



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

**MEMO**

**DATE:** 7 July 2015  
**TO:** Members, San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
**FROM:** John Rahaim  
Director of Planning  
**RE:** **HOUSING BALANCE REPORT**

1650 Mission St.  
Suite 400  
San Francisco,  
CA 94103-2479

Reception:  
**415.558.6378**

Fax:  
**415.558.6409**

Planning  
Information:  
**415.558.6377**

## SUMMARY

This report is submitted in compliance with the recently passed Ordinance No. 53-15 requiring the Planning Department to monitor and report on the balance between new market rate housing and new affordable housing production. This "Housing Balance" is defined as the proportion of all new affordable housing units to the total number of all new housing units for a 10-year "Housing Balance Period."

One of the stated purposes of the Housing Balance is "to ensure that data on meeting affordable housing targets City-wide and within neighborhoods informs the approval process for new housing development." In November 2014, San Francisco's voters endorsed Proposition K, which set a goal of 33% of all new housing units to be affordable. Housing production targets in the City's Housing Element adopted in April 2015 includes 28,870 new units to be built between 2015 and 2022, 57% of which should be affordable. Thirty percent (30%) of net new housing produced in the last ten years were affordable.

The ordinance requires that the Housing Balance be provided using two calculations: a) "Cumulative Housing Balance" consisting of housing built within a 10 year Housing Balance period, acquisition and substantial rehabilitation of affordable units, projects that have received both approvals from the Planning Commission or Planning Department and site permits from the Department of Building Inspection, and units withdrawn from protected status; and b) "Projected Housing Balance" which includes residential projects that have received approvals from the Planning Commission or Planning Department but have not yet commenced construction.

The Citywide Cumulative Housing Balance for the 2005-2014 Housing Balance Period is 21%, although this varies by districts. Distribution of the Cumulative Housing Balance over the 11 Board of Supervisor Districts ranges from -376% (District 4) to 53% (District 5). This variation, especially with negative housing balances, is due to the high number of units withdrawn from protection such as rent control relative to the number of total net new units and affordable units built in specific districts. The Projected Housing Balance Citywide is 11%.

## BACKGROUND

On 21 April 2015, the Board of Supervisors passed Ordinance No. 53-15 amending the Planning Code to include a new Section 103 requiring the Planning Department to monitor and

report on the Housing Balance between new market rate housing and new affordable housing production. The Housing Balance Report will be submitted bi-annually by March 1 and September 1 of each year and will also be published on a visible and accessible page on the Planning Department’s website. Section 103 also requires an annual hearing at the Board of Supervisors on strategies for achieving and maintaining the required housing balance in accordance with the City’s housing production goals. The ordinance also instructed the Planning Department to produce the first report by 1 June 2015.

The stated purposes for the Housing Balance Monitoring and Reporting are: a) to maintain a balance between new affordable and market rate housing Citywide and within neighborhoods; b) to make housing available for all income levels and housing need types; c) to preserve the mixed-income character of the City and its neighborhoods; d) to offset the withdrawal of existing housing units from rent stabilization and the loss of single-room occupancy hotel units; e) to ensure the availability of land and encourage the deployment of resources to provide sufficient housing affordable to households of very low, low, and moderate incomes; f) to ensure adequate housing for families, seniors and the disabled communities; g) to ensure that data on meeting affordable housing targets Citywide and within neighborhoods informs the approval process for new housing development; and h) to enable public participation in determining the appropriate mix of new housing approvals.

Specifically, the Housing Balance Report will track performance toward meeting the goals set by Proposition K and the City’s Housing Element. On November 2014, San Francisco’s voters endorsed Proposition K, which set a goal of 33% of all new housing units to be affordable. Housing production targets in the City’s Housing Element adopted in April 2015 includes 28,870 new units built between 2015 and 2022, 57% of which should be affordable.

**CUMULATIVE HOUSING BALANCE CALCULATION**

Section 103 states that the Housing Balance “be expressed as a percentage, obtained by dividing the cumulative total of extremely low, very low, low, and moderate income affordable housing (all units 0-120% AMI) minus the lost protected units, by the total number of net new housing units with the Housing Balance Period.” “Protected units” include units that are subject to rent control under the City’s Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance. Additional elements that figure into the Housing Balance include HOPE SF and RAD public housing replacement, substantially rehabilitated units, and single-room occupancy hotel units (SROs).

$$\begin{array}{r}
 \text{[New Affordable Housing + Acquisitions \& Rehabs} \\
 \text{+ HOPE SF + RAD Public Housing Replacement +} \\
 \text{Entitled \& Permitted Affordable Units]} \\
 \text{- [Units Removed from Protected Status]} \\
 \hline
 \text{[Net New Housing Built + Entitled \& Permitted Net Units]}
 \end{array}
 =
 \text{HOUSING BALANCE}$$

The “Housing Balance Period” is a ten-year period starting with the first quarter of 2005 through the last quarter of 2014. Subsequent housing balance reports will cover the 10 years preceding the most recent quarter.

Table 1 below shows the Cumulative Housing Balance for 2005-2014 is 21% Citywide. Housing Balances for Board of Supervisor Districts range from -376% (District 4) to 53% (District 5). Districts 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10 have positive housing balances (53%, 27%, 6%, 3% and 36%). Negative balances in several districts resulted from the larger numbers of units removed from protected status relative to the new affordable housing and net new housing units built.

**Table 1  
Cumulative Housing Balance Calculation**

BoS Districts	New Affordable Housing Built	Acquisitions & Rehabs Completed	Units Removed from Protected Status	Total Entitled Affordable Units Permitted	Planned RAD Units	Net Affordable Housing Stock	Total Net New Units Built	Total Entitled Units	Housing Balance
BoS D1	255	-	535	4	144	(132)	372	39	-32.1%
BoS D2	37	24	491	9	113	(308)	374	69	-69.5%
BoS D3	339	72	580	12	143	(14)	1,436	107	-0.9%
BoS D4	15	-	388	1	-	(372)	43	56	-375.8%
BoS D5	620	430	562	217	263	968	1,374	444	53.2%
BoS D6	3,307	1,014	641	683	189	4,552	12,939	3,814	27.2%
BoS D7	109	-	222	36	110	33	344	182	6.3%
BoS D8	377	-	844	173	132	(162)	1,061	244	-12.4%
BoS D9	279	319	688	16	118	44	1,187	117	3.4%
BoS D10	1,056	-	216	445	213	1,498	2,467	1,667	36.2%
BoS D11	165	-	303	13	-	(125)	274	89	-34.4%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>6,559</b>	<b>1,859</b>	<b>5,470</b>	<b>1,609</b>	<b>1,425</b>	<b>5,982</b>	<b>21,871</b>	<b>6,828</b>	<b>20.8%</b>

## CUMULATIVE HOUSING BALANCE ELEMENTS

Because the scope covered by the Housing Balance calculation is broad, each element – or group of elements – will be discussed separately. The body of this report will account for figures at the Board of Supervisor district level; an appendix will show the breakdown of each element using the Planning Department District geographies as required by Section 103. This is to ensure simple and uncluttered tables.

### Affordable Housing and Net New Housing Production

Table 2 below shows housing production between 2005 and 2014, as well as Q1 2015. This ten-year period resulted in a net addition of 21,870 units to the City’s housing stock, including 6,560 affordable units. Housing affordability categories listed in the table are consistent

with annual reporting submitted to the State Department of Housing and Community Development in compliance with the State Housing Element law. Units affordable to Extremely Very Low Income (EVLI) households are included under the Very Low Income (VLI) category because certain projects that benefit homeless individuals and families – groups considered as EVLI – have income eligibility caps at the VLI level. The table below also does not include Middle Income Units as required by Section 103 because information on or tracking of non-deed restricted units affordable to households at this income level is difficult to obtain.

Almost 12,940 (60%) of net new housing and over 3,300 (50%) of affordable housing built in the last ten years were in District 6. District 10 follows with almost 2,470 (11%) net new units, including 1,060 (16%) affordable units. The table below also shows that almost 30% of net new units built in the last ten years were affordable units. While Districts 1 and 11 saw modest gains in net new units built, most of these were affordable (69% and 60% respectively).

**Table 2**  
**New Housing Production by Affordability, 2005-2014 and Q1 2015**

BoS District	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Total Affordable Units	Total Net Units	Affordable Units as % of Total Net Units
BoS District 1	184	2	67	255	372	68.5%
BoS District 2	-	-	36	37	374	9.9%
BoS District 3	267	13	58	338	1,436	23.5%
BoS District 4	-	-	15	15	43	34.9%
BoS District 5	422	77	121	620	1,374	45.1%
BoS District 6	2,341	568	392	3,307	12,939	25.6%
BoS District 7	70	-	39	109	344	31.7%
BoS District 8	260	32	84	377	1,061	35.5%
BoS District 9	158	47	65	279	1,187	23.5%
BoS District 10	383	309	364	1,056	2,467	42.8%
BoS District 11	138	11	15	165	274	60.2%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,223</b>	<b>1,059</b>	<b>1,256</b>	<b>6,558</b>	<b>21,871</b>	<b>30.0%</b>

### Acquisition and Rehabilitation of Existing Affordable Housing Units

Table 3 below lists the number of units that have been substantially rehabilitated and/or acquired to ensure permanent affordability between 2005 and 2014. These are mostly single-room occupancy hotel units that are affordable to very low-income households.

**Table 3**  
**Acquisitions and Rehabilitation of Affordable Housing, 2005-2014**

BoS District	No. of Buildings	No. of Units
BoS District 2	1	24
BoS District 3	1	72
BoS District 5	4	430
BoS District 6	13	1,014
BoS District 9	2	319
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>1,859</b>

**Units Withdrawn From Protected Status**

San Francisco’s Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance preserves affordability of about 175,000 rental units by limiting annual rent increases. Landlords can, however, remove such units from the rental market through no-fault evictions including owner move-in, Ellis Act, condo conversion, or demolition. The Housing Balance calculation takes into account units withdrawn from rent stabilization as loss of affordable housing.

The table below shows the distribution of no-fault evictions between 2005 and 2014. Owner move-ins and Ellis Out evictions made up the majority of no fault evictions (41% and 34% respectively). Districts 8 (15%), 9 (13%) and 6 (12%) lead in the number of no-fault evictions.

**Table 4**  
**No-Fault Evictions, 2005-2014**

BoS District	Demolition	Ellis Out	Owner Move-In	Condo Conversion	Other	Total No Fault
BoS District 1	26	167	304	1	37	535
BoS District 2	15	189	213	12	62	491
BoS District 3	11	358	115	3	93	580
BoS District 4	90	63	224	-	11	388
BoS District 5	35	186	249	14	78	562
BoS District 6	86	128	53	2	372	641
BoS District 7	31	47	138	2	4	222
BoS District 8	51	370	333	14	76	844
BoS District 9	69	276	288	3	52	688
BoS District 10	31	29	141	1	14	216
BoS District 11	86	40	162	-	15	303
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>531</b>	<b>1,853</b>	<b>2,220</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>814</b>	<b>5,470</b>

## Entitled and Permitted Units

The table below lists units that have received entitlements from the Planning Commission or the Planning Department. These pipeline projects have also received site permits from the Department of Building Inspection and most are under construction as of the first quarter of 2015. About 58% of these units are being built in District 6.

**Table 5**  
**Permitted Units, Q1 2015**

BoS District	Very Low Income	Low Income	Moderate	Total Affordable Units	Net New Units	Total Affordable Units as % of Net New Units
BoS District 1	-	-	4	4	39	10.3%
BoS District 2	-	-	9	9	69	13.0%
BoS District 3	-	-	12	12	107	11.2%
BoS District 4	-	-	1	1	56	1.8%
BoS District 5	98	91	28	217	444	48.9%
BoS District 6	137	164	382	683	3,814	17.9%
BoS District 7	-	-	36	36	182	19.8%
BoS District 8	110	60	3	173	244	70.9%
BoS District 9	-	-	16	16	117	13.7%
BoS District 10	120	273	52	445	1,667	26.7%
BoS District 11	-	4	9	13	89	14.6%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>465</b>	<b>592</b>	<b>552</b>	<b>1,609</b>	<b>6,828</b>	<b>23.6%</b>

## RAD Program

The San Francisco Housing Authority's Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) program will preserve at risk public and assisted housing projects. According to the Mayor's Office, Phase 1 with 15 projects and a total of 1,425 units is slated to start construction in December 2015.

**Table 6**  
**RAD Affordable Units**

BoS Districts	Projects	Units
BoS District 1	2	144
BoS District 2	1	113
BoS District 3	2	143
BoS District 5	3	263
BoS District 6	2	189
BoS District 7	1	110
BoS District 8	2	132
BoS District 9	1	118
BoS District 10	1	213
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>1,425</b>

**Single-Room Occupancy Residential Hotel Units**

Single-Room Occupancy residential hotels (SROs) have historically provided low rent options to lower income individuals and households. The Department of Building Inspection administers Administrative Code Chapter 41, or the Residential Hotel Conversion and Demolition Ordinance. This ordinance preserves the stock of residential hotels and regulates the conversion and demolitions of SROs. According to DBI records, the number of residential hotel units has been stable in the last four years, with no loss nor other change in the unit numbers.

There are over 20,000 SRO units in San Francisco. Table 7 shows the distribution of SRO units across the City. Majority of these units are in Districts 6 and 3 (53% and 37%, respectively).

**Table 7**  
**Single-Room Occupancy Hotel Units, 2014**

BoS Districts	No. of SRO Buildings	No. of SRO Units	% of Total SRO Units
BoS District 1	7	95	0.5%
BoS District 2	21	623	3.1%
BoS District 3	210	7,297	36.5%
BoS District 4	2	34	0.2%
BoS District 5	20	369	1.8%
BoS District 6	233	10,647	53.2%
BoS District 7	2	69	0.3%
BoS District 8	6	153	0.8%
BoS District 9	20	566	2.8%
BoS District 10	6	144	0.7%
BoS District 11	3	16	0.1%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>530</b>	<b>20,013</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

### Public Housing Units

Table 8 shows the distribution of public housing in San Francisco. To ensure that affordable public housing built between 2005 and 2014 are not double counted, the table below shows the number of units at the start of the housing balance reporting period.

**Table 8**  
**Public Housing Units**

BoS District	No. of Units	Units as % of Total Units
BoS District 1	256	1.4%
BoS District 2	502	2.8%
BoS District 3	1,606	8.9%
BoS District 4	16	0.1%
BoS District 5	3,535	19.5%
BoS District 6	3,601	19.9%
BoS District 7	120	0.7%
BoS District 8	1,464	8.1%
BoS District 9	716	4.0%
BoS District 10	4,395	24.3%
BoS District 11	25	0.1%
Not Available	1,859	10.3%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>18,095</b>	<b>100.0%</b>



## PROJECTED HOUSING BALANCE

Table 9 below residential projects that have received entitlements from the Planning Commission or the Planning Department but have not yet received a site or building permit. Four major development projects – Treasure Island, ParkMerced, Hunters Point, and Schlage – are not included in the accounting below. These four projects will yield almost 25,400 net new units, including 5,425 units affordable to low and moderate income households (21%).

**Table 9**  
**Projected Housing Balance Calculation**

BoS District	Very Low Income	Low Income	Moderate	Total Affordable Units	Net New Units	Total Affordable Units as % of Net New Units
BoS District 1	-	-	-	-	25	0.0%
BoS District 2	-	-	3	3	73	4.1%
BoS District 3	-	2	12	14	462	3.0%
BoS District 4	-	-	-	-	-	-
BoS District 5	-	-	-	-	51	0.0%
BoS District 6	-	324	80	404	2,718	14.9%
BoS District 7	-	-	-	-	38	0.0%
BoS District 8	-	-	-	-	73	0.0%
BoS District 9	-	-	-	-	29	0.0%
BoS District 10	-	-	-	-	287	0.0%
BoS District 11	-	-	-	-	15	0.0%
<b>TOTALS</b>	-	<b>326</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>421</b>	<b>3,771</b>	<b>11.2%</b>

## NEXT STEPS

The ordinance also requires the following: a) that the Planning Department publish and update the Housing Balance Report bi-annually by September 1 and March 1 of each year; b) that the Department makes the Housing Balance Report available online and accessible on the Planning Department’s website; c) schedule an annual hearing on the Housing Balance before the Board of Supervisors by April 1 of each year. The Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development, the Mayor’s Office of Economic and Workforce Development, the Rent Stabilization Board, the Department of Building Inspection, and the City Economist will present strategies for achieving and maintaining a housing balance consistent with the City’s housing goals at this annual meeting. Should the cumulative housing balance fall below 33%, MOHCD will determine the amount of funding needed to bring the City into the required minimum 33%.

APPENDIX

CUMULATIVE HOUSING BALANCE REPORT TABLES BY PLANNING DISTRICTS

**Table 1**  
**Cumulative Housing Balance Calculation**

Planning District	New Affordable Housing Built	Acquisitions & Rehabs Completed	Units Removed from Protected Status	Total Entitled Affordable Units Permitted	Planned RAD Units	Net Affordable Housing Stock	Total Net New Units Built	Total Entitled Units	Housing Balance
1 Richmond	261	-	656	87	144	(164)	539	89	-26.1%
2 Marina	23	24	292	-	-	(245)	135	-	-181.5%
3 Northeast	321	72	595	12	143	(47)	1,072	107	-4.0%
4 Downtown	1,703	745	500	408	189	2,545	4,998	845	43.6%
5 Western Addition	399	362	297	137	376	977	914	416	73.5%
6 Buena Vista	138	-	356	179	132	93	570	291	10.8%
7 Central	66	-	519	-	-	(453)	357	-	-126.9%
8 Mission	637	319	764	37	-	229	1,731	256	11.5%
9 South of Market	1,953	337	133	445	-	2,602	9,669	3,899	19.2%
10 South Bayshore	733	-	65	253	118	1,039	998	588	65.5%
11 Bernal Heights	14	-	195	-	213	32	119	-	26.9%
12 South Central	174	-	301	10	-	(117)	326	71	-29.5%
13 Ingleside	106	-	186	40	-	(40)	315	210	-7.6%
14 Inner Sunset	15	-	223	-	110	(98)	90	-	-108.9%
15 Outer Sunset	15	-	388	1	-	(372)	38	56	-395.7%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>6,558</b>	<b>1,859</b>	<b>5,470</b>	<b>1,609</b>	<b>1,425</b>	<b>5,981</b>	<b>21,871</b>	<b>6,828</b>	<b>20.8%</b>

**Table 2**  
**New Housing Production by Affordability, 2005-2014 and Q1 2015**

Planning District	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Total Affordable Units	Total Net Units	Affordable Units as
1 Richmond	184	2	75	261	539	48.4%
2 Marina	-	-	23	23	135	17.0%
3 Northeast	267	9	45	321	1,072	29.9%
4 Downtown	1,351	216	136	1,703	4,998	34.1%
5 Western Addition	266	77	56	399	914	43.7%
6 Buena Vista	55	14	69	138	570	24.2%
7 Central	-	18	48	66	357	18.5%
8 Mission	494	47	96	637	1,731	36.8%
9 South of Market	1,015	428	510	1,953	9,669	20.2%
10 South Bayshore	364	256	113	733	998	73.4%
11 Bernal Heights	-	-	14	14	119	11.8%
12 South Central	138	11	25	174	326	53.4%
13 Ingleside	70	-	36	106	315	33.7%
14 Inner Sunset	-	-	15	15	90	16.7%
15 Outer Sunset	-	-	15	15	38	39.5%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>4,204</b>	<b>1,078</b>	<b>1,276</b>	<b>6,558</b>	<b>21,871</b>	<b>30.0%</b>

**Table 3**  
**Acquisitions and Rehabilitation of Affordable Housing, 2005-2014**

Planning District	No. of Buildings	No. of Units
2 Marina	1	24
3 Northeast	1	72
4 Downtown	6	745
5 Western Addition	3	362
8 Mission	2	319
9 South of Market	7	295
Treasure Island	1	42
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>1,859</b>

**Table 4**  
**No-Fault Evictions, 2005-2014**

Planning District	Demolition	Ellis Out	Owner Move-In	Condo Conversion	Other	Total No Fault
1 Richmond	32	233	348	3	40	656
2 Marina	5	99	137	4	47	292
3 Northeast	12	363	129	6	85	595
4 Downtown	71	34	13	-	382	500
5 Western Addition	22	95	128	10	42	297
6 Buena Vista	15	132	149	4	56	356
7 Central	42	217	212	10	38	519
8 Mission	43	396	273	2	50	764
9 South of Market	15	42	66	2	8	133
10 South Bayshore	10	11	37	-	7	65
11 Bernal Heights	25	46	100	3	21	195
12 South Central	86	33	167	-	15	301
13 Ingleside	45	20	115	-	6	186
14 Inner Sunset	18	69	122	8	6	223
15 Outer Sunset	90	63	224	-	11	388
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>531</b>	<b>1,853</b>	<b>2,220</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>814</b>	<b>5,470</b>

**Table 5**  
**Permitted Units**

Planning District	Very Low Income	Low Income	Moderate	Total Affordable Units	Net New Units	Total Affordable Units as % of Net New Units
1 Richmond	-	83	4	87	89	97.8%
2 Marina	-	-	-	-	-	-
3 Northeast	-	-	12	12	107	11.2%
4 Downtown	-	47	361	408	845	48.3%
5 Western Addition	98	8	31	137	416	32.9%
6 Buena Vista	110	60	9	179	291	61.5%
7 Central	-	-	-	-	-	-
8 Mission	-	22	15	37	256	14.5%
9 South of Market	137	261	47	445	3,899	11.4%
10 South Bayshore	120	107	26	253	588	43.0%
11 Bernal Heights	-	-	-	-	-	-
12 South Central	-	-	10	10	71	14.1%
13 Ingleside	-	4	36	40	210	19.0%
14 Inner Sunset	-	-	-	-	-	-
15 Outer Sunset	-	-	1	1	56	1.8%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>465</b>	<b>592</b>	<b>552</b>	<b>1,609</b>	<b>6,828</b>	<b>23.6%</b>

**Table 6**  
**RAD Affordable Units**

<b>Planning District</b>	<b>No. of Units</b>	<b>as % of Total</b>
1 Richmond	144	10.1%
3 Northeast	143	10.0%
4 Downtown	189	13.3%
5 Western Addition	376	26.4%
6 Buena Vista	132	9.3%
10 South Bayshore	213	14.9%
11 Bernal Heights	118	8.3%
14 Inner Sunset	110	7.7%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>1,425</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Table 7**  
**Single-Room Occupancy Hotel Units, 2014**

<b>Planning District</b>	<b>No. of SRO Buildings</b>	<b>No. of SRO Units</b>	<b>% of Total SRO Units</b>
1 Richmond	8	115	0.6%
2 Marina	18	368	1.8%
3 Northeast	161	5,459	27.3%
4 Downtown	225	10,187	50.9%
5 Western Addition	13	515	2.6%
6 Buena Vista	16	334	1.7%
8 Mission	56	1,956	9.8%
9 South of Market	18	645	3.2%
10 South Bayshore	3	79	0.4%
11 Bernal Heights	3	62	0.3%
12 South Central	3	157	0.8%
13 Ingleside	1	1	0.0%
14 Inner Sunset	3	101	0.5%
15 Outer Sunset	2	34	0.2%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>530</b>	<b>20,013</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Table 8**  
**Public Housing Units**

Planning District	No. of Units	as % of Total
1 Richmond	396	2.2%
2 Marina	138	0.8%
3 Northeast	1,606	8.9%
4 Downtown	2,599	14.4%
5 Western Addition	3,597	19.9%
6 Buena Vista	352	1.9%
7 Central	584	3.2%
8 Mission	1,074	5.9%
9 South of Market	1,498	8.3%
10 South Bayshore	3,158	17.5%
11 Bernal Heights	357	2.0%
12 South Central	467	2.6%
13 Ingleside	29	0.2%
14 Inner Sunset	116	0.6%
15 Outer Sunset	16	0.1%
Presidio	100	0.6%
Treasure Island	149	0.8%
n/a	1,859	10.3%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>18,095</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Table 9**  
**Projected Housing Balance Calculation**

Planning District	Very Low Income	Low Income	Moderate	Total Affordable Units	Net New Units	Total Affordable Units as % of Net New Units
1 Richmond				-	26	0.0%
2 Marina			3	3	72	4.2%
3 Northeast			12	12	409	2.9%
4 Downtown		279	9	288	1,300	22.2%
5 Western Addition				-	1	0.0%
6 Buena Vista				-	111	0.0%
7 Central				-	6	0.0%
8 Mission				-	25	0.0%
9 South of Market		47	71	118	1,719	6.9%
10 South Bayshore				-	29	0.0%
11 Bernal Heights				-	7	0.0%
12 South Central				-	25	0.0%
13 Ingleside				-	3	0.0%
14 Inner Sunset				-	38	0.0%
15 Outer Sunset	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>421</b>	<b>3,771</b>	<b>11.2%</b>