

2012

Revitalized Streets of San Francisco: A Study of Redevelopment and Gentrification in SoMa and the Mission

Lucy K. Phillips
Scripps College

Recommended Citation

Phillips, Lucy K., "Revitalized Streets of San Francisco: A Study of Redevelopment and Gentrification in SoMa and the Mission" (2012). *Scripps Senior Theses*. Paper 99.
http://scholarship.claremont.edu/scripps_theses/99

This Open Access Senior Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Scripps Student Scholarship at Scholarship @ Claremont. It has been accepted for inclusion in Scripps Senior Theses by an authorized administrator of Scholarship @ Claremont. For more information, please contact scholarship@cuc.claremont.edu.

**REVITALIZED STREETS OF SAN FRANCISCO: A STUDY OF
REDEVELOPMENT AND GENTRIFICATION IN SOMA AND THE
MISSION**

by

LUCY K. PHILLIPS

**SUBMITTED TO SCRIPPS COLLEGE IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF ARTS**

PROFESSOR DIONNE BENSONSMITH

PROFESSOR DIPA BASU

APRIL 20, 2012

Thank you to Professor Dipa Basu for her enthusiasm with this project, and to Professor Dionne Benson-Smith for her guidance, invaluable insight, and occasional confidence boost. I am also indebted to Amanda Tevis, who introduced to me the city as a living thing and consistently inspires me to interact, challenge, and learn from the world around me.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Chapter One: Introduction | 4 |
| Chapter 2: Urban Planning and Gentrification Theory..... | 27 |
| Chapter 3: The Mission | 35 |
| Chapter 4: South of Market (SoMa) | 48 |
| Chapter 5: Discussion of Gentrification and Recommendations for Redevelopment | 61 |
| Chapter Six: Conclusion..... | 76 |

Chapter One: Introduction

San Francisco currently faces two redevelopment problems. The beloved Mission District is experiencing an influx of capital that threatens the Latino community living there, and could change the neighborhood forever. In South of Market (SoMa), industrial space is transforming into homes, retail and entertainment, and the city is trying to create community from vacant lots. These circumstances are not unusual; cities have managed neighborhoods as they undergo similar transformations over the course of the twentieth century. What is unusual about SoMa and the Mission's redevelopment is the city's approach. As planners work with the government, private developers and community members to revitalize these two neighborhoods, the question on everyone's mind is how do we revitalize without gentrifying? More basically, how to renew urban space and without excluding the low-income population? This problem is leading to creative execution of project developments and policy-making. This thesis will explore what those actions are, and what they mean for both neighborhoods. Before discussing what transformations are occurring in these two neighborhoods, it is important to consider preexisting notions of redevelopment and gentrification and where they came from.

In 1893 at the Chicago World's Fair, the City Beautiful Movement began with the intention to improve the city's housing, particularly the sprawling tenements and slums, and to inspire the design of public parks, gardens and streetscapes. The city government engaged private organizations in a dialogue that led to the adoption of European policies such as German zoning and street practices as well as the English comprehensive plan, both of which will be discussed further in the second chapter of

this thesis. Chicago adopted these practices in order to increase the quality of life for middle to high-income urban dwellers. In addition, these plans aimed to redistribute populations so as to limit congestion and promote even economic growth and social stability.¹ The Housing Act of 1949 created the Urban Redevelopment Agency, which marked the beginning of federal slum clearing and redevelopment in the United States.² These early examples of urban redevelopment, a term which was often cited with the more optimistic phrase ‘urban renewal’, provided U.S. cities with a planning model that shaped the development of cities, including San Francisco.

The city planning process evolved as manufacturing districts and residential neighborhoods evolved, shaping the geography and social dynamics of the city. Planner Clarence Perry introduced the ‘neighborhood unit’ approach to city planning, which suggested that the neighborhood, defined as at minimum a geographical area with residences, pedestrian accessible buildings, one or more shopping areas, parks and an elementary school. He proposed that a neighborhood’s good design would promote the economic and social health of a community.³ While neighborhood units developed into the framework of city planning, social scientists began to criticize the focus on a neighborhood’s design and layout, arguing that a neighborhood required social and income homogeneity in order to function successfully.⁴ This concept was not new, rather the deliberate organization of urban space into ethnically and religiously homogenous districts dates back to ancient Greece and Milesian city

¹ Eran Ben-Joseph, *The Code of the City: Standards and the Hidden Language of Place Making* (Cambridge, MA: MIT, 2005), 46.

² "HUD Historical Background" *Department of Housing and Urban Development*, (<http://www.hud.gov/offices/adm/about/admguid/history.cfm>, 18 May 2007) 3 Apr. 2012.

³ Tridib Banerjee and William C. Baer, *Beyond the Neighborhood Unit: Residential Environments and Public Policy* (New York: Plenum, 1984) 19.

⁴ Banerjee, 28.

planning, the results of which are still observable in socially polarized cities that exist all over the world.

Post-World War II, a new trend appeared that would change the face of American cities: suburbanization. In 1943, an immensely powerful coalition of automobile and trucking groups came together to form the American Road Builder's Association. Within ten years, oil, asphalt and rubber industries joined the association making it the second largest lobbying group in the country after munitions. In concert with real estate groups and home-builder's associations, the American Road Builder's Association pushed politicians to pass the Interstate Highway Act of 1956 and build 41,000 miles of highway.⁵ Soon industry and residents began moving out of the cities, resulting in the decline of public transportation and the growth of a society dependent on the automobile. Deindustrialization is evident in the South of Market area of San Francisco, where formerly bustling ports and warehouses are now empty and facing redevelopment. As deindustrialization and suburbanization thrived in the twentieth century, scholars began referring to the suburbs as 'sprawl' or the 'anti-city'. The urban-suburban dichotomy led to racial and income segregation, which was enforced by capital outflow to the suburbs and the subsequent lack of investment in the urban center.⁶

After the war, however, a trend of middle class families moving back to the city into lower-rent districts became apparent. Often the influx of wealthy homeowners and renters increases the desirability of real estate and the original

⁵ Kenneth T. Jackson, "The Drive-In Culture of Contemporary America," *The City Reader*, ed. Richard T. Legates and Frederic Stout (New York: Routledge, 2011) 67.

⁶ Jackson, 65.

occupants find themselves unable to afford their own homes, resulting in the displacement of significant urban populations. This demographic transformation is occurring in the Mission as young professionals are finding residential appeal in the relatively inexpensive neighborhood. This process is called gentrification.

The gentrification phenomenon took hold in post-war capitalist cities, particularly in Britain and the United States. Large cities such as Boston, New York and London experienced stages of renewal that involved heavy demolition and the construction of housing and highway systems to serve the urban population and encourage economic growth.⁷ In New York, the movement became known as ‘brownstoning’. In San Francisco, it was called ‘red-brick chic’.⁸ Mayors, city planners and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development promoted this concept under the name of ‘reinvestment or the back-to-the-city movement’, in order to remove their policies from the negative connotations associated with the term gentrification.⁹ Pro-gentrification groups, such as a New York magazine called *The Brownstoner*, formed to supplement the movement and promulgate the benefits of gentrification. They encouraged middle-class families to repurpose older residential buildings and partake in the ‘urban renewal’ process.¹⁰

Gentrification promised economic growth and the development of safe neighborhoods, but at the same time it ignored the displaced populations that were forced to find new areas to reside. The movement of middle-class families to lower-rent neighborhoods posed an opportunity for the area to develop, while

⁷ Loretta Lees, Tom Slater and Elvin K. Wyly, *Gentrification* (New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group, 2008) 5.

⁸ Lees, Slater, and Wyly 6.

⁹ Lees, Slater, and Wyly, 7.

¹⁰ Lees, Slater, and Wyly 9.

simultaneously adding stress to the already populated neighborhoods that lower-class families moved into. The segregation of wealth leads to the growth of ghettos and the increase in crime. The cyclical nature of any city's urban renewal and decline over the past sixty years pays testament to the poor structure of redevelopment programs, and the need for a better understanding of gentrification among urban actors.¹¹

San Francisco: Microcosm of Gentrification and Revitalization

*Image: "Yuppie Map of San Francisco"*¹²

The purpose of this thesis is to compare effects of gentrification in two San Francisco neighborhoods, and assess how urban revitalization may occur without the displacement of the low-income population. San Francisco boasts a history of transformative neighborhoods, namely the Haight/Ashbury, the Mission, and more recently, Dogpatch and SoMa. The 2010 U.S. Census revealed dramatic changes in the demographics of San Francisco neighborhoods, such as a declining Asian population in Chinatown and an influx of young Caucasians in the Mission. The southern and western neighborhoods, however, have increasing Hispanic and Asian populations and a growing demand for affordable housing. The effects of the dot com boom in the early 2000's, the Great Recession and the subsequent changing demographics of the state are reflected in the shape of the city's development and shifting neighborhood identities.

¹¹ Lees, Slater, and Wyly, xvii.

¹² "Yuppie Map of San Francisco." Yuppies are defined as young urban professionals making \$100,000 a year or more. They are highly concentrated in the Marina, the Castro, and Mission Bay. They are now also encroaching on the Mission and SoMa. Town Me. "Yuppie Map of San Francisco." Map. *The Map Scroll* (http://mapscroll.blogspot.com/2009_07_01_archive.html, 9 July 2012), 12 Apr. 2012.

The eastern neighborhoods, which have remained largely vacant for most of San Francisco's history and include SoMa, are also evolving with the changing demographics of the city. More than 7,000 housing units are planned for the neighborhoods but are dependent on economic recovery in the state.¹³ How the successors of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency and Planning Department respond to the economic and demographic changes in the city will determine whether or not these neighborhoods in transition will undergo an inclusive revitalization, or exclusionary gentrification.

San Francisco's most notorious neighborhood, the Tenderloin, is adjacent to SoMa and has also received proposals for redevelopment that have fallen through due to opposition from district supervisors.¹⁴ Members of the city council seem to have gained a grasp on the dangers of gentrification, and what remains is the task of developing a method to address the needs of the lower class while also addressing the desire to maintain and improve an urban space. A recent attempt to gentrify the area came with a proposal that promised to aid the existing community of the Tenderloin. The microblogging company Twitter and the Board of Supervisors negotiated a tax cut on the payroll of new jobs for six years as an incentive for the company to establish its headquarters in the Tenderloin. Twitter signed on to a Community Benefit Agreement that asks the company to get involved with job development, donate old technology, and participate in community events and organizing. A move

¹³ Katie Worth, "San Francisco Neighborhoods Have Changed Faces Over Two Decades" *San Francisco Examiner*, (<http://www.sfexaminer.com/local/development/2011/03/san-francisco-neighborhoods-have-changed-faces-over-last-two-decades>, 20 Mar. 2011) 5 Dec. 2011.

¹⁴ C.W. Nevius, "Twitter Would Move Tenderloin Forward" *San Francisco Chronicle*, (<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2011/03/24/BAFE1115UI.DTL>, 24 Mar. 2011) 4 Oct. 2011.

like this could bring an onslaught of young companies to the Tenderloin, which would result in an inevitable gentrification of the area as bars and restaurants would develop and educated, tech-minded employees would seek nearby housing. This assumption also begs the question, how effective would statutes such as the Community Benefit Agreement be in the Tenderloin's changing environment? Would gentrification once again displace and leave behind a community, or would this new, community-based model successfully renew the city as well as its inhabitants?¹⁵ Twitter's move to the Tenderloin in the summer of 2011 and the gaming company Zynga's move to a nearby area in 2011 suggests a trend of companies will follow suit, and cause redevelopment of the neighborhood. The future of the Tenderloin's current residents and businesses remains yet to be determined.¹⁶

Another example of San Francisco's unusual approach to gentrification may be witnessed in the SoMa district, which formerly consisted of empty warehouses, lots and bunkers and now boasts restaurants, luxury apartment buildings and the Giants' stadium: AT&T Park. But in SoMa's case, developers followed-through with plans to build affordable housing adjacent to the luxury buildings. Because there was no preexisting population to displace, the developments created more useable, affordable housing than existed before. The problem that remains in SoMa is that it lacks the personality and vibrancy of other San Francisco neighborhoods. Plans to build gathering spaces, improve landscaping and reign in small businesses are underway. But putting them into action and seeing them through remains the true test

¹⁵ Nevius, "Twitter Would Move Tenderloin Forward".

¹⁶ Maura W. Sadovi, "Tech Meets Tenderloin." *The Wall Street Journal*, (<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304567604576454944068058726.html>, 20 July 2011) 21 Oct. 2011.

of whether or not this new breed of gentrification will have any legitimacy in SoMa or elsewhere in the city.¹⁷

Several approaches to revitalization have occurred around the country, some focusing more on reinvestment and economic growth while others focus more on creating affordable housing and inclusive neighborhood improvement. The current problem remains that few neighborhoods have successfully incorporated both.

Existing Analysis and Methods of Redevelopment

Inclusionary Zoning Moves Downtown, traces a study that resulted from a legal symposium sponsored by the Center for Metropolitan Action at Queens College, the Pratt Institute Center for Community and Environmental Development, the CUNY Law School at Queens College and the American Planning Association at CUNY Graduate Center in New York City in 1985. Edited by Dwight Merriam, David J. Brower and Philip D. Tegeler, the book analyzes the effects of inclusionary zoning, previously only employed in the suburbs, but recently common in urban centers.¹⁸ In the 1970s policies promoting inclusionary zoning began appearing in the suburbs. The policies encouraged residential development with one caveat: a percentage of the development had to include affordable housing. The ordinances arose in response to cuts in federal subsidies for low-income housing despite the clear need for it. In the following decade, cities such as Boston and San Francisco that were experiencing high-density development in downtown areas began adopting the same policies with the intention of fostering the development of affordable housing and

¹⁷“Twitter Would move Tenderloin Forward”.

¹⁸ Dwight H. Merriam, David J. Brower, and Philip D. Tegeler, *Inclusionary Zoning Moves Downtown*, (Washington, D.C.: Planners, American Planning Association, 1985).

reducing the stress of the housing crunch. By adopting inclusionary zoning ordinances, the cities hoped to eliminate the exclusionary characteristics of many neighborhood development projects.¹⁹ The concept behind inclusionary zoning addresses the most prominent issue involved in gentrification: the displacement of the low-income residents.

The new problem that arises with inclusionary zoning is the lack of incentive for private developers to initiate projects because of increased government regulation. To create incentive, some cities make inclusionary zoning voluntary by offering compensation that comes in the form of density bonuses or fast-track approval procedures.²⁰ The former allows developers to build more units per project than would normally be allowed under zoning regulation as long as a percentage of the project is affordable for low-income residents.²¹ The latter lightens regulations usually required for project approvals, thus allowing projects to move forward sooner and with fewer obstacles. Other concessions may include loosened environmental regulation, parking requirements and design standards, to name a few.²² While these concessions stimulate investment in affordable housing, it is at the risk of the housing's quality and long-term sustainability. Ultimately, it still threatens the quality of life of low-income residents, as well as the buyer appeal of the neighborhood.

Other approaches to the issue of planning and urban revitalization focus on the neighborhood as an individual but conforming entity. A project intended to rewrite *Planning the Neighborhood*, the American Public Health Association (APHA)'s

¹⁹ Merriam, Brower, and Tegeler, viii.

²⁰ Merriam, Brower, and Tegeler, viii.

²¹ "Tool Name: Inclusionary Zoning" *Envision Lancaster County*, (<http://www.co.lancaster.pa.us/toolbox/cwp/view.asp?a=3&q=62586627>, July 2009), 5 Oct. 2011.

²² Merriam, Brower, and Tegeler, viii.

guidelines for residential living became a study on the neighborhood experience for different socioeconomic bodies and its implications for policy and planning. Tridib Banerjee and William C. Baer conducted their project by focusing on 400 families living in the greater Los Angeles area in the book entitled *Beyond the Neighborhood Unit: Residential Environments and Public Policy*. Banerjee and Baer challenge the traditional model of the neighborhood unit as we know it and suggest that new planning paradigms are required in order to address and solve the issues that concern the existing model. They propose turning focus to the status of the *residential environment*, rather than the encumbered term *neighborhood*.²³ They challenge other planning and sociological habits by engaging the individuals that live in the regions, rather than assessing the situation based on prejudged standards. In other words, they gauged the residential environment by analyzing the social conditions rather than the physical.²⁴

The authors propose that existing conflict in the neighborhood cannot be fixed with changes in city planning, rather by policy changes in areas such as inclusionary zoning, redevelopment or conservation that directly affect the social dynamic and the community.²⁵ Other important themes that play into the stability and desirability of a neighborhood include safety, school quality, parks and the overall perception of the neighborhood. Big businesses, particularly chain stores, are usually disagreeable but at the same time they are built into the necessary fabric of city life and residents easily become dependent on them. How they are organized in relation to residential or

²³Tridib Banerjee, and William C. Baer, *Beyond the Neighborhood Unit: Residential Environments and Public Policy*, (New York: Plenum, 1984).

²⁴ Banerjee, and Baer, 78.

²⁵ Banerjee, and Baer, 81.

social areas is a result of the physical structure of the region, and in turn affects its social structure.²⁶ The significance of the neighborhood unit is reflected in both its economic and social condition, and its impact on the city. In order to address urban issues and begin positive transformation, Banerjee and Baer argue the focus must be placed on the social, rather than the structural dynamics of the neighborhood.²⁷ This concept of people-based planning remains the basis off which the Mission and SoMa are being revitalized today, and will be looked at further in this thesis.

Loretta Lees, Tom Slater and Elvin Wyly assess the growth and impact of gentrification, the process of renewing a neighborhood at the expense of the low-income residents, in their study entitled *Gentrification*. These three urban researchers understand gentrification as a result of the neoliberal lifestyle seeping into the city space. The book consolidates theories that assert gentrification as a form of urban colonialism.²⁸ It compares the situations in the cities to instances of neoliberal globalization that occur naturally, where, as one theorist points out “the neoliberal state is now the agent of, rather than the regulator of, the market.”²⁹ This claim rests on the assertion that neoliberalism has become an inevitable process, slave to the capitalist market that drives today’s leading world powers. Correspondingly, the line drawn between the neoliberal market and the gentrification process suggests that the latter itself is an inevitable process, and a harmful one.

As neoliberalism grew in the 20th century, so did gentrification. The book traces the source to post World War II reconstruction when cities began embracing

²⁶ Banerjee, and Baer, 122.

²⁷ Banerjee, and Baer, 196.

²⁸ Lees, Slater, and Wyly, 167.

²⁹ Lees, Slater, and Wyly, 163.

capitalist structure and moved industry outward and infrastructure upward. Youth, middle class families, architects and similar members of the demographic protested the destruction of old neighborhoods and took to buying and revitalizing old buildings in less desirable neighborhoods. This concept, ‘brownstoning,’ became some of the earliest examples of systematic gentrification in US cities.³⁰ As cities rebuilt themselves, the middle class served to develop the rustic, almost antiurbanism trend of adopting uncovered brick and open fireplaces as symbols of home over the new, modern housing projects that the government made available. Meanwhile, the low-income groups were left behind. *Gentrification* is the first comprehensive book on the subject, and provides insight and histories that explain the process and its harmful effects on a city and its population.

In this thesis, the elements of gentrification that are occurring in the Mission and in SoMa will be identified and examined using the tools that Lees, Slater and Wyly present. While the focus of this thesis is not on gentrification itself, it remains a significant element of urban revitalization and a real threat to both the Mission and SoMa, as well as other San Francisco neighborhoods, and thus must be understood and considered throughout the analyses of these neighborhood’s transformation. The book also deliberately casts a negative light on the subject. This thesis aims to identify the issues that gentrification produces in these neighborhoods and challenge its viability as a development tool, but also unravel the ways in which the process as it exists can be manipulated to help a neighborhood, physical spaces and social dynamics included. After all, ‘the gentry’ need housing too, and the services they request must be readily available in order to induce further investment.

³⁰ Lees, Slater, and Wyly, 6.

The Code of the City by Eran Ben-Joseph discusses the transformative nature of urban planning, as it acts as to provide direction for the structure of a city, socially, economically and physically. He argues that in its most basic sense, urban planning outlines the minimum standards required for a city to function. Similar to *Gentrification*, Ben-Joseph acknowledges the significance of the social space a city creates. The standards of city planning, as a result “are also seen as the legal and moral instruments by which professionals can guarantee the good of the public.”³¹ While standards have good intent, city governments often adopt preexisting standards in order to avoid lawsuits rather than expend the effort to rework and personalize standards based on the needs of the city. As a result, the basis for creating and enforcing for these standards, designed to promote healthy and safe residential areas, is no longer applicable. Rather than help the city and its inhabitants, they provide unnecessary regulation that limit residents and inhibits development.³²

Historically, city planning has carried deep roots in social hierarchies, particularly in regions with centralized authority such as Ancient Greece and China. Some more recent examples, for example Black Rock City, the site of Burning Man in Nevada, demonstrate planning that stems from socially driven principles, such as common purpose. This begs the question of whether or not it is possible to design a city based on the ever-changing social norms of a particular region, rather than by standards that remind us of the social inequities of traditional societies, or even those as recent at the 20th century.³³ The issue with engaging successful planning and design becomes the lack of creativity and innovative ideas that are considerate of

³¹ Ben-Joseph, xv.

³² Ben-Joseph, xvi.

³³ Ben-Joseph, 24.

changing social dynamics and the status quo of the modern city. Ben-Joseph's argument does not disagree with development, urbanism or civic revitalization. On the contrary, he hopes to persuade government representatives, planners and designers instead to confront outdated and irrelevant standards and to replace them with efficient design paradigms that consider the diverse and fluid social and economic condition of the city, rather than confine social progress by limiting the design of the urban space.³⁴

The result of redefining industry standards appears in the current revitalization of SoMa, but the extent to which old standards are challenged and new standards are effective will become clear as the neighborhood continues to take shape. The social influence of local residents continues to affect the manipulation of policy and the planning goals; the extent to which it is effective will be revealed in the case study.

As for the Mission district, the social influence on its reshaping not only comes from within the neighborhood but also from the rest of city. The neighborhood plays a significant role in the history and personality of San Francisco, and the urban dwellers are well aware of it. The Mission currently faces a crisis in which San Franciscan's wish to preserve the integrity of the neighborhood, but also wish to be a part of it and partake in its improvement. The problem remains reconciling the practical aspect of planning, such as architecture, public spaces and streetscapes, with the social norms, or community habits, standards and culture, of the area. Ben-Joseph questions whether or not this middle ground is feasible in the design of a city.

My research goes a step further to ask not only how to challenge planning standards and use social norms as a strategic influence, but also how the preexisting

³⁴ Ben-Joseph, xvii.

social norms in and around the neighborhood can shape planning standards to that they reflect the progressing social dynamics and neighborhood relations of San Francisco, while also maintaining the spirit of such an iconic district. San Francisco itself remains a one-of-a-kind metropolis, in which a relatively small population has turned a small city into a bustling cultural, political, economic, social and intellectual center. It is clear not only from an observation of the city's unique personality, but also from its district size and structure that standardized planning models remain inapplicable. It is easy to assume that an awareness of San Francisco's unique condition has inspired the 'new models' of gentrification that the Mission and Soma are currently experiencing and that this thesis will analyze. The question that remains asks whether or not these 'new models' are sustainable, if they protect and enhance the physical and social structure of the neighborhood, and ultimately, if they are transferrable.

The Mission: a Neighborhood Threatened

The analytical framework of this study asks how San Francisco residents, businesses, private developers and the city government approach the processes of revitalization and gentrification, and if these methods are effective and beneficial to the neighborhood directly affected and the city as a whole. To answer this question, this thesis contains two case studies that assess the revitalization of two areas in San Francisco: the Mission and SoMa. The study of the Mission aims to reveal the city government and private developer's methodology behind the revitalization of a low-income, characteristically violent neighborhood and the fate of the preexisting community. The Mission is under particular scrutiny in the city because the

displacement of low-income residence as a result of the arrival of students, young professionals, artists and other members of the ‘creative class’ as well as the businesses they patronize. While the transformation has cleaned up the appearance of the neighborhood, it is also a clear example of gentrification and all the negative outcomes that the definition of the process implies. The Mission boasts a strong artistic and multi-cultural community that makes it one of the city’s most famous and beloved neighborhoods. It is important to note that this community did not grow out of the planning structure, but is the product of social and historical processes. Community shaped the Mission, and now it is community that will have to preserve it.

SoMa: The New Model

The study of SoMa will demonstrate how an industrial space may be converted into a living space for a diverse, urban community and analyze whether or not it will be successful. The health of local businesses and the density of rented homes help measure the success of redevelopment. The analysis of publications produced by and about the San Francisco City Government, private developers and local residents set the standard by which this thesis will analyze the goals of gentrification and the realities, and will also reveal issues that are thwarting redevelopment’s progress and their legitimacy.

The revitalization process occurring in SoMa remains unique because of the clean slate from which the process began. No preexisting neighborhood has been destroyed nor populations displaced, but a new neighborhood has been created from commercial space. The deindustrialization of urban space has occurred previously in

other cities for the sake of creating space for white-collar industry or housing, a similar process is occurring in SoMa, but with the addition of affordable housing. While this ‘new model’ of gentrification does not displace a preexisting population, it still creates conflict as physical development shapes social spaces. Historically, as in most cities, San Francisco’s neighborhoods have developed around the standards and limitations of socioeconomic groups, resulting in the alienation of less privileged populations. In SoMa’s case, the social dynamic is appearing as the neighborhood is defined. The juxtaposition of affordable and luxury housing developments, large office buildings and more intimate shopping areas, expensive restaurants and ballpark snack stands presents a diverse and unparalleled culture of SoMa that has yet to fully gain ground. San Francisco is trying to create a community by shaping space, which is often unsustainable and makes a neighborhood feel contrived like the ideal worlds that exist in Disneyland and shopping malls. The case study of SoMa, presented in Chapter three, will shed light onto the community and physical shaping that is taking place there, and the hopes and concerns for its future. By comparing its transformation to that of the Mission, the study extrapolates the facets of revitalization that are adapting city planning to social norms.

Organization of This Thesis

Chapter two delves into a brief history of planning and gentrification theory. In order to effectively analyze what is happening in SoMa and the Mission is important to understand the different levels at which gentrification occurs, and why certain planning decisions are made. Because cities are the site of social processes, they are ever changing and dynamic, just as cultures and demographics are. For this

reason, planning cannot be derived from a template but must be constructed in the local context. The intentions and abilities of different actors, such as policy-makers, developers and community organizers, are more clear with a better understanding of urban planning theory, and will help explain the processes currently taking place in San Francisco. It is also important to understand that gentrification is multifaceted and cannot be labeled generally as ‘good’ or ‘bad’. For the past fifty years, the term has had negative connotations, but the practice and the perception are both changing. Urban space is constantly in transformation, as is the structure of gentrification and its implications. Redevelopment and neighborhood improvements will always happen. The question is not how to avoid it, but how to make it inclusive.

In Chapter three, this thesis presents the study of the Mission District and its current position as it transitions between existing as a low-income, crime-ridden and ethnically homogenous area and its oncoming role as a trendy, young and gentrified neighborhood, even as locals in and around the neighborhood try to avoid it. It represents the classical example of gentrification in which private investment leads to a medium to high-income population to displace a low-income community. This form of gentrification begins with the growth of the ‘creative class,’ which, as defined by Richard Florida in 2003 consists of “gays, youths bohemians, professors, scientists, artists, entrepreneurs, and the like.”³⁵ Neighborhood elements such restaurants, bars, shops and galleries offering higher-priced products are soon to follow, leading up to the reinvestment that comes from high-income home buyers. As these developments occur, preexisting individuals and families that live in the area are hit with soaring rent prices and find they cannot afford the local services and products offered. As a

³⁵ Lees, Slater, and Wyly, xix.

result, they are forced to relocate which creates additionally housing-crunches elsewhere, and forever changes the fabric of the community that once existed in the now-gentrified area.

The study of the Mission incorporates the opinions and agendas of private developers, residents, business owners and members of city government in order to grasp a diverse understanding of the revitalization process and a solid basis on which assumptions about the future of the neighborhood may be made. It also presents an example of a neighborhood with distinct personality and presence in the city, which are qualities that make it more worthwhile for outside influences (private developers, city planners) to recognize the threats of gentrification and seek for ways to assuage them.

Chapter four will present the study of SoMa as an example of the development of an unused area into a livable and workable space. SoMa's redevelopment presents a new form of gentrification. In this case, the change appears as a process of revitalization that creates community from nothing, rather than the reshaping and displacing of an existing community. The situation in SoMa also allows for the observation of the interaction between affordable and luxury housing, as how well as the factors, such as parks, schools, et cetera, that form a community come into fruition. The neighborhood's growth and real estate appeal over the next ten years will demonstrate whether or not this 'new model' of gentrification is successful and will shed light on what similar methods may be applied onto an area that does have preexisting residents. If a successful model of city planning for social

inclusion comes out of SoMa's development, it may be the first of many that occur in San Francisco and the rest of the country.

Chapter five will consist of policy and development recommendations with the assessments of the aforementioned studies analyzed. With both revitalization processes under consideration, the ways in which neighborhoods and their residents both benefit from reinvestment will be more clear. Additionally, the interactions and relationships between local governments, residents, businesses and private developers will be easier to compare and contrast, and will disclose which policies and arrangements are effective, and which are not. The nontraditional approach to redevelopment in these two neighborhoods presents new ways in which city planning, government policy and social norms affect revitalization. New perspective will serve to improve upon the preexisting standards of planning and design that have become outdated, irrelevant and more detrimental than integral in a city's success.

Chapter six will reach a conclusion on the processes and outcomes of gentrification and its future role in San Francisco. The Mission and SoMa are microcosms of the effects of developmental agendas that are overtaking cities in the United States. A solution to the issues presented in these two neighborhoods may be a catalyst in the redesign of revitalization and city planning in cities across the country. It will also provide new ways to evaluate a neighborhood's success and its needs, and foster a better understanding of the interplay between social interaction and physical design in an urban residential area.

Conclusion

By observing the patterns of development and their effects on businesses and residents in these two, very different neighborhoods and the rest of the city this thesis will present an analyses of urban revitalization that will demonstrate the ways in which revitalization may benefit a city as well as the community that it transforms. In order to do this, new businesses must be engaged in the community and contribute to it through events, development programs, donations, or other beneficial activities and offer services that are accessible to residents of the community regardless of income. Housing developments must offer options of comparable quality for residents of varying socioeconomic groups so as to not exclude or intentionally group together certain populations. In order to create a viable incentive for private developers and businesses to invest in the area, local governments need to understand the concessions that are made when for-profit individuals invest time and money into programs that benefit the community but are not lucrative. In addition, building policies should seek ways to ensure sustainable and socially conscious building practices without hindering the development process.

The parties involved in a neighborhood's revitalization need to understand the demographic of the existing community as well as their needs and hopes for the neighborhood so that policies are applicable and that housing developments are practical. Community cannot be constructed because it must evolve organically. Space cannot be shaped to create community; rather it is community that shapes space. Lastly, the existing community must participate in their neighborhood's revitalization, so as to ensure it remains their own and that the process may be equally beneficial. Whether there is a formulaic method to reach these goals, or if these goals

are in fact reachable remains yet to be determined. The application of planning and gentrification theory to an analysis of the events occurring in SoMa and the Mission will reveal where partnerships and policies involved in the current transformations are falling short, and where they are succeeding.

Several limitations to the analyses of the revitalization processes of SoMa and the Mission exist that will constrain the assessment of their validity and sustainability. First of all, several language barriers exist in both neighborhoods considering the significant Latino and Filipino populations that reside there. With limited communicative ability, the concerns and opinions of many residents are unheard. By considering the experiences of residents of different backgrounds, housing developments and socioeconomic status, however, this thesis aims to provide accurate portrayals of diverse communities' hopes and concerns regarding revitalization. Community organizations also hold regular meetings that aim to organize the voice of the residents and respond to changes such as policy actions in the neighborhood. Access to these meetings provided insight into the collective hopes and grievances of both communities.

The flexible and undefined nature of the terms 'gentrification' and 'revitalization' also poses a problem because each party that they affect interprets them differently. For the purpose of this study, 'revitalization' refers more specifically to the processes of physical redevelopment of buildings, streetscapes and infrastructure. 'Gentrification' on the other hand, refers to the redevelopment process that includes those physical attributes but also implies the social changes that occur, including the influx of middle to high-income residents and the displacement of low-

income residents. Influential parties that want to promote investment and development, such as policy makers and private developers, are more likely to refer to the process as ‘revitalization’ or ‘renewal’ because of its appeal as progressive term implying economic growth. Those that are displaced and their sympathizers are more likely to refer to the process as ‘gentrification’ because the term carries negative connotations of white privilege, class oppression and exclusion. These terms are also understood differently by scholars in the field but for clarity for this study, the above definitions will remain constant.

Another limitation that remains is the lack of an orthodox measurement of success for revitalization in the real estate development and urban planning industries, or in socially focused special interest groups. Each field carries its own interpretations based on interest and varied data collection. Because this thesis addresses the economic growth that results from urban reinvestment paired in contrast to changes in the quality of life of the community, data points such as business turnover, employment and rent rates and buyer appeal as well as physical improvements and neighborhood additions such as parks, gathering places and schools will evaluate the Mission and SoMa’s success as revitalized communities. Because of the inevitable ties between physical space, economic success and social stability, personal accounts and opinions of those involved in the neighborhoods’ transformations are taken into consideration as measurements of redevelopment success.

The ultimate aim of this study is to uncover a way in which revitalization may occur so that it benefits the physical as well as the social space it affects. Because the case studies focus on neighborhoods in San Francisco, the experiences of the

residents and the programs instigated by developers and the local government are specific to the city and in particular, the Mission and SoMa. For this reason, the methods that are successful for these two San Francisco neighborhoods may not be successful for other neighborhoods in the US, which presents the final limitation. This and the aforementioned limitations will constrain the scope of this study and the implication of the data collected. With this in mind, however, the analysis of these two neighborhoods provides a critique of urban revitalization and a basis for which the process may be improved upon in future reinvestment and renewal projects.

Chapter 2: Urban Planning and Gentrification Theory

One of the most significant changes in the urban planning process of the twentieth century is community participation. Early planning based on the City Beautiful movement focused on slum-clearing and creating space for the urban elite. Now planning encourages participation and has become just as much about community planning as physical planning. This concept is referred to as comprehensive planning and became more common as municipal governments began seeing the city as not a single unit, but a combination of moving parts. It began with the English Comprehensive Plan, which incorporated systems such as sewage into city plans early in the twentieth century.³⁶ In Germany, city authorities began implementing zoning regulations in order to protect the natural environment as urban growth began to take off after the industrial boom. German zoning practices aimed to

³⁶ Edward J. Kaiser and David R. Godschalk, "Twentieth-Century Land Use Planning" *The City Reader*, Ed. Richard T. LeGates and Frederic Stout (New York: Routledge, 2011) 401.

relieve city residents from the fumes of commercial and industrial enterprises. In the 1920s, American cities adopted German zoning and added their own interpretations of regulation in order to address what they saw as the needs of the city.³⁷

Today, rather than focusing on just land use, planning concepts are built off the English model and expanded to community development, environmental protection, and growth supervision. Towards the end of the twentieth-century, the planning process became more of a collaborative effort than ever before. This increase in participation can be attributed to both better community organizing and to increased communication through technology outlets.³⁸ As planning methods evolve, they must continue to adapt to this trend of increasing public-private interaction as it will continue to be an important force in urban politics and development.

The twentieth century witnessed the growth of global cities and a transformation of urban planning theory. Until the 1970's, planning decisions were largely based on empirical methods drawn from geography, economics, demography and politics. It remained a scientific approach that considered urban space in the context of buildings, streets, infrastructure and incomes. From the analysis of the city down to the single home, policy drew from an empirical understanding. Space was negotiated as an apolitical concept. It remained scientific and subject to the manipulation of power-wielding, decision-makers: the urban elite, and politicians.³⁹ This approach to urban planning is what shaped many American cities as we now know them today. In San Francisco, the Mission became an immigrant neighborhood

³⁷George W. Liebmann, "Modernization of Zoning" *Regulation* 21996: 72, *Cato Institute*, (www.cato.org/pubs/regulation/regv19n2/v19n2-8.pdf, 1996) 11 Apr. 2012.

³⁸Kaiser & Godschalk, 404.

³⁹Henri Lefebvre, "Reflections on the Politics Of Space" Trans. Michael J. Enders, *Antipode* 8.2 (<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.1976.tb00636.x/abstract>, 1976) 9 Apr. 2012.

because of low rents and SoMa became an industrial space because of its proximity to the piers. Zoning restrictions limited the development of these areas and constructed the mold that they continue to exist in. French sociologist Henry Lefebvre discussed these concepts as he assessed the ideology of space. Unlike popular urban theory, he understood space as a social product, and divided planning into three categories: science and physicality, economics and production, and spatio-temporal or the concept of social networks and space through time.⁴⁰ When space is considered neutral and evaluated empirically, social discontent may not be addressed.⁴¹ Because social processes shape the physical environment, social decay leads to the decline of cities.

Johns Hopkins University geologist David Harvey is one of many contemporary urban theorists that consider the urban environment as a process influenced by time and social interactions. In the twentieth century, cities around the world experienced an influx of urban residents. In his essay titled “Contested Cities: Social Processes and Spatial Form,” Harvey acknowledged that if these migration trends continue, more than half of the world’s population would be living in cities before 2050. This mass-migration highlights the importance of measuring and improving the quality of life for urban residents.⁴² Harvey emphasizes that as we design cities for the twenty-first century, planners and urban theorists should focus on dynamic processes and see cities as products of those processes.⁴³ This change in thought is reflected in the alternative approach to redeveloping SoMa. Social

⁴⁰ Lefebvre, 31.

⁴¹ Lefebvre, 34.

⁴² David Harvey, "Contested Cities: Social Processes and Spatial Form" *The City Reader*, Ed. Richard T. LeGates and Frederic Stout, (New York: Routledge, 2011) 232.

⁴³ Harvey, 233.

processes are transforming the area into a mixed-use neighborhood, forcing city planners and policy-makers to think creatively about how zoning and policy decisions will influence not only the neighborhood's shaping, but also the existing social norms

A more widespread understanding of cities as social processes may also be what saves the Mission from gentrification. An educated population and a government with a dynamic approach to policy could prevent the linear progress of gentrification that commonly occurred in twentieth century cities. Although the area may not be as economically productive as it could be, there are social networks developing that will increase the social capital of the neighborhood and make it a space to serve and better human wellbeing. Strong social capital includes community participation, complex social networks and boosts interest in public policy and neighborhood affairs.⁴⁴ If the significance of social processes is realized, then urban planning can be geared to react to them rather than limit them and inspire discontent.

The analysis of urban space as political, a social product and a grouping of processes have redefined the understanding of gentrification. Sociologist Ruth Glass coined the term 'gentrification' in 1964 as she witnessed London's poor driven from their homes by the wealthy. In 1979, MIT professor of city planning Phillip Clay delved further into Glass' term introduced the stage model of gentrification. After watching the phenomenon take place in cities around the United States, he proposed that the process was linear and irreversible. He argued that gentrification began with 'pioneers', members of the creative class that moved into an inexpensive neighborhood and used their sweat equity to renovate deteriorating homes. In the next

⁴⁴ Robert D. Putnam, "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital" *The City Reader*, Ed. Richard T. LeGates and Frederic Stout (New York: Routledge, 2011) 134.

stage, more people begin moving into the area and displacement begins. Once young professionals view the neighborhood as trendy, private developers enter the scene and physical improvements become more apparent. It is at this time, according to Clay, that tension grows between middle and low-income individuals. The neighborhood is considered gentrified when members of the high-middle class begin moving in, rents increase dramatically, and specialized retailers and services appear.⁴⁵ This familiar pattern is what residents of the Mission are observing occur in their own neighborhood. According to Clay's stage model, the neighborhood is somewhere between the second and fourth stages.

In recent years, the Mission has become an attractive area for young families, college graduates, artists and trendy restaurant ventures. Rents have increased and displacement has occurred. Some private developers have begun to assert a presence in the area, but not to a great extent. The Mission is at a critical stage in which gentrification could easily continue along Clay's linear schedule, or attempt to adopt innovative approach to redevelopment could foster progressive neighborhood improvements. For this to happen policy makers, developers and community members must be aware of the benefits and threats of gentrification. Open dialogue and a creative approach to planning and organizing may be the key to guiding inclusive redevelopment.

Neil Smith provided a significant contribution to the study of gentrification when he described it as both a process and a product. It is the product of neoliberalism and the influx of capital into an urban space, but it is also the process of social and spatial exclusion. Furthermore, gentrification marks the simultaneous

⁴⁵ Lees, Slater, and Wyly, 31.

centralization and decentralization of capital.⁴⁶ Over the course of the twentieth century, globalization and growing business networks have decentralized capital, but it has also been centralized into the hands of an elite few.⁴⁷ Gentrification is at once political, economic and social. For this reason it cannot be viewed in a simple stage modeled theory, but must be analyzed as a dynamic and ever-changing progression.

Smith stresses that the significance of gentrification is not based on a list of the factors involved, but on how these factors interact and their importance.⁴⁸ Smith argued that urban growth is the constant structuring and restructuring of urban space.⁴⁹ His contribution to gentrification theory challenges Clay's stage model because it asserts the malleability of urban space. Historically, it has not been natural urban growth but an elite-driven process of redevelopment that is linear. Smith notes that space is the product of social processes, which means growth and redevelopment will be different in the spaces in which they occur, and depending on the social norms that exist there.⁵⁰ The nonlinear approach to redevelopment is particularly apparent in SoMa, where different forces such as the Giants organization, mayor Ed Lee, young technology professionals and the fairly large Filipino population that live there are all contributing to the neighborhood's evolution.

SoMa's gentrification process is marked by deindustrialization. The area has remained the site of warehouses and vacant lots, now it is becoming the new technology hub of the Bay Area. SoMa's deindustrialization is representative the

⁴⁶ Neil Smith, "Gentrification, the Frontier, and the Restructuring of Urban Space." *The Urban Geography Reader*. Ed. Nicholas R. Fyfe and Judith T. Kenny (New York: Routledge, 2005) 266.

⁴⁷ Smith, 268.

⁴⁸ Smith, 265.

⁴⁹ Smith, 264.

⁵⁰ Smith, 265.

decentralization of capital and the growth of the white-collar economy in urban areas. This process demonstrates that gentrification is not only the redevelopment of working-class areas, but also the deindustrialization of urban space and the urban economy. The lack of investment in urban industry signals that the white-collar economy is growing, and that manufacturing and production are moving into suburban and rural areas.⁵¹ These economic changes affect the social norms of the neighborhood as well as the physical space. As SoMa changes from an industrial to residential area, for example, the demographic is changing as well as the neighborhood's identity. If zoning policies and development continue to gear towards affordable housing as well as young, single professionals, SoMa could successfully maintain its mixed-use and mixed-income identity. An awareness of the deindustrialization of the area and decentralization of capital must force planners and developers to look beyond the stage model of gentrification and adopt new plans to develop what could be the first inclusively redeveloped neighborhood in San Francisco.

Loretta Lees proposed the most recent development in theory: super-gentrification. It is the most advanced form of gentrification and happens in a neighborhood's later development. It is the capital investment in a neighborhood made by the truly-rich: an elite, transnational class of homeowners.⁵² But even at this advanced stage of gentrification it is worth considering Jason Hackworth's

⁵¹ Smith, 267.

⁵²Loretta Lees, "Super-Gentrification: The Case of Brooklyn Heights, New York City" *Urban Studies* 40.12 (2003) 2487.

explanation of the wave model of gentrification.⁵³ Building off of Smith's process model, Hackworth suggests that gentrification has hit the United States in waves: the entire process is an ebb and flow. The first wave arrived before the 1970's as redevelopment, the second occurred between 1970 and 1990, and the third between 1990 and 2008, during the dot com boom. Since the financial crisis there has been less scholarship on gentrification and less government involvement, especially since the dissolution of the redevelopment agencies in California. According to Hackworth's wave theory, post-2008 gentrification may be the beginning of a new wave in which community participation is higher than ever before. With other significant changes such as the growth of the tech industry, a general lack of capital and increasing communications, post-2008 gentrification will have different characteristics than gentrification in the past. This is not only evidence that the process is ever-changing, but it also confirms that development and policy-making needs to adapt to these changes in order to produce effective results. Gentrification theory is still evolving and the process remains dynamic, which is evident in the different experiences of the Mission and SoMa.

⁵³ Jason Hackworth and Neil Smith, "The Changing State of Gentrification" *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 92 (2001) 464–477.

Chapter 3: The Mission

*Image: District 9: The Mission*⁵⁴

History

The Mission remains one of San Francisco's oldest and most storied neighborhoods. The Ohlone Indians, the region's original inhabitants, lived in the area for 2,000 years until they were wiped out in less than thirty years by Spanish missionaries. Soon came the Californios, who converted the land into *ranchos* and used their prosperity to found the port city of Yerba Buena, later called San Francisco.⁵⁵

A brief two decades later in 1846, the Californios lost their hold on the land as the Gold Rush led to a population boom from less than 1,000 to 34,000 inhabitants in only a few years. After the Gold Rush, the mining population and their families stayed and continued to grow. Developing industry and infrastructure attracted immigrants from around the world and the region became home to a diverse population of mostly factory and shipyard workers. In the early 1900's the Mission district continued to be a focal point of the city: a place increasingly called home by a wide range of ethnicities and income levels, including a significant proportion of the white elite.⁵⁶

⁵⁴ San Francisco Board of Supervisors, "District 9" *Wikipedia* (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:SFSupervisorDistrict9.svg>) 12 Apr. 2012.

⁵⁵ "The Story Of The Mission District" KQED, *PBS Online*, (<http://www.kqed.org/w/hood/mission/thestory.html>) 31 Oct. 2011.

⁵⁶ "Californio Ranchos to Cosmopolitan Neighborhood" KQED, *PBS Online*, (<http://www.kqed.org/w/hood/mission/ranchostocosmos.html>) 31 Oct. 2011.

In 1906, the infamous fire and earthquake destroyed a significant portion of San Francisco's neighborhoods, including North Beach, the Market Street thoroughfare and the Financial District. In the span of three days and two nights, the fire raged on causing the destruction of ninety percent of the city's original Victorian homes. The earthquake displaced an estimated 250,000 residents, forcing them to relocate. Most chose the Mission because it remained largely intact. The population influx, however, ended up changing the Mission forever, from an elite neighborhood to densely populated working-class and labor-producing district. For the first thirty or so years after the fire, the Mission remained home to mostly Irish-Catholic immigrants. After World War II, a new wave of immigrants once again changed the district's identity and it became the Latino center of the city.⁵⁷

The war industry's need for labor attracted a large migration of Central Americans into San Francisco. As the Irish left for the suburbs, the immigrants found the Mission as home. Most of the immigrant represented Mexico, Guatemala, Cuba, El Salvador, Bolivia, Chile and Nicaragua, thus creating a dynamic blend of ethnic and cultural identities into the neighborhood. Labor unions, cultural preservation groups, political groups and artist communities emerged from the melting pot and established the identity of the Mission as it remains today, remaining on the map as an integral part of San Francisco and its multi-ethnic personality and left-leaning majority. The artistic and political fire that continued to grow in the neighborhood inspired the creation of hundreds of murals that still deck the walls of Victorian

⁵⁷ "Earthquake and Fire Impact the Mission" KQED, *PBS Online*, (<http://www.kqed.org/w/hood/mission/earthquakefire.html>) 31 Oct. 2011.

homes and the Mission's small businesses, telling the stories of Latino immigrants' struggles and victories.

*Image: "Maestrapeace" on the Women's Building in the Mission*⁵⁸

The Mission community first faced the threat of gentrification in the late seventies as wealthy Arab and Asian families began purchasing large parcels of land in the area. While the influx put stress on the housing options in the neighborhood, it was not enough to eliminate its Latino identity and the neighborhood's reputation as the political and artistic hub of the city.⁵⁹ It was not until the nineties' dot com boom that the Mission's residents and small businesses faced the immediate threat of gentrification and displacement. As rent rates rose and small businesses began disappearing, the neighborhood began to change shape and subsequently shift its identity towards a hub for young people, trendy restaurants and high-end retail.⁶⁰ Inexpensive, situated in a warm microclimate and between two freeways and several bus stations, the Mission attracted young people that commuted to Silicon Valley to work in the tech industry.

In the neighborhood, grocery stores geared toward to needs of middle to high-income residents quickly replaced the specialty Hispanic food stores and wine bars replaced taquerias. In the span of a few short years, rent for a two-bedroom apartment rose from \$600 a month to \$1,800 and the price of a house jumped from \$150,000 to

⁵⁸ On the Issues, *Maestrapeace*. 1995, photograph, San Francisco, *On the Issues Magazine*, (http://www.ontheissuesmagazine.com/1995winter/win95_scott.php, winter 1995) 14 Apr. 2012.

⁵⁹ "A Barrio of Many Colors" KQED, *PBS Online*, (<http://www.kqed.org/w/hood/mission/barrio.html>) 31 Oct. 2011.

⁶⁰ Nancy R. Mirabal, "Gentrification in San Francisco's Mission District" *Cesar Chavez Institute*, San Francisco State University, (<http://cci.sfsu.edu/taxonomy/term/10322>, Oct. 2010) 21 Oct. 2011.

\$450,000.⁶¹ Today, community organizers and Planning Commission members are working to develop projects that will continue to make the neighborhood safe, economically productive and environmentally sound while also maintaining and cultivating the Latino heritage that defines the Mission. Raised awareness of the risks of gentrification and the benefits of mixed-use zoning and mixed-income residential buildings may be the key to preserving the neighborhood for its current residents, while simultaneously opening doors for revitalization.

Current Conditions

Home to 47,332 residents, the Mission, a 1.87 square mile region remains one of San Francisco's most densely populated neighborhoods. Of those residents, forty-nine percent are foreign born and twenty-two percent are unable or experience significant difficulty speaking English. Almost eighteen percent of the Mission's residents live below the poverty level, compared to the eleven percent of the entire San Francisco population that live under the same condition. Social tensions in the area have led to increased crime rates that topple the national average.⁶² With these conditions under consideration, it is clear that community programs to improve language skills and increase employment are essential to the neighborhood's success. It is also clear that a physical revitalization, including the development of affordable housing, improvement of public transportation and safe streets, is essential to maintain a stable and productive neighborhood. San Francisco organizations and

⁶¹ Evelyn Nieves, "In Old Mission District, Changing Grit to Gold" *New York Times*, (<http://www.nytimes.com/1999/01/21/us/in-old-mission-district-changing-grit-to-gold.html?pagewanted=all&src=pm>, 21 Jan. 1999) 14 Jan. 2012.

⁶² "San Francisco, California" *City Data*, (<http://www.city-data.com/city/San-Francisco-California.html>) 01 Mar. 2012.

government bodies such as the San Francisco Planning Department and the San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association have spent the past decade initiating projects that aim to improve the aesthetic and functionality of the neighborhood, while also taking into consideration the needs of the community.⁶³

Existing Projects

The San Francisco Planning Department approached the Mission's revitalization first through the Mission Street Study, a project that gathered data on height restrictions in the neighborhood's main corridor.⁶⁴ The significance of these restrictions lies in each parcel's potential to exist as commercial and residential space. The study found that 1,395 to 1,670 units on Mission Street occupy thirty percent or less of the height and overall size that zoning requirements allow them. In other words, the existing spaces could be expanded, adding more room for housing and commercial space. One of the issues with the Mission Street corridor is that most of the parcels are relatively small, which makes them more difficult to redevelop. Only a few spaces are large enough that they could be converted into affordable housing.

*Image: Mission Street*⁶⁵

The Mission Street Study found that twenty three percent of small businesses in the corridor have month-to-month leases. This poses a problem because the leasee carries the insecurity of losing its lease, and the landlord loses incentive to build a

⁶³ Claudia Flores and Sarah Dennis, "Mission Street Study Update-DRAFT Alternatives for Public Comment" *San Francisco Planning Department*, (San Francisco, 2009) 1.

⁶⁴ "Mission Street Study Update-DRAFT Alternatives for Public Comment" 2.

⁶⁵ Mission St. San Francisco, CA. 2012, photograph, *Google Maps*, San Francisco, (<http://maps.google.com/>)15 Apr 2012.

relationship with the leasee, let alone make an effort to keep the space maintained while they seek other potential tenants that will agree to a long-term contract.⁶⁶ Part of the difficulty of finding these tenants is that many small businesses are hesitant to commit to a lease on Mission Street because of the area's notorious reputation and its lack of aesthetic desirability. These same qualities discourage foot traffic and subsequently place a heavier burden on existing tenants to produce profits and meet rent requirements. Their financial insecurity makes them less desirable as tenants and leads to the prevalence of month-to-month leases and business turnover potential.

One way to combat this neighborhood decay is through streetscape improvement projects. One such project, the "Mission Streetscape Plan" approaches the issue as a function of pedestrian safety and space accessibility. The plan proposed traffic calming methods, parking flexibility and the improvement of gathering and outdoor spaces, to name a few.⁶⁷ The Mission Street corridor exists as a hub for public transportation; some of BART and Muni's lines servicing downtown have their busiest stations on the street. Additionally, nearby Dolores Park and Garfield Square remain popular open spaces that attract local residents and people from other parts of the city. The Mission Streetscape Plan hopes to reconceptualize these public spaces so as to create a safer environment that is more accessible and a "could better serve as the center of the neighborhood's public life and social activity..."⁶⁸ The project hopes to follow the example of nearby Valencia Street by widening sidewalks, adding greenery, and amenities such as benches. The project also works in

⁶⁶ "Mission Street Study Update--DRAFT Alternatives for Public Comment"

⁶⁷ "Mission Streetscape Plan" *City Design Group*, San Francisco Planning Department, (http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/CDG/CDG_mission_streetscape.htm, Oct. 2010) 03 Nov. 2011, 54.

⁶⁸ "The Mission District Streetscape Plan: Draft Document" *San Francisco Planning Department* (<http://www.sf-planning.org>, Oct. 2011) 3 Nov. 2011.

collaboration with several local organizations, such as the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission and the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), that are interested in improving the Mission Street experience for pedestrians. In a neighborhood as active as the Mission, the collaboration of different institutions is essential for effective and sustainable urban renewal.

Another phase of the project focuses on smart growth regarding building heights and density. This incentive, the Mission Heights Study, aims to utilize existing space in the Mission to create more space for affordable housing and to protect local businesses.⁶⁹ In an already dense urban space, desirable space is limited and attracts high rents. By taking advantage of loose zoning requirements, the neighborhood could lend extra space toward mixed-use developments and encourage more interaction between businesses and residents. This interaction is only one component of the social process that is intrinsic to effective urban renewal and the preservation of community.

Community Development

The planning department and various governmental bodies involved in the Mission's revitalization are not the only catalysts inclined to create change. Grassroots organizations focused on community development have taken shape with the intention of empowering individuals and strengthening community identity. Mission Neighborhood Centers, Inc. sponsors several projects such as La Tierra, a program designed to train Mission residents for environmentally-minded careers in

⁶⁹ "The Mission District Streetscape Plan" 3.

construction.⁷⁰ In addition to programs implemented nonprofits, development-minded individuals often notorious for encouraging gentrification, are also working to improve the community through small-scale projects.. David Winslow, an architect based in San Francisco, for example, started a nonprofit called Linden Living Alley. It specializes in transforming alleyways into mixed-use areas that are bike and pedestrian-friendly.⁷¹ Poorly lit and underused streets and alleyways often contribute to high crime-rates and uncomfortable social settings, developers and other private groups' efforts to make streets lively again can combat this. This is especially important in a neighborhood like the Mission that has higher crime rates and a large family population. Renewal of the streets and other public space, through undertakings of the City, private developers or independent citizens such as Winslow has the potential to make significant improvements in the social stability and community pride in these areas.

Efforts to Combat Gentrification

At revitalization projects improve the quality of life in the Mission, the number of more affluent home renters and buyers increases as well. The threat of gentrification is visible on the street front as trendy and high-priced bars, restaurants and shops continue to appear around the neighborhood. Many San Francisco residents fear that the neighborhood improvements and subsequent gentrification not only threaten the security of low-income families that face eviction, but also the rich

⁷⁰ "La Tierra" *Mission Neighborhood Centers* (http://www.mncsf.org/la_tierra.html) 01 Mar. 2012.

⁷¹ David Winslow, "About" web blog post, *Linden Living Alley* (<http://lindenlivingalley.wordpress.com/about>) 3 Mar. 2012.

Latino culture that has defined the Mission for the past fifty years.⁷² Well aware of these concerns, the Planning Department took the Mission's cultural identity into consideration while developing the Streetscape Plan. Beyond producing street improvement and structuring maintenance plans, the proposal aims to "reflect and reinforce the Mission District's identifiable sense of place."⁷³ This sense of place refers to the Latino heritage made district by the Mission's demographics, cultural events, unique local merchants and storied murals that decorate buildings around the neighborhood.

Anti-gentrification group such as the Mission Anti-Displacement Coalition (MAC) have also formed with the conviction that "everyday peoples, not corporate developers and sell-out politicians, should be planning the future of our neighborhoods."⁷⁴ The group advocates reform designed by members of the community, but some residents and small business owners are concerned that the group may doing more to hold the community back than they are protecting families from displacement.⁷⁵ In 2007, Ron Mallia, a San Francisco resident that owns an auto body shop in the Mission, tried to build eight apartments and condominiums in a parking lot next to his shop. He planned to rent the units to mechanics that worked in the shop, providing them with a place to live and eliminating their commute. The project, however, was challenged by MAC until the city could evaluation how new projects affect housing, land and jobs in the area. Mallia told the San Francisco

⁷² Mirabal

⁷³ "The Mission District Streetscape Plan", 25.

⁷⁴ La Pachuquita, "Are Trustifarians Endangered? We Can Only Hope...." web blog post, *MAC SF*, Mission Anti-Displacement Coalition, (<http://missionantidisplacement.blogspot.com/2009/06/are-trustifarians-endangered-we-can.html>, 19 June 2009) 10 Mar. 2012.

⁷⁵ Robert Selna, "Anti-gentrification Forces Stymie Housing Development" *San Francisco Chronicle*, (<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2007/08/21/BAFARK1GE.DTL>, 21 Aug. 2007) 3 Mar. 2012.

Chronicle “they don’t want any development at all in the Mission because development makes the area better... the cost of housing might go up.”⁷⁶ City politicians such as supervisor Sean Elsbernd also think that the coalition’s efforts to thwart development are causing more harm than help. Elsbernd, similar to Mallia, reported to the Chronicle that the coalition’s argument for an expanded environmental review on the development of new projects such as Mallia’s apartments would stop the development of housing all over the city.⁷⁷ By focusing on stopping development, MAC SF is also losing sight of what the community does need: a healthy a safe urban environment. Their strengths lay in organizing community, which they should do for the purpose of protecting the Mission, but also easing its transition into the twenty-first century. Rather than protesting neighborhood improvements, they should protest how improvements exclude low-income residents, and collaborate with developers and the city to find a solution to it.

Public Transportation

The Mission Streetscape Plan addresses the aesthetics of the heavily used BART and Muni stations used in the mission, but the effectiveness of the program’s attempt to ease congestion and increase accessibility remains in question. One step the Planning Department took to ease congestion was to remove obsolete barriers, such as a tall fence than divides Osage Alley near the 24th Street Bart Plaza.⁷⁸

⁷⁶ "Anti-gentrification Forces Stymie Housing Development."

⁷⁷ "Anti-gentrification Forces Stymie Housing Development."

⁷⁸ "The Mission District Streetscape Plan" 36.

*Image: Osage Alley*⁷⁹

The removal of barriers such as these allows for more fluid pedestrian movement throughout a neighborhood. Jane Jacobs, a 20th century writer and activist, concisely stated “this is something everyone already knows: a well-used city street is apt to be a safe street. A deserted city street is apt to be unsafe.”⁸⁰ Access and foot traffic create safer neighborhoods. Additionally, physical changes such as these are intended to encourage commuters to walk to the bus rather than drive to work. The BART system, however, remains limited and an increase in passenger use could result in more crowding on the buses, which would threaten accessibility, passenger safety, and the lifetime of each vehicle. Ensuring the continued development of the program will require more smart growth collaboration between the Planning department and SFMTA. Both organizations have also opened their forums to the public, allowing community members to ask questions and comment on projects. With more community input, the public transportation system can better serve a larger group of commuters. Other city government agencies are also a part of the forum in order to encourage discussion and a dynamic approach to solving planning and public transportation issues.⁸¹ The development of more bus lines could reduce pollution and traffic, making the Mission a safer and healthier place to live. Furthermore, it will grant its residents easier access to other areas of the city, which will expand job options and inter-neighborhood exposure.

⁷⁹ Osage Alley in the Mission. The alley has become the canvas for years of mural art. This image shows a graffitied portion of the alley that is less accessible because of a barrier that impedes pedestrian access.

Kiser, Rob. *Osage Alley in the Mission District*. 2011. Photograph. San Francisco. *Peenie Weenie* (<http://www.peeniwallie.com/2011/07/san-francisco-m.html>, 26 July 2011) 14 Apr. 2012.

⁸⁰ Jane Jacobs, "The Uses of Sidewalks: Safety" 1961, *The City Reader*, Ed. Richard T. LeGates and Frederic Stout (5th ed. York: Routledge, 2011) 104.

⁸¹ “The Mission District Streetscape Plan: Draft Document,” 9.

Conclusion

The collaboration between the government, business owners, landlords and residents is crucial to the survival and development of the Mission. The planning department and SFMTA are both contributing to the improvement of the Mission's physicality and function, which could improve the accessibility and safety of the neighborhood, but also its desirability. For this reason it is vital that landlords are able to provide housing to the low-income residents, but can also make a profit from renting to higher-income residents. Nancy Mirabal, a professor at San Francisco State University and collaborator with the Cesar Chavez Institute, explained succinctly that in order to combat gentrification in the Mission "the most effective policy is to insure affordable housing, protect and expand rent control, provide protections to cultural organizations and assist low-income families with purchasing homes. [The city] also needs to consider ending policies like the Ellis Act, which allows landlords to move out tenants unfairly."⁸² Policy needs to be restructured so that development and revitalization may continue, but make certain that the existing community will be protected. This applies to businesses in the Mission as well. Retail areas must balance between national chains, which reliably bring in money and foot traffic, and independently owned businesses, which cater to locals and increase the feeling of community.

With the abolition of California's redevelopment agencies, the department's projects and responsibilities will have to be shifted to other entities in city, such as private developers or local governments, in order to continue progress. Luckily for

⁸² "Interview with Nancy Mirabal" e-mail interview, 12 Jan. 2012.

the Mission, most of the redevelopment agency's efforts were turned to the Mid-Market, Tenderloin and Mission Bay areas.⁸³ Regardless of where the changes will happen, it is important that redevelopment plans in the near future are handled carefully as they will inevitably influence surrounding neighborhoods, including the Mission. With the abolition of the redevelopment agency and raised awareness of gentrification in the San Francisco community, new forms of redevelopment are about to surface, which may or may not heal the divide between renewal and community stability.

The recurring problem with redevelopment remains its outcome, which is often a neighborhood designed to meet the needs of high-income, and most often white, families. If the redevelopment process is geared towards the needs and interests of the preexisting community, the likelihood that groups are displaced will decrease because the space they occupy is still theirs, and still accessible. A community like the Mission's cannot be created by policy and planning, thus it must be preserved before it is lost. As for the maintenance and safety of the neighborhood, residents must develop a sense of ownership and responsibility to do their part and get involved. Government policy can only go so far before the people must enact their own efforts to see the changes they desire.

⁸³ Marisa Lagos, "Calif. Wins OK to Abolish Redevelopment Agencies" *SFGate*, (<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2011/12/30/MN6R1MI73D.DTL>, 30 Dec. 2011) 08 Mar. 2012.

Chapter 4: South of Market (SoMa)

*Image: District 6: South of Market (includes Alcatraz)*⁸⁴

History

The area south of Market Street, referred to as SoMa, boasts a history that reflects the transformative influences that have shaped San Francisco. Primarily an industrial space, SoMa's loose zoning requirements allowed for bigger developments and few community-oriented designs. For most of its growth, SoMa was home only to the industrial workers that wanted to be near the factories and those associated with waterfront enterprises. Low-income immigrants later found their home in SoMa as rents stayed below the city average.

Change began in SoMa when young tech-minded entrepreneurs, attracted by the low-rent and proximity to downtown, began moving into empty spaces in the area. Developers soon followed, taking advantage of the flexible zoning, empty warehouses and lots in order to build high-rise apartments buildings and office buildings. By the mid-1990's the dot com boom had established itself in the Bay Area and SoMa was quickly becoming the San Francisco hub of the industry. While the investments coming from venture capitalists and profits from the tech businesses continued to pour into the commercial real estate of the area, the preexisting production, distribution and repair (PDR) industries took a hit. Between 1998 and 2001, the number of PDR and employees dropped from over 2,400 people to less than

⁸⁴ San Francisco Board of Supervisors, "District 6" *Wikipedia*, web. 12 Apr. 2012. <<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:SFSupervisorDistrict6.svg>>.

800 as space became less available and more expensive.⁸⁵ Yet the population continued to grow, almost doubling in ten years from 11,560 to 20,488 residents. Then again in 2010, the U.S. census recorded 40,451 people living in the area.⁸⁶

To address this issue, the Planning Department's 2008 East SoMa Area plan developed projects that ensure the continued growth of the district while also supporting existing businesses and the interests of the community. Their goals include maintaining the area as a mixed-use space, building affordable housing, improving pedestrian safety and increasing the sense of community through open spaces, creating local jobs and attracting small businesses to serve the area.⁸⁷

Current Conditions

To residents of San Francisco, SoMa is home of AT&T Park and the Caltrain station. To private developers, it is a blank canvas awaiting investment. To the City, it is an opportunity to plan a socially and environmentally conscious neighborhood. What the neighborhood lacks is a strong sense of community. While planning and policy cannot create community, a safe, attractive and inclusive space can help build it. Because it consists largely of vacant lots and warehouses, the population density is below the city average. The population is mostly white or Asian, and the median income is around \$30,000, which is significantly below the city's median income of \$70,000. Most of the neighborhood's residents are renters, and most are unmarried,

⁸⁵ "East SoMa (South of Market) Area Plan" San Francisco General Plan, *San Francisco Planning Department*, (http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/general_plan/East_SoMa.htm) 05 Dec. 2011.

⁸⁶ Katie Worth, "San Francisco Neighborhoods Have Changed Faces Over Two Decades" *San Francisco Examiner* (<http://www.sfexaminer.com/local/development/2011/03/san-francisco-neighborhoods-have-changed-faces-over-last-two-decades>, 20 Mar. 2011) 5 Dec. 2011.

⁸⁷ "East SoMa (South of Market) Area Plan."

which suggests that the community is mobile and as a result less likely to take interest in the long-term development of the area.⁸⁸

Since the dot com boom, tech heavyweights such as Twitter and Salesforce, Inc., have made bids for potential headquarters on properties in the area. On April 22nd, 2011, Twitter signed a lease in the mid-Market and expect to move-in in mid-2012. The company's Chief Financial Officer Ali Rowghani wrote "our employees are excited to be active members of our future neighborhood as volunteers, customers, diners and patrons of the arts."⁸⁹ Salesforce, on the other hand, in February of 2012 backed out of their deal to build two million square feet of offices in Mission Bay due to rapid expansion of the company. A representative of Salesforce told the San Francisco Examiner that the company may require more flexibility and space, and that the deal would be on hold indefinitely.⁹⁰ Unexpected obstacles to SoMa's redevelopment, such as Salesforce's change of plans and the closing of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency have forced the city and community organizations to change their plans for the next few years, but their goals have remained the same.

*Image: Architect's rendering of Salesforce's Mission Bay campus by the water*⁹¹

⁸⁸ "South Of Market (SOMA) Neighborhood in San Francisco, California (CA), 94103 Detailed Profile." *City-Data.com*, (<http://www.city-data.com/neighborhood/South-Of-Market-San-Francisco-CA.html>) 15 Mar. 2012.

⁸⁹ Benny Evangelista, "Twitter Signs Lease for Headquarters in Mid-Market" *SFGate*, (<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2011/04/22/BUAF1J63D4.DTL>, 23 Apr. 2011) 15 Mar. 2012.

⁹⁰ Andrea Koskey, "Salesforce Backs Out of Mission Bay Campus" *San Francisco Examiner*, (<http://www.sfexaminer.com/local/2012/02/salesforce-backs-out-mission-bay-campus>, 27 Feb. 2012) 15 Mar. 2012.

⁹¹ Legorreta and Legorreta. *Salesforce Mission Bay Campus Rendering*, photograph, San Francisco, *Huffington Post* (http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/02/28/salesforce-san-francisco-mission-bay_n_1307149.html?ref=san-francisco#s599078, 28 Feb. 2012) 1 Mar. 2012.

The Goals of Redevelopment in SoMa

Given the development potential of the area, the Planning Department and city government are presented with the opportunity to create and implement the inclusive ‘new model’ of gentrification that could become the paradigm for neighborhoods around the city and for other cities around the country that are experiencing similar space crunches and the need to improve housing, transportation, infrastructure and job opportunities. To integrate the area into the rest of the city, planners have to consider not only the best uses for SoMa but how development can affect the nearby neighborhoods as well. For example, how construction of the Central Subway will shape the neighborhood, and what office space needs exist in the city’s future. For these reasons it is difficult to create land use controls, but without the controls, SoMa remains at risk of becoming a glorified business park and losing its potential to develop as a mixed-income residential neighborhood.⁹²

While aiming to maintain SoMa’s potential as a mixed-use space, the planning department and Redevelopment Agency highlighted the importance of improving the housing appeal for San Francisco residents, including those that already live there. In the SoMa redevelopment plan, approved by the Board of Supervisors in 2005, the “redevelopment and removal of blight will be done in a manner which includes a maximum number of current property owners and residents in the redevelopment process, with a minimum of displacement.”⁹³ The Redevelopment Agency also

⁹² "East SoMa (South of Market) Area Plan".

⁹³ San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. *Redevelopment Plan for the South of Market Redevelopment Project Area*. (San Francisco, 2005), 4.

adopted the plan to provide relocation assistance to businesses or residents that were displaced, “with the goal of obtaining equal or better permanent accommodations.”⁹⁴

The Agency’s other steps to avoid gentrification include involving existing residents in the new design process and utilizing vacant or debilitated spaces to develop housing, thus creating a net increase in affordable housing units, rather than converting existing affordable units into high-priced and exclusive housing. To encourage current residents to participate in the Redevelopment Plan, the Agency offered to provide subsidies to homeowners that agree to comply with the Owner Participant Agreement and follow the guidelines of the Plan. Sometimes the agreement requires that the subsequent owner of the space also comply with the agreements when undergoing improvements.⁹⁵

Individuals and smaller private companies are also contributing to the neighborhood’s revitalization. Martin Building Company, a local developer with fourteen years of experience building in San Francisco, donated Mint Plaza to the City and County in 2007. The plaza provides storm water management, seating, street closure and landscaping in a lot that was previously overlooked. Additionally, it is maintained by a nonprofit named Friends of Mint Plaza (FoMP), which removes the cost burden off of SoMa residents. Locals run the nonprofit for other locals. FoMP describe the space as “consciously designed to accommodate a wide range of uses, including art exhibitions, theatre, live music, cafes, and small festivals, while also providing a quiet, clean and green refuge for neighboring residents...”⁹⁶ Projects such

⁹⁴“Redevelopment Plan for the South of Market Redevelopment Project Area” 4.

⁹⁵“Redevelopment Plan for the South of Market Redevelopment Project Area” 5.

⁹⁶ “Overview” Welcome to Mint Plaza, *Friends of Mint Plaza*, (<http://www.mintplazasf.org/overview.php>, 2010) 06 Mar. 2012.

as these contribute public space that allows residents to feel a part of and take pride in their community. The responsibility of future maintenance was passed to a nonprofit called Friends of Mint Plaza, which is also run by residents.⁹⁷

After the California Supreme Court passed Governor Jerry Brown's decision to eliminate the state's redevelopment agencies, the future of SoMa's redevelopment plan remained in question. In January of 2012, Mayor Ed Lee met with the Board of Supervisors to introduce a plan that would transfer the responsibilities and resources of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency to a successor agency, and current projects to the Mayor's Office of Housing. Lee has also pledged to develop projects that will increase the size of the workforce, availability of affordable housing, as well as programs that support small business and the improvement of public space.⁹⁸ He also plans to continue working with tech companies by addressing their needs and incentivizing their growth through plans such as a six-year payroll tax break for companies moving to the Tenderloin and Central Market areas, to begin with.⁹⁹ Word of SoMa's potential as a tech headquarters is spreading rapidly, with both Twitter and Salesforce making deals in 2011, and the gaming giant Zynga purchasing 670,000 square-feet in the neighborhood in March of 2012.¹⁰⁰ While some residents do oppose what they refer to as a 'corporate land grab', others see the potential to remove blight, without gentrification. Supervisors and members of the mayor's office see Twitter

⁹⁷ San Francisco Planning Department, "Better Streets Plan" *SF Planning*, (http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/BetterStreets/proposals.htm#Final_Plan, 16 Jan. 2011) 23 Feb. 2012.

⁹⁸ SF Examiner Editorial, "Redevelopment Is Still Important Without Agency" *San Francisco Examiner*, (<http://www.sfoxaminer.com/opinion/editorials/2012/01/redevelopment-still-important-without-agency>) 22 Jan. 2012) 14 Mar. 2012.

⁹⁹ "Twitter Signs Lease for Headquarters in Mid-Market"

¹⁰⁰ Benny Evangelista, "Zynga Agrees to Buy SF Headquarters for \$228 Million" *SF Gate*, (<http://blog.sfgate.com/techchron/2012/03/05/zynga-agrees-to-buy-sf-headquarters-for-228-million>) 5 Mar. 2012) 15 Mar. 2012.

and Salesforce's presence in the area as an opportunity to develop space for small businesses and improve overall community welfare.

Liberal grassroots organizations such as The South of Market Community Action Network want to see companies like Twitter donate significant sums of money to the surrounding neighborhood, but the City worries that such conditions could persuade the companies to move elsewhere. Instead plans such as the Community Benefit Agreement have been drafted, which asks Twitter specifically to help with community workforce development, event organization, and other community building activities.¹⁰¹ Whether or not the agreement can effectively make positive change is yet to be determined. The most likely risks include a lack of program development and execution, inadequate funding, or that the program fails to meet the needs of the Tenderloin residents. With poor communication, aid is easily misdirected and underutilized.

Public Transportation

SoMa is to feel drastic changes in the next few years after the construction of the Central Subway Project. Construction is slated to begin in mid-2012, and may continue until 2019.¹⁰² The SFMTA hopes to reduce traffic congestion and shorten the commute time for residents heading to the city's digital hub, SoMa, and the financial center downtown. The project's slogan "Connecting People. Connecting Communities." suggests that the organization wants to be viewed as a facilitator of

¹⁰¹"Twitter".

¹⁰²"Timeline" SFMTA Central Subway, *SFMTA*, (<http://centralsubwaysf.com/content/timeline>) 19 Mar. 2012.

inter-cultural and inter-class socialization. The SFMTA wants to make neighborhoods accessible, and to promote mobility between communities.

Among the benefits of the Central Subway Project listed on their website, the SFMTA states that the project will encourage development in SoMa and serve the low auto-ownership population that lives there.¹⁰³ The former statement follows the traditional publicity of urban renewal: the promise of a construction project that will make a neighborhood more desirable. With increased awareness of the negative connotation of urban renewal, however, the SFMTA addresses the needs of the pre-existing population to demonstrate their efforts to avoid gentrifying the area. As discussed in the previous chapter, one of the most significant threats of development are the new projects that do not serve the existing community. SFMTA's decision to put the Central Subway in SoMa and connect it to the city's financial center is an example of a project that benefit the community because it is inclusive and accessible. Additionally, it benefits the rest of the city by providing affordable transportation to key employment areas, which increases job opportunities and allows employees to live in different areas of the city, rather than next to the workplace.

When workers of similar trades in incomes live in the same area, it promotes homogenization of social classes that can lead to both the ghettoization or gentrification of an area. Diversity promotes cultural and interclass exposure, which benefit a community by fostering understanding and communication. Because a significant amount of land in SoMa remains unoccupied, the subway construction will cause minimal disturbances to the businesses and residents of the neighborhood.

¹⁰³ "Project Overview. SFMTA Central Subway, *SFMTA*, (<http://centralsubwaysf.com/content/project-overview>) 19 Mar. 2012.

Underground tunneling and careful consideration of existing infrastructure will minimize displacement and will ensure that life in SoMa will go largely uninterrupted.

The Future of SoMa's Redevelopment

The San Francisco Redevelopment Agency directed the planning and construction of SoMa's cultural anchors: AT&T Park and the UCSF Mission Bay campus.¹⁰⁴ Both projects brought life into the China Basin and Mission Bay neighborhoods and gave promise of a bright future for the area. After the elimination of the SFRA, city planners, business owners and interested residents are now responsible for SoMa's future. Restaurant owner Peter Osbourne opened and operated three restaurants in the city, including SoMa's popular Momo's. He sees opportunity in SoMa, and plans to open a new, high-end restaurant to cater to the many boaters that like tend to dock in the area. He described the area as "such a cool, neglected corner of the bay... I'm proud to be a part of the reincarnation of the city's waterfront."¹⁰⁵ Often when one upscale restaurant opens, others will follow and the cycle of gentrification begins again. How will SoMa be different? It depends on the decisions of entrepreneurs like Osborne, local politicians and the availability of affordable housing.

¹⁰⁴ Olivia, Paul V. "Redevelopment Salvaged, Redefined S.F. Waterfront." *SFGate*, (<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2012/01/27/DDBU1MVJ4E.DTL>, 28 Jan. 2012) 20 Mar. 2012.

¹⁰⁵ Paul V. Olivia, "Redevelopment Salvaged, Redefined S.F. Waterfront" *SFGate*, (<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2012/01/27/DDBU1MVJ4E.DTL> 28 Jan. 2012) 20 Mar. 2012.

The ‘New Model’

The key features of SoMa’s ‘new model’ redevelopment include the drafting of Community Benefit Agreements (CBA’s) for incoming businesses, the focus on following green and sustainable building practices, and the goal of keeping the neighborhood mixed-use and mixed-income. The Western SoMa Citizens Planning Task Force, a group created by the Board of Supervisors, adopted the Western SoMa Community Stabilization Policy in April of 2009 in an effort to make redevelopment a democratic and citizen-based process. The policy provides metrics to determine land uses and housing affordability in accordance with the goals of SoMa’s redevelopment. These metrics help the Planning Commission make decisions regarding zoning and development, as well as analyze how projects will affect the area’s economic vitality and residential desirability. To ensure sustainable growth, the policy also sets forth requirements to keep construction technology and infrastructure up-to-date, and calls for all new projects to include public amenities and provide impact fees to benefit the greater community.¹⁰⁶

The Task Force supports the goal of making SoMa mixed-use and mixed-income. The Stabilization Policy includes the City’s recent requirement to set aside thirty percent of projects in redevelopment areas (for example Mission Bay and Hunter’s Point) for affordable housing, built through both inclusionary zoning and by nonprofit organizations. In fact, since SoMa’s zoning was adopted in 1990, thirty-eight percent of housing units have been designated as affordable. The SoMa Community Stabilization Policy maintains this statute, with the goal of a promoting

¹⁰⁶ Western SoMa Citizens Planning Task Force, “DRAFT-Western SoMa Community Stabilization Policy” (San Francisco, 31 May 2011).

mixed-income population. To support the diverse population, Objective 1.1 of the plan states that there will be a “proximate mix of uses and services serving local needs and thereby developing a complete neighborhood.”¹⁰⁷ The Citizen’s Planning Task Force makes a clear statement by setting this goal as their first objective; not only will the neighborhood be mixed-use and mixed-income, it will be a cohesive unit in which services offered benefit the residents that live there. Historically, neighborhoods that face redevelopment eventually attract new businesses. These businesses are rarely geared towards the needs of the residents; rather they are for higher-income residents coming from other neighborhoods. Rather than communities mixing, it is often the lower-income community that is pushed out.

In addition to balancing the availability of moderate and low-income housing units, the Stabilization Policy also tries to manage the ratio of jobs to housing. The Task Force looked at historical data from the San Francisco Planning Department describing the job to housing ratio in Western SoMa for 2005. An environmental analysis revealed that for every 7.67 jobs, there was one home. Without careful zoning, this ratio is predicted to be 5.81 jobs per home by 2030 as residential units continue to develop faster than the number of available jobs. To monitor this the Stabilization plan suggests that the Planning Commission places a restriction on the development of housing if the home to job ratio falls below 6.60:1. The Task Force’s hope is to use these restrictions to promote “a vibrant community where neighborhood opportunities to live and work in proximity to retail shopping and Bay Area transit services are maintained.”¹⁰⁸ While these conditions could limit the

¹⁰⁷ Western SoMa Citizens Planning Task Force, 2.

¹⁰⁸ Western SoMa Citizens Planning Task Force, 10.

availability of housing in the area, they are also intended to encourage job growth. Planners want to keep SoMa the unusual, mixed-use neighborhood that it is, but at what point do restrictions on housing development do more harm than help? A thirty percent minimum affordable housing rule would already make the neighborhood more accessible than others for low-income residents, but it also may dissuade private developers from wanting to invest in the area. It would especially be a concern if the job to home conditions became applicable. To limit the potential of a developer's profit is to limit the likelihood that they will invest in the first place. The Stabilization Policy was not included in the Planning Code agreements decided upon in October of 2011, but the Planning Commission requested the Board of Supervisors ratify the policy after the Western SoMa plan is approved.¹⁰⁹

The 'new model', incorporating PDR, retail, market rate and affordable housing will also continue to take shape in East SoMa, but the construction of the Central Subway may delay an agreement on land use controls. The subway, which will begin on the Fourth Street corridor, will benefit from a higher-density area because more offices and PDR buildings will likely increase ridership.¹¹⁰ Additionally, plans to develop an entertainment district around Folsom Eleventh Streets will affect how land is used. The Planning Commission proposed designating the area as a special use district (SUD), but they were met by unhappy residents that did not want to be bothered with the noise and late-night activity.¹¹¹ To follow the

¹⁰⁹ "Local Land Use Law Firm Reviews the Western SoMa Plan" web blog post, *SoMa Leadership Council*, (<http://somaleadership.org/2011/10/24/local-land-use-law-firm-reviews-the-western-soma-plan>, 24 Oct. 2011) 25 Mar. 2012.

¹¹⁰ "East SoMa (South of Market) Area Plan"

¹¹¹ "8 Reasons Why an Entertainment Zone Won't Help 11th Street" web blog post, *SoMa Leadership Council*, (<http://somaleadership.org/2011/12/13/8-reasons-why-an-entertainment-zone-wont-help-11th-street>, 13 Dec. 2011) 26 Mar. 2012.

‘new model’, the Planning Commission must heed residents’ requests and avoid displacement. This requires creating a mixed-use area to involve creativity and non-traditional planning practices, the success of which will not be known for another ten years or so.

Conclusion

When boiled down, the primary goals of redevelopment in SoMa appear to be avoiding displacement, creating vibrancy through entertainment, retail and restaurants, and to maintain a balance of affordable and market rate housing, and business. The East SoMa Plan and the Stabilization Policy tackle the ‘new model’ by designing policies that encourage a mixed-income and mixed-use identity in SoMa. What the policies do not cover include the types of businesses that will open, who they cater to, the elements of a neighborhood such as schools and parks and whether or not the demographic will remain mostly single-renters or open up to families looking to buy homes. While the plans for SoMa have a strong promise of creating a new type of neighborhood that does not discriminate based on class or race, it remains uncertain whether or not it will ever really feel like a neighborhood. Large-scale developments such as AT&T Park and the UCSF campus extension maintain the area’s longstanding industrial feel. The growth of high-rise apartment buildings discourages social interaction. Furthermore, the construction of the Central Subway, in addition to the existing Caltrain depot and interstate highway entrance in the area make SoMa feel more like a transfer point than a destination. The planners of SoMa have indeed broken ground with the ‘new model’, but the plan’s success of creating space for a neighborhood remains yet to be proven.

Chapter 5: Discussion of Gentrification and Recommendations for Redevelopment

Lance Freeman, an Urban Planning professor at Columbia University in New York, described gentrification as a “chaotic concept”.¹¹² It has both positive and negative connotations, as well as a definition that is changing as the concept itself adapts to social developments and the restructuring of urban landscape. Freeman’s study of displacement in Harlem revealed an unanticipated optimism regarding gentrification in the inner city, as well as new depths of pessimism.¹¹³ Gentrification is multifaceted and complex, and as a result opinions on how to deal with it go beyond the two camps of for or against. In order to tailor new programs that revitalize space and communities without displacing and excluding residents, the experiences and motivations of those involved must be considered. This includes but is not limited to policy makers, private developers, businesses, and residents.

The theoretical definition and understanding of gentrification has morphed over the 20th century as planning has shifted from place-based to people-based design. New developments and policies must not be shaped in a mold used by past cities, but instead be crafted in order to benefit the community that they apply to, and structured to be flexible with change. The goal should rise above revitalization, and also discourage gentrification. Cities are fluid, and redevelopment policies should be as well.

¹¹² Lance Freeman, *There Goes the 'hood: Views of Gentrification From the Ground Up* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple UP, 2006) 3.

¹¹³ Freeman, 1.

Non-Governmental Programs in Place

Gentrification has become a hot-button issue and raised-awareness has left developers more accountable for their decisions. San Francisco in particular takes pride in its innovative approach to redevelopment and efforts to avoid further gentrification. In addition to inclusive policies such as those recommended in the East and Western SoMa Plans, several grassroots organizations and developers are taking a stand in order to defend residents of the urban space. These approaches to revitalization may be the key to ending gentrification as we know it.

One of the most influential groups is the San Francisco Community Land Trust (SFCLT). The SFCLT uses a combination of public and private funding to purchase rental buildings and convert them into affordable and shared-equity cooperatives for the residents already living there. Under this system, the residents share ownership of the building while the SFCLT owns the land, giving them the power to keep the building low-rent, forever. The SFCLT also offers financial counseling programs to residents and works with them toward the goal of home ownership. They also cooperate with community organizations, such as the Chinatown Community Development Center, to help tenants fight against eviction. Current projects exist in Chinatown and the Western Addition, and the SFCLT is now looking to take on properties in SoMa.¹¹⁴ In the Mission district, cooperatives such as these would also prevent eviction, gentrification and allow residents to maintain a sense of ownership in the neighborhood. In theory, ownership would hold residents

¹¹⁴ "Projects" *San Francisco Community Land Trust*, (<http://www.sfclt.org/about-sfclt-mainmenu-34/projects-mainmenu-35>) 29 Mar. 2012.

accountable for the upkeep of their homes as well as the nearby streetscape. Because high rents and eviction are the main causes of displacement in the area, rent controls set by landlords such as the SFCLT could provide tenants with the protection they may not receive from citywide legislation. SoMa would also benefit from cooperatives that would house individuals unable to rent from low-income housing units because of competition. While many projects are being developed in the area, the growth of the tech industry will likely bring a slew of young members of the creative class searching for housing in the area. As the demand for inexpensive housing increases, the supply will dwindle and place pressure on low-income residents to find alternative housing. Cooperatives, however, could protect some of these families from displacement and encourage them to remain in SoMa for a long time. Less mobility in the area could help foster a sense of place, and organically develop SoMa into a true neighborhood.

In the wake of the redevelopment agency's shutdown, responsibility of action has shifted to the mayor, community groups such as SFCLT, and less obvious private developers, such as the San Francisco Giants. Individuals with more limited capital, such as Momo's owner Peter Osbourne have claimed a vision for Mission Bay that boasts the area's potential as a destination neighborhood and the heart of SoMa. With a power player such as the Giants organization behind its development, these visions could soon become a reality. Because of the growth of the tech industry in the nineties, Mission Bay remains mostly office space. The Giants' plan to redevelop the parking lot next to the ballpark includes an additional 1.7 million square feet of office space, but also the construction of 1,000 rental units, a parking garage and shopping

and dining attractions. The Giants plan to work in partnership with The Cordish Companies of Baltimore on the 1.6 billion dollar, twenty-seven acre project, and after working out a deal with the lot's owner, the Port of San Francisco, construction is slated to begin in 2015.¹¹⁵

The Giants want the development to become the link that connects Mission Bay to the rest of San Francisco, and helps SoMa become more of a neighborhood. To do this, the developers are focused on bringing in local businesses that reflect San Francisco's personality. Commonly with redevelopment, the new businesses and housing that arrive in a targeted area attract wealthier patrons and homeowners from outside the neighborhood. The Mission Bay plan, however, is proposed to serve the residents that already live and work in the area. In addition, the project will provide an estimated 9,000 jobs during construction and add 7,200 permanent jobs to the area. The Giants also have a long-term interest in the success of the project, because they are neighbors to it. This relationship will ensure that the developer (the Giants) remains aware of the project's progress and how it is affecting the neighboring residents and businesses. Because the organization itself is part of the community, it will have a firsthand account of how the project is helping or harming Mission Bay, and what needs to be done to address it. Currently the project lacks any programs directly tied to benefitting the community beyond the construction of space and the revenue that the city will gain from property and sales taxes. That being said, those two benefits are significant in that they provide housing, opportunities for business

¹¹⁵ John Wildermuth, "Giants' Mission Rock Plan Is in City's Ballpark" *SFGate*, (<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2012/04/03/MNUS1NUA5G.DTL>, 4 Apr. 2012) 5 Apr. 2012.

development, and up to \$700 million a year for the school district through property taxes.¹¹⁶

On April 5th, 2012, the project received support from Mayor Ed Lee and the Board of Supervisors. They see it as a realization of plans for Mission Bay that several San Francisco mayors of the past attempted but never successfully reached because of financing issues and anti-gentrification pressures.¹¹⁷ As SoMa's 'new model' of gentrification becomes more popular and dialogue between the city, developers and the community continues to grow, this Mission Bay project could become the first large-scale development to successfully redevelop a San Francisco neighborhood without gentrifying it. Residents and businesses will not be evicted, rather open areas and other amenities will be provided. The previously wind-swept and desolate parking lot and derelict pier could become the city's newest great attraction, complete with socially and environmentally conscious design and an immodest supply of San Francisco pride. While the players in power have shifted from government-controlled bodies to private entities and individuals, the goals of redevelopment have changed as well. Along with the shifted responsibility, new technology is also changing the face of redevelopment and urban planning. Geographic Information Systems (GIS), in particular, have become a game-changer in the planning world by bringing maps to life and encouraging small-scale development.

¹¹⁶ "Giants' Mission Rock Plan Is in City's Ballpark."

¹¹⁷ John Wildermuth, "SF Backs Mission Rock Development Plan by Giants" *SFGate*, (<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2012/04/04/BAAB1NUS9F.DTL>, 5 Apr. 2012) 5 Apr. 2012.

Geographic Information Systems

Since 1998, the introduction of parcel politics and GIS systems changed the face of redevelopment policy and the debate over gentrification. SoMa's mixed-use identity is based off of the concept of parcel politics: a variety of interdependent actors occupy urban space. Unlike the area-wide zoning of planning in the second half of the 20th century, parcel politics allows a space, for example a neighborhood, to be the site of various activities from industry to business to housing. Parcel planning takes down redevelopment's previous notion of flattening diverse communities in order to create space for monolithic development, and instead encourages mixed-use.¹¹⁸ Parcel planning is also problematic, however, because it encourages market-driven competition to intensify as more power players vie for smaller pieces of land. When this competition grows, the voices of less-informed individuals are lost. Additionally, such narrowly focused politics easily lose sight of the larger picture, such as economic goals and the urban development plan for the neighborhood. When planners began using GIS, abstract statistics became visual and the city was able to visualize the complexity of SoMa and better understand its needs. The maps also helped educate the public about where they lived, thus allowing a better-informed community to organize and address the important issues.

The GIS came into play again during the planning process, as the Planning Commission looked to rezone SoMa for the burgeoning tech industry. As more and more tech employees moved into the Bay Area, a housing crunch caused the requests

¹¹⁸ William J., Craig, Trevor M. Harris, and Daniel Weiner, *Community Participation and Geographic Information Systems* (New York: Taylor & Francis, 2002) 55.

for live-work permits to quickly grow in SoMa. Live-work units were becoming increasingly popular because they were easier to finance than strictly commercial buildings, they could be built taller than residential buildings, and aesthetics were less important. But the units also represented a new type of displacement: one that targeted businesses facing eviction and incompatible use claims.¹¹⁹ To fight the proposal of a citywide rezoning and land-use analysis, the Coalition for Jobs, Artists and Housing (CJAH) used GIS to educate various constituencies affected by the rezoning. The use of GIS maps allowed residents and business owners to see how the rezoning was affecting other members of the neighborhood. With a better understanding of how policy was changing the area, those involved were able to form a stronger coalition against harmful legislation. Perhaps even more significant, the GIS maps gave viewers a better sense of place and a renewed commitment to reclaim their neighborhood.¹²⁰

Building Social Capital

When shaping a neighborhood, the existing social capital is just as if not more important than the physical design. Robert Putnam, a political scientist and Harvard University professor defines social capital as the human relationships and interactions that define a community, and argues that it is becoming dangerously depleted in American cities.¹²¹ As technology, planning theory and the people involved in redevelopment have changed, so has the most significant component of a neighborhood: its people. This is also one of the most obvious distinctions between

¹¹⁹ Craig, Harris, and Weiner, 58.

¹²⁰ Craig, Harris, and Weiner, 62.

¹²¹ Putnam, 134.

SoMa and the Mission, and another reason why gentrification and redevelopment cannot be looked at as blanket terms but must be evaluated in their respective circumstances.

In the Mission, the community and the culture is the neighborhood's strongpoint. The Mission's distinctive identity, which is marked with cultural pride, is what makes it so beloved to residents of San Francisco. The residents of the neighborhood, which is mostly Latino, are also the owners and patrons of the businesses there. The Latino culture that is preserved there is not commodified by gentrifiers, but lived by the residents. As housing in the city becomes more difficult to find, the largest risk the Mission faces is high rents. Changes in the neighborhood are inevitable, and the next ten years will likely witness gentrification occur in its traditional form, with high prices leading to displacement. The existing culture, which can be seen as the neighborhood's social capital, however, may be strong enough to prevent the familiar breed gentrification that cities experience and preserve the community. If community members can successfully organize and communicate with city planners and developers, the neighborhood will likely become mixed-use, but still maintain its distinctive identity.

SoMa, on the other hand, has been presented with a different dilemma. Since the dot com boom, SoMa has remained a self-aware mixed-use neighborhood. What the neighborhood lacks is coherent and cohesive social capital. According to Putnam's study of sub-national governments in various regions of Italy, a successful region could be marked by the citizens' civic engagement in activities such as voting, newspaper readership and club and sports league memberships. Putnam argues that

more developed networks encourage social trust and successful governance.¹²² If tools to develop social capital in SoMa could be identified and implemented, it could transform the region from a ‘place’ to a ‘neighborhood’. Part of the reason why the Mission has remained a Latino neighborhood is because of strong social capital and civic engagement with the government. For the past ten to twenty years, millions of Americans in other neighborhoods and cities have removed themselves from community politics.¹²³ Mission residents, however, have kept their ground and developed a strong sense of community. This same solidarity needs to be nourished in SoMa, so that residents can effectively communicate with their representatives in order to build a successful neighborhood. Likewise in the Mission, civic engagement must continue so that the neighborhood is not lost to gentrifiers. For this reason it is vital that policy makers consider what social capital is lost when physical capital is restructured. If buildings are raised or parks are built on, for example, are social networks facilitated or destroyed?¹²⁴

Employment and Housing

The other key to civic engagement and successful communities is employment. William Julius Wilson, a Harvard sociologist studied the relationship between joblessness among urban poor and the creation of ghettos. While studying the predominantly black neighborhood of South Side in Chicago, Wilson observed that neighborhoods previously filled with businesses were becoming vacant and dangerous. Streets became poorly lit, less traveled, and hubs of increasing crime

¹²² Putnam, 136.

¹²³ Putnam, 137.

¹²⁴ Putnam, 142.

rates.¹²⁵ One resident of the neighborhood explained “there is a more positive outlook if you come from an upwardly mobile neighborhood than you would here. In this type of neighborhood, all you here is negative [things] and that can kind of bring you down when you’re trying to make it.”¹²⁶ The South Side experienced a high rate of joblessness and subsequent increase in crime and drug usage. Residents seemed to experience an overall loss of confidence in themselves and in the neighborhood, which continued to deteriorate as building maintenance came to a halt.

In the Mission, joblessness has prevented the upward mobility of residents and led to a surplus of day laborers. These temporary workers spent time on street corners waiting for employment, often with no success. Without steady jobs, they become less desirable applicants for housing and are easily turned away by landlords in favor of tenants with a steady salary. Additionally, a lack of consistent employment does not encourage long-term renting, and buildings are more prone to dilapidate. Community groups such as La Tierra, mentioned earlier, are working to help residents find long-term employment but their programs can only go so far. But rather than let the neighborhood improve by encouraging chain stores to open in the Mission and allow rents to raise, the city needs to focus on making the neighborhood better for those that already live there. The city may not be able to create jobs, but it can monitor what types of businesses open in the Mission and make sure that they observe worker’s rights and fair wages.

The city should also ensure that the smaller Latino businesses can continue operating without fear of eviction or competition with corporate chains. In Wilson’s

¹²⁵ William Julius Wilson, "From Institutional to Jobless Ghettos" *The City Reader* Ed. Richard T. LeGates and Frederic Stout (New York: Routledge, 2011) 118.

¹²⁶ Wilson, 119.

study of the South Side, he repeatedly heard from residence that when businesses shut down, the streets became dark, less populated, and unsafe. This trend has begun in the Mission but could be stopped if the existing businesses that serve the neighborhood are preserved. More successful Mission businesses also means more Mission employment and the increased likelihood that these businesses will continue to contribute the community they are in, rather than target members of more affluent communities under the guidance of a corporate headquarters in another area.

In order to house these employees, affordable housing developments need to be available to workers with different income levels. Each affordable housing unit has an income limit that is based on the area median income (AMI). In some areas the median can be quite high, and landlords will prefer to lease to tenants with higher incomes. In order to promote more equal access to housing, the city must work with developers and community members to determine rent rates that reflect the need in the area. It is important that developers are a part of the conversation regarding housing regulation. Tight zoning requirements and rent roofs can become enough of an obstacle for developers that they lose the incentive to invest in an area. Even though the Mission wants to avoid gentrification, building maintenance and repurposing are sometimes necessary to prevent a neighborhood from becoming stagnant. Furthermore, in a growing city like San Francisco, housing is always needed and will need to be available to a wide range of income levels. While the young tech professionals have been demonized in discourse, anti-gentrification groups must understand that they need a place to live as well, and that they are not all on determined to displace low-income residents. Housing policy could promote more

equal housing access, but change also needs to come from the bottom-up. Community participation and open-dialogue between all residents of the neighborhood is critical to the Mission's survival.

SoMa's greatest challenge in the next ten years will be creating a neighborhood feeling and becoming a place where people not only want to live but are able to afford. Investment in housing will likely come from private entities such as the Giants or Salesforce, assuming the company continues plans to build a campus in Mission Bay. The Giants' plan for redevelopment of the parking lot next to AT&T Park did not include any plans for affordable housing, which poses a problem for low-income residents of the area. The same goes for any housing that follows Twitter, Zynga or other tech companies claiming headquarters in the area. The young, educated and highly paid employees of those companies will represent a stark majority in SoMa, unless more plans for affordable housing are created. In the wake of the redevelopment agency's dissolution, it is the responsibility of the mayor to ensure that new developments include the low-income population. Furthermore, these projects should be designed to promote home-ownership and long-term residency. Buildings such as the co-ops owned by the SFCLT are an example of one way to do this. The Human Services Agency of San Francisco also offers long-term housing options such as single-room occupancy hotels (SRO), most of which are in the Tenderloin, adjacent to SoMa, for very low-income people. The hotels are renovated by the Human Services Agency and managed by nonprofit agencies that also provide job and housing support.¹²⁷ The adoption of co-ops and SRO's in SoMa, in addition

¹²⁷ "Housing for Low-Income Adults and Families" *Human Services Agency*, (<http://www.sfhsa.org/91.html>, San Francisco, 2008) 13 Apr. 2012.

to the high-income developments, are essential to making SoMa a mixed-income neighborhood. Low-income housing in SoMa would also reduce congestion in the Tenderloin because the residents would have more options for housing.

The financial crisis has had an incredibly adverse affect on affordable housing. Lack of private capital and public funding, in addition to the termination of the redevelopment agencies has slowed down investment in the housing market. Because growth has slowed, nontraditional housing programs such as Hope VI and Section 8 can support even development. Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program provides very low-income families with government-funded rent vouchers. Families may select the housing unit that use the vouchers as partial rent payment if the landlord is participating in the program.¹²⁸ This program benefits landlords because it guarantees rent payment, but the program is also criticized for the amount of federal funding it requires. During this time when few new public housing units are being built, however, alternatives are limited.

Hope VI is another important program that facilitated the construction of public housing in San Francisco in the early 2000's. It was based on the concept of New Urbanism, which considers aesthetic design and social interactions in building development. Hope VI aimed to decentralize poverty by building projects with mixed-income units. The units also had elements such as front lawns, courtyards and street access, which was conceived in order to facilitate community. The projects were very successful, and studies demonstrated increases in per-capita income and decreases in crime rates in low-income neighborhoods. Hope VI also received

¹²⁸ "Information Section-8" *SFHA, San Francisco Housing Authority*, (<http://www.sfha.org/Information--Section-8.html>) 14 Apr. 2012.

criticism, however, because is repealed the one-for-one rule that required new projects to replace the same number of units in the old projects, which often resorted in a net loss of units. Some also accused the program of facilitating gentrification by evicting low-income residents for the purpose of creating mixed-income projects. The program lost funding under the Bush Administration and remains in a period of transition.¹²⁹ If the result of the program's actions can meet its goals, then it could be very effective in the Mission, where mixed-income residents are ascertaining how to share the neighborhood. In SoMa, the program would facilitate the neighborhood's ambition of becoming permanently mixed-use and mixed-income. The influence of the New Urbanism philosophy would also contribute to the area's efforts to engineer a neighborhood feeling. Design can have an incredible impact on the success of a residential environment.

Neighborhood Amenities

The condition of the public environment is critical to the health of a community. As the street-facing projects of Hope VI demonstrated, design can facilitate social interaction. The development of spaces such as Mint Plaza and the potential new park replacing the parking lot in Mission Bay demonstrate that private developers are also aware of the importance of public space and specifically, the natural environment. Public parks have posed a problem in urban space because of criticism that they are not, in fact, 'public'. A conflict arises when a park that is designed for families, complete with barbeques and play structures, is also highly patrolled to keep out homeless people. This raises questions of whether or not space

¹²⁹ "HOPE VI in San Francisco" *SPUR*, San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association, (<http://www.spur.org/publications/library/article/HOPEVIinsf03012005>, Mar. 2005) 14 Apr. 2012.

is actually public, or whom in fact it is designed for. The question of public parks, and public space in general, can only be answered with consideration of the community that it is designed for. The Mission, for example, frequently holds cultural events and for that reason needs space designed for gathering and performance, and family. SoMa, on the other hand, is home to many single, young people so a park designed for walking or lunch breaks would be more appropriate than one designed for families and children. Other necessary public amenities include schools, recreation centers and farmer's markets, to name a few. Amenities such as these tend to make neighborhoods more desirable and increase property value, so it is crucial that they are designed for the people already living there and their needs.

A well-designed residential environment fosters healthy community and benefits the rest of the city. Jane Jacobs and William Wilson, both mentioned earlier, promoted the concept of visible and well-used city streets and how they make neighborhoods both safe and sociable. Strong social capital and social networks are even more effective than police, according to Jacobs. She argues, "no amount of police can enforce civilization where the normal, casual enforcement of it has broken down."¹³⁰ A residential environment that encourages its residents to walk around, because of access to parks or stores, for example, fosters a sense of community and encourages interaction. Pride of a community makes residents feel responsible for the maintenance of the physical space, as well as the continued development of social networks. In the Mission, good lighting and a public presence at night could make the neighborhood safer. In SoMa, it could be the key to developing a sustainable, neighborhood feel.

¹³⁰ Jacobs, 107.

Chapter Six: Conclusion

In urban planning, technology and the people in power are never constant. Throughout the twentieth century, the definition and theoretical framework of redevelopment has shifted with these variables and demonstrated that gentrification is a process, not a linear and necessarily replicable pattern. For this reason it is also not inevitable. As the comparison of events in the Mission and SoMa describe, gentrification is personalized to neighborhoods and to an extent, controllable. In other words, the changes we witness in urban neighborhoods are deliberate and the responsibility of someone or something. Since the 2008 financial crisis, redevelopment and the discussion of gentrification have both slowed down, and an awareness of neighborhood dynamics is larger. The financial crisis has made class issues in housing more transparent, and has also forced cities and developers to be more conscious about how they spend money. Urban revitalization has entered a new stage where priorities have shifted. More urban planners are adopting New Urbanism ideology and incorporating people-based design into their city plans. In San Francisco specifically, Mayor Ed Lee has made an effort to shift away from the Mayor Willie Brown's previous pro-development policies to policies that are inclusive, environmentally conscious, and designed for long-term residency.

As the Mission fights to preserve itself and SoMa continues to develop into a cohesive neighborhood, is it vital that planners, policy-makers and developers avoid constructing community. Their contributions to the neighborhood may aim to facilitate community development, but it must evolve based off of social norms of the area. In "Contested Cities: Social Processes and Spatial Form," Harvey warns against

constructing community, which he views as a group of ethnically and socio-economically homogenous beings. This happens when community is regarded as a thing, rather than a process. He argues that community is a moment in a political process when common values are discovered during a struggle. Community is not an answer to problems, but part of the construction of a city's identity.¹³¹ The performers of revitalization in San Francisco are responsible for identifying, not creating, the community that exists in a neighborhood and responding their needs. The corollary to that is that communities must effectively organize and maintain an open dialogue so that they can communicate their needs and establish their presence.

During a housing boom in 1964, a survey revealed that labor and material costs and financing remained the largest obstruction to the building process. Ten years later, government regulation became the problem.¹³² With limited capital today, more regulation will only deter development and discourage all forms of neighborhood revitalization. Government redevelopment policy should not hinder redevelopment, but should guide projects to be inclusive and long-term. If a minimum percentage of a development must be affordable, the government should not require the affordable units to be the same as the more expensive units because it will cause the developer to lose money. If developers do not have incentive to build in an area, the project may not happen at all. This is particularly important in SoMa, where a net increase in housing will be essential in the upcoming years as tech companies continue to move into the area. In the Mission, it is more important that the number of affordable units, specifically, increases. Redevelopment and revitalization will

¹³¹ Harvey, 236.

¹³² Ben-Joseph, 102.

continue in the Mission, but displacement can be avoided or at least minimized if affordable units are made available.

The parcel politics of both neighborhoods are an important way to identify a community's conditions and needs, but revitalizers also need to see the larger picture. In *Code of the City*, Ben-Joseph argues for an analysis of collaborative components such as transportation, the natural environment and the state of social segregation. He also encourages governments to reduce regulation, because it raises costs. Neighborhoods must be able to evolve organically.¹³³ Unfortunately there is a very fine line between where the city government should be protecting the citizens of a neighborhood, and where it should sit back and let growth occur. It is a line that must always be considered, even if it will inevitably be overstepped at times.

Like all neighborhoods, the future of the Mission remains uncertain. It is a landmark of San Francisco, and one of the city's most beloved neighborhoods. Its stature will ensure that it remains under a watchful eye. The government will want to protect it because its residents' cultural and labor contributions to the city are invaluable. Members of the Mission and greater San Francisco communities will continue to fight for the rights of residents and the upkeep of the area. Developers will want to continue development and make it an attractive area for high-paying renters and businesses, but they must be reminded to build for the community, not those that live outside of it. New businesses and renters will continue to become a part of the neighborhood, so action, such as community organization and inclusive planning, must be taken to make certain that the smaller, local businesses are not out-priced and the low-income renters are not displaced. Developers and planners should

¹³³ Ben-Joseph, 168.

also turn their focus to creating space for community, not just affordable housing. This includes parks, safe streets, performance space and community centers.

SoMa faces a different challenge, but one that may be easier to tackle. SoMa's revitalization involves creating a neighborhood out of industrial space. The real challenge is creating a neighborhood that is inclusive to begin with. As high-end apartment developments emerge in SoMa, affordable housing must grow as well. The restaurants and bars that arrived in response to the construction of AT&T Park cater baseball fans with higher incomes. There is a demand for less expensive restaurants near the ballpark. A more diverse selection of businesses to patronize would benefit those that live in SoMa and those who visit it multiple times a week during baseball season.

Because of the ballpark and the increasing number of businesses in the area, SoMa is constantly in a state of flux. Large numbers of employees and baseball fans are going to and from the area on a regular basis, so SoMa must find a way to develop its own community identity and encourage residents to establish long-term homesteads. Like the Mission, this requires strong community involvement. Developers can contribute by bringing in businesses that work in synergy and make the neighborhood feel more connected. Ground floor stores and outdoor seating will facilitate pedestrian flow and encourage outdoor activity and social interaction. Attractions such as parks and small performance spaces will create venues unlike AT&T Park that are specifically for the community, rather than the whole city. A strong sense of community will improve safety of the streets and facilitate appropriate development. Furthermore, strong community will more effectively be able to

communicate with the city and the planning department and help the neighborhood grow into its goal of remaining mixed-use and mixed-income. Policy cannot create community, but it can protect and encourage it.

This study demonstrated that even in neighborhoods with different communities, conflicts and planning agendas, revitalization can occur without gentrification as long as there is careful planning and follow-through. Public-private cooperation and strong community is essential for inclusive revitalization. If communities remain organized and a dialogue remains open, these two neighborhoods could be the sites of a new breed of redevelopment that will become a template for future projects. Technology and the financial crisis have forced governments, developers and community members to begin a new approach to redeveloping urban space. This study presented the new methods and philosophies that accompany the new model, but only time will prove whether or the new model will be capable of revitalizing a neighborhood while protecting the community.

Bibliography

- "8 Reasons Why an Entertainment Zone Won't Help 11th Street." Web blog post. *SoMa Leadership Council*. 13 Dec. 2011. Web. 26 Mar. 2012. <<http://somaleadership.org/2011/12/13/8-reasons-why-an-entertainment-zone-wont-help-11th-street/>>.
- "A Barrio of Many Colors." *KQED*. PBS Online. Web. 31 Oct. 2011. <<http://www.kqed.org/w/hood/mission/barrio.html>>.
- Banerjee, Tridib, and William C. Baer. *Beyond the Neighborhood Unit: Residential Environments and Public Policy*. New York: Plenum, 1984. Print.
- Ben-Joseph, Eran. *The Code of the City: Standards and the Hidden Language of Place Making*. Cambridge, MA: MIT, 2005. Print.
- California. San Francisco Planning Department. *Mission Street Study Update--DRAFT Alternatives for Public Comment*. By Claudia Flores and Sarah Dennis. San Francisco, 2009. Print.
- "Californio Ranchos to Cosmopolitan Neighborhood." *KQED*. PBS Online. Web. 31 Oct. 2011. <<http://www.kqed.org/w/hood/mission/ranchostocosmos.html>>.
- Craig, William J., Trevor M. Harris, and Daniel Weiner. *Community Participation and Geographic Information Systems*. New York: Taylor & Francis, 2002. Print.
- "Earthquake and Fire Impact the Mission." *KQED*. PBS Online. Web. 31 Oct. 2011. <<http://www.kqed.org/w/hood/mission/earthquakefire.html>>.

- "East SoMa (South of Market) Area Plan." *San Francisco General Plan*. San Francisco Planning Department. Web. 05 Dec. 2011. <http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/general_plan/East_SoMa.htm>.
- Evangelista, Benny. "Twitter Signs Lease for Headquarters in Mid-Market." *Www.SFGate.com*. 23 Apr. 2011. Web. 15 Mar. 2012. <<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2011/04/22/BUAF1J63D4.DTL>>.
- Evangelista, Benny. "Zynga Agrees to Buy SF Headquarters for \$228 Million." *SF Gate*. 5 Mar. 2012. Web. 15 Mar. 2012. <<http://blog.sfgate.com/techchron/2012/03/05/zynga-agrees-to-buy-sf-headquarters-for-228-million/>>.
- Freeman, Lance. *There Goes the 'hood: Views of Gentrification From the Ground Up*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple UP, 2006.
- Godfrey, BJ (07/31/1997). "Urban Development and Redevelopment in San Francisco". *Geographical review* (0016-7428), 87 (3), p. 309.
- Hackworth, J. and Smith, N. (2001), *The Changing State of Gentrification*. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 92: 464–477.
- Harvey, David. "Contested Cities: Social Processes and Spatial Form." *Transforming Cities* (1997). Rpt. in *The City Reader*. Ed. Richard T. LeGates and Frederic Stout. New York: Routledge, 2011. 230-37. Print.
- "HOPE VI in San Francisco." *SPUR*. San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association, Mar. 2005. Web. 14 Apr. 2012. <<http://www.spur.org/publications/library/article/HOPEVIinsf03012005>>.

- "Housing for Low-Income Adults and Families." *Human Services Agency*. San Francisco, 2008. Web. 13 Apr. 2012. <<http://www.sfhsa.org/91.htm>>.
- "Information Section-8." *SFHA*. San Francisco Housing Authority. Web. 14 Apr. 2012. <<http://www.sfha.org/Information--Section-8.html>>.
- "Interview with Nancy Mirabal." E-mail interview. 12 Jan. 2012.
- Jackson, Kenneth T. "The Drive-In Culture of Contemporary America." *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States* (1985). Rpt. in *The City Reader*. Ed. Richard T. LeGates and Frederic Stout. New York: Routledge, 2011. 65-74. Print.
- Jacobs, Jane. "The Uses of Sidewalks: Safety." 1961. *The City Reader*. Ed. Richard T. LeGates and Frederic Stout. 5th ed. York: Routledge, 2011. 104-09. Print.
- Kaiser, Edward J., and David R. Godschalk. "Twentieth-Century Land Use Planning." *Journal of the American Planning Association*. APA, 1995. Print. *The City Reader*. Ed. Richard T. LeGates and Frederic Stout. New York: Routledge, 2011. 399-420.
- Kiser, Rob. *Osage Alley in the Mission District*. 2011. Photograph. San Francisco. *Peenie Weenie*. 26 July 2011. Web. 14 Apr. 2012. <<http://www.peeniewallie.com/2011/07/san-francisco-m.html>>.
- Koskey, Andrea. "Salesforce Backs Out of Mission Bay Campus." *San Francisco Examiner*. 27 Feb. 2012. Web. 15 Mar. 2012. <<http://www.sfexaminer.com/local/2012/02/salesforce-backs-out-mission-bay-campus>>.

La Pachuquita. "Are Trustifarians Endangered? We Can Only Hope...." Web log post.

MAC SF. Mission Anti-Displacement Coalition, 19 June 2009. Web. 10 Mar. 2012. <<http://missionantidisplacement.blogspot.com/2009/06/are-trustifarians-endangered-we-can.html>>.

"La Tierra." *Mission Neighborhood Centers*. Web. 01 Mar. 2012.

<http://www.mncsf.org/la_tierra.html>.

Lagos, Marisa. "Calif. Wins OK to Abolish Redevelopment Agencies."

Www.SFGate.com. 30 Dec. 2011. Web. 08 Mar. 2012.

<<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2011/12/30/MN6R1MI73D.DTL>>.

Lees, Loretta. "Super-Gentrification: The Case of Brooklyn Heights, New York

City." *Urban Studies* 40.12 (2003): 2487-509. Print.

Lees, Loretta, Tom Slater, and Elvin K. Wyly. *Gentrification*. New York:

Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group, 2008. Print.

Lefebvre, Henri. "Reflections on the Politics Of Space." Trans. Michael J. Enders.

Antipode 8.2 (1976): 30-37. *Online Library*. Wiley, 29 May 2006. Web. 9 Apr. 2012. <<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8330.1976.tb00636.x/abstract>>.

Liebmann, George W. "Modernization of Zoning." *Regulation* 21996: 71-78. *Cato*

Institute. Web. 11 Apr. 2012.

<www.cato.org/pubs/regulation/regv19n2/v19n2-8.pdf>.

"Local Land Use Law Firm Reviews the Western SoMa Plan." Web blog post. *SoMa*

Leadership Council. 24 Oct. 2011. Web. 25 Mar. 2012.

<<http://somaleadership.org/2011/10/24/local-land-use-law-firm-reviews-the-western-soma-plan/>>.

Legorreta and Legorreta. *Salesforce Mission Bay Campus Rendering*. Photograph. San Francisco. *Huffington Post*. 28 Feb. 2012. Web. 1 Mar. 2012.

<http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/02/28/salesforce-san-francisco-mission-bay_n_1307149.html?ref=san-francisco#s599078>.

Merriam, Dwight H., David J. Brower, and Philip D. Tegeler. *Inclusionary Zoning Moves Downtown*. Washington, D.C.: Planners, American Planning Association, 1985. Print.

Mirabal, Nancy R. "Gentrification in San Francisco's Mission District." *Cesar Chavez Institute*. San Francisco State University, 22 Oct. 2010. Web. 21 Oct. 2011.

<<http://cci.sfsu.edu/taxonomy/term/103>>.

Mirabal, Nancy R. "Geographies of Displacement: Latina/os, Oral History, and The Politics of Gentrification in San Francisco's Mission District." *The Public Historian* 31.2 (2009): 7-31. *JSTOR*. Web. 7 Dec. 2011.

<<http://www.jstor.org/stable/40271441>>.

Mission St. San Francisco, CA. 2012. Photograph. Google Maps, San Francisco.

Web. 15 Apr 2012. <<http://maps.google.com/>>.

"Mission Streetscape Plan." *City Design Group*. San Francisco Planning Department,

Oct. 2010. Web. 03 Nov. 2011. <[http://www.sf-](http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/CDG/CDG_mission_streetscape.htm)

[planning.org/ftp/CDG/CDG_mission_streetscape.htm](http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/CDG/CDG_mission_streetscape.htm)>.

- Nieves, Evelyn. "In Old Mission District, Changing Grit to Gold." *New York Times* 21 Jan. 1999. Web. 14 Jan. 2012. <<http://www.nytimes.com/1999/01/21/us/in-old-mission-district-changing-grit-to-gold.html?pagewanted=all&src=pm>>.
- Nevius, C.W. "SoMa Gentrification: Model for New SF." *SFGate*. San Francisco Chronicle, 9 Oct. 2009. Web. 21 Oct. 2011. <<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2011/03/24/BAFE1II5UI.DTL>>.
- Nevius, C. W. "Twitter Would Move Tenderloin Forward." *SFGate*. San Francisco Chronicle, 24 Mar. 2011. Web. 4 Oct. 2011. <<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2011/03/24/BAFE1II5UI.DTL>>.
- Olivia, Paul V. "Redevelopment Salvaged, Redefined S.F. Waterfront." *SFGate*. San Francisco Chronicle, 28 Jan. 2012. Web. 20 Mar. 2012. <<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2012/01/27/DDBU1MVJ4E.DTL>>.
- On the Issues. *Maestrapeace*. 1995. Photograph. San Francisco. *On the Issues Magazine*. Winter 1995. Web. 14 Apr. 2012. <http://www.ontheissuesmagazine.com/1995winter/win95_scott.php>.
- "Projects." *San Francisco Community Land Trust*. Web. 29 Mar. 2012. <<http://www.sfclt.org/about-sfclt-mainmenu-34/projects-mainmenu-35>>.
- "Project Overview." *SFMTA Central Subway*. SFMTA. Web. 19 Mar. 2012. <<http://centralsubwaysf.com/content/project-overview>>.
- Putnam, Robert D. "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital." *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon

- & Schuster, 2000. Print. *The City Reader*. Ed. Richard T. LeGates and Frederic Stout. New York: Routledge, 2011. 134-42.
- Rybczynski, Witold. *Makeshift Metropolis: Ideas About Cities*. New York: Scribner, 2010. Print.
- Sadovi, Maura W. "Tech Meets Tenderloin." *The Wall Street Journal*. 20 July 2011. Web. 21 Oct. 2011. <<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304567604576454944068058726.html>>
- "San Francisco, California." *City Data*. Web. 01 Mar. 2012. <<http://www.city-data.com/city/San-Francisco-California.html>>.
- San Francisco Board of Supervisors. "District 6." Map. *Wikipedia*. Web. 12 Apr. 2012. <<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:SFSupervisorDistrict6.svg>>.
- San Francisco Board of Supervisors. "District 9." Map. *Wikipedia*. Web. 12 Apr. 2012. <<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:SFSupervisorDistrict9.svg>>.
- San Francisco Planning Department. *Better Streets Plan*. *SF Planning*. 16 Jan. 2011. Web. 23 Feb. 2012. <http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/BetterStreets/proposals.htm#Final_Plan>.
- San Francisco Planning Department. *The Mission District Streetscape Plan: Draft Document*. *San Francisco Planning Department*. Oct. 2011. Web. 3 Nov. 2011. <<http://www.sf-planning.org/>>.
- San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. *Redevelopment Plan for the South of Market Redevelopment Project Area*. (San Francisco, 2005), 4.

- Selna, Robert. "Anti-gentrification Forces Stymie Housing Development." *San Francisco Chronicle*. 21 Aug. 2007. Web. 3 Mar. 2012.
<<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2007/08/21/BAFARK1GE.DTL>>.
- SF Examiner Editorial. "Redevelopment Is Still Important Without Agency." *San Francisco Examiner*. 22 Jan. 2012. Web. 14 Mar. 2012.
<<http://www.sfexaminer.com/opinion/editorials/2012/01/redevelopment-still-important-without-agency>>.
- Smith, Neil. "Gentrification, the Frontier, and the Restructuring of Urban Space." *The Dictionary of Human Geography* (2000). Rpt. in *The Urban Geography Reader*. Ed. Nicholas R. Fyfe and Judith T. Kenny. New York: Routledge, 2005. 260-75. Print.
- "SOMA/South Beach (District 9) Street Map." Map. *Zephyr SoMa*. Zephyr Real Estate. Web. 23 Mar. 2012. <http://www.zephyrsoma.com/soma_sobe.php>.
- "South Of Market (SOMA) Neighborhood in San Francisco, California (CA), 94103 Detailed Profile." *City-data.com*. Web. 15 Mar. 2012. <<http://www.city-data.com/neighborhood/South-Of-Market-San-Francisco-CA.html>>.
- "Tool Name: Inclusionary Zoning." *Lancaster County Smart Growth Toolbox*. Envision Lancaster County, 27 July 2009. Web. 5 Oct. 2011.
<<http://www.co.lancaster.pa.us/toolbox/cwp/view.asp?a=3&q=625866>>.
- Town Me. "Yuppie Map of San Francisco." Map. *The Map Scroll*. 9 July 2012. Web. 12 Apr. 2012. <http://mapscroll.blogspot.com/2009_07_01_archive.html>.

- "The Story Of The Mission District." *KQED*. PBS Online. Web. 31 Oct. 2011.
<<http://www.kqed.org/w/hood/mission/thestory.html>>.
- "Timeline." *SFMTA Central Subway*. SFMTA. Web. 19 Mar. 2012.
<<http://centralsubwaysf.com/content/timeline>>.
- Western SoMa Citizens Planning Task Force. *DRAFT-Western SoMa Community Stabilization Policy*. 31 May 2011. San Francisco.
- Wildermuth, John. "Giants' Mission Rock Plan Is in City's Ballpark." *SFGate*. San Francisco Chronicle, 4 Apr. 2012. Web. 5 Apr. 2012.
<<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2012/04/03/MNUS1NUA5G.DTL>>.
- Wildermuth, John. "SF Backs Mission Rock Development Plan by Giants." *SFGate*. San Francisco Chronicle, 5 Apr. 2012. Web. 5 Apr. 2012.
<<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2012/04/04/BAAB1NUS9F.DTL>>.
- Wilson, William Julius. "From Institutional to Jobless Ghettos." *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor*. New York: Knopf, 1996. Print. *The City Reader*. Ed. Richard T. LeGates and Frederic Stout. New York: Routledge, 2011. 117-126.
- Worth, Katie. "San Francisco Neighborhoods Have Changed Faces Over Two Decades." *San Francisco Examiner*. 20 Mar. 2011. Web. 5 Dec. 2011.
<<http://www.sfexaminer.com/local/development/2011/03/san-francisco-neighborhoods-have-changed-faces-over-last-two-decades>>.