

Supervisors to Ponder Definition of a Family

The Board of Supervisors, apparently roused to action by the Delancey Street controversy in Pacific Heights, has tackled the thorny problem of defining a family for purposes of residential zoning.

Supervisor Dianne Feinstein announced yesterday that her Planning and Development Committee will hold a special hearing on the question at City Hall on May 15.

The committee, whose other members are Supervisors Robert Gonzales and Dorothy von Beroldingen, will hear public arguments and prepare a proposed amendment to the City Planning Code for consideration by the full board.

At present, the Planning Code gives a very simple definition of "family" to determine who may live in a single-family housing unit: "One or more persons occupying the premises and living therein as a single and separate housekeeping unit."

AMENDMENT

Before Mrs. Feinstein's committee will be an amendment which was first proposed by the city's planning department in 1968.

Under the amendment, a family would be defined as "one person or two or more persons related by blood, marriage or adoption or by legal guardianship pursuant to court order, plus necessary domestic servants and not more than three roomers or borders."

An alternative definition under the amendment would be "a group of not more than five persons unrelated by blood, marriage or adoption."

CENTER

Although the proposed amendment has never been acted upon by supervisors, it has been used as a guideline by the city zoning administrator's office, and was the basis of a "cease and desist" order issued earlier this year against the Delancey Street Foundation.

The foundation operates a rehabilitation center for former drug addicts, ex-convicts and probationers in two Pacific Heights mansions. The city has ordered Delancey Street to move most of its people out of the mansions by April 28 on grounds that the operation violates single-family zoning. The foundation has said it would appeal the order to Superior Court.

The old planning department proposal was brought out of mothballs on March 5, when Supervisor Quentin Kopp called it up before the full Board of Supervisors. The board then referred it back to the Planning and Development Committee for action.

Mrs. Feinstein said yesterday that her committee would not limit its study to the planning department's amendment, but would listen to all proposals.