and Services, Retail" whereas neither the Key nor the various Zoning Control Tables do not use those terms. This was confusing to read and these terms need to be re-worked for transitional consistency. Once this is completed, the corrected terms need to be included in Section 102.

Table 145.1, Page 16, Lines 9 and 13: These specific defined terms ("Service, Health" and "Service, Medical") do not track with the source document. Please conform.

Sampling of District Zoning Control Tables

In our sampling of the Zoning Control Tables, we have not reviewed any possible new legislation since the publication of the Reorganization on June 30, 2016.

We reviewed the Zoning Control Tables of two Districts, NC-3 (Table 712) and West Portal Neighborhood Commercial District (Table 722), comparing each with their respective source documents in current Article 7 and found the following exceptions:

NC-3

Page 65, Line 6, of current law reflected in the "crossed-out version" thereof, the term "Administrative Service" which was Sec. 712.70 and which referenced Sec. 790.106, defined it as "A non-retail use..." Since the term is not found in the Key, we assume it falls under "Service, Non-Retail Professional." If that is correct, then it appears to provide services to the public as well. THIS IS A UNIVERSAL COMMENT AND IS APPLICABLE TO ALL ZONING CONTROL TABLES.

Page 111, Line 6: Need to restore the reference to Section 135 entitled "Usable Open Space for Dwelling Units and Group Housing, R, NC, Mixed Use, C, and M Districts" so that it would parallel its source document.

Page 111, Line 20 for "Group Housing": The "References" column

shows only §208 entitled "Density Limits for Group Housing and Homeless Shelters" and deletes §207 entitled "Dwelling Unit Density Limits". Is the intent of this change to increase density?

THIS IS A UNIVERSAL COMMENT AND IS APPLICABLE TO ALL ZONING CONTROL TABLES.

Page 111, Line 21, opposite "Accessory Dwelling Units", under "Controls" column: clarify which law(s) apply to all districts. THIS IS A UNIVERSAL COMMENT AND IS APPLICABLE TO ALL ZONING CONTROL TABLES WHICH SPECIFY ADU CONTROLS.

Page 112, Line 10, in the "References" column it mentions §145.1 which is also the reference for "Street Frontage Requirements" as on Page 110. How are these integrated?

Page 112, Line 14, for "Drive-up Facility": the "(2)" in the "Controls" column appears to be in error.

Page 113, Line 24 for "Massage Establishment": Current source document has a "#" in chart on Page, 63, Line 17, for which we could not find an explanation.

On Page 113, Line 24, for "Massage Establishments," the reference should be changed to "303(n)" in the "Reference" column which is applicable to "Massage Establishments." In addition, the reference to Health Code 29.32 entitled "Inspection" has been deleted. This section refers to inspections for massage establishments, and it is unclear if its deletion is intended as a substantive change.

West Portal Neighborhood Commercial District

Page 201, reference to "Design Guidelines" control: No comment is made regarding anything appearing for this guideline or to any references to the General Plan as a source. A UNIVERSAL COMMENT APPLICABLE TO ALL ZONING CONTROL TABLES WHICH SPECIFY ANY SUCH CONTROL.

Page 201, Line 11, in the "Controls" column: Add the following text "Car share parking as per §166," as has been done for bike parking. A UNIVERSAL COMMENT APPLICABLE TO ALL ZONING CONTROL TABLES WHICH SPECIFY §166 AS A REFERENCE.

Page 202, Line 8 in the "Controls" column for "Residential Conversion, Demolition, or Merger": We do not understand the narrative. A UNIVERSAL COMMENT FOR THIS ZONING CATEGORY.

Miscellaneous

Pages 18-30: We would like from Staff a simpler explanation of the additions, changes, and deletions of non-conforming uses.

On Page 26, Line 21, of the proposed legislation which reflects a "crossed-out" version of existing law, there is a category entitled "Service, Business or Professional." Is the transitional description in new Sec. 102, "Service, Retail Professional"? If the correlation is intentional, is that true also with the deletion of the elimination for on-site storage?

On Page 86, Lines 2-10, the summary description of Neighborhood Commercial Districts has replaced serial such descriptions for each of the NC Districts. As a consequence, detail applicable to some or all is eliminated. For example, the references to rear yard requirements are eliminated. Moreover the new description introduces the concept of "low to high density" without explaining the meaning. This needs to be clarified and shown to be part of the existing Article 7 unless, of course, this is an intentional substantive change. If so, why is it being introduced?

In addition, on Page 86, at Line 5, change second "commercial" to "residential" and at Line 6, change "Residential" to "Commercial."

Cont. to page 4

President's Report *Cont. from p. 3***Other Observations and Comments**

Please refer to the Letter under this heading. In addition, with the Urban Design Guidelines now out in draft form, the likely new Residential Guidelines which may be published next year and with the Article 8 reorganization waiting somewhere in the wings, we again urge you to NOT give piecemeal approval now to Article 7, but wrap it together with these other major pieces for an overall approval. This is the most comprehensive restructuring in years, if not ever. The summary programs being given are not really informing neighborhoods what is happening. This brings us to our next suggestion.

Prepare a Video Tutorial of "How Article 7 Works"

In working through Article 7 for these two letters, we have spent upwards of 50 person hours on the project. The Staff has spent over a year developing the transition structure utilizing, we are sure, a large block of person hours, including time spent with Supervisor Tang's Staff to fashion changes which they wanted for the Neighborhood Commercial Districts within the Supervisor's district. As we are sure that the Staff found there, for groups to understand the "why and how," it was necessary to get into the "weeds."

That cannot happen in the short periods of time which have been spent explaining the project, as the programs given have assumed a certain level working knowledge which we do not believe is extant. This is not meant as a criticism of Staff.

As Staff and we have mentioned, some groups, if informed, may wish to go through their Supervisor to seek changes to their controls. We know of three which are currently considering that, and in each case, they are getting into the "weeds." For example, how many groups really know that commercial facilities such as restaurants can stay open 24 hours a day, as is the case in some Commercial Districts? Hardly any.

So we are proposing the following and will be happy to participate. There needs to be a comprehensive tutorial video prepared which gets into the "how and the why" and walks through how the control tables work and what they mean. Using the Department's equipment and creating a program which runs maybe an hour to an hour and a half, to just walk viewers through the universal ground rules, at least by category, and couple of sets of tables, the "locals" will be in a better position make their own decision to seek changes or not and become even more informed or not.

The video could be posted on the Planning Department website with a link to that on the Coalition's website. We could provide at least two people to be part of the "cast" and work on the production as well.

We hope that you will seriously consider this approach to inform the neighborhoods and will hold off on moving Article 7 until it can be offered as part of a larger package of a vetted Article 8 and Urban and Residential Design Guidelines.

The list of participants appears below and reflects electronic authorization to use their names.

George Wooding, Midtown Terrace Homeowners Association & President of CSFN

Marlayne Morgan, Cathedral Hill Neighbors Association & 1st Vice President of CSFN

Rose Hillson, Jordan Park Improvement Assn and Delegate to CSFN

Paul Webber Telegraph Hill Dwellers & Delegate to CSFN

Letter from Telegraph Hill Dwellers**Urban Design Guidelines - 2nd Draft**

September 2, 2016

Via Email: jeff.joslin@sfgov.org

Jeff Joslin

Director of Current Planning Planning Department

1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: Initial Comments on the 2nd Round Draft of San Francisco's Urban Design Guidelines

Dear Jeff,

On behalf of the Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD), I am writing to offer our initial comments on the 2nd round draft of the Urban Design Guidelines (UDG). While we expect to provide additional comments going forward, our comments thus far include the following:

1. Public outreach and consultation with community and neighborhood organizations must be conducted. We remain seriously concerned that the Planning Department has not engaged in public outreach and consultation with interested community and neighborhood organizations in the development of this UDG draft. Such consultation is essential for transparency and community support, must be meaningful, collaborative and representative, and must be completed and incorporated into a subsequent draft of the UDG before it is proposed for final adoption.

2. The deadline for public comments needs to be extended. Because there is insufficient time to conduct and incorporate such public outreach and consultation into the UDG draft before the Planning Department's Planning Commission target date of October 20th, the Department needs to publish a subsequent UDG draft updated to reflect public outreach and consultation, and to extend the deadline for comment to provide a more reasonable length of time, even if doing so pushes the Planning Commission hearing on adoption of the UDG beyond the Department's target date.

3. Conformance with the General Plan should be demonstrated. Consistency and compatibility with the existing urban form of the City, as well as recognition and respect for existing neighborhood diversity, architectural character, and history, are critical to urban design. As its basis, the UDG must draw from the Urban Design Element and Priority Policies of the General Plan, which have primacy in their statement of City urban design objectives and policies. The UDG draft should be amended to demonstrate how the guidelines "map" back to and incorporate the following Urban Design Element objectives and policies:

Objective 1 — Emphasis Of The Characteristic Pattern Which Gives To The City And Its Neighborhoods An Image, A Sense Of Purpose, And A Means Of Orientation

Objective 2 — Conservation Of Resources Which Provide A Sense Of Nature, Continuity With The Past, And Freedom From Overcrowding

Objective 3 — Moderation Of Major New Development To Complement The City Pattern, The Resources To Be Conserved, And The Neighborhood Environment

Objective 4 — Improvement Of The Neighborhood Environment To Increase Personal Safety, Comfort, Pride And Opportunity

The UDG must also demonstrate how it relates to the Priority Policies added by Proposition M, enacted by the voters on November 4, 1986 [see also Planning Code Section 101.1(b)], especially the

following:

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

Policy (3) — That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced

Policy (7) — That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved

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

In addition, the Urban Design Element tabulates a number of "fundamental principles" for each of its four objectives that "reflect the needs and characteristics with which this plan is concerned, and describe measurable and critical urban design relationships in the city pattern." The UDG should describe how it relates to and incorporates these principles.

4. A statement of General Plan urban design policies should be attached to, and more explicitly integrated into, the UDG. The policies in the Urban Design Element and the Priority Policies of the General Plan should be attached to and integrated into the UDG. Ideally, this would include the entire text of the Urban Design Element. If not, at a minimum, a summary should be attached to the UDG, perhaps using a format such as shown in Attachments 1 and 2 to this comment letter. Specific principles provided in the General Plan for each Urban Design Element objective should be referenced and their relationship to the UDG discussed.

5. The respective roles of the UDG and the Residential Design Guidelines need to be clarified. The guidelines contained in the existing Residential Design Guidelines (RDG), which were developed with input from neighborhood organizations including THD, have been very helpful in guiding design review of alterations and new construction in existing neighborhoods. In contrast, the UDG draft as currently proposed is skewed toward high-density areas and modern buildings and is not appropriate for design reviews in the diverse, lower density neighborhoods more typical in much of the City. While the UDG and the RDG should be interrelated and complementary, we are concerned that the UDG may become the City's de facto design guidelines and may influence proposed future revisions to the RDG. The UDG is being considered prematurely without a full discussion and understanding of how the UDG and the RDG will interact and reinforce one another. The UDG and the RDG should work together to conform to and implement the requirements of the General Plan, including its twenty Area and Sub-Area Plans, and to protect and enhance the City's existing neighborhood character.

6. A wholesale rewriting of the RDG is not necessary. The guidelines in the RDG are organized in a tight, clear and hierarchical way, and they emphasize the elements most important to low-density residential development. If the UDG are used parallel to, or worse as the guiding document for low density residential districts, we will lose the strong controls the RDG now promote. While we acknowledge that the RDG can be improved — for example, they need discussion of and sketches on side setbacks on key lots, inclusion in the historic building section on guidelines for new construction and renovations to non-historic buildings in historic and potential historic districts and some additional drawings for many of the discussed objectives — they do not need a wholesale rewriting.

7. A "one-size-fits-all" guideline approach should be avoided. Because the proposed guidelines are designed to apply to projects throughout the City, the UDG should avoid imposing a one-size-fits-

all design approach that may not adequately consider the unique and distinguishing elements that contribute to the cohesive character of the City's individual neighborhoods, such as North Beach and Telegraph Hill. Because neighborhoods vary considerably, both contextually and in terms of their values, design guidelines must recognize and allow for neighborhood-by-neighborhood differences, rather than imposing a one-size-fits-all approach.

8. A more representative mix of illustrative examples should be used. Many of the illustrative examples in the UDG are of new and highly urbanized construction that does not represent the more typical neighborhood character in much of the City. In many instances, it is unclear what the photos are intended to illustrate, and often they appear incompatible with their surroundings. A more representative mix of illustrative examples is needed, one that better represents the diversity and character of City neighborhoods, and that is less skewed to highly-urbanized "hard-edged" designs that are not reflective of the existing built environment in many areas of the City.

9. Illustrative examples should be better matched to the guideline, rationale, and range of means they are intended to illustrate. The captions accompanying the examples are more descriptive than in the 1st round UDG draft, but in a number of cases, it remains difficult to relate clearly the example back to the intended guideline design principles. Further interpretive discussion of how examples relate to and illustrate a guideline is needed. We note that the sketches and guidelines contained in the existing RDG are in many cases more helpful in illustrating the issues raised by new development in our existing neighborhoods than the illustrative examples in the UDG draft.

10. The Waiver Provision must be deleted. The "waiver" provision in the UDG, if adopted, could undercut even this overly general document, rendering it unduly subject to interpretation and overriding discretionary action. The proposed guidelines in the UDG draft are written very generally and without hierarchy, and a number of the terms either are not defined or are open to broad interpretation. This provision must be deleted.

In summary, we look forward to working with you and interested community and neighborhood organizations to conduct the public outreach and consultation that is necessary, and to reflect the results of that effort in a subsequent draft of the UDG.

Sincerely,

Stan Hayes President

Telegraph Hill Dwellers

cc: Anne Brask, Planner Anne.Brask@sfgov.org Jonas P. Ionin Commissions.Secretary@sfgov.org

Supervisor Aaron Peskin, District 3 aaron.peskin@sfgov.org

ATTACHMENT 1. Urban Design Element of San Francisco General Plan, Objectives and Policies

San Francisco General Plan, see http://sf-planning.org/ftp/General_Plan/index.htm

URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT

Introduction

City Pattern

Objective 1 EMPHASIS OF THE CHARACTERISTIC PATTERN WHICH GIVES TO THE CITY AND ITS NEIGHBORHOODS AN IMAGE, A SENSE OF PURPOSE, AND A MEANS OF ORIENTATION.

Policy 1.1 Recognize and protect major views in the city, with particular attention to those of open space and water.

Policy 1.2 Recognize, protect and reinforce the existing street

Cont. to page 6

Urban Design Guidelines *Cont. from p. 5*

pattern, especially as it is related to topography.

Policy 1.3 Recognize that buildings, when seen together, produce a total effect that characterizes the city and its districts.

Policy 1.4 Protect and promote large-scale landscaping and open space that define districts and topography.

Policy 1.5 Emphasize the special nature of each district through distinctive landscaping and other features.

Policy 1.6 Make centers of activity more prominent through design of street features and by other means.

Policy 1.7 Recognize the natural boundaries of districts, and promote connections between districts.

Policy 1.8 Increase the visibility of major destination areas and other points for orientation.

Policy 1.9 Increase the clarity of routes for travelers.

Policy 1.10 Indicate the purposes of streets by adopting and implementing the Better Streets Plan, which identifies a hierarchy of street types and appropriate streetscape elements for each street type.

Policy 1.11 Indicate the purposes of streets by means of a citywide plan for street landscaping.

Policy 1.12 Indicate the purposes of streets by means of a citywide plan for street lighting.

Conservation

Objective 2 CONSERVATION OF RESOURCES WHICH PROVIDE A SENSE OF NATURE, CONTINUITY WITH THE PAST, AND FREEDOM FROM OVERCROWDING.

Policy 2.1 Preserve in their natural state the few remaining areas that have not been developed by man.

Policy 2.2 Limit improvements in other open spaces having an established sense of nature to those that are necessary, and unlikely to detract from the primary values of the open space.

Policy 2.3 Avoid encroachments on San Francisco Bay that would be inconsistent with the Bay Plan or the needs of the city's residents.

Policy 2.4 Preserve notable landmarks and areas of historic, architectural or aesthetic value, and promote the preservation of other buildings and features that provide continuity with past development.

Policy 2.5 Use care in remodeling of older buildings, in order to enhance rather than weaken the original character of such buildings.

Policy 2.6 Respect the character of older development nearby in the design of new buildings.

Policy 2.7 Recognize and protect outstanding and unique areas that contribute in an extraordinary degree to San Francisco's visual form and character.

Policy 2.8 Maintain a strong presumption against the giving up of street areas for private ownership or use, or for construction of public buildings.

Policy 2.9 Review proposals for the giving up of street areas in terms of all the public values that streets afford.

Policy 2.10 Permit release of street areas, where such release is warranted, only in the least extensive and least permanent manner appropriate to each case.

Major New Development

Objective 3 MODERATION OF MAJOR NEW DEVELOPMENT TO COMPLEMENT THE CITY PATTERN, THE RESOURCES TO BE CONSERVED, AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD ENVIRONMENT.

Policy 3.1 Promote harmony in the visual relationships and transi-

tions between new and older buildings.

Policy 3.2 Avoid extreme contrasts in color, shape and other characteristics which will cause new buildings to stand out in excess of their public importance.

Policy 3.3 Promote efforts to achieve high quality of design for buildings to be constructed at prominent locations.

Policy 3.4 Promote building forms that will respect and improve the integrity of open spaces and other public areas.

Policy 3.5 Relate the height of buildings to important attributes of the city pattern and to the height and character of existing development.

Policy 3.6 Relate the bulk of buildings to the prevailing scale of development to avoid an overwhelming or dominating appearance in new construction.

ATTACHMENT 1. Urban Design Element of San Francisco General Plan, Objectives and Policies

San Francisco General Plan, see http://sf-planning.org/ftp/General_Plan/index.htm

URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT

Policy 3.7 Recognize the special urban design problems posed in development of large properties.

Policy 3.8 Discourage accumulation and development of large properties, unless such development is carefully designed with respect to its impact upon the surrounding area and upon the city.

Policy 3.9 Encourage a continuing awareness of the long-term effects of growth upon the physical form of the city.

Neighborhood Environment

Objective 4 IMPROVEMENT OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD ENVIRONMENT TO INCREASE PERSONAL SAFETY, COMFORT, PRIDE AND OPPORTUNITY

Policy 4.1 Protect residential areas from the noise, pollution and physical danger of excessive traffic.

Policy 4.2 Provide buffering for residential properties when heavy traffic cannot be avoided.

Policy 4.3 Provide adequate lighting in public areas.

Policy 4.4 Design walkways and parking facilities to minimize danger to pedestrians.

Policy 4.5 Provide adequate maintenance for public areas.

Policy 4.6 Emphasize the importance of local centers providing commercial and government services.

Policy 4.7 Encourage and assist in voluntary programs for neighborhood improvement.

Policy 4.8 Provide convenient access to a variety of recreation opportunities.

Policy 4.9 Maximize the use of recreation areas for recreational purposes.

Policy 4.10 Encourage or require the provision of recreation space in private development.

Policy 4.11 Make use of street space and other unused public areas for recreation, particularly in dense neighborhoods, such as those close to downtown, where land for traditional open spaces is more difficult to assemble.

Policy 4.12 Install, promote and maintain landscaping in public and private areas.

Policy 4.13 Improve pedestrian areas by providing human scale and interest.

Policy 4.14 Remove and obscure distracting and cluttering elements.

Policy 4.15 Protect the livability and character of residential properties from the intrusion of incompatible new buildings.

The Future

ATTACHMENT 2. San Francisco General Plan, Priority Policies

Added to San Francisco General Plan by Proposition M, November 4, 1986

SF Planning Code, Article 1: GENERAL PLAN ZONING PROVISIONS, Section 101.1(b)

(b) The following Priority Policies are hereby established. They shall be included in the preamble to the General Plan and shall be the basis upon which inconsistencies in the General Plan are resolved:

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

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

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

(4) That commuter traffic not impede Muni transit services or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

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

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

(7) That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved; and

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

Special CSFN Meeting Draft Minutes 8/8/16

15 delegates representing 13 organizations and 5 guests signed in. Refreshments were provided by CSFN. The meeting began at 6:45. Government and Elections Chair Charles Head (S.H.A.R.P.) ran the program.

1. Initiative Ordinance: Affordable Housing Requirements for Market Rate Development Projects. Jay Cheng argued for the measure and Peter Cohen argued against it. The GA voted to follow the Committee's recommendation to oppose, 7-1.

2. Initiative Ordinance: Competitive Bidding for Affordable Housing Projects on City Owned property. Jay Cheng argued in favor and Peter Cohen argued in opposition. The GA voted to follow the Committee's recommendation to oppose, 7-2.

3. Charter amendment: Housing and Development Commission. Supervisor Peskin spoke in favor of establishing it. The GA voted in favor of the Committee's no recommendation and took no position.

4. General Obligation Bond Election : Amendment to finance affordable housing. Peter Cohen spoke in favor of using bond money to buy and rehab seismically unsafe buildings. The GA overruled the Committee's recommendation to support by taking no position.

5. Initiative Ordinance : Allocation of Hotel Tax Funds. Tony Kelly spoke in favor of restoring earmarks for the Arts and also for Homeless families. The GA followed the Committee's recommendation and voted to support 8-3.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15

Draft Minutes: General Assembly Meeting 8/16/16

26 Delegates representing 22 organizations and 6 guests signed in. The meeting was called to order at 7:00. Guests introduced themselves. Hosts were recognized; Nancy Stafford (GGHNA) and Rae Doyle (GWPNA) spoke about their groups' current concerns. President Wooding (MTHA) presided over the first two items before turning the rest of the program over to Government and Elections Chair Charles Head (SHARP).

1. Paul Webber (THD) introduced a motion to rescind the votes on items one and two of the previous meeting. A 2/3 majority voted in favor, so he introduced a motion to support each, which passed with a 2/3 majority concurring.

2. Charter Amendment to create the office of Public Advocate: Jon Golinger spoke in favor of establishing it, and the GA overrode the Committee's recommendation to oppose it by voting to support it, 12-1-6.

3. Expanding the registration of "Expenditure Lobbyists" Several Friends of Ethics spoke in favor of the measure, and the GA voted unanimously to follow the Committee's recommendation to support it.

4. General Sales Tax and Set Asides for Homeless and Transportation: Supervisor Peskin spoke against these two measures. The GA followed the Committee's recommendation to oppose by voting this way unanimously .

5. Candlestick Point Waiver for More Office Space than Prop M previously allowed. Angelo King argued for it, and Calvin Welsch argued against it. The GA followed the Committee's recommendation to oppose it, unanimously.

6. Charter Amendment on Filling Vacancies on the BOS. Jon Golinger spoke in favor of this change. The GA followed the Committee's recommendation by voting to support it, 17-2.

7. Measure to increase the Transfer Tax on Properties valued over \$5 million. Alisa Messer spoke in favor of this; principally to support tuition reduction for CCSF students. The GA voted to override the Committee's recommendation of support by taking no position.

8. Initiative to support conversion of PDR, Arts and Community Spaces. April Veneracion of Supervisor Kim's office spoke in favor of saving these. The GA followed the committee's recommendation and voted to support, 14-2.

9. Charter Amendment on MTA Board Selection and Budget Vote Mari Eliza (EDIA) spoke in favor of changing to a split appointment and simple majority vote. The GA followed the Committee's recommendation and voted to support, 18-2.

At the end of the meeting, the GA voted to write paid ballot arguments opposing

General Sales Tax, (Prop K) and the Set Asides (Prop K) of item 4 and supporting Prop L (item 9)

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 pm.

Submitted by Charles Head, (SHARP)

Executive Committee Report • August 24, 2016

The CSFN ExCom met on Wednesday, July 27 at the Northern Station. Chair Morgan called the meeting to order at 4:45 and established a quorum, with Wooding, Boken, Rogers, Scott, Clark, Harris and Zvanski present.

President Wooding thanked Charles Head, G&E Chair and Greg Scott, Treasurer for their out-standing work on the November election and the financials, respectively.

First VP Morgan submitted the final draft budget. She reported that Assembly Member Ting has contacted CSFN to present at an upcoming meeting.

Second VP Boken referred a transportation issue to New Business.

Corresponding Secretary Rogers submitted an updated membership list after the August GA. Member Mary Harris thanked him for producing an excellent work product. He also reported that the hosts for the September GA will be:

East Mission Neighborhood Association (EMIA)

Midtown Terrace Homeowners Association (MTHA)

Treasurer Scott reported that CSFN's 501(c)4 status has been reinstated.

Unfinished Business.

With one correction, the ExCom unanimously approved the draft budget to be presented to the GA in September.

Chair Morgan submitted a checklist/timeline from the 2015 Holiday Dinner for discussion. Members Harris and Zvanski volunteered to work with Secretary Rogers on planning the banquet.

New Business

VP Boken presented material and draft response for a transportation proposal affecting Taraval Street. The ExCom unanimously approved a letter to be sent on behalf of CSFN on this proposal.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 pm.

Submitted by Marlayne Morgan (CHNA)

CORRECTIONS TO NEWSLETTER

Turn in written submissions to ExCom Chair (marlayne16@gmail.com)

Correction to August CSFN Newsletter:

The name of the law firm involved in the "Google Bus" case representing the defendants was Morrison and Foerster. The law firm representing the plaintiffs was Lozeau, Drury LLP.

ExComm—How to Reach Us:

President: George Wooding • gswooding@gmail.com • 695-1395

1st VP: Marlayne Morgan • marlayne16@gmail.com

2nd VP: Eileen Boken • aeboken@gmail.com

Recording Secretary: Charles Head • charlesnhead@hotmail.com

Corresponding Secretary: Glenn Rogers • alderlandscape@comcast.net

Treasurer: Greg Scott • lgscpa@icloud.com

Member-at-Large: Penny Clark • penelopeclark@yahoo.com

Member-at-Large: Mary Harris maryharris_dist11@msn.com

Member-at-Large: Claire Zvanski czvanski@hotmail.com

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Bylaws Chair Claire Zvanski, czvanski@hotmail.com. Ongoing meetings.

Gov't & Elections Chair Charles Head, charlesnhead@hotmail.com. 6pm, second Friday, Taraval Police Station.

Land Use & Housing Chair, George Wooding, gswooding@gmail.com. Ongoing meetings

Open Space Chair Nancy Wuerfel, nancenumber1@aol.com, 731-6432, Co-chair Ramona Albright, 621-9621. Ongoing meetings.

Transportation Chair Mari Eliza, mari.eliza@sbcglobal.net Ongoing meetings.

Water Task Force • Chair Joan Girardot, csfnwatertaskforce@gmail.com, 346-5525. Ongoing meetings.

NEIGHBORHOOD VIEWS is published monthly, the official voice of the Coalition for SF Neighborhoods, Inc., a 501(c)4 organization.

To Submit Articles: Email articles by the 3rd (third) of the month to: Newsletter Editor (2nd VP) in Microsoft Word-compatible document (i.e. no pdf's) in-line or as attachment. Articles reflect the opinions of the submitter, not necessarily the opinion of the CSFN. We invite material from member organizations as well as rebuttal to articles already printed. We reserve the right to edit where necessary. .



September 20, 2016 • CSFN GENERAL ASSEMBLY AGENDA

- 6:30 I. Sign In and Refreshments
- 7:00 II. Call to Order/ Ascertain Quorum
 - A. Introduction of Delegates and Guests / Short Announcements
 - B. Hosts
 - 1. East Mission Improvement Association
 - 2. Midtown Terrace Homeowners Association
- 7:15 III. Officers' Reports
 - A. President
 - B. Vice Presidents
 - C. Secretaries
 - D. Treasurer
- 7:30 IV. Committee Action Items—written reports in Newsletter
 - A. Executive
 - B. Bylaws
 - C. Dinner
 - D. Government & Elections
 - E. Land Use & Housing
 - F. Open Space
 - G. Transportation
- 7:45 V. Approval of July, 20, 2016 Minutes
- 8:00 VI. Unfinished Business
- 8:15 VII. New Business
 - 2016-2017 Budget
 - Urban Design Guidelines
- 8:30 VIII. **Program - SFMTA Proposals to Overhaul Residential Parking - A Review**
- 9:15 IX. Adjournment