

Discretionary Review Abbreviated Analysis

HEARING DATE: JULY 9, 2015

| Date: | July 2, 2015 |
|---------------------|--|
| Case No.: | 2008.0645D |
| Project Address: | 7 LAKE FOREST COURT |
| Permit Application: | 2007.11.05.7258 |
| Zoning: | RH-1(D) [Residential House, One-Family (Detached)] |
| | 40-X Height and Bulk District |
| Block/Lot: | 2675/028 |
| Project Sponsor: | Amir Afifi |
| | SIA Consulting Corporation |
| | 1256 Howard Street |
| | San Francisco, CA 94103 |
| Staff Contact: | Andrew Perry – (415) 575-9017 |
| | Andrew.Perry@sfgov.org |
| Recommendation: | Do not take DR and approve as proposed |

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

Reception: 415.558.6378

Fax: 415.558.6409

Planning Information: 415.558.6377

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposal is to construct a new third story vertical addition over an existing two-story, single-family home, which would add approximately 830 square feet of habitable space. There is also a proposed deck at the rear of the house over the second story roof. The third-story addition is set back from the front building wall by 15 feet, and is set back from the side property line (along Oak Park Dr.) by 3 feet. Although there is no additional setback for the third level along the shared side property line with 15 Lake Forest Court, there is an existing separation between the buildings of approximately 7 feet.

SITE DESCRIPTION AND PRESENT USE

The project site is located on Lot 028 in Assessor's Block 2675 on the northwest side of Lake Forest Court, at the intersection with Oak Park Drive. The project site is on a relatively level lot, with a slight lateral slope, measuring approximately 24 feet wide and 90 feet deep, with a listed parcel area of 2,962 square feet in the Assessor's database. The existing building was constructed in 1961, and is two-stories with one unit and a two-car garage.

SURROUNDING PROPERTIES AND NEIGHBORHOOD

The building immediately to the right (northeast) is another two-story, single-family dwelling with twocar garage, on roughly the same size lot. On the subject block face, and in the surrounding neighborhood as a whole, there is a very defined and uniform character of two-story buildings with two-car garages. However, due to topography in the area, there are some examples of buildings that are two stories along one particular street frontage, but appear as a three-story building along another frontage, usually at the rear. The subject block and surrounding neighborhood, within 300 feet of the project site, is uniformly zoned RH-1(D). The neighborhood is situated between two swaths of Public zoned land – the Laguna Honda Reservoir and Mount Sutro.

BUILDING PERMIT NOTIFICATION

| ТҮРЕ | REQUIRED PERIOD | NOTIFICATION DATES | DR FILE DATE | DR HEARING DATE | FILING TO HEARING TIME |
|---------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| 311 Notice | 30 days | May 9, 2008 – June 8, 2008 | May 30, 2008 | DR never heard | 2596 days (7 years, 1 |
| 311 Notice | 30 days | March 10, 2015 – April 9, 2015 | No New DRs filed | July 9, 2015 | month, 9 days) |

The project was originally sent out for Sec. 311 notification in May 2008 and a Discretionary Review was filed before the notice expired. The project was reviewed by the Residential Design Team at that time, however the project never went to a hearing before the Commission and was inactive until 2015. The project was noticed for a new 30-day period under Sec. 311 and no additional DRs were filed. However, the original DR was still active, so the project went back to the Residential Design Team and scheduled for a hearing on July 9, 2015.

HEARING NOTIFICATION

| ТҮРЕ | REQUIRED PERIOD | REQUIRED NOTICE DATE | ACTUAL NOTICE DATE | ACTUAL PERIOD |
|---------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| Posted Notice | 10 days | June 29, 2015 | June 29, 2015 | 10 days |
| Mailed Notice | 10 days | June 29, 2015 | June 26, 2015 | 13 days |

PUBLIC COMMENT

| | SUPPORT | OPPOSED | NO POSITION |
|--------------------------|---------|------------------|-------------|
| Adjacent neighbor(s) | | 1 (DR Requestor) | |
| Other neighbors on the | | | |
| block or directly across | | 13 | |
| the street | | | |
| Neighborhood groups | | | |

The comments received from other neighbors have been uniformly opposed to the project, primarily on the grounds that the third-story vertical addition would drastically alter the character of the neighborhood, and would set a precedent allowing others in the neighborhood to also expand. In turn, this would cause an increase in density to the neighborhood, potentially facilitating the creation of illegal second units and causing issues with limited off-street parking.

DR REQUESTOR

Kathleen Ue of 15 Lake Forest Court, located immediately adjacent to the right (northeast) of the subject property.

DR REQUESTOR'S CONCERNS AND PROPOSED ALTERNATIVES

Issue #1: The vertical addition of the project will block the southwest sunlight into the 2nd floor bedroom and kitchen, and the ground floor family room of the DR requestor's home. Currently, the DR requestor receives full afternoon sunlight to these rooms, representing about half of their total living area. The vertical addition would allow no sunlight to enter and result in an increase in heating and lighting costs.

Issue #2: The windows of the vertical addition and deck at the rear over the second story will allow for viewing into the DR requestor's bedroom, kitchen, and backyard, representing an invasion of privacy.

Issue #3: The need for curbside parking will naturally increase for a 5-bedroom home, as compared to a 3-bedroom unit. The subject property is located at the intersection of three graded slopes and a cul-de-sac, making parking even more difficult in practice.

Issue #4: A three-story house and an expanded second floor will extraordinarily change the character of a two-story home neighborhood. There are no homes on Lake Forest Court or on Oak Park Drive from Christopher Dr. to Devonshire Way which have three stories.

See attached Discretionary Review Application, dated May 30, 2008, for more information.

PROJECT SPONSOR'S RESPONSE TO DR APPLICATION

The project sponsor is proposing a modest addition to the home in order to accommodate a growing family, with elderly parents moving in and more young children. The project sponsor has shown a willingness to modify the project at the request of the Planning Department, in order to align with Residential Design Guidelines and not cause significant impacts to the adjacent neighbors. The neighbors would only accept a complete removal of the proposed third story, and this effectively eliminates the project's goals.

See attached Response to Discretionary Review, dated June 19, 2015, for more information.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The Department has determined that the proposed project is exempt/excluded from environmental review, pursuant to CEQA Guideline Section 15301 (Class One - Minor Alteration of Existing Facility, (e) Additions to existing structures provided that the addition will not result in an increase of more than 10,000 square feet).

RESIDENTIAL DESIGN TEAM REVIEW

The Residential Design Team (RDT) found that the proposed project meets the standards of the Residential Design Guidelines (RDGs) and that the project does not present any exceptional or extraordinary circumstances. The project provides adequate setbacks from the adjacent building and is within the RH-1(D) district, which minimizes concerns over blocking of sunlight. The deck is set back

Discretionary Review – Abbreviated Analysis July 2, 2015

from the side property lines and is oriented toward the subject property's rear yard; privacy is achieved within thresholds to be expected for dense City environments. Parking and traffic is not addressed by the RDGs, however, the project is compliant with the Planning Code and no additional off-street parking is required. Lastly, the RDGs support the vertical addition, as appropriate setbacks have been provided and taller buildings can be accommodated at corner lots.

Under the Commission's pending DR Reform Legislation, this project <u>would not</u> be referred to the Commission as this project does not contain or create any exceptional or extraordinary circumstances.

RECOMMENDATION: Do not take DR and approve project as proposed

Attachments: Block Book Map Sanborn Map Zoning Map Aerial Photographs Context Photographs Section 311 Notice (2008 Notice) Section 311 Notice (2015 Notice) DR Application dated May 30, 2008 Response to DR Application dated June 19, 2015 Exhibit A – 3D rendering Exhibit B – Neighborhood examples of 3-story buildings Reduced Plans Letters of Opposition from Neighbors

AP: G:\Plan Checks\7 Lake Forest Ct\7_Lake Forest Court_DR - Abbreviated Analysis.doc



Sanborn Map*



* The Sanborn Maps in San Francisco hae not been updated since 1998, and this map may not accurately reflect existing conditions.

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Zoning Map



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Aerial Photo (looking north)



SAN FRANCISCO Planning department





Aerial Photo (looking east)



Site Photo (at Lake Forest Court and Oak Park Drive, looking northwest)



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT



1650 Mission Street Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

NOTICE OF BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION (SECTION 311)

On November 5, 2007, the Applicant named below filed Building Permit Application No. 2007.11.05.7258 (Alteration) with the City and County of San Francisco.

| | CONTACT INFORMATION | PROJECT | SITE INFORMATION |
|--|--|--|--|
| Applicant: Address: City, State: Telephone: | Justin Tin 7 Lake Forest Court San Francisco, CA 94131 415.368.1295 | Project Address: Cross Street: Assessor's Block /Lot #: Zoning District: Height-Bulk District: | 7 Lake Forest Court Oak Park Drive 2675/028 RH-1(D) 40-X |

Under San Francisco Planning Code Section 311, you, as a property owner or resident within 150 feet of this proposed project, are being notified of this Building Permit Application. You are not obligated to take any action. For more information regarding the proposed work, or to express concerns about the project, please contact the Applicant above or the Planner named below as soon as possible. If your concerns are unresolved, you can request the Planning Commission to use its discretionary powers to review this application at a public hearing. Applications requesting a Discretionary Review hearing must be filed during the 30-day review period, prior to the close of business on the Expiration Date shown below, or the next business day if that date is on a week-end or a legal holiday. If no Requests for Discretionary Review are filed, this project will be approved by the Planning Department after the Expiration Date.

| | PROJECT SCOPE | |
|--|--------------------------------|--|
| [] DEMOLITION and/or | [] NEW CONSTRUCTION or | [X] ALTERATION |
| [X] VERTICAL EXTENSION | [] CHANGE # OF DWELLING UNITS | [X] FACADE ALTERATION(S) |
| [] HORIZ. EXTENSION (FRONT) | [] HORIZ. EXTENSION (SIDE) | [] HORIZ. EXTENSION (REAR) |
| PROJECT FEATURES | EXISTING CONDITION | PROPOSED CONDITION |
| SIDE SETBACK (OF VERTICAL ADDITI REAR YARD HEIGHT OF BUILDING NUMBER OF STORIES NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS | ±67 feet, 6 inches ON) N/A | At least ±3 feet No Change ±29 feet, 6 inches (avg.) 3 No Change |

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposal is to construct a third-story addition to an existing two-story, single-family dwelling. New vertical addition will be setback at least 24 feet from the front property line, and will increase the height of the existing dwelling by approximately 8 feet, 6 inches.

| PLANNER'S NAME: | Adrian C. Putra |
|-----------------|------------------------|
| PHONE NUMBER: | (415) 575-9079 |
| EMAIL: | adrian.putra@sfgov.org |

DATE OF THIS NOTICE:

EXPIRATION DATE:

5/09/2008 6/08/2008



1650 Mission Street Suite 400 San Francisco. CA 94103

NOTICE OF BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION (SECTION 311)

On November 5, 2007, the Applicant named below filed Building Permit Application No. 2007.11.05.7258 with the City and County of San Francisco.

| PROPERTY INFORMATION | | APPL | APPLICANT INFORMATION | |
|----------------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------------------|--|
| Project Address: | 7 Lake Forest Court | Applicant: | Aidin Massoudi | |
| Cross Street(s): | Oak Park Drive | Address: | 1256 Howard St. | |
| Block/Lot No.: | 2675/028 | City, State: | San Francisco, CA 94103 | |
| Zoning District(s): | RH-1(D) / 40-X | Telephone: | (415) 922-0200 x 105 | |

You are receiving this notice as a property owner or resident within 150 feet of the proposed project. You are not required to take any action. For more information about the proposed project, or to express concerns about the project, please contact the Applicant listed above or the Planner named below as soon as possible. If you believe that there are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances associated with the project, you may request the Planning Commission to use its discretionary powers to review this application at a public hearing. Applications requesting a Discretionary Review hearing must be filed during the 30-day review period, prior to the close of business on the Expiration Date shown below, or the next business day if that date is on a week-end or a legal holiday. If no Requests for Discretionary Review are filed, this project will be approved by the Planning Department after the Expiration Date.

Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Commission or the Department. All written or oral communications, including submitted personal contact information, may be made available to the public for inspection and copying upon request and may appear on the Department's website or in other public documents.

| PROJECT SCOPE | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| Demolition | New Construction | □ Alteration | | |
| Change of Use | Façade Alteration(s) | Front Addition | | |
| Rear Addition | □ Side Addition | Vertical Addition | | |
| PROJECT FEATURES | EXISTING | PROPOSED | | |
| Building Height | ~21 feet | ~30 feet | | |
| Number of Stories | 2 | 3 | | |
| Number of Dwelling Units | 1 | No Change | | |
| | | | | |

The proposal is to construct a third story vertical addition with a new roof deck at the rear of the house, over an existing two-story, single-family home. The addition will add approximately 830sf of habitable space to the home. This project was previously noticed from 5/9/2008 - 6/8/2008, however must be renoticed given the length of time that has elapsed since that original notice. There is currently an active Discretionary Review case filed against the project, filed in 2008 during the original notification period. This second notification will allow neighbors to file additional Discretionary Reviews, should there be additional concerns, however this project will appear before the Plannig Commission regardless, at a future hearing date, which will receive separate notice. See attached plans.

The issuance of the building permit by the Department of Building Inspection or the Planning Commission project approval at a discretionary review hearing would constitute as the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

For more information, please contact Planning Department staff:

| Planner: | Andrew Perry |
|------------|------------------------|
| Telephone: | (415) 575-9017 |
| E-mail: | andrew.perry@sfgov.org |

Notice Date: **Expiration Date:**

GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT PROCEDURES

Reduced copies of the proposed project plans have been included in this mailing for your information. If you have questions about the plans, please contact the project Applicant listed on the front of this notice. You may wish to discuss the plans with your neighbors or neighborhood association, as they may already be aware of the project. If you have general questions about the Planning Department's review process, please contact the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, 1st Floor (415/558-6377) between 8:00am - 5:00pm Monday-Friday. If you have specific questions about the proposed project, you should contact the planner listed on the front of this notice.

If you believe that the impact on you from the proposed project is significant and you wish to seek to change the project, there are several procedures you may use. We strongly urge that steps 1 and 2 be taken.

- 1. Request a meeting with the project Applicant to get more information and to explain the project's impact on you.
- 2. Contact the nonprofit organization Community Boards at (415) 920-3820, or online at <u>www.communityboards.org</u> for a facilitated discussion in a safe and collaborative environment. Community Boards acts as a neutral third party and has, on many occasions, helped reach mutually agreeable solutions.
- 3. Where you have attempted, through the use of the above steps or other means, to address potential problems without success, please contact the planner listed on the front of this notice to discuss your concerns.

If, after exhausting the procedures outlined above, you still believe that exceptional and extraordinary circumstances exist, you have the option to request that the Planning Commission exercise its discretionary powers to review the project. These powers are reserved for use in exceptional and extraordinary circumstances for projects which generally conflict with the City's General Plan and the Priority Policies of the Planning Code; therefore the Commission exercises its discretion with utmost restraint. This procedure is called Discretionary Review. If you believe the project warrants Discretionary Review by the Planning Commission, **you must file a Discretionary Review application prior to the Expiration Date shown on the front of this notice.** Discretionary Review applications are available at the Planning Information Center (PIC), 1660 Mission Street, 1st Floor, or online at <u>www.sfplanning.org</u>). You must submit the application in person at the Planning Information Center (PIC) between 8:00am - 5:00pm Monday-Friday, with all required materials and a check payable to the Planning Department. To determine the fee for a Discretionary Review, please refer to the Planning Department Fee Schedule available at <u>www.sfplanning.org</u>. If the project includes multiple building permits, i.e. demolition and new construction, a <u>separate request</u> for Discretionary Review must be submitted, with all required materials and fee, for <u>each</u> permit that you feel will have an impact on you. Incomplete applications will not be accepted.

If no Discretionary Review Applications have been filed within the Notification Period, the Planning Department will approve the application and forward it to the Department of Building Inspection for its review.

BOARD OF APPEALS

An appeal of the Planning Commission's decision on a Discretionary Review case may be made to the **Board of Appeals within 15 calendar days after the building permit is issued** (or denied) by the Department of Building Inspection. Appeals must be submitted in person at the Board's office at 1650 Mission Street, 3rd Floor, Room 304. For further information about appeals to the Board of Appeals, including current fees, contact the Board of Appeals at (415) 575-6880.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

This project has undergone preliminary review pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). If, as part of this process, the Department's Environmental Review Officer has deemed this project to be exempt from further environmental review, an exemption determination has been prepared and can be obtained through the Exemption Map, on-line, at <u>www.sfplanning.org</u>. An appeal of the decision **to exempt the proposed project from CEQA may be made to the Board of Supervisors within 30 calendar days** after the project approval action identified on the determination. The procedures for filing an appeal of an exemption determination are available from the Clerk of the Board at City Hall, Room 244, or by calling (415) 554-5184.

Under CEQA, in a later court challenge, a litigant may be limited to raising only those issues previously raised at a hearing on the project or in written correspondence delivered to the Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, Planning Department or other City board, commission or department at, or prior to, such hearing, or as part of the appeal hearing process on the CEQA decision.

APPLICATION REQUESTING DISCRETIONARY REVIEW ("D.R.")

This application is for projects where there are exceptional and extraordinary circumstances that justify further consideration, even though the project already meets requirements of the Planning Code, City General Plan and Priority Policies of the Planning Code.

| D.R. Applicant's Name_ | KATHLEEN UE | Telephone No: <u>415-564-9</u> 039 |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|
| D.R. Applicant's Addres | SS 15 LAKE FOREST CT. | |
| | Number & Street | (Apt. #) 94/3/ |
| | City | Zip Code |
| | | IN SIT 511 Pasa |

D.R. Applicant's telephone number (for Planning Department to contact): <u>4/5.364.7037</u> If you are acting as the agent for another person(s) in making this request please indicate the name and address of that person(s) (if applicable):

Name__

Telephone No:

Address_

Number & Street

Zip Code

(Apt. #)

NO G

NO G

08.0645D

Address of the property that you are requesting the Commission consider under the Discretionary Review: 7 LAKE FOREST CT., SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94131

Name and phone number of the property owner who is doing the project on which you are requesting D.R.: <u>JUSTIN</u> <u>TIN</u>, <u>415</u>, <u>368</u>, <u>1295</u>

Building Permit Application Number of the project for which you are requesting D.R.: <u>203</u>.11.05.7258

City

Where is your property located in relation to the permit applicant's property? I AM THE NEXT DOOR NEIGHBOR. MY PROPERTY IS ON THE NORTHEAST SIDE of THE PERMIT APPLICANT'S PROPERTY.

A. ACTIONS PRIOR TO A DISCRETIONARY REVIEW REQUEST Citizens should make very effort to resolve disputes before requesting D.R. Listed below are a variety of ways and resources to help this happen.

- 1. Have you discussed this project with the permit applicant? (YES)G
- 2. Did you discuss the project with the Planning Department permit review planner? (YES) G NO G SEE ATTACHMENT PAGE / SECTION AZ.

1

Did you participate in outside mediation on this case? Community Board G Other G 3. SEE ATTACHMENT PI SECTION A3.

4. If you have discussed the project with the applicant, planning staff or gone thorough mediation, please summarize the results, including any changes that were made to the proposed project so far.

B. DISCRETIONARY REVIEW REQUEST

1. What are the reasons for requesting Discretionary Review? The project meets the minimum standards of the Planning Code. What are the exceptional and extraordinary circumstances that justify Discretionary Review of the project? How does the project conflict with the City's General Plan or the Planning Code's Priority Policies?

| SEE ATTACHMENT PAGE 1.2 SECTION BI. a. BLOCKING of DIRECT SWUGHT | |
|---|--|
| a BLOCKING of DIRECT STULLEHT | |
| b. INVASION OF DRIVACY | |
| C. INCREASE DARKING AND TRAFFIC ISSUES. | |
| d. CHANGING NEIGHOR HOOD CHARACTER. | |

PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT DAG ASECTION BI FOR DETAILS.

2. If you believe your property, the property of others or the neighborhood would be adversely affected, please state who would be affected, and how:

SEE ATTACHNENT PAGE 2,3 SECTION Ba INCLUDING MY PROPERTY. THERE WILL BE TO HOMES THAT WILL BE AFFECTED PLEASE SET ATTACHMENT DAGE 2, 3 SECTION B2 FOR DETRILS.

3. What alternatives or changes to the proposed project, beyond the changes (if any) already made would respond to the exceptional and extraordinary circumstances and reduce the adverse effects noted above (in question B1)?

ELIMINATION of THE 3 Nd FLOOR ADDITION WILL REDUCE ADVERSE EFFECTS ON MY PROPERTY AND THE NEIGHBOR'S

Please write (in ink) or type your answers on this form. Please feel free to attach additional sheets to this form to continue with any additional information that does not fit on this form.

CHECKLIST FOR APPLICANT:

Indicate which of the following are included with this Application:

REQUIRED:



Check made payable to Planning Department (see current fee schedule).

Address list for nearby property owners, in label format, plus photocopy of labels.

Letter of authorization for representative/agent of D.R. applicant (if applicable).

Photocopy of this completed application.

OPTIONAL:



Photographs that illustrate your concerns.

Covenants or Deed Restrictions.

Other Items (specify).

File this objection in person at the Planning Information Center. If you have questions about this form, please contact Information Center Staff from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday to Friday.

Plan to attend the Planning Commission public hearing which must be scheduled after the close of the public notification period for the permit.

Signed Kathleen Ue 5-30-2008 Applicant Date

N:\applicat\drapp.doc

А.

ACTION PRIOR TO A DISCRETIONARY REVIEW REQUEST Citizens should make very effort to resolve disputes before requesting D.R. Listed below are a variety of ways and resources to help this happen.

I OF 5

1. Have you discussed this project with the permit applicant?

Yes.

2. Did you discuss the project with the Planning Department permit review planner?

Yes.

On May 21, 2008 I called and talked to Mr. Adrian Putra, the Planning Department permit review planner. The subject matter covered sunlight blocking, traffic and parking, privacy, and the impact on the character of the neighborhood. In our discussion, suggestions were made by Mr. Putra and me as alterations to the proposed plan but both Mr. Putra and I could not agree upon any alterations that were suggested.

3. Did you participate in outside mediation on this case?

No.

As a result of the 5/21/2008 discussion, Mr. Putra suggested to request for a discretionary review.

4. If you have discussed the project with the application with the applicant, planning staff or gone thorough mediation, please summarize the results, including any changes that were made to the proposed project so far.

On October 27, 2007 the applicant, Mr. Justin Tin held an open house in which he displayed his preliminary plan for his remodeling. At this point, no documents had been filed to the Planning Department. During this open house, I voiced my concern about the third floor addition to the applicant, Mr. Tin. In the current version of Mr. Tin's application (dated 4/21/08), none of my concerns were addressed. According to my conversation with Mr. Putra on May 21, 2008, one 3^{rd} floor window in the original plan has been eliminated from the northeast side of applicant's building.

- B. DISCRETIONARY REVIEW REQUEST
 - 1. What are the reasons for requesting Discretionary Review? The project meets the minimum standards of the Planning Code. What are the exceptional and extraordinary circumstances that justify Discretionary

08.0645D

Requesting Discretionary Review of: 7 Lake Forest Court

Review of the project? How does the project conflict with the City's General Plan or the Planning Code's Priority Policies?

- a. Blocking of direct sunlight: The applicant's plans propose an 8 foot 6 inch, 3rd floor addition to his home. This addition will block the southwest sunlight into my 2nd floor bedroom, kitchen, and most importantly, my ground floor family room, and the laundry area. Currently I receive a full afternoon of direct sunlight in these rooms which represent approximately 1/2 of my total living area. This is an exceptional and extraordinary circumstance that an 8 foot 6 inch vertical addition would allow no sunlight to enter any of the four windows on the southwest side of my home in the winter. One of the immediate impacts on me, a retiree, will be the increase of heating and lighting cost.
- b. *Invasion of privacy:* The 3rd floor Roof Deck and windows of the addition provide direct viewing of my bedroom, kitchen and back yard. This is an invasion of privacy.
- c. *Increase parking and traffic issues:* 7 Lake Forest Court is located at the intersection of three graded slopes and the entrance to the Lake Forest Court cul-de-sac. The need for curbside parking will naturally increase for a 5 bedroom home as compared to a 3 bedroom home (entertainment, house guests, etc). This will also greatly increase the possibility of traffic problems (lack of parking space, increase of traffic accidents, etc).
- d. *Changing neighborhood character:* A three story house and an expanded second floor building will extraordinarily change the character of a two story home neighborhood. There are no homes on Lake Forest Court or on Oak Park Drive from Christopher Drive to Devonshire Way which have three stories.
- 2. If you believe your property, the property of others or the neighborhood would be adversely affected, please state who would be affected, and how:

| Name | Address | How Neighbor is Affected |
|---------------|--------------------|----------------------------|
| Peter Wohlers | 100 Devonshire Way | - Invasion of privacy |
| | SF, CA 94131 | - Increase parking and |
| | | traffic issues |
| | | - Changing of neighborhood |
| | | character |
| Evelyn Campi | 429 Oak Park Dr. | - Increase parking and |
| | SF, CA 94131 | traffic issues |
| | | - Changing of neighborhood |
| | | character |
| Mario Onetto | 425 Oak Park Dr. | - Increase parking and |

20F5

08.06450

| | SF, CA 94131 | traffic issues - Changing of neighborhood character |
|------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Patrick Yi | 421 Oak Park Dr. SF, CA 94131 | Increase parking and traffic issues Changing of neighborhood character |
| Grace Dito | 2 Lake Forest Ct. SF, CA 94131 | Increase parking and traffic issues Changing of neighborhood character |
| Jeremiah Robison | 14 Lake Forest Ct. SF, CA 94131 | Increase parking and traffic issues Changing of neighborhood character |
| Lisa Spranger | 29 Lake Forest Ct. SF, CA 94131 | Increase parking and traffic issues Changing of neighborhood character |
| Penny Hubhes | 57 Lake Forest Ct. SF, CA 94131 | Increase parking and traffic issues Changing of neighborhood character |
| David Gendreau | 41 Lake Forest Ct. SF, CA 94131 | Increase parking and traffic issues Changing of neighborhood character |

3. What alternatives or changes to the proposed project, beyond the changes (if any) already made would respond to the exceptional and extraordinary circumstances and reduce the adverse effects noted above (in question B1)?

Elimination of the 3rd floor addition will reduce the adverse effects on my property and the neighbors' properties.

08.06450

The following pages are photos of the windows that will be blocked if the applicant is approved to build his 3^{rd} floor. As you see in the photos, currently these windows receive direct sunlight.



08.06450

Second photo exhibiting the windows (specifically the kitchen and family room windows) on my property that will be blocked if the 3rd floor addition is approved.

Kitchen Window Family Room Window

08.06450

50F5

REUBEN, JUNIUS & ROSE, LLP

June 19, 2015

By Hand Delivery

President Rodney Fong San Francisco Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: 7 Lake Forest Court – Brief in Opposition to Discretionary Review Request Our file: 8848.01

Dear President Fong:

Our office represents Justin Tin, owner of the property located at 7 Lake Forest Court (the "Property"). The Property is currently improved with a two-story single family home. Mr. Tin has two young children and is proposing the current project (the "Project") to accommodate his growing, multi-generational family. The Project consists of a modest third story addition to the existing single-family home. The third floor is proposed for the purpose of moving in Mr. Tin's elderly parents, who are especially in need of the additional support and could greatly benefit from the proximity to their son, daughter-in-law, and grandchildren.

The proposed third floor consists of 827 square feet. It will have a significant front setback of 24 feet, 6 inches from the property line and a rear setback of 31 feet, 10 inches from the rear property line. The Project will increase the maximum height of the building by just 8 feet, 9 inches. The architectural style of the proposed third story is completely consistent with the architectural style of the existing home.

As will be detailed in this letter, Mr. Tin has worked hard and in good faith to consult his neighbors and the Planning Department to craft a project that the neighborhood is comfortable with and the Planning Department has supported. This has resulted in a project that proposes a modest expansion of the home, increases the building area by 827 square feet, increases the effective height by 8 feet, 9 inches, and significantly sets back the new third story from both the front and the rear of the lot. Despite working diligently with the Planning Department and extensively reaching out to neighbors to achieve a design that would (1) meet the needs of his family, (2) be supported by the entire neighborhood, and (3) be supported by the Department, Mr. Tin has been unable to satisfy all of his neighbors, one of which, Kathleen Ue of 15 Lake Forest Court (the "DR Requestor"), requested a discretionary review hearing at the Planning Commission.

One Bush Street, Suite 600 San Francisco, CA 94104

James A. Reuben | Andrew J. Junius | Kevin H. Rose | Daniel A. Frattin | John Kevlin Jay F. Drake | Lindsay M. Petrone | Sheryl Reuben¹ | Tuija I. Catalano | Thomas Tunny | David Silverman Melinda A. Sarjapur | Mark H. Loper | Jody Knight | Stephanie L. Haughey | Jared Eigerman^{2,3} | John McInerney III²

1. Also admitted in New York 2. Of Counsel 3. Also admitted in Massachusetts

tel: 415-567-9000 fax: 415-399-9480

The Project will allow Mr. Tin's parents to move into an accessible and comfortable living area on-site along with Mr. Tin's family. The Project will allow his family to live under one roof. We respectfully ask that you deny the request for discretionary review and approve the modest home expansion as proposed.

A. <u>Neighborhood Outreach and Design Development</u>

Throughout the entire entitlement process to date, Mr. Tin has strived to design a project that meets his and his family's needs that also fulfills the aesthetic and design considerations of the neighborhood and the Planning Department. On October 27, 2007, Mr. Tin held a pre-application meeting at the Property. From the beginning of the process, the DR Requester, who lives in the adjacent property, did not support a vertical addition to the home.

Mr. Tin has been willing to change the proposed project in response to reasonable requests. The third floor plans have been updated to include a 15-foot setback from the front building wall, as requested by the Planning Department. Also, Mr. Tin has reconsidered window options in response to the Residential Design Team comment to select higher quality windows for the third floor. What the DR Requestor proposes – eliminating the third floor in its entirety – is unreasonable. Limiting Mr. Tin, his wife, their two children, and his elderly parents within the existing home would put a 6-person household in a space with only three bedrooms. Eliminating the proposed third floor is simply not adequate to meet the needs of Mr. Tin's growing family and his elderly parents.

Mr. Tin's goal of providing a single home for his multi-generational family is reasonable, and the Project he proposes is modest in scale. Mr. Tin has shown he is flexible and responsive to design requests that still allow him to achieve that goal. Mr. Tin has demonstrated good faith in reaching out and attempting to accommodate neighbors.

B. The Project Complies with Residential Design Guidelines

The DR Requestor cites only two areas of inconsistency between the Project and the Residential Design Guidelines: neighborhood character and light. However, the focus of the DR Requestor's argument is really on the height of the Project. The DR Requestor's argument is essentially this: there is no other three-story residence on the same block face or on the block of Oak Park Drive that intersects with Lake Forest Court, and therefore the Project disrupts neighborhood character and is not consistent with the Residential Design Guidelines (the "Guidelines"). This is a far too narrow application of the Guidelines and does not in fact express their actual intent.

The Guidelines include specific guidance on how to provide appropriate building scale at the street when adding height to a building. The general guideline is:

One Bush Street, Suite 600 San Francisco, CA 94104

tel: 415-567-9000 fax: 415-399-9480

REUBEN, JUNIUS & ROSE, LLP

Design the height and depth of the building to be compatible with the existing building scale at the street. (Guidelines, page 24.)

The Guidelines go on to say that when "a new floor is being added to an existing building, it may be necessary to modify the building height or depth to maintain the existing scale at the street." (Guidelines, page 24). The Guidelines then recommend four specific modifications to make the new story compatible with and sensitive to the surrounding neighborhood, three of which the Project fully incorporates:

- <u>Setback the upper story by 15 feet from the front building wall.</u> The Project has incorporated a 15-foot setback from the existing building's front wall, for a total setback of 26 feet, 6 inches from the front property line.
- <u>Eliminate the building parapet.</u> The new third story has no parapet, and is as short as feasibly possible. The height of the third story is further mitigated by the addition occupying existing attic space and sloping roofline at the second story, limiting the effective height increase of the Project to 8 feet, 9 inches.
- <u>Provide a sloping roofline</u>. The side-facing roofline of the proposed third story slopes at a 33¹/₃ degree angle. This slope will be covered with asphalt shingles, consistent with the architectural style of the existing building and many of the other homes in the neighborhood.

A rendering of the Project is attached as Exhibit A.

With respect to neighborhood character, the DR Requestor doesn't provide a full picture of the neighborhood. While the adjacent and nearby homes on the same block face are two stories, the homes in the neighborhood are on the slope of Mount Sutro. As such, the properties closer to the peak are at higher elevation than the Property. Due to the slope, the DR Requestor's home will be nearly as tall as the Tins' home. Also, there are numerous homes just one block away Oak Park Drive, where there are three story homes lining the up-slope side of the street with two story building on the down-slope side. (See **Exhibit B** with photos attached.)

The Guidelines expressly state that "a building that is larger than its neighbors can still be in scale and compatible with smaller buildings in the area." (Guidelines, page 23.) The Project does everything possible to minimize the impact of the new third floor, and will not change the character of the neighborhood, which already has dozens of three-story homes. The Residential Design Team confirmed, "there is nothing exceptional or extraordinary about the property or project, pursuant to RDG pgs. 19, 24-25," which cover corner buildings, building scale at the street and building scale at the mid-block open space.

> One Bush Street, Suite 600 San Francisco, CA 94104

tel: 415-567-9000 fax: 415-399-9480

REUBEN, JUNIUS & ROSE, LLP

The architectural style of the Project will also ensure that the third story addition will not change the character of the existing home. The design of the Project will maintain its existing style with the third floor addition. Stucco surfaces and asphalt shingles on the third floor roof will be used to match the style of the existing home, which will leave the third floor architecturally indistinguishable from the existing first two floors.

When considering neighborhood character, it is important to consider the character in the context of someone living in or walking through the neighborhood. As discussed above, the third story addition is designed in a way that has minimal effect on someone at street level. Even the impact on those occupying the second third floor of buildings across the street on Oak Park would be limited due to the modest scale of the proposed addition (essentially looking at the partial third floor of the Property instead of the south wall of the DR Requestor's home).

The DR Requestor asserts that the third floor addition would block sunlight to four windows of her home facing the Property. One of the Residential Design Guidelines states "maintain light to adjacent properties by providing adequate setbacks." (Guidelines, page 5.) The proposed third floor addition will maintain the existing side spacing between the buildings. There is a 7 foot, 3 inch-wide open space between the buildings.

When the project was reviewed by the Residential Design Team, the planners commented that "there are no significant impacts due to the side setbacks at both properties." For these reasons, the Planning Commission should find that the Design Principle and the Guidelines concerning light are met.

The DR Requestor also raises a concern over privacy. The Guidelines covers the issue of privacy: "As with light, some loss of privacy to existing neighboring buildings can be expected with a building expansion. However, there may be special situations where a proposed project will have an unusual impact on privacy to neighboring interior living spaces." (Guidelines, page 17.) On the new floor, there will only be two small windows facing DR Requestor's property. There will not be an unusual impact due to the third floor addition.

C. Conclusion

Mr. Tin is proposing a modest addition to his family home so that his elderly parents can live comfortably and safely with his wife and children. Mr. Tin and his family represent a shrinking demographic in San Francisco: families with children. According to the City's Housing Element, "under 12% of the city's total population is 14 years old and younger, giving San Francisco the distinction of having the fewest children per capita of all major U.S. cities." (2014 Housing Element, page I.3.) To that end, Housing Element Policy 4.1 states "Develop new housing, and encourage the remodeling of existing housing, for families with children."

The Project design has been modified over the course of Planning Department review to incorporate reasonable recommendations. The Project has the support of the Planning

One Bush Street, Suite 600 San Francisco, CA 94104

tel: 415-567-9000 fax: 415-399-9480

REUBEN, JUNIUS & ROSE, LLP

Department, which has expressly recognized that the Project will not cause significant light or air impacts and that there is nothing exceptional or extraordinary about the Project with regard to scale at the street and at the mid-block open space or considering its location at the corner of the block.

Mr. Tin has reached out to the neighborhood in a good faith attempt to design the Project in a way that will assuage their concerns. Having realized that the remaining opponents will not accept a third story in any case, and since the third story is the only way to accommodate Mr. Tin's family and parents, Mr. Tin now appeals to the Planning Commission to confirm that the Project is reasonable and modest in nature, and does not rise to the threshold of "exceptional and extraordinary circumstances" that are required to approve the DR request. We respectfully ask the Planning Commission to deny the discretionary review request and to allow the Project to move forward. Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

REUBEN & JUNIUS, LLP

John Kevlin

cc: Vice President Cindy Wu Commissioner Michael Antonini Commissioner Rich Hillis Commissioner Christine Johnson Commissioner Kathrin Moore Commissioner Dennis Richards Jonas Ionan - Commission Secretary Andrew Perry – Southwest Quadrant Planner Justin Tin – Project Sponsor

> One Bush Street, Suite 600 San Francisco, CA 94104

tel: 415-567-9000 fax: 415-399-9480

REUBEN, JUNIUS & ROSE, LLP





<u>Exhibit B</u>

Aerial view of the 7 Lake Forest Court (the "Property) and neighboring streets



Nearby 3-story homes on Devonshire Way and Oak Park Drive



Nearby 3-story homes on Devonshire Way and Oak Park Drive











Street view of the Property and the slope of Lake Forest Court

| ASSESSOR'S MAP | SCOP | E OF WORK | | DRAWING INDEX | PROJECT NAME |
|---|--|---|----------------------------------|--|--|
| CRESTMONT 12 12 | | | ARCHITECTURAL | | 7 Lake Forest Co |
| 1 4 2 3 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 | -FROFOSED VERTICAL ADDITION | -PROPOSED VERTICAL ADDITION TO EXISTING SINGLE FAMILY HOME | | COVER SHEET | SAN FRANCISCO, |
| $\begin{bmatrix} y \\ y \\ z \\$ | | | A-0.1 A-1.1 | SITE PLANS & NOTES | |
| $\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array}{} \end{array} \\ \end{array} $ | | | | FIRST FLOOR PLANS | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | A-2.2 | SECOND FLOOR PLANS | |
| 8 51.545 50.742 49.784 33.442 33.441 33.443 33.443 0.00 8.581 | | | A-2.3 | THIRD FLOOR PLAN, & ROOF PLAN | |
| 35 36 JA | | | A-3.1 | FRONT ELEVATIONS | |
| $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | A-3.2 | REAR ELEVATIONS | nsulli |
| Ш | | | A-3.3 | LEFT ELEVATIONS | 100 TO |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | A-3.4 | RIGHT ELEVATIONS | SLA |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | A-4.1 | BUILDING SECTION | 100. At 1 |
| | | | A-4.2 | GENRAL NOTES AND TYPICAL DETAILS | 1 Corporation |
| | | | G-0.1 | GREEN BUILDING CHECKLIST | |
| | | | | | SIA CONSULTING CORPOR 1256 HOWARD ST |
| SUBJ. PARCEL | | | | | SAN FRANCISCO CA TEL: (415) 92 |
| OAK PARK DRIVE | | | | | FAX: (415) 92 WEBSITE:WWW. SIACONSUL |
| GENERAL NOTES | ABB | REVIATION | | PROJECT DATA | SHEET TITLE |
| L WORK SHALL BE PERFORMED IN COMPLETE COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE CODES, LAWS, ORDINANCES AND | | | LOT AREA: | 2,962 ± S.F. | |
| LING WALL AUTHORITIES HAVING JURISDICTION OVER THE WORK ALL CONTACTORS SHALL HOLD HARMLESS THE HITECT/ENGINEER AND THE OWNER FROM ALL DAMAGES AND/OR PENALTY ARISING OUT OF VIOLATION THEREOF. | # POUND OR NUMBER & AND | H.C. HANDICAPPED HI HIGH | (E) NUMBER OF UNITS: | 1 (NO CHANGE) | |
| L ATTACHMENTS, CONNECTIONS OR FASTENING OF ANY NATURE ARE TO BE PROPERLY AND PERMANENTLY SECURED IN | Q AT ABV ABVE ACOUNTR OF IND THE | HM HOLLOW METAL HP HIGH POINT HR HOUR | (E) NUMBER OF STORIES: | 2 PLUS ATTIC | O su su Oh su |
| IST THE CONTRACTOR AND DO NOT ILLUSTRATE EVERY DETAIL. | ACT ACOUSTIC CEILING TILE AD AREA DRAIN AFF ABOVE FINISHED FLOOR | HR HOUR HVAC HEATING, VENTILATING, AND AIR CONDITIONING | (N) NUMBER OF STORIES | 3 | Cover Shee |
| HE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR VERIFYING ALL CONDITIONS DIMENSIONS, AND MEASUREMENTS IN THE FIELD | ALUM ALUMINUM APPROX APPROXIMATE | IRGWB IMPACT RESISTANT GYPSUM WALLBOARD | | , and the second s | |
| ORE BEGINNING WORK. ANY AND ALL DISCREPANCIES, UNUSUAL CIRCUMSTANCES, ERRORS OMISSIONS AND/OR CONFLICTS DS SHALL BE REPORTED TO THE ARCHITECT/ENGINEER'S AND THE OWNER ATTENTION IMMEDIATELY BEFORE PROCEEDING | ANOD ANODIZED ASPH ASPHALT | ILO IN LIEU OF INSUL INSULATED | (E) BUILDING HEIGHT @ FRONT P.L | | |
| H THE WORK. | BD BOARD BLDG BUILDING | INT INTERIOR LO LOW | (N) BUILDING HEIGHT @ FRONT P.L | | |
| HE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR COORDINATION BETWEEN ARCHITECTURAL, STRUCTURAL, FIRE PROTECTION, HANICAL, PLUMBING, AND ELECTRICAL. THIS INCLUDES REVIEWING REQUIREMENTS OF INDIVIDUAL SYSTEMS BEFORE | BLKG BLOCKING BOT BOTTOM | MAX MAXIMUM MECH MECHANICAL | CONSTRUCTION TYPE: | V-B | |
| ERING AND INSTALLATION OF ANY WORK, VERIFY ALL ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS AND ALL FINISH CONDITIONS (WHETHER ICTED IN DRAWINGS OR NOT) WITH THE SAME DISCIPLINES. | BSMT BASEMENT BST BOTTOM OF STAIRS | MEMBR MEMBRANE MIN MINIMUM | OCCUPANCY GROUP: | R-3 (NO CHANGE) | |
| NLESS OTHERWISE NOTED, ALL ANGLES SHALL BE RIGHT ANGLES, ALL LINES WHICH APPEAR PARALLEL SHALL BE PARALLEL, | BYND BEYOND CIP CAST IN PLACE | MO MASONRY OPENING MTL METAL | BLOCK & LOT : | 2675 / 028 | |
| I ALL ITEMS WHICH APPEAR CENTERED SHALL BE CENTERED. CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR MAINTAINING ALL IS TRUE LEVEL, PLUMB AND SQUARE. | CHNL CHANNEL CJ CONTROL JOINT | (N) NEW NIC NOT IN CONTRACT | ZONING: | RH-1 | |
| ONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL SHORING AND PROTECTION DURING CONSTRUCTION. ALL EXISTING | CLG CEILING CLO CLOSET | NO NUMBER NOM NOMINAL | APPLICABLE CODES: | 2013 CALIFORNIA CODES EDITIONS | |
| ROVEMENTS TO REMAIN SHALL BE PROTECTED. ALL MATERIALS DELIVERED TO THE SITE SHALL BE PROPERLY STORED AND ITECTED UNTIL INSTALLATION. ALL LUMBER SHALL BE PROTECTED FROM MOISTURE AND STORED ABOVE GROUND. | CLR CLEAR CNTR COUNTER | N.T.S. NOT TO SCALE O.C. ON CENTER | | W/ SAN FRANCISCO AMENDMENTS | |
| ETAILED AND/OR LARGER SCALE DRAWINGS SHALL TAKE PRECEDENCE OVER GENERAL AND SMALLER SCALE DRAWINGS. | CMU CONCRETE MASONRY UNIT COL COLUMN | OFF OFFICE OH OPPOSITE HAND | | | |
| JRED DIMENSIONS SHALL TAKE PRECEDENCE OVER SCALED DIMENSIONS. ALL SCALED DIMENSIONS SHALL BE VERIFIED. | COMPR COMPRESSIBLE CONC CONCRETE | OZ OUNCE PCC PRE-CAST CONCRETE | FLOOR AREA: | | |
| LL WORK SHALL BE DONE UNDER PERMIT. PLANS AND CALCULATIONS, IF REQUIRED, SHALL BE SUBMITTED TO AND APPROVED HE BUILDING DEPARTMENT. CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL REQUIRED PERMITS. | CONT CONTINUOUS CORR CORRIDOR | P.L. PROPERTY LINE PLUMB PLUMBING | (E) GARAGE FLOOR AREA (1ST FLR | R): $550 \pm S.F.$ (NO CHANGE) | These documents are property of SIA CONS |
| THE THAT MECHANICAL, ELECTRICAL, FIRE PROTECTION, PLUMBING AND COMMUNICATIONS ARE DESIGN BUILD ITEMS. | CPT CARPET CT CERAMIC TILE CTR CENTER | PLYD PLYWOOD PT PRESSURE TREATED PNT PAINT/PAINTED | (E) FIRST FLOOR AREA (INCL. GAR/ | AGE): 1,213 ± S.F. (NO CHANGE) | and are not to be produced changed or cop without the expressed written consent of SI/ CONSULTING ENGINEERS. |
| HITECTURAL DRAWINGS SHOW DESIGN INTENT, CONTRACTOR TO CONFIRM ALL SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS WITH BUILDING VER AND ARCHITECT PRIOR TO INSTALLATION. CONTRACTOR/SUBCONTRACTOR SHALL SUBMIT PLANS FOR THEIR RESPECTIVE RX TO THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT AS REQUIRED FOR PLAN CHECK AND PERMIT ISSUANCE. INCLUDING PAYING FOR ALL PLAN | CTR CENTER CTYD COURTYARD DBL DOUBLE | PNI PAIN I PAIN I PAIN I PU PVC POLYVINYL CHLORIDE RBR RUBBER | (E) SECOND FLOOR AREA: | 1,484 ± S.F. (NO CHANGE) | ISSUES / REVISIONS |
| r to the building department as required for plan check and permit issuance, including patting for all plan CK AND PERMIT FEES. | DEMO DEMOLISH DET DETAIL | RCP REFLECTED CEILING PLAN RD ROOF DRAIN | (E) ATTIC FLOOR AREA: | N/A | NO. DATE DESCRIPTIO |
| THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR APPLYING AND OBTAINING ALL REQUIRED INSPECTIONS TO CONFORM WITH AL BUILDING AND FIRE CODES. | D.F. DRINKING FOUNTAIN DIA DIAMETER | RDWD REDWOOD REQD REQUIRED | (E) TOTAL BLDG. GROSS AREA (INC | CL. GARAGE): 2,697 ± S.F. | 12/02/2014 REVISION PER 0 |
| AL BUILDING AND FIRE CODES. DO NOT SCALE DRAWINGS. WRITTEN DIMENSIONS GOVERN. | DIMS DIMENSIONS DN DOWN | RM ROOM S.F. SQUARE FOOT | (E) TOTAL HABITABLE FLOOR AREA | A (EXCL. GARAGE): 2,147 ± S.F. | |
| DETAILS SHOWN ARE TYPICAL, SIMILAR DETAILS APPLY IN SIMILAR CONDITIONS. | DR DOOR DWG DRAWING | SIM SIMILIAR SPEC SPECIFIED OR SPECIFICATION | | | |
| /ERIFY CLEARANCES FOR VENTS, CHASES, SOFFITS, FIXTURES BEFORE ANY CONSTRUCTION, ORDERING OF, OR INSTALLATION | (E) EXISTING EA EACH | SPK SPRINKLER SSTL STAINLESS STEEL | (N) THIRD FLOOR AREA: | 827 ± S.F. | |
| INY ITEM OF WORK. | EL ELEVATION ELEC ELECTRICAL | STC SOUND TRANSMISSION COEFFICIENT | (N) TOTAL BLDG. GROSS AREA (INC | | |
| JNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE SOLID BLOCKING AND BACKING AS REQ'D FOR ALL NAILING OF FRIOR TRIM AND FINISHES, AND SHALL COORDINATE AND PROVIDE ALL FRAMING, BACKING AND BRACING AS NECESSARY FOR | ELEV ELEVATOR/ELEVATION EQ EQUAL | STD STANDARD STL STEEL | (N) TOTAL BEDG. GROSS AREA (INC. | | |
| TALLATION OF EQUIPMENT INDICATED ON THE DRAWINGS, PROVIDE BACKING PLATES AT ALL BATH ACCESSORIES, HANDRAILS, INETS, TOWEL BARS, WALL MOUNTED FIXTURES AND ANY OTHER ITEMS ATTACHED TO WALLS. | EXT EXTERIOR EXP JT EXPANSION JOINT | STRUCT STRUCTURAL SQ. SQUARE | | $(LAOL GARAGE)$. 2,314 \pm 3.F. | DRAWN R.L. |
| NSTALL ALL FIXTURES, EQUIPMENT, AND MATERIALS PER MANUFACTURER'S RECOMMENDATIONS AND CODE REQUIREMENTS. | EXT EXTERIOR F.D. FLOOR DRAIN | T&G TONGUE AND GROOVE TC TOP OF CURB | | | |
| APPLIANCES, FIXTURES, AND EQUIPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH PLUMBING, ELECTRICAL, MECHANICAL SYSTEMS SHALL BE LISTED I NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED AND APPROVED AGENCY. | FEC FIRE EXTINGUISHER CABINET FIXT FIXTURE FLR FLOOR | TELE TELEPHONE TLT TOILET TO TOP OF | | | CHECKED R.K. |
| THERMAL AND SOUND INSULATING INSULATION SHALL COMPLY WITH CBC SEC. 719. | FLR FLOOR FLUOR FLUORESCENT FM FILLED METAL | TOC TOP OF CONCRETE TOS TOP OF STEEL | | | DATE 09/02/2014 |
| ALL WALL AND CEILING FINISHES SHALL COMPLY WITH CBC CHAPTER 8. | FND FOUNDATION FO FACE OF | TP TOILET PAPER DISPENSER T/D TELEPHONE/DATA | | | |
| ALL NEW SMOKE DETECTORS TO E HARD WIRED. | F.O.F. FACE OF FININSH FURR FURRING | TST TOP OF STAIRS TYP TYPICAL | | | REVISED DATE 06/18/2015 |
| OTE: WATERPROOFING OF BUILDING ENVELOPE IS NOT UNDER THE SCOPE | GA GAUGE GALV GALVANIZED | U.N.O. UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE U/S UNDERSIDE | | | JOB NO. 14-1628 |
| F THIS PERMIT. OWNER IS TO HIRE A WATERPROOFING EXPERT TO PROVIDE ATERPROOFING DETAILS | G.B. GRAB BAR GND GROUND | V.I.F. VERIFY IN FIELD VP VISION PANEL | | | SHEET NO. |
| | GRP GROUP GWB GYPSUM WALL BOARD | W/ WITH WD WOOD | | | A-0.1 |
| | GYP GYPSUM | W.H. WATER HEATER | | | A-U. I |



| ł | 9 | | 10 | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| | | PROJECT NAME | | |
| ES CLOSETS. | NOT BE LOCATED IN THE VICINITY OF EASILY DTECTED TO MAINTAIN FIREWALL | | orest Court Francisco, ca | |
| OWING LOCATIONS. | | | | A |
| STORAGE SPACES. | | | | ~ |
| NG LOCATIONS. ID OF WALLS. DE. COUNTER SPACE WID | | | | |
| COUNTER SPACE WIL | ER THAN 12'. SO THAT NO POINT IN ANY | | | |
| OSURES AND EXTERIO | OR LIGHT FIXTURES SHALL BE LABELED | consulling | | |
| | RBAGE DISPOSALS, TRASH COMPACTORS, BRANCH CIRCUIT RATED FOR THE | CT / | | |
| HALL BE ACCESSIBLE, | NOT BEHIND APPLIANCE. | DTT | 1 | |
| A MINIMUM OF 30 AM | PERES IS REQUIRED FOR AN ELECTRIC | Corporatio | >/ | в |
| LOSURES SHALL BE L | ABELED "SUITABLE FOR DAMP LOCATION(S)." | - T | | |
| 30(C), OF PERMANENT FFICACY LUMINAIRES, | E HIGH EFFICACY LUMINAIRES. UP TO 50% OF LY INSTALLED LUMINAIRES IN KITCHENS MAY PROVIDED THAT THESE LUMINAIRES ARE LUNC THE HIGH EFECACY LUMINAIRES | 12 SAN I | LTING CORPORATION 256 HOWARD STREET FRANCISCO CA 94103 TEL: (415) 922.0200 FAX: (415) 922.0203 W. SIACONSULT.COM | |
| ET SHALL HAVE AT LE PER WATT FOR 15 W/ T FOR 40 WATT OR HIC | LING THE HIGH EFFICACY LUMINAIRES. AST ONE LUMINAIRE WITH LAMPS WITH AN NTT OR SMALLER, 50 LUMENS PER WATT FOR SHER. IF THERE IS MORE THAN ONE | SHEET TITLE | | |
| | IALL BE SWITCHED AT AN ENTRANCE TO THE | | | |
| ERS LABORATORIES O | ISTALLATION OF FACTORY-BUILT AND | Site Pla | n & Notes | с |
| NTAKE MUST BE EQUIP OR COMBUSTION AIR C IR INTAKE IS NOT REQ | FROM OUTSIDE OF THE BUILDING DIRECTLY PPED WITH A READILY ACCESSIBLE, ONTROL DEVICE. UIRED IF THE FIREPLACE IS INSTALLED OVER ED ON AN EXTERIOR WALL. | | | |
| CESSIBLE CONTROL TER, OR DECORATIVE | GAS APPLIANCE IS INSTALLED IN A QUIRED BY THE MANUFACTURER'S | | | |
| ICAL NOTES: | | | | |
| | A FIRE DAMPER PROVIDED WHEN THE HE GARAGE AND THE HOUSE. | | | |
| JST EXTENDING TO OU | | | | |
| ON DEVICES ON ALL EX | TERIOR HOSE BIBS. | | | D |
| OWABLE 1.6 GALLONS | PER FLUSH. | | | |
| OPS SHALL BE PROVID UCTIONS TO DELIVER | RE BALANCE OR THERMOSTATIC MIXING DED ON SUCH VALVES AND SHALL BE A MAXIMUM MIXED WATER SETTING OF 120 CONSIDERED A SUITABLE CONTROL FOR | These documents are p and are not to be produ | roperty of SIA CONSULTING | |
| | AND ADJACENT WALL OPENINGS WITHIN 60" Y TEMPERED. LAMINATED SAFETY GLASS OR | without the expressed written consent of SIA CONSULTING ENGINEERS. | | |
| TH A PERMANENT LAB | EL. | NO. DATE | DESCRIPTION | |
| | | 12/02/2014 | REVISION PER COMMENT | • |
| IC TILE EXTENDING 70 | INCHES ABOVE THE DRAIN INLET | | | 1 |
| e.g. WATER RESISTAN | GYP. BD.) TO A HEIGHT OF 70 INCHES | | | E |
| | | | | |
| WIDTH: 20" MIN HEIGH | T: 24" AND | | | |
| | | DRAWN | R.L. | |
| N SIGNS AS PER CBC | | CHECKED | R.K. | |
| ALL COMMON CORRI | DORS, SEE FIRE ALARM SYSTEM PLAN | DATE | 09/02/2014 | |
| | REAS LEADING TO THEM. | REVISED DATE | 06/18/2015 | |
| ENING. | | JOB NO. | 14-1628 | F |
| T ABOVE A DOOR, AN TEMS SHALL TERMIN | FEET BELOW OR 4 FEET HORIZONTALLY N OPENABLE WINDOW OR A GRAVITY AIR IATE AT LEAST 3 FEET ABOVE AN | SHEET NO. | | |
| CATED WITHIN 10 FE AY. | ET AND AT LEAST 4 FEET FROM A | | A-1.1 | |
| | 9 | | 10 | - |
| | , I | | | |


















3

С

D

F













Green Building: Site Permit Checklist

3

4

BASIC INFORMATION:

These facts, plus the primary occupancy, determine which requirements apply. For details, see AB 093 Attachment A Table 1.

| Project Name | Block/Lot | Address |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| 7 Lake Forest Ct | 2675 / 028 | 7 Lake Forest Ct |
| Gross Building Area | Primary Occupancy | Design Professional/Applicant: Sign & Date |
| 3,524 S.F. +/- | R-3 | Bahman Ghassemzadeh |
| # of Dwelling Units | Height to highest occupied floor | Number of occupied floors |
| 1 | 32'-9" +/- | 3 |

ALL PROJECTS AS APPLICA

2

| Construction activity stormwater pollution prevention and site runoff controls - Provide a construction site Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and implement SFPUC Best Management Practices. | • |
|--|----|
| Stormwater Control Plan: Projects disturbing ≥ 5,000 square feet must implement a Stormwater Control Plan meeting SFPUC Stormwater Design Guidelines | • |
| Water Efficient Irrigation - Projects that include ≥ 1,000 square feet of new or modified landscape must comply with the SFPUC Water Efficient Irrigation Ordinance. | • |
| Construction Waste Management – Divert at least 65% of construction and demolition debris by complying with the San Francisco Construction & Demolition Debris Ordinance) | |
| GREENPOINT RATED PROJEC | TS |
| Proposing a GreenPoint Rated Project | TS |
| Proposing a GreenPoint Rated Project (Indicate at right by checking the box.) | |
| Proposing a GreenPoint Rated Project (Indicate at right by checking the box.) | |
| Proposing a GreenPoint Rated Project (Indicate at right by checking the box.) Base number of required Greenpoints: Adjustment for retention / demolition of | |
| Proposing a GreenPoint Rated Project (Indicate at right by checking the box.) Base number of required Greenpoints: Adjustment for retention / demolition of historic features / building: Final number of required points (base number +/- adjustment) | |
| Proposing a GreenPoint Rated Project (Indicate at right by checking the box.) Base number of required Greenpoints: Adjustment for retention / demolition of historic features / building: Final number of required points (base number +/- | 75 |

(CalGreen measures for residential projects have been integrated into the GreenPoint Rated system.

Notes

1) New residential projects of 75' or greater must use the "I dential High-Rise" column. New residential projects with >3 floors and less than 75 feet to the highest occupied floor m to apply the LEED for Homes Mid-Rise rating system; if so, use the "New Residential Mid-Rise" column

2) LEED for Homes Mid-Rise projects must meet the "Silve including all prerequisites. The number of points required to Silver depends on unit size. See LEED for Homes Mid-Rise System to confirm the base number of points required.

3) Requirements for additions or alterations apply to applica received on or after July 1, 2012.

Instructions:

As part of application for site permit, this form acknowledges the specific green building rec under San Francisco Building Code Chapter 13C, California Title 24 Part 11, and related loc will be due with the applicable addendum. To use the form:

6

(a) Provide basic information about the project in the box at left. This info determines which

AND

5

(b) Indicate in one of the columns below which type of project is proposed. If applicable, fill number of points the project must meet or exceed. A LEED or GreenPoint checklist is not re permit application, but such tools are strongly recommended to be used .

Solid circles in the column indicate mandatory measures required by state and local codes. GreenPoint Rated, prerequisites of those systems are mandatory. This form is a summary Chapter 13C for details.

| ABLE | LI | EED PR | OJECT | S | | | | OTHER APPLICABLE NON-RES | |
|---------------------------------|---|-------------------------|---|--|------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|---|--|
| a on • | | New Large Commercial | Nøw Residential Mid-Rise ¹ | Nøw Residential High-Rise ¹ | Commerical Interior | Commercial Alteration | Residential Alteration | Requirements below only apply when the measure is applicable to the p references below are applicable to New Non-Residential buildings. Corre quirements for additions and alterations can be found in Title 24 Part 11, Requirements for additions or alterations apply to applications received after. ³ | |
| | Type of Project Proposed (Indicate at right) | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Overall Requirements: | | | | | | | Type of Project Proposed (Check box if applicable) | |
| | LEED certification level (includes prerequisites): | SILVER | SILVER | SILVER | SILVER | SILVER | SILVER | Recycling by Occupants: Provide space for storage, collection, an recycling, compost and trash. (13C.5.410.1, et al) - See Administrative Bu | |
| | Base number of required points: | 50 | 2 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | details. Energy Efficiency: Demonstrate a 15% energy use reduction compa | |
| e De | Adjustment for retention / demolition of historic features / building: | | | | n/a | | | California Energy Code, Title 24, Part 6. (13C.5.201.1.1) Bicycle parking: Provide short-term and long-term bicycle parking for | |
| | Final number of required points (base number +/- adjustment) | | | | 50 | | | motorized parking capacity each, or meet San Francisco Planning Code So whichever is greater (or LEED credit SSc4.2). (13C.5.106.4) | |
| Бу | Specific Requirements: (n/r indicates a measure is no | ot required) | | | | | | Fuel efficient vehicle and carpool parking: Provide stall mark low-emitting, fuel efficient, and carpool/van pool vehicles; approximately 89 spaces. (13C.5.106.5) | |
| \$ | Construction Waste Management – 75% Diversion LEED MR 2, 2 points | • | • | • | • | Meet C&D ordinance only | • | Water Meters: Provide submeters for spaces projected to consume >1 or >100 gal/day if in buildings over 50,000 sq. ft. Indoor Water Efficiency: Reduce overall use of potable water within the b | |
| | 15% Energy Reduction Compared to Title-24 2008 (or ASHRAE 90.1-2007) LEED EA 1, 3 points | • | 0 | • | ۰ | LEE prerequis | | for showerheads, lavatories, kitchen faucets, wash fountains, water closets, and urinal Commissioning: For new buildings greater than 10,000 square feet, c shall be included in the design and construction of the project to verify that | |
| | Renewable Energy or Enhanced Energy Efficiency Effective 1/1/2012: Generate renewable energy on-site ≥1% of total annual energy cost (LEED EAc2), OR Demonstrate an additional 10% energy use reduction (total of 25% | • | n/r | n/r | n/r | n/r | n/r | systems and components meet the owner's project requirements. (13C.5.4 OR for buildings less than 10,000 square feet, testing and adjusting of syste Protect duct openings and mechanical equipment during c (13C.5.504.3) Adhesives, sealants, and caulks: Comply with VOC limits in SCA(| |
| 75 | compared to Title 24 Part 6 2008), OR Purchase Green-E cartified renewable energy credits for 35% of total electricity use (LEED EAc6). | | | | | | | VOC limits and California Code of Regulations Title 17 for aerosol adhesives. Paints and coatings: Comply with VOC limits in the Air Resources B Architectural Coatings Suggested Control Measure and California Code of | |
| | Enhanced Commissioning of Building Energy Systems LEED EA 3 | Meet LEED prerequisites | | Title 17 for aerosol paints. (13C,5.504.4.3) Carpet: All carpet must meet one of the following: | | | | | |
| | Water Use - 30% Reduction LEED WE 3, 2 points | • | n/r | • | Meet | LEED prerequis | ites | Carpet and Rug Institute Green Label Plus Program California Department of Public Health Standard Practice for the testin (Prestingting Content) | |
| /- | Enhanced Refrigerant Management LEED EA 4 | • | n/r | n/r | n/r | n/r | n/r | (Specification 01350) 3. NSF/ANSI 140 at the Gold level 4. Scientific Certifications Systems Sustainable Choice | |
| (- | Indoor Air Quality Management Plan LEED IEQ 3.1 | • | n/r | n/r | n/r | n/r | n/r | AND Carpet cushion must meet CRI Green Label, | |
| | Low-Emitting Materials LEED IEQ 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4 | • | n/r | • | • | • | • | AND Carpet adhesive must not exceed 50 g/L VOC content. (13C.5.50 Composite wood: Meet CARB Air Toxics Control Measure for Composite Woo | |
| use ode, | Recycling by Occupants: Provide space for storage, collection, and loading of compost, recycling, and trash. Exceeds requirements of LEED MR prerequisite 1. See Administrative Bul- letin 088 for details. | 0 | 0 | 0 | • | • | • | Resilient flooring systems: For 50% of floor area receiving resilient resilient flooring complying with the VOC-emission limits defined in the 2009 (for High Performance Schools (CHPS) criteria or certified under the Resilient Covering Institute (RFCI) FloorScore program. (13C,5.504,4.6) | |
| | Bicycle parking: Provide short-term and long-term bicycle parking for 5% of total motorized parking capacity each, or meet San Francisco Planning Code Sec 155, whichever is greater, or | • | n/r | | • | n/r | n/r | Environmental Tobacco Smoke: Prohibit smoking within 25 feet o entries, outdoor air intakes, and operable windows. (13C.5.504.7) | |
| э п.) | meet LEED credit SSc4.2. (13C.5.106.4) Designated parking: Mark 8% of total parking stalls | | See San Franci Code | sco Planning | | | | Air Filtration: Provide at least MERV-8 filters in regularly occupied sp mechanically ventilated buildings. (13C.5.504,5.3) | |
| | for low-amitting, fuel efficient, and carpool/van pool vehicles. (13C.5.106.5) | • | | | • | n/r | n/r | Acoustical Control: Wall and roof-ceilings STC 50, exterior windows S walls and floor-ceilings STC 40. (13C.5.507.4) | |
| e "New Resi- >3 occupied | Water Meters: Provide submeters for spaces projected to consume more than 1,000 gal/day, or more than 100 gal/day if in building over 50,000 sq. ft. (13C,5,303,1) | • | n/r | n/r | n/r | n/r | n/r | CFCs and Halons: Do not install equipment that contains CFCs or Halons. | |
| may choose | Air Filtration: Provide at least MERV-8 filters in regularly | | | - | | | | Additional Requirements for New A, B, I, OR M Occupancy | |
| so, you must lver" standard, | occupied spaces of mechanically ventilated buildings (or LEED credit IEQ 5). (13C.5.504.5.3) | • | n/r | n/r | ۲ | n/r | n/r | Construction Waste Management – Divert 75% of construction ar debris (i.e. 10% more than required by the San Francisco Construction & Demoliti Ordinance) | |
| to achieve lise Rating | Air Filtration: Provide MERV-13 filters in residential buildings in air-quality hot-spots (or LEED credit IEQ 5). (SF Health Code Article 38 and SF Building Code 1203.5) | n/r | • | • | n/r | n/r | n/r | Renewable Energy or Enhanced Energy Efficiency Effective January 1, 2012: Generate renewable energy on-site equal to ≥1% annual energy cost (LEED EAc2), OR | |
| lications | Acoustical Control: wall and roof-ceilings STC 50, exterior | • | See CBC | | • | n/r | n/r | demonstrate an additional 10% energy use reduction (total of 25% compared | |

| t is proposed. If applicable, fill in the blank lines below to identify the r GreenPoint checklist is not required to be submitted with the site to be used . uired by state and local codes. For projects applying LEED or atory. This form is a summary; see San Francisco Building Code APPLICABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL PROJECTS Ity apply when the measure is applicable to the project. Code policable to New Non-Residential buildings. Corresponding re- and alterations can be found in Title 24 Part 11, Division 5.7, ons or alterations apply to applications received July 1, 2012 or applicable to New Non-Residential ponts: Provide space for storage, collection, and loading of ash. (13C.5.410.1, et al) - See Administrative Bulletin 088 for Demonstrate a 15% energy use reduction compared to 2008 itile 24, Part 6. (13C.5.201.1.1) wide short-term and long-term bicycle parking for 5% of total yeach, or meet San Francisco Planning Code Sec 155, Demonstrate San Francisco Planning Code Sec | SIA CONSULTING CORPORATION SIA CONSULTING CORPORATION 1256 HOWARD STREET SAN FRANCISCO CA 94103 TEL: (415) 922.0203 FAX: (415) 922.0203 WEBSITE:WWW. SIACONSULT.COM |
|--|---|
| Ivy apply when the measure is applicable to the project, Code Other New Addition opplicable to New Non-Residential buildings, Corresponding re- and alterations can be found in Title 24 Part 11, Division 5.7. Other New >2,000 sq ft ons or alterations apply to applications received July 1, 2012 or Residential Alteration opposed (Check box if applicable) > > opmonstrate a 15% energy use reduction compared to 2008 n/r n/r ite 24, Part 6. (13C.5.201.1.1) n/r | SIA CONSULTING CORPORATION 1256 HOWARD STREET SAN FRANCISCO CA 94103 TEL: (415) 922.0200 FAX: (415) 922.0203 WEBSITE:WWW. SIACONSULT.COM SHEET TITLE |
| r GreenPoint checklist is not required to be submitted with the site to be used . uired by state and local codes. For projects applying LEED or itory. This form is a summary; see San Francisco Building Code APPLICABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL PROJECTS Ity apply when the measure is applicable to the project. Code plicable to New Non-Residential buildings. Corresponding re- is and alterations apply to applications received July 1, 2012 or ns or alterations apply to applicable) Dants: Provide space for storage, collection, and loading of ash. (13C.5.410.1, et al) - See Administrative Bulletin 088 for Demonstrate a 15% energy use reduction compared to 2008 it 24, Part 6. (13C.5.201.1.1) Performed San Francisco Planning Code Sec 155. | SIA CONSULTING CORPORATION 1256 HOWARD STREET SAN FRANCISCO CA 94103 TEL: (415) 922.0200 FAX: (415) 922.0203 WEBSITE:WWW. SIACONSULT.COM SHEET TITLE |
| Applicable Non-Residential project Code Applicable to New Non-Residential buildings. Corresponding re- and alterations can be found in Title 24 Part 11, Division 5.7. cons or alterations apply to applications received July 1, 2012 or Other New Non- Residential Addition >2,000 sq ft OR Alteration >\$500,000 ³ oposed (Check box if applicable) Other New of the space for storage, collection, and loading of ash. (13C.5.410.1, et al) - See Administrative Builletin 088 for Image: Collection compared to 2008 Pemonstrate a 15% energy use reduction compared to 2008 n/r We short-term and long-term bicycle parking for 5% of total yeach, or meet San Francisco Planning Code Sec 155, Image: Collection space 105, or meet San Francisco Planning Code Sec 155, or | SIA CONSULTING CORPORATION 1256 HOWARD STREET SAN FRANCISCO CA 94103 TEL: (415) 922.0200 FAX: (415) 922.0203 WEBSITE:WWW. SIACONSULT.COM SHEET TITLE |
| iv apply when the measure is applicable to the project. Code Other New Addition opticable to New Non-Residential buildings. Corresponding re- rand alterations can be found in Title 24 Part 11. Division 5.7. Other New >2,000 sq ft ons or alterations apply to applications received July 1, 2012 or Residential Alteration opposed (Check box if applicable) >5500,000 ³ opnents: Provide space for storage, collection, and loading of ash. (13C.5.410.1, et al) - See Administrative Bulletin 088 for Demonstrate a 15% energy use reduction compared to 2008 itle 24, Part 6. (13C.5.201.1.1) n/r vide short-term and long-term bicycle parking for 5% of total yeach, or meet San Francisco Planning Code Sec 155, | SIA CONSULTING CORPORATION 1256 HOWARD STREET SAN FRANCISCO CA 94103 TEL: (415) 922.0200 FAX: (415) 922.0203 WEBSITE:WWW. SIACONSULT.COM SHEET TITLE |
| iv apply when the measure is applicable to the project. Code Other New Addition opticable to New Non-Residential buildings. Corresponding re- rand alterations can be found in Title 24 Part 11. Division 5.7. Other New >2,000 sq ft ons or alterations apply to applications received July 1, 2012 or Residential Alteration opposed (Check box if applicable) >5500,000 ³ opnents: Provide space for storage, collection, and loading of ash. (13C.5.410.1, et al) - See Administrative Bulletin 088 for Demonstrate a 15% energy use reduction compared to 2008 itle 24, Part 6. (13C.5.201.1.1) n/r vide short-term and long-term bicycle parking for 5% of total yeach, or meet San Francisco Planning Code Sec 155, | SIA CONSULTING CORPORATION 1256 HOWARD STREET SAN FRANCISCO CA 94103 TEL: (415) 922.0200 FAX: (415) 922.0203 WEBSITE:WWW. SIACONSULT.COM SHEET TITLE |
| oposed (Check box if applicable) pants: Provide space for storage, collection, and loading of ash. (13C.5.410.1, et al) - See Administrative Bulletin 088 for Demonstrate a 15% energy use reduction compared to 2008 n/r vide short-term and long-term bicycle parking for 5% of total yeach, or meet San Francisco Planning Code Sec 155, | FAX: (415) 922.0203 WEBSITE:WWW. SIACONSULT.COM SHEET TITLE |
| ash. (13C.5.410.1, et al) - See Administrative Bulletin 088 for • Demonstrate a 15% energy use reduction compared to 2008 • title 24, Part 6. (13C.5.201.1.1) • vide short-term and long-term bicycle parking for 5% of total • yeach, or meet San Francisco Planning Code Sec 155, • | |
| itle 24, Part 6. (13C.5.201.1.1) vide short-term and long-term bicycle parking for 5% of total y each, or meet San Francisco Planning Code Sec 155, | |
| y each, or meet San Francisco Planning Code Sec 155, Diagonal Se | |
| | Green Building Site Permit |
| e and carpool parking: Provide stall marking for and carpool/van pool vehicles; approximately 8% of total | Checklist |
| submaters for spaces projected to consume >1,000 gal/day, tigs over 50,000 sq. ft. | |
| ncy: Reduce overall use of potable water within the building by 20% tchen faucets, wash fountains, water closets, and urinals. (13C.5.303.2) | |
| new buildings greater than 10,000 square feet, commissioning sign and construction of the project to verify that the building meet the owner's project requirements. (13C.5.410.2) (Testing & In 0,000 square feet, testing and adjusting of systems is required. Balancing) | |
| s and mechanical equipment during construction | |
| , and caulks: Comply with VOC limits in SCAQMD Rule 1168 ode of Regulations Title 17 for aerosol adhesives. (13C.5.504.4.1) | |
| : Comply with VOC limits in the Air Resources Board gested Control Measure and California Code of Regulations (13C.5.504.4.3) | |
| neet one of the following: ute Green Label Plus Program t of Public Health Standard Practice for the testing of VOCs Gold level is Systems Sustainable Choice nust meet CRI Green Label, must not exceed 50 g/L VOC content, (13C.5.504.4.4) | These documents are property of SIA CONSULTING and are not to be produced changed or copied without the expressed written consent of SIA <u>CONSULTING ENGINEERS</u> . ISSUES / REVISIONS NO. DATE DESCRIPTION |
| CARB Air Toxics Control Measure for Composite Wood (13C.5.504.4.5) | 12/02/2014 REVISION PER COMMENT |
| stems: For 50% of floor area receiving resilient flooring, install with the VOC-emission limits defined in the 2009 Collaborative ols (CHPS) criteria or certified under the Resilient Floor oorScore program. (13C.5.504.4.6) | |
| cco Smoke: Prohibit smoking within 25 feet of building and operable windows. (13C,5,504.7) | |
| tt least MERV-8 filters in regularly occupied spaces of dings. (13C.5.504.5.3) | |
| Vall and roof-ceilings STC 50, exterior windows STC 30, party 40, (13C.5.507.4) • See CA T24 Part 11 Section 5.714.7 | DRAWN R.L. |
| not install equipment that contains CFCs or Halons. (13C.5.508.1) | CHECKED R.K. |
| nts for New A, B, I, OR M Occupancy Projects 5,000 - 25,000 Square Feet | DATE 09/02/2014 |
| Management - Divert 75% of construction and demolition quired by the San Francisco Construction & Demolition Debris ordinance only | REVISED DATE 06/18/2015 |
| Enhanced Energy Efficiency Generate renewable energy on-site equal to ≥1% of total | JOB NO. 14-1628 |
| Ac2), OR D% energy use reduction (total of 25% compared to Title 24 n/r enewable energy credits for 35% of total electricity use | SHEET NO. G-0.1 |

| david gendreau |
|--|
| Perry, Andrew (CPC) |
| Andrew Solow (Gladding & Michel) |
| Proposed Construction at 7 Lake Forest Court |
| Wednesday, April 08, 2015 8:43:18 PM |
| |

Mr Perry: This is to confirm a telephone conversion we had on April 3, 2015 in which I stated my objection to project #: 2007.11.05.7258 dated 3/10/2015 for construction at 7 Lake Forest Court. I object on the grounds that construction of a third floor addition would change the character of the neighborhood and set a percedent for other construction in the area.

I have spoken to other neighbors who also object to this proposed construction. This includes an objection by one property owner living within 150 feet of this property who was not issued with a notice. I have received signatures of other neighboing property owners who also object to this project. As you advised, I will submit these to you in writing within 10-14 days of the hearing so that they can be included in the Case Report.

Thank you for your attention in this matter.

David Gendreau 41 Lake Forest Court

Mr Andrew Perry 1650 Mission Street San Francisco, CA

Dear Mr Perry:

This letter is to inform you that we, the undersigned, object to the proposed construction of a third story structure at 7 Lake Forest Court. There are no other houses with three stories on Lake Forest Court, adjacent Oak Park Drive and nearby Devonshire Way and Christopher Street.

Such a construction would dramatically change the character of this residential Forest Knolls Neighborhood. This would also serve as a precedent for other third story construction in this neighborhood. This would then lead to increased traffic congestion in the area.

Please contact me if you have any additional questions.

Sincerely,

And Kundrean

David Gendreau

oe Chursin

That y Ko & Charles Hudgins - 29 Lake forest Ct

| From: | Chip Hudgins |
|----------|--|
| To: | Perry, Andrew (CPC) |
| Subject: | Building Permit at 7 Lake Forest Court (2007.11.05.7258) |
| Date: | Tuesday, March 24, 2015 3:35:24 PM |

Hello Mr Perry,

I wanted to send you an email to express my concerns about the building permit application for a third level at the address of 7 Lake Forest Court.

There are currently no 3 story buildings on the block or in the neighborhood near to 7 Lake Forest Court. Such a change would dramatically change the character of the neighborhood. I feel such a change if approved would also set a precedence for many more third story additions in the neighbor, benefiting those who can afford such a change and penalizing those who cannot.

The addition of a third story at 7 Lake Forest Court will block all natural light to the home(s) next to the higher expansion. I feel this would also reduce the privacy of home(s) next to that dwelling as the third story height would expose the upper bedroom windows of the lower houses.

When the homes in Forest Knolls were built, all home owners abided by the 'Declaration of Restrictions' set forth by the original owners of the land, Joseph and Clara Stadler. These restrictions prevented the building of any structures on the roof of homes to preserve the equity and beauty of the neighborhood. While the time limit on this document of restrictions has expired, I would hope the spirit of the neighborhood would remain.

And lastly, despite concerns expressed by neighbors, there has been no attempt to reach out to those that would be impacted by the owners of 7 Lake Forest Court.

I did contact Mr Aidin Massoudi (as per the applicant on the application) but found he was only a lawyer hired by the owner and could not provide any relevant information about this project. This was most concerning.

I appreciate your time in listening to my concerns and how it will impact my family's home, street and neighborhood. It is my understanding that there will be a hearing which I also plan to attend.

Regards, Charles Hudgins <u>chudgins@gmail.com</u> 29 Lake Forest Court, SF CA 94131 415-335-9560

Mr Andrew Perry 1650 Mission Street San Francisco, CA

Dear Mr Perry:

This letter is to inform you that we, the undersigned, object to the proposed construction of a third story structure at 7 Lake Forest Court. There are no other houses with three stories on Lake Forest Court, adjacent Oak Park Drive and nearby Devonshire Way and Christopher Street.

Such a construction would dramatically change the character of this residential Forest Knolls Neighborhood. This would also serve as a precedent for other third story construction in this neighborhood. This would then lead to increased traffic congestion in the area.

Please contact me if you have any additional questions.

Sincerely,

Divid hundrean

David Gendreau

41 Lake Forest Court

DANSIEL SCHMUTZ

89 LAKE FOLEST CT.

Dear Mr. Perry,

I am writing in opposition to the proposed 3rd story addition at 7 Lake Forest. I never received notice of this project.

The proposed undertaking is totally out of character with the existing neighborhood which is two story detached homes less than 25 feet in height. I therefore request discretionary review of this project.

Approval of this out of scale project would set a precedent under which every house in the neighborhood will almost certainly be converted to a 3 story dwelling. This would fundamentally alter the character of this neighborhood by radically increasing the population density, promoting the creation of illegal dwelling units in an RH1 zoning district, and dramatically reducing the available street parking. That is why discretionary review of this out of scale project is critically important.

Yours truly, Daniel Schultz

--Daniel Schultz 89 Lake Forest Court San Francisco, CA 94131 415.676.7055 (mobile) 415.681.1334 (fax)

Mr Andrew Perry 1650 Mission Street San Francisco, CA

Dear Mr Perry:

This letter is to inform you that we, the undersigned, object to the proposed construction of a third story structure at 7 Lake Forest Court. There are no other houses with three stories on Lake Forest Court, adjacent Oak Park Drive and nearby Devonshire Way and Christopher Street.

Such a construction would dramatically change the character of this residential Forest Knolls Neighborhood. This would also serve as a precedent for other third story construction in this neighborhood. This would then lead to increased traffic congestion in the area.

Please contact me if you have any additional questions.

Sincerely,

And Gendrean

David Gendreau

41 Lake Forest Court

PAPERICE YI 921 OAK PAPER DRIVE

Hi Andrew,

I hope all is well.

This is a follow up to my voice mail this morning re: Notice of Building Permit Application for 7 Lake Forest Court to add a vertical addition.

As I stated on the VM, I am opposed to the vertical addition and would like to block this effort.

Thank you. Regards, Patrick Yi 421 Oak Park Drive San Francisco, CA 650-787-9761

Mr Andrew Perry

1650 Mission Street

San Francisco, CA

Dear Mr Perry:

This letter is to inform you that we, the undersigned, object to the proposed construction of a third story structure at 7 Lake Forest Court. There are no other houses with three stories on Lake Forest Court, adjacent Oak Park Drive and nearby Devonshire Way and Christopher Street.

Such a construction would dramatically change the character of this residential Forest Knolls Neighborhood. This would also serve as a precedent for other third story construction in this neighborhood. This would then lead to increased traffic congestion in the area.

Please contact me if you have any additional questions.

Sincerely,

Bund hindrean

David Gendreau

GRACE Dito GRACE Dito

Mr Andrew Perry

1650 Mission Street

San Francisco, CA

Dear Mr Perry:

This letter is to inform you that we, the undersigned, object to the proposed construction of a third story structure at 7 Lake Forest Court. There are no other houses with three stories on Lake Forest Court, adjacent Oak Park Drive and nearby Devonshire Way and Christopher Street.

Such a construction would dramatically change the character of this residential Forest Knolls Neighborhood. This would also serve as a precedent for other third story construction in this neighborhood. This would then lead to increased traffic congestion in the area.

Please contact me if you have any additional questions.

Sincerely,

) vid hundrean

David Gendreau

The underighed co-ourser of 26 Lake Forest Court beneby object to the proposed construction of a third floor story structure at 7 Leke Forest Court for the reasons stated above. Hultury Jean Hulang

Mr Andrew Perry 1650 Mission Street San Francisco, CA

Dear Mr Perry:

This letter is to inform you that we, the undersigned, object to the proposed construction of a third story structure at 7 Lake Forest Court. There are no other houses with three stories on Lake Forest Court, adjacent Oak Park Drive and nearby Devonshire Way and Christopher Street.

Such a construction would dramatically change the character of this residential Forest Knolls Neighborhood. This would also serve as a precedent for other third story construction in this neighborhood. This would then lead to increased traffic congestion in the area.

Please contact me if you have any additional questions.

Sincerely,

Dond hundren David Gendreau

PENNY HUGHES 57 Lake Forest ict.

Mr Andrew Perry 1650 Mission Street San Francisco, CA

Dear Mr Perry:

This letter is to inform you that we, the undersigned, object to the proposed construction of a third story structure at 7 Lake Forest Court. There are no other houses with three stories on Lake Forest Court, adjacent Oak Park Drive and nearby Devonshire Way and Christopher Street.

Such a construction would dramatically change the character of this residential Forest Knolls Neighborhood. This would also serve as a precedent for other third story construction in this neighborhood. This would then lead to increased traffic congestion in the area.

Please contact me if you have any additional questions.

Sincerely,

Dovid Kundrean

David Gendreau

Robert Karonkian BhJ/CQ 40 LAKE FOREST Ct.

San Francisco Planning Department Re: 7 Lake Forest Ct. Block/Lot No: 2675/028

Dear Planning Department:

The addition of a third story to 7 Lake Forest Ct. will have a negative impact on the neighborhood of mostly two-story homes. This single family residence has already been enlarged. A rear addition was added some years ago, so this home has a larger footprint than most of the other homes in Forest Knolls.

Adding a third story will make this home larger than the few three story homes in the development.

The reasons to deny a permit are:

1. Negative visual impact – we own 425 Oak Park Drive, directly across the street from 7 Lake Forest Ct.. I will no longer be able to see the sky or the Mt. Sutro tree line. Light into my home in this northerly direction will be diminished as well.

2. Increased traffic and parking issues. The probability of increased residents to the home will require street parking. This will severely impact the safety of Oak Park Drive from Devonshire to Lake Forest Ct.

a. Emergency vehicles as well as waste disposal trucks will not be able to turn onto Oak Park Drive from Devonshire. There can be cars parked along the north side of Oak Park Drive as well as the south side, creating a narrow, one lane road.

b. With cars parked as noted above, the intersection at Devonshire and Oak Park Drive becomes unsafe due to decreased visibility in spite of the stop sign.

3. The imposing footprint of the proposed third story is definitely out of character for the neighborhood considering this house already has an enlarged footprint.

4. Due to the above issues, this addition will decrease the property values of the surrounding homes including ours. If 7 Lake Forest is allowed to increase their footprint a precedent has been set for other homeowners to do the same.

Please consider the fact that this house has already been enlarged and any larger, more imposing structure will not improve the neighborhood, but seriously detract from the overall character of Forest Knolls and create visual and safety issues.

Please let me know when the hearing for 7 Lake Forest Ct. will take place.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lynda Oneto and Janice Oneto

Lynda Oneto PO Box 2116 Boyes Hot Springs, CA 95416

707-539-3192

Mr. Perry-

I live at 100 Devonshire Way, at the property below 7 Lake Forest Court, the subject of the building permit # 2007.11.05.7258.

I would like to say that I plan on calling the applicant, but it seems like there are some legitimate concerns with this project:

1) the addition will change the character of the neighborhood. There is/was a deed restriction of 25 ft vertical height to the neighborhood, which dictated the look/feel of the neighborhood. Whether the deed restriction is still valid does not change that.

2) Our house is below the subject property. By 'below', I mean that we are downhill and the additional vertical addition would cause our property to be cast in shadow for a portion of the day, reducing our ability to garden, add solar to our house and generally, enjoy our yard.

3) We are concerned by the height in that in will reduce privacy in that it will allow the residents to violate our privacy, both inside our house as well as our yard.

4) Permitting this verbal addition will set a precedent for the rest of the houses on the block, casting our house in a permanent shadow throughout most of the day if they follow suit.

We plan on contacting Mr. Massoudi (applicant) directly, but want to see if there is anything else that can be done on our part to stop this project.

Peter Wohlers pedro@whack.org

| From: | Andrew Solow (Comcast Alt Email) |
|----------|--|
| To: | Perry, Andrew (CPC) |
| Subject: | Project #: 2007.11.05.7258 - 7 Lake Forest Ct CA Public Records Act Request - Mailing list for notice of project dated 3/10/2015 |
| Date: | Wednesday, April 08, 2015 10:50:49 PM |

San Francisco Planning Dept. 1660 Mission St. San Francisco, CA 94103

Attention: Andrew Perry, Planner - 415-575-9017

Hello Mr. Perry,

Pursuant to the public disclosure requirements of the CA Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance, I hereby request an electronic copy of the mailing list to which the notice of Project #: 2007.11.05.7258, dated 3/10/2015 (regarding 7 Lake Forest Ct.) was mailed. Please Email it to me at your earliest convenience.

On information and belief, the subject notice is defective on its face because it was not timely mailed to ALL property owners within 150 feet of the proposed undertaking at 7 Lake Forest Ct., San Francisco, CA.

I further contend that the proposed undertaking will change the zoning of the entire area to 2 dwelling units de facto within 300 feet of the proposed 3^{rd} floor addition at 7 Lake Forest.

In consideration of the defective notice and the de facto zoning change, I demand that a new notice be mailed to ALL affected properties within 300 feet of 7 Lake Forest Ct.

Your immediate response would be greatly appreciated.

Yours truly,

Andrew Solow 58 Lake Forest Ct. San Francisco, CA 94131-1025 Cell 415-722-3047

From: Andrew Solow (Comcast Alt Email) [mailto:andrewsolow08@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, April 08, 2015 7:41 PM
To: 'andrew.perry@sfgov.org'
Subject: Project #: 2007.11.05.7258 - 7 Lake Forest Ct. - third story vertical addition - OPPOSED!!! - DEMAND FOR DISCRETIONARY REVIEW - DEFECTIVE NOTICE

San Francisco Planning Dept. 1660 Mission St. San Francisco, CA 94103

Attention: Andrew Perry, Planner - 415-575-9017

Dear Mr. Perry,

I am writing in opposition to the proposed 3rd story addition at 7 Lake Forest Ct.

- DEFECTIVE NOTICE: The Notice for project #: 2007.11.05.7258 dated 3/10/2015 is defective on its face because my primary residence at 58 Lake Forest Ct. is only 118 feet from 7 Lake Forest Ct., considerably less than the 150 foot radius specified on the notice. I therefore DEMAND that this project be re-noticed to all property owners within at least 300 feet.
- 2) **OUT OF CHARACTER WITH EXISTING NEIGHBORHOOD:** The proposed undertaking is totally out of character with the existing neighborhood which is two story detached homes less than 25 feet in height. I therefore request discretionary review of this project.
- 3) **DEMAND FOR DISCRETIONARY REVIEW:** Approval of this out of scale project would set a precedent under which every house in the neighborhood will almost certainly be converted to a 3 story dwelling. This would fundamentally alter the character of this neighborhood by radically increasing the population density, promoting the creation of illegal dwelling units in an RH1 zoning district, and dramatically reducing the available street parking. That is why discretionary review of this out of scale project is critically important.

Yours truly,

Andrew Solow 58 Lake Forest Ct. San Francisco, CA 94131-1025 Cell 415-722-3047

| From: | Billy Shen |
|-------|---|
| To: | Perry, Andrew (CPC) |
| Cc: | andrewsolow08@comcast.net; Dan Schultz |
| • | Project #: 2007.11.05.7258 - 7 Lake Forest Ct third story vertical addition - OPPOSED!!! - DEMAND FOR DISCRETIONARY REVIEW - DEFECTIVE NOTICE |
| Date: | Thursday, April 09, 2015 10:44:44 AM |

San Francisco Planning Dept. <u>1660 Mission St.</u> <u>San Francisco, CA 94103</u> Opposed Attention: Andrew Perry, Planner – <u>415-575-9017</u>

Dear Mr. Perry,

I am writing in opposition to the proposed 3rd story addition at <u>7 Lake</u> <u>Forest Ct.</u>

1) **DEFECTIVE NOTICE:** The Notice for project #:

2007.11.05.7258 dated 3/10/2015 is defective on its face because my primary residence at <u>58 Lake Forest Ct.</u> is only 118 feet from 7 Lake Forest Ct., considerably less than the 150 foot radius specified on the notice. I therefore DEMAND that this project be re-noticed to all property owners within at least 300 feet.

2) OUT OF CHARACTER WITH EXISTING

NEIGHBORHOOD: The proposed undertaking is totally out of character with the existing neighborhood which is two story detached homes less than 25 feet in height. I therefore request discretionary review of this project.

3) **DEMAND FOR DISCRETIONARY REVIEW:** Approval of this out of scale project would set a precedent under which every house in the neighborhood will almost certainly be converted to a 3 story dwelling. This would fundamentally alter the character of this neighborhood by radically increasing the population density, promoting the creation of illegal dwelling units in an RH1 zoning district, and dramatically reducing the available street parking. That is why discretionary review of this out of scale project is critically important.

Thank you. Billy

Billy Shen Billy Shen Art Direction 415.731.6096