

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Discretionary Review Abbreviated Analysis

HEARING DATE: MAY 3, 2012

Date:	April 26, 2012
Case No.:	2012.0135DDDDD
Project Address:	2705 Larkin Street
Permit Application:	2010.12.27.7441
Zoning:	RH-2 [Residential House, Two-Family]
	40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot:	0477/004
Project Sponsor:	Lev Bereznycky
	Lundburg Design
	2620 Third Street
	San Francisco, CA 94107
Staff Contact:	Glenn Cabreros – (415) 588-6169
	glenn.cabreros@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 an approximately 21-foot deep four-story-over-basement horizontal addition at the rear of the existing four-story-over-basement, two-unit building.

SITE DESCRIPTION AND PRESENT USE

The project is located on the west side of Larkin Street between Francisco and Chestnut Streets. The subject property contains a four-story, two-unit building on a steeply downward sloping lot measuring approximately 27 feet wide and 137.5 feet deep with an area of 3,712.5 square feet. The project site is located in the RH-2 Zoning District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

SURROUNDING PROPERTIES AND NEIGHBORHOOD

The subject property is located within a residential neighborhood on the northwest slope of Russian Hill. Directly adjacent and north of the project is a three-story-over-basement, single-family residence. Directly adjacent and south of the project is a large three-story-over-basement, 13-unit apartment building located in the RM-3 (Residential-Mixed, Medium Density) Zoning District. Directly across Larkin Street from the project site is a tall 14-story, 12-unit apartment building.

BUILDING PERMIT NOTIFICATION

TYPE	REQUIRED PERIOD	NOTIFICATION DATES	DR FILE DATE	DR HEARING DATE	FILING TO HEARING TIME
311 Notice	30 days	Jan. 12, 2012 – Feb. 11, 2012	Feb. 6, 2012	May 3, 2012	90 days

HEARING NOTIFICATION

ТҮРЕ	REQUIRED PERIOD	REQUIRED NOTICE DATE	ACTUAL NOTICE DATE	ACTUAL PERIOD
Posted Notice	10 days	April 23, 2012	April 23, 2012	10 days
Mailed Notice	10 days	April 23, 2012	April 23, 2012	10 days

PUBLIC COMMENT

	SUPPORT	OPPOSED*	NO POSITION
Adjacent neighbor(s)		1	
Other neighbors on the			
block or directly across		4	
the street			
Neighborhood groups			

*The five neighbors that are opposed to the project are also the DR requestors listed below.

DR REQUESTORS

Carol Seligman of 2707 Larkin Street, which is directly north and adjacent to the project.

Jim Stafford of 2709 Larkin Street, which is two lots north of the project.

Jill Tarlau of 120 **Culebra Terrace**, which is directly west and downhill from the project and has a shared rear lot line with the subject lot.

Nancy Brown Williamson of **129 Culebra Terrace**, which is west, downhill and across Culebra Terrace from the project.

Steve and Madelaine Gunders of **133-135 Culebra Terrace** which is west, downhill and across Culebra Terrace from the project.

DR REQUESTOR'S CONCERNS AND PROPOSED ALTERNATIVES

See attached Discretionary Review Applications.

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 (RDT) REVIEW

The RDT did not find any exceptional or extraordinary circumstances related to the project. The proposed depth of the rear horizontal addition would act as a transition between the adjacent building depths: from the deeper apartment building to the south to the shallower single-family residence to the

north. The massing of the project is shaped to address the existing adjacent conditions; the rear addition proposes a stepped rear wall and a side setback along the upper floors at the northwest corner of the addition. The width of the existing northern side setback (approximately 10 feet wide) at the adjacent building to the south would continue to provide sufficient light and air to the adjacent property's north-facing windows. Issues related to construction do not fall under the purview of the Planning Code and are better addressed by the Building Code and the Department of Building Inspection.

Under the Commission's pending DR Reform Legislation, this project would not 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: Parcel Map Sanborn Map Aerial Photographs Zoning Map Section 311 Notice DR Applications / Context Photographs Reduced Plans / Renderings

GC: G:\Documents\2012\DR\2012.0135D - 2705 Larkin\2012.0135D - 2705 Larkin - DR analysis.doc

Parcel Map





Sanborn Map*



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







SUBJECT PROPERTY **B** T I 1 illi tilli illi illi illi illi IN 121 131 IN 10 31 11 LH III 121 101 107 100 101 101 131 131 101 181 101 121 141 IIII I int 1#1 101 131 18 (3) 101 i i iiiiiii 1003 (003 (003 (003 10)) 101 = 1 Ĥ. 11 83 inni 11 111 -









SUBJECT PROPERTY



Zoning Map







SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1650 Mission Street Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

NOTICE OF BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION (SECTION 311)

On December 27, 2010, the Applicant named below filed Building Permit Application No. 2010.12.27.7441 (Alteration) with the City and County of San Francisco.

	CONTACT INFORMATION	PROJECT	SITE INFORMATION
Applicant:	•	Project Address:	2705 Larkin Street
Address:		Cross Streets:	Chestnut / Francisco Streets
City, State:		Assessor's Block /Lot No.:	0477/004
Telephone		Zoning Districts:	RH-2 /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	
[] VERTICAL EXTENSION	[] CHANGE # OF DWELLING UNITS	[] FACADE ALTERATION(S)	
[] HORIZ. EXTENSION (FRONT)	[] HORIZ. EXTENSION (SIDE)	[X] HORIZ. EXTENSION (REAR)	
PROJECT FEATURES	EXISTING CONDITIO	N PROPOSED CONDITION	
BUILDING USE	Two-Family Dwelling		
FRONT SETBACK	12 feet	No Change	
SIDE SETBACKS	None	No Change	
BUILDING DEPTH			
REAR YARD		36 feet	
HEIGHT OF BUILDING		No Change	
NUMBER OF STORIES	4 over basement	4 over 2 basement levels	
NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS		No Change	
NUMBER OF OFF-STREET PARKING SP	ACES2	No Change	
PROJECT DESCRIPTION			

The proposal is for a four-story-over-basement rear horizontal addition to the existing four-story, two-unit building. See attached plans.

PLANNER'S NAME:	Glenn Cabreros		
PHONE NUMBER:	(415) 558-6169	DATE OF THIS NOTICE:	01/12/2012
EMAIL:	glenn.cabreros@sfgov.org	EXPIRATION DATE:	02/11/2012

e constanti de la constanti Constanti de la constanti de la

APPLICATION FOR Discretionary Review

1. Owner/Applicant Information

Carol Seligman		
CHAPPINGAN BATCHESS	ZIZCODE	TELEPHONE
2707 Larkin Street	94109-1117	(415)922-2254
PEOPERTY OWNERWHONS DOINS THE PROVEDTION WHICH YOU ARE RECUESTING DISORPTION	ARY REVIEW NOVE	
Peter Fenton		
ADISPESO	ZECODE	STREEP-ONE
2705 Larkin Street	94109-1117	(415) 362-4455
CONTRACT FOR OBSIDE LOATION	fritte and a state of the state	
Same as Above 🕞 Howard N. Ellman, Esq., Buchalter Nemer		
Molences	el Zieclopie	TELEPHONE
55 Second Street, 17th Floor	94105-3493	(415) 227-0900
Kale Aponts's and the second		A CARACTER STATE

2. Location and Classification

STREE NooRess OF PROJECT				
Chosse insers: Chestnut/Francisco				94109-1117
ASSESSOFS BICORIOT	27 x 137.50	. LOT АНБА (SOTE) 3,712.50	ZONING DISTRICT RH-2 Residential 2-Family	HEIGHT/BULK DISTRICT 2005 40x (35ft /section 261.b.2)
3. Project Descripti	on			
Please check all that apply Change of Use	hange of Hours 🗌	New Constru	ction 🔀 Alterations 🔀	Demolition 🗌 Other 🗌
Additions to Building Present or Previous Us	Residential	ont 🗌 🛛 Heigh	t 🔀 Side Yard 🕱	
Proposed Use:	ential			
Building Permit Applic	cation No. 2010122	77441	Date F	iled: 12/27/2010

4. Actions Prior to a Discretionary Review Request

Prior Action	YES	NO
Have you discussed this project with the permit applicant?	[¥]	
Did you discuss the project with the Planning Department permit review planner?	LX.	
Did you participate in outside mediation on this case?		X

5. Changes Made to the Project as a Result of Mediation

8

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT V.10.21.2011

If you have discussed the project with the applicant, planning staff or gone through mediation, please summarize the result, including any changes there were made to the proposed project. Despite numerous discussions, the DR Applicant and the Project Proponent have not been able to reach an agreement. The Project Proponent apparently believes that anything that complies with the Code is what he is entitled to build without regard to the revisions that can be wrought through Discretionary Review.

9

Discretionary Review Request

In the space below and on separate paper, if necessary, please present facts sufficient to answer each question.

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 or Residential Design Guidelines? Please be specific and site specific sections of the Residential Design Guidelines.

See Addendum Attached

2. The Residential Design Guidelines assume some impacts to be reasonable and expected as part of construction. Please explain how this project would cause unreasonable impacts. 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 Addendum Attached

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 #1?

.

See Addendum Attached

Applicant's Affidavit

Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:

- a: The undersigned is the owner or authorized agent of the owner of this property.
- b: The information presented is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.
- c: The other information or applications may be required.

- oral Delignan Signature:

Date: 2 7 12

Print name, and indicate whether owner, or authorized agent:

Carol Seligman Owner / Authorized Agent (circle one)

10

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT V 10 21 2011

Signature: Stewart M. Elhum. Date: Fel 6, 2012

Buchalter Nemer

By: Howard N. Ellman

Attorneys for Applicant Carol Seligman

AMENDED

ADDENDUM TO DISCRETIONARY REVIEW APPLICATION

of

CAROL SELIGMAN 2707 LARKIN STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109-1117

With Respect To

PROPOSED ALTERATION AND NEW CONSTRUCTION

by

PETER FENTON 2705 LARKIN STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109-1117

I. Introductory Statement.

Carol Seligman seeks Discretionary Review of Building Permit No. 201012277441 under Planning Code Section 311(d) on three grounds:

(i) The proposed construction by Mr. Fenton on his property at 2705 Larkin Street will result in an invasion of the privacy of the occupants of 2707 Larkin Street. The new construction will provide direct visual access into the primary living space at 2707 Larkin Street by creating both vantage points and large windows that provide direct views into the interior of the residence at 2707 Larkin;

(ii) The proposed construction will significantly impair the light that is available to 2707 Larkin Street and currently illuminates the interior of that residence; and

(iii) Although it is more of a Building Code than Planning Code violation, the proposed construction by Mr. Fenton will exceed applicable height limitations by creating five floors over a basement rather than four as the application represents.

II. Discretionary Review Criteria.

By definition, Discretionary Review applies in cases where proposed construction otherwise complies with all planning constraints. It is a mechanism in the Planning Code expressly recognizing that strict application of the planning restrictions that the Code contains can result in construction of improvements that are out of keeping with neighborhood character, as well as fundamental residential values. These values find their expression in Section 101:

Purposes.

•••

(b) To protect the character and stability of residential ... areas within the City ... ;

BN 10947601v1	1	AMENDED ADDENDUM TO DISCRETIONARY REVIEW
		APPLICATION REGARDING 2705 LARKIN STREET

(c) To provide adequate light, air, privacy and convenience of access to property, and to secure safety from fire and other dangers ...

Section 311 of the Planning Code states:

(a) **Purpose**. The purpose of this Section is to establish procedures for reviewing building permit applications for lots in R Districts in order to determine compatibility of the proposal with the neighborhood and for providing notice to property owners ... so that concerns about a project may be identified and resolved during the review of the permit.

Under subsection (c), the Code states that permits are to be considered in light of applicable design guidelines approved by the Planning Commission. Section 311(c)(1) provides that the adopted Residential Design Guidelines shall be used to review plans for all new construction and alterations. It confers upon the Planning Commission the authority to require revisions in order to secure conformity with the spirit of the guidelines. The Guidelines emphasize neighborhood character (p.7, *et seq.*), minimizing impacts on access to light (p.16); and preservation of privacy in cases where a proposed project will have "*an unusual impact on privacy to neighboring interior living spaces*" (p.17).

The Planning Commission is familiar with these principles and implementing provisions. We will not add undue length to this Addendum with further detail. Rather, we turn now to those respects in which the pending application violates the spirit of these design principles.

III. Discretionary Review Criteria.

A. **Invasion of Privacy**. We have attached a series of diagrams taken from Mr. Fenton's application showing the projected new construction at 2705 Larkin Street. The additions proposed for the rear of the building, directly south of the Seligman residence at 2707 Larkin Street, will project out to the west. As the diagrams plainly illustrate, the new construction will provide vantage points for viewing directly into the back yard and living spaces of 2707 Larkin Street, including the bedrooms. The permit applicant has made no effort and made no offer to mitigate this impact by design revision. The diagrams that come directly from his own application starkly illustrate the degree of that invasion. They are included in the Exhibit File submitted with the Application under the heading "Invasion of Privacy."

Pictures 1-6 submitted with the Discretionary Review Application show the existing conditions. They aid in understanding the degree of privacy invasion Fenton's proposed construction will create.

B. **Impairment of Light**. Because the proposed construction at 2705 Larkin Street will extend to the west, it will cut off the light enjoyed by the 2707 residence during parts of the day and at times of the year when light currently reaches the residence. Because there is a large structure that extends farther to the west immediately adjacent to 2705 Larkin on the westerly side, the light impairment occurs only during certain times of day and seasons of the year – but it will be material. In addition to the diagrams provided to illustrate the invasion of privacy, the

BN 10947601v1	2	AMENDED ADDENDUM TO DISCRETIONARY REVIEW
		APPLICATION REGARDING 2705 LARKIN STREET

Discretionary Review applicant will submit a diagram demonstrating the degree of interference with light based on an analysis currently in progress.

C. **Excessive Building Height**. As noted in the Introductory Statement, the issue of height arises primarily under the Building Code and will be raised again if the plans are not revised and a Building Permit is eventually issued for construction in accordance with the current plans or something substantially equivalent. But as height is a consideration under the Planning Code as well, we have attached a diagram showing that the application for the Building Permit at 2705 Larkin Street does not accurately reflect the true height of the proposed construction.

IV. Conclusion.

For all the foregoing reasons, the plan proposed by Mr. Fenton for new construction and alterations at 2705 Larkin Street should not be approved in its current form. The Planning Commission should direct that it be modified to address the foregoing concerns. Ms. Seligman would be willing to participate in mediation in an effort to resolve these issues if the Planning Commission so directs.

3

Dated: February 8, 2012

BUCHALTER NEMER A Professional Corporation

By: <u>Journal M. Mann</u> Howard N. Ellman

Attorneys for Applicant Carol Seligman

BN 10947601v1	lv1
---------------	-----

Discretionary Review applicant will submit a diagram demonstrating the degree of interference with light based on an analysis currently in progress.

C. **Excessive Building Height**. As noted in the Introductory Statement, the issue of height arises primarily under the Building Code and will be raised again if the plans are not revised and a Building Permit is eventually issued for construction in accordance with the current plans or something substantially equivalent. But as height is a consideration under the Planning Code as well, we have attached a diagram showing that the application for the Building Permit at 2705 Larkin Street does not accurately reflect the true height of the proposed construction.

IV. Conclusion.

For all the foregoing reasons, the plan proposed by Mr. Fenton for new construction and alterations at 2705 Larkin Street should not be approved in its current form. The Planning Commission should direct that it be modified to address the foregoing concerns. Ms. Seligman would be willing to participate in mediation in an effort to resolve these issues if the Planning Commission so directs.

Dated: February 8, 2012

BUCHALTER NEMER A Professional Corporation

By: Jourd R. Man

Howard N. Ellman

Attorneys for Applicant Carol Seligman

3













FENTON PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS AT 2705 LARKIN. SIDE WINDOWS PROVIDE PLATFORM FOR INVASION OF PRIVACY. NEW STRUCTURE BLOCKS LIGHT FROM THE WEST.

FENTON PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS LOOK DIRECTLY INTO LIVING SPACE IN 2707 LARKIN RESIDENCE.



FENTON IMPROVEMENTS INVADE PRIVACY OF RESIDENCE AT 2707 LARKIN.



ANOTHER PERSPECTIVE ON INVASION OF PRIVACY AND BLOCKAGE OF LIGHT.









 $\widehat{}$

APPLICATION FOR Discretionary Review

1. Owner/Applicant Information

DR APPLICANT'S NAME: JIM Statford				
DR APPLICANT'S ADDRESS:	ZIP CODE:	TELEPHONE:		
2709 Larkin Street, San Francisco, CA	94109	⁽⁴¹⁵⁾ 860-9951		
PROPERTY OWNER WHO IS DOING THE PROJECT ON WHICH YOU ARE REQUES	STING DISCRETIONARY REVIEW NAME:			
ADDRESS:	ZIP CODE:	TELEPHONE:		
2705 Larkin Street	94109	(650) 799-7250		
CONTACT FOR DR APPLICATION:				
Same as Above				
ADDRESS:	ZIP CODE:	TELEPHONE:		
		()		
E-MAIL ADDRESS: jstafford1@gmail.com				

2. Location and Classification

STREET ADD	RESS OF PROJECT	ZIP CODE:					
		San Francisco CA	L		94109		
CROSS STRE							
Chestnu	it Street						
ASSESSORS	BLOCK/LOT:	LOT DIMENSIONS:	LOT AREA (SQ FT):	ZONING DISTRICT:	HEIGHT/BULK DISTRICT:		
29	[/] 4	27'x137'.5"	3.712.5	RH2	35ft Section 261		
Additions	s to Building:	Rear 🔀 🛛 Fro	ont 🗌 🛛 Heigł	nt 🔀 Side Yard 🕱			
Present or	Previous Use	: Residential	HAR JURITUM III ART RENAL III VIIVOODIO, O, O, MOODI	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			
Proposed	Use: Reside	ential					
3uilding I	Permit Applica	ation No. 201012 2	277441	Dat	Date Filed: 12/27/2010		
				garage (rear garage			

FEB 0 7 200

CITY & COUNT OF ST

12.0135D

4. Actions Prior to a Discretionary Review Request

Prior Action	YES	NO
Have you discussed this project with the permit applicant?	X	
Did you discuss the project with the Planning Department permit review planner?		x
Did you participate in outside mediation on this case?		X .

5. Changes Made to the Project as a Result of Mediation

If you have discussed the project with the applicant, planning staff or gone through mediation, please summarize the result, including any changes there were made to the proposed project.



Discretionary Review Request

In the space below and on separate paper, if necessary, please present facts sufficient to answer each question.

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 or Residential Design Guidelines? Please be specific and site specific sections of the Residential Design Guidelines.

Please see attached document

- 2. The Residential Design Guidelines assume some impacts to be reasonable and expected as part of construction. Please explain how this project would cause unreasonable impacts. If you believe your property, the property of others or the neighborhood would be adversely affected, please state who would be affected, and how:

Please see attached document

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 #1?

Please see attached document

12.0135**D**

Section 1- what are the reasons for requesting Discretionary Review?

We respectfully submit the following reasons to request the discretionary review according to the Residential Design Guidelines:

- Compromising the Neighborhood Context and Character
- Rear Yard Encroachment Incompatible Code
- Scale Incompatibility with Surrounding Buildings and history of neighborhood
- Loss of privacy
- Loss of light and open space

Compromising the Neighborhood Context and Character – (San Francisco Planning Code Section 101.1B2/Residential Guidelines II Neighborhood Character)

These three pre 1906, earthquake surviving, historic homes on Larkin Street (2705, 2707 and 2709) were originally designed in 1900 with the intent of providing all three homes with a wellbalance of light, airflow and residential inner privacy for all three neighbors. By placing this massive addition significantly deeper than the other two homes, the new plans will deteriorate an over 100 year old design in terms of architectural elements, privacy, convenience as well as the light and airflow balance. When our home was renovated (2010), we respected the history and character of the homes adjacent and lined up the back of our home in the same plane in the backyard; thus allowing everyone the beauty of open space, privacy and views.

Rear Yard Encroachment – (San Francisco Planning Code Section 101/Residential Guidelines III Site Design)

These ambitious plans are intruding into the mid block adjoining open space of the backyards and negatively impacting the light and privacy of all adjacent properties. The multi tenant building next door (2701) currently has light filled rooms for it's future tenants. The kitchen, dining and living rooms for several units will drastically turn light filled rooms into darkness. The condos on Culebra Terrace that adjoin Fenton's property will also be affected by light and encroachment into their bedrooms, bathrooms, kitchen and living room. The open space in the back of our three historic homes would be altered forever, to the detriment of each and all of the adjoining neighbors.

Scale Incompatibility with Surrounding Buildings (San Francisco Planning Code 134 & 136/Residential Guidelines IV Building Scale and Form)

The 'scale' of the proposed plans is incompatible both in terms of depth and height of the project, which clearly will make it stand out like a sore thumb, while deteriorating the well-balanced backyard lines of these homes, which have been in place for well over a century. By Fenton's using the measurement standards and scale of a multi tenant buildings to apply it to a single family home, it defies common sense and puts the neighborhood at a disadvantage.

Page -1- Discretionary Review Request for 2705 Larkin Street Project
12.0135**D**

Section 2- what are the unreasonable impacts of these plans and the adverse affects to the neighborhood properties?

Loss of Privacy

By allowing these plans, the City will enable Fenton's and their visitors an 'observation platform' into my home from all levels piercing into my home as well as my adjoining neighbors. The new addition would have a direct view line into our master bedroom and our kitchen family room.

While we understand that we live in a high-density city and appreciate that people have the right to try and improve their homes, this project is way out of scale with this historic neighborhood and unnecessarily imposes grandiosity onto this historic block. We certainly would be forced to address this unfortunate development to preserve our privacy. The scale of this plan will unfortunately destroy our mid open block spaciousness, light-filled backyards and architectural balance that has been there for over a century.

Restricted Sunlight

The Fenton's proposed plans will cast shadows and block the natural sunlight that flows throughout the open backyard space today. The shadow cast from the Fenton's plans will cause the neighboring homes and gardens to suffer the loss of nature light. A significant reduction in plans and setback from the property lines will reduce the destructive impact on all surrounding gardens and neighboring homes.

Extreme Inconvenience

The proposed plans will need to excavate and dig a deep hole through solid bedrock. The nonstop drilling, jack hammering of the solid rocks will create boisterous noises, earthquake like vibrations and layers of heavy rock dust in the vicinity, essentially making our home difficult to live in for an extended period of time. A significant reduction in plans and setbacks from the property lines will mean less inconvenience to ALL adjoining neighbors.

Section 3. What alternatives or changes to proposed project....

- Considering Neighborhood Context Architectural alignment with the adjacent homes
- Addressing Light, Airflow, Privacy, and Convenience for the adjacent homes/gardens by narrowing the width of additions leaving side spaces to limit the impact on both sides
- Scaling back to maintain a code-compliant backyard and balanced open space for landscaping
- Limiting development significantly reducing the size and scope of project.

Page -2- Discretionary Review Request for 2705 Larkin Street Project

12.01350 '

Applicant's Affidavit

Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:

- a: The undersigned is the owner or authorized agent of the owner of this property.
- b: The information presented is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.
- c: The other information or applications may be required.

Signature: Mal Seligman Date: 2.7.12

Print name, and indicate whether owner, or authorized agent: Carol Seligman, Authorized Agent

Owner / Authorized Agent (circle one)

12.0135D

February 7, 2012

To all San Francisco Permitting Departments, Agencies, Commissions, and Boards:

As the owner of the property at 2709 Larkin Street, I hereby grant authority to Carol Seligman, to act on my behalf, as my agent, to represent my interests and file a request for Discretionary Review regarding the expansion project at 2705 Larkin Street.

SIGNED

2/7/2012

Jim Stafford, Owner 2709 Larkin Street San Francisco, CA 94109





APPLICATION FOR Discretionary Review

1. Owner/Applicant Information

Dill Tarlau, Öwner		
DR APPLICANT'S ADDRESS: 120 Culera Terrace, San Francisco CA	ZIP CODE: 94109	TELEPHONE: (415) (415)
PROPERTY OWNER WHO IS DOING THE PROJECT ON WHICH YOU ARE REQUEST Peter Fenton	TING DISCRETIONARY REVIEW NAME:	
ADDRESS: 2705 Larkin Street, San Francisco CA	ZIP CODE: 94109	TELEPHONE: (650) 799-7250
CONTACT FOR DR APPLICATION:		
Same as Above $\Box oldsymbol{X}$		
ADDRESS:	ZIP CODE:	TELEPHONE:
		()
E-MAIL ADDRESS: Jill@Oriane.net		

2. Location and Classification

STREET ADDRESS OF PROJECT: ZIP CODE: 2705 Larkin Street, San Francisco CA								
CROSS STREETS: Francisco and Chestni	ıt				94109			
ASSESSORS BLOCK/LOT:	27 X 137.5	LOT AREA (SQ FT): 3,712.5	ZONING DISTRICT: RH2	HEIGHT/BULK 35 ft Sec	DISTRICT: ction 261			
3. Project Description Please check all that apply Change of Use 🗌 Change of Hours 🗌 New Construction 🔀 Alterations 🕱 Demolition 🗌 Other 🗌								
Additions to Building: Rear 🗴 Front 🗌 Height 🛣 Side Yard 🕱 Rensidential Present or Previous Use: Residential								
Proposed Use: 201012277441 12/27/2010 Building Permit Application No. Date Filed:								
					Contraction of the second			

FEB 0 6 mag

CITY & CULINIT OF 3.1 PLANNING DEPARTMENT PTC

4. Actions Prior to a Discretionary Review Request

Prior Action	YES	NO
Have you discussed this project with the permit applicant?		x
Did you discuss the project with the Planning Department permit review planner?		⊠ ⊀
Did you participate in outside mediation on this case?		×

5. Changes Made to the Project as a Result of Mediation

If you have discussed the project with the applicant, planning staff or gone through mediation, please summarize the result, including any changes there were made to the proposed project.



Discretionary Review Request

In the space below and on separate paper, if necessary, please present facts sufficient to answer each question.

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 or Residential Design Guidelines? Please be specific and site specific sections of the Residential Design Guidelines.

Please see Addendum

- 2. The Residential Design Guidelines assume some impacts to be reasonable and expected as part of construction. Please explain how this project would cause unreasonable impacts. If you believe your property, the property of others or the neighborhood would be adversely affected, please state who would be affected, and how:

Please see Addendum

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 #1?

Please see Addendum

ADDENDUM TO DISCRETIONARY REVIEW REQUEST

1. Reasons for my request:

The design of my apartment, so carefully conceived by one of San Francisco's greatest architects, Joe Esherick, is dependent on light sources. The impact of filling up open space adjacent to me will adversely affect my own space.

It is not appropriate to the arrangement of houses on our wellpreserved block.

2. Construction;

The noise of the construction and activity it involves will be experienced by my proximity. Even when the Fentons need a tree trimmed, they use my deck for the work. A greater project will certainly have more impact on my privacy.

3. Alternatives:

What must be considered is how the homes align on the block. The amount of open space must be compatible with neighbors. San Francisco is proud of its aesthetic appearance, so carefully reviewed over its history. February 8, 2012

To all San Francisco Permitting Departments, Agencies, Commissions, and Boards:

As the owner of the property at 120 Culebra Terrace, I hereby grant authority to Carol Seligman, to act on my behalf, as my agent, to represent my interests and file a request for Discretionary Review regarding the expansion project at 2705 Larkin Street.

adau SIGNED]

5005

Jill Tarlau, Owner 120 Culebra Terrace San Francisco, CA 94109

Applicant's Affidavit

Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:

- a: The undersigned is the owner or authorized agent of the owner of this property.
- b: The information presented is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.
- c: The other information or applications may be required.

Signature: Carol Seligman Date: 2.8.12

Print name, and indicate whether owner, or authorized agent: Carol Seligman, Authorized agent

Owner / Authorized Agent (circle one)

CASE NUMBER:

Application for **Discretionary Review**

12.0135D

2

FEB 0 8 2012 CITY & COUNTY OF S.F.

1. Owner/Applicant Information

Nancy Brown Williamso	br
-----------------------	----

DR APPLICANT'S ADDRESS:	ZIP CODE:	TELEPHONE:
129 Culebra Terrace, San Francisco, CA	94109	⁽ 415 ⁾ 5272248

PROPERTY OWNER WHO IS DOING THE PROJECT ON WHICH YOU ARE REQUESTING DISCRETIONARY REVIEW NAME:

	Peter Fenton		
	ADDRESS:	ZIP CODE:	TELEPHONE:
	2705 Larkin Street	94109	(650) 799-7250
	CONTACT FOR DR APPLICATION:		
	Same as Above $\Box \mathbf{X}$		
ŝ			TELEBLIONE:

ADDRESS:	ZIP CODE:	TELEPHONE:
		()
e-MAIL ADDRESS: njbrown@lbl.gov		

2. Location and Classification

STREET ADDRE	STREET ADDRESS OF PROJECT: ZIP CODE:							
2705 Larkin Street. San Francisco CA 94109								
Chestnut Street								
ASSESSORS BL	ASSESSORS BLOCK/LOT: LOT DIMENSIONS: LOT AREA (SQ FT): ZONING DISTRICT: HEIGHT/BULK DISTRICT:							
29	/ 4	27'x137'.5"	3.712.5	RH2	35ft Section 261			

3. Project Description

Please check all that apply Change of Use Cha	nge of Hours	New 0	Construction 🔀	Alterations 🔀	Demolition 🗌	Other 🗌
Additions to Building:	Rear 🔀	Front 🗌	Height 🔀	Side Yard		
Present or Previous Use:	Residentia					
Proposed Use: Residen	itial				na 1990 - Josh C. Sang Canada Manada ang Sang Sang Sang Sang Sang Sang Sang	
Building Permit Applicat	ion No. 2010	12277441		Date	Filed: 12/27/20	10

4. Actions Prior to a Discretionary Review Request

Prior Action	YES	NÔ
Have you discussed this project with the permit applicant?		x ⊡
Did you discuss the project with the Planning Department permit review planner?		×
Did you participate in outside mediation on this case?		×

5. Changes Made to the Project as a Result of Mediation

If you have discussed the project with the applicant, planning staff or gone through mediation, please summarize the result, including any changes there were made to the proposed project.



Discretionary Review Request

In the space below and on separate paper, if necessary, please present facts sufficient to answer each question.

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 or Residential Design Guidelines? Please be specific and site specific sections of the Residential Design Guidelines.

Please see attached document

- 2. The Residential Design Guidelines assume some impacts to be reasonable and expected as part of construction. Please explain how this project would cause unreasonable impacts. If you believe your property, the property of others or the neighborhood would be adversely affected, please state who would be affected, and how:

Please see attached document

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 #1?

Please see attached document

12.01350

Neighborhood D.R. Response

Section 1 – What are the reasons for requesting a Discretionary Review?

- Out of Context for the Character of the Neighborhood
- Interference with Open Yard Space
- Scale Incompatibility with Surrounding Buildings

Out of Context for the Character of the Neighborhood – (San Francisco Planning Code Section 101.1B2/Residential Guidelines II Neighborhood Character)

The project will be the biggest square footage of any single family home on the block and will impact the other homes nearby by blocking light and air for them. It will directly impact the neighbors who have homes/condos just below the property on Culebra Terrace. Further, it will also set precedence for more build-outs in the neighborhood which already has more than enough of such build-outs. Other owners on the block may well choose to build-out as well causing a significant impact on open space in the area. Finally, we have been told that the proposed project height is not in compliance with current City Design Guidelines – the Fifth Floor Penthouse. Therefore, I believe the proposed project is unnecessarily expansive, dismisses the current lot patterns of the other homes nearby as well as the overall ambiance of the broader neighborhood.

Interferes with Open Yards – San Francisco Planning Code Section 101/Residential Guidelines III Site Design)

We trust that the Planning Board of the City understands and appreciate the need for a balance in the neighborhood between expansion of individual property and the need for open space to maintain the neighborhood's character. The neighbors on our block all enjoy the current open space consisting of gardens and greenery that add to the beauty of our neighborhood. We are concerned that by allowing this significant addition, others will follow which will significantly impact the gardens and greenery of the neighborhood.

Scale Incompatibility with Surrounding Buildings – (San Francisco Planning Code 134 & 136/Residential Guidelines IV Building Scale and Form)

We have been told that the project is using the multi-tenant building next door to scale the proposed addition. We believe that this is not the correct "measurement" for the project as it will encroach into the backyards of others by casting shadows for the surrounding neighbors on the other side and probably will also impact the multi-tenant building as well. The original homes on Larkin were designed to line up with each other to provide appropriate scale. This proposed addition will change the "line-up" originally designed for homes on the street.

Section 2 – What are the unreasonable impacts of these plans and the adverse effects to the neighborhood properties?

• Unnecessary Destruction of Trees, Gardens ,and Greenery and Local Climatology

Unnecessary Destruction of Gardens and Greenery

We are currently surrounded by tasteful and lush green gardens and trees which beautify the neighborhood and help with our clean air quality. We are told that the excavation for the basement of the proposed project may damage and/or kill surrounding trees/greenery. Consequently, the planned size of this project may have a negative impact on neighboring yards. We suggest that a reduction in the scale of the planned project will reduce the impact of the neighboring homes. It will also affect the neighborhood energy balance.

Section 3 – What alternatives or changes to the proposed project do you recommend?

We respect and support the right of all our neighbors to build, beautify and enjoy their properties. With this in mind we recommend the following modifications:

- Reduce the scale of the proposed project to minimize the impact on the direct neighbors on Larkin as well as the broader neighborhood
- Reduce the proposed project size to perhaps be only one story while still being in compliance with code and provide balance with open yard/garden spaces.

Thank you for your consideration of our views.

Steven Gunders 133-135 Culebra Terrace San Francisco, CA 94109

Madelaine Gunders 133-135 Culebra Terrace San Francisco, CA 94109

aun- Holling 53

Nancy Brown Williamson 119 Culebra Terrace San Francisco, CA 94109

Applicant's Affidavit

Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:

- a: The undersigned is the owner or authorized agent of the owner of this property.
- b: The information presented is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.
- c: The other information or applications may be required.

Signature:

Carol Deligman

Date: 2.7.12

Print name, and indicate whether owner, or authorized agent: Carol Seligman, Authorized Agent

Owner / Authorized Agent (circle one)

February 7, 2012

To all San Francisco Permitting Departments, Agencies, Commissions, and Boards:

As the owner of the property at 119 Culebra Terrace, I hereby grant authority to Carol Seligman, to act on my behalf, as my agent, to represent my interests and file a request for Discretionary Review regarding the expansion project at 2705 Larkin Street.

Openar & Braun- (D. 14 cm 2

[SIGNED] Nancy Brown Williamson, Owner 129 Culebra Terrace San Francisco, CA 94109



APPLICATION FOR Discretionary Review

FEB 0 8 2012 CITY & COUNTY OF S.F.

1. Owner/Applicant Information

ł	ĭ	- Qx	Ui.	ΙUN	1	¥.	UF	S
	F			DEP.				
				PIC				

DR APPLICANT'S NAME:

Steve and Madelaine Gunders		
DR APPLICANT'S ADDRESS:	ZIP CODE:	TELEPHONE:
133-135 Culebra Terrace, San Francisco CA	94109	(415)
PROPERTY OWNER WHO IS DOING THE PROJECT ON WHICH YOU ARE REQUESTING	DISCRETIONARY REVIEW NAME:	n a Mariana ana ana ana ana ana ana ana ana ana
Peter Fenton		
ADDRESS:	ZIP CODE:	TELEPHONE:
2705 Larkin Street	94109	(650) 799-7250
CONTACT FOR DR APPLICATION:		
Same as Above		
ADDRESS:	ZIP CODE:	TELEPHONE:
		()
e-MAIL ADDRESS: stevegunders@gmail.com		

2. Location and Classification

STREET ADDRESS OF PROJECT:					ZIP CODE:	
2705 Larkin Street. San Francisco CA 94109						
Chestnu	it Street				מסירה בנוגנה המשביעה המכנר היוניה היוני היוניה בינו יזה היוני בעניים ביו היוניה ביו היוניה המעניירים בנה היוניה	2000 - 11.4 - Talifardina
ASSESSORS	BLOCK/LOT:	LOT DIMENSIONS:	LOT AREA (SQ FT):	ZONING DISTRICT:	HEIGHT/BULK DISTRICT	
29	/ 4	27'x137'.5"	3.712.5	RH2	35ft Section 261	

3. Project Description

Please check all that apply Change of Use Chat	nge of Hours 🗌] New (Construction 🛛	Alterations	Demolition	Other 🗌
Additions to Building:	Rear 🔀 F	ront 🗌	Height 🔀	Side Yard 🔀		
Present or Previous Use:	Residential					
Proposed Use: Residential						
Building Permit Application No. 201012277441 Date Filed: 12/27/2010				10		

4. Actions Prior to a Discretionary Review Request

Prior Action	YES	NO
Have you discussed this project with the permit applicant?		×
Did you discuss the project with the Planning Department permit review planner?		X
Did you participate in outside mediation on this case?		×

5. Changes Made to the Project as a Result of Mediation

If you have discussed the project with the applicant, planning staff or gone through mediation, please summarize the result, including any changes there were made to the proposed project.



Discretionary Review Request

In the space below and on separate paper, if necessary, please present facts sufficient to answer each question.

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 or Residential Design Guidelines? Please be specific and site specific sections of the Residential Design Guidelines.

Please see attached document

- 2. The Residential Design Guidelines assume some impacts to be reasonable and expected as part of construction. Please explain how this project would cause unreasonable impacts. If you believe your property, the property of others or the neighborhood would be adversely affected, please state who would be affected, and how:

Please see attached document				

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 #1?

Please see attached document

Neighborhood D.R. Response

Section 1 -- What are the reasons for requesting a Discretionary Review?

- Out of Context for the Character of the Neighborhood
- Interference with Open Yard Space
- Scale Incompatibility with Surrounding Buildings

Out of Context for the Character of the Neighborhood – (San Francisco Planning Code Section 101.1B2/Residential Guidelines II Neighborhood Character)

The project will be the biggest square footage of any single family home on the block and will impact the other homes nearby by blocking light and air for them. It will directly impact the neighbors who have homes/condos just below the property on Culebra Terrace. Further, it will also set precedence for more build-outs in the neighborhood which already has more than enough of such build-outs. Other owners on the block may well choose to build-out as well causing a significant impact on open space in the area. Finally, we have been told that the proposed project height is not in compliance with current City Design Guidelines – the Fifth Floor Penthouse. Therefore, I believe the proposed project is unnecessarily expansive, dismisses the current lot patterns of the other homes nearby as well as the overall ambiance of the broader neighborhood.

Interferes with Open Yards – San Francisco Planning Code Section 101/Residential Guidelines III Site Design)

We trust that the Planning Board of the City understands and appreciates the need for a balance in the neighborhood between expansion of individual property and the need for open space to maintain the neighborhood's character. The neighbors on our block all enjoy the current open space consisting of gardens and greenery that add to the beauty of our neighborhood. We are concerned that by allowing this significant addition, others will follow which will significantly impact the gardens and greenery of the neighborhood.

Scale Incompatibility with Surrounding Buildings – (San Francisco Planning Code 134 & 136/Residential Guidelines IV Building Scale and Form)

We have been told that the project is using the multi-tenant building next door to scale the proposed addition. We believe that this is not the correct "measurement" for the project as it will encroach into the backyards of others by casting shadows for the surrounding neighbors on the other side and probably will also impact the multi-tenant building as well. The original homes on Larkin were designed to line up with each other to provide appropriate scale. This proposed addition will change the "line-up" originally designed for homes on the street.

Section 2 – What are the unreasonable impacts of these plans and the adverse effects to the neighborhood properties?

Unnecessary Destruction of Trees, Gardens and Greenery

Unnecessary Destruction of Gardens and Greenery

We are currently surrounded by tasteful and lush green gardens and trees which beautify the neighborhood and help with our clean air quality. We are told that the excavation for the basement of the proposed project may damage and/or kill surrounding trees/greenery. Consequently, the planned size of this project may have a negative impact on neighboring yards. We suggest that a reduction in the scale of the planned project will reduce the impact of the neighboring homes.

Section 3 -- What alternatives or changes to the proposed project do you recommend?

We respect and support the right of all our neighbors to build, beautify and enjoy their properties. With this in mind we recommend the following modifications:

- Reduce the scale of the proposed project to minimize the impact on the direct neighbors on Larkin as well as the broader neighborhood
- Reduce the proposed project size to perhaps be only one story while still being in compliance with code and provide balance with open yard/garden spaces.

Thank you for your consideration of our views.

Steven Gunders 133-135 Culebra Terrace San Francisco, CA 94109

Madelaine Gunders 133-135 Culebra Terrace San Francisco, CA 94109

Nancy Brown Williamson 129 Culebra Terrace San Francisco, CA 94109

Applicant's Affidavit

Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:

- a: The undersigned is the owner or authorized agent of the owner of this property.
- b: The information presented is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.
- c: The other information or applications may be required.

Signature:

Date: FER 5, 2012

Print name, and indicate whether owner, or authorized agent:

GREAR O. GUNDER OWNER Owner / Authorized Agent (circle one)

Applicant's Affidavit

Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:

a: The undersigned is the owner or authorized agent of the owner of this property.

b: The information presented is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

c: The other information or applications may be required.

Signature:

Carol Seligman

Date: 2.7.17

Print name, and indicate whether owner, or authorized agent: Carol Seligman, Authorized Agent

Owner / Authorized Agent (circle one)

February 8, 2012

To all San Francisco Permitting Departments, Agencies, Commissions, and Boards:

As the owner of the property at 133-135 Culebra Terrace, I hereby grant authority to Carol Seligman, to act on my behalf, as my agent, to represent my interests and file a request for Discretionary Review regarding the expansion project at 2705 Larkin Street.

(adelaine Junders Feb. 8, 2012 SIGNED] DATE [SIGNED]

Madelaine Gunders, Owner 133-135 Cuebra Terrace San Francisco, CA 94109

PRE-APPLICATION PLAN REVIE	W AGREEMENT
-----------------------------------	-------------

PRE-APPLICATION PLAN REVIEW SUMMARY LUNDBERG **Design**

LARKIN ADDITION

415-695-0110 x25

R-3

V-B

2705 LARKIN STREET

PROJECT NAME: STREET ADDRESS: ZONING CLASSIFICATION: OCCUPANCY TYPE: CONSTRUCTION TYPE: FIRE SPRINKLERS: STORIES:

ARCHITECT: Contact: Email: Tel:

MEETING DATE:

FOUR + Basement LUNDBERG DESIGN Lev Bereznycky lev@lundbergdesign.com

RH-2 (Residential - House, Two Family)

Wednesday, November 10, 2010

ITEMS REVIEWED:

1. Cascading Building: We had several conversations with the Technical Services Division regarding the number of levels allowed for type R-3 buildings (unsprinklered/sprinklered), and the possibility of adding a new basement level on a sloping site. We were told that there are no provisions, exemptions, or amendment that deal with a sloping site and cascading buildings, but is something that is determined together with the Department of Building Inspection via the Pre-Application Plan Review process. We would like to clarify/confirm if our understanding of the cascading building principal is correct.

ANSWER: Jeff Ma confirmed that the Proposed Addition was consistent with the concept of a cascading building.

2. <u>Sprinklering of Existing Building</u>: In the same discussions, we asked if an addition would trigger the need for the existing building (a 4 Story + Basement structure that pre-dates the current code, and is NOT sprinklered) to be brought up to current code (ref: Table 503). We were told that regardless of size or cost, the addition will NOT trigger sprinklering of the existing structure, as long as the permit application is submitted by the end of the calendar year (2010). We would like to get confirmation regarding the accuracy of this statement. We will, as per code, sprinkler the addition.

ANSWER: Jeff Ma confirmed the above but with the following conditions. 1) The new portion will have to be sprinklered. 2) The new portion will have to be of 1-hr rated construction. 3) Hot-wired smoke detectors will have to be located in the new portion, on all levels. See Additional Discussion Items for details on specific areas.

PRE-APPLICATION PLAN REVIEW SUMMARY LUNDBERG DESIGN

3. Elevator as Means of Egress / Area of Refuge: Due to its proximity to the garden at the rear of the property, we would prefer to locate the new Playroom on the lowest level (new basement). And due to space constraints, we would prefer to have this level serviced only by an elevator. Can we use the rear garden as an Area of Refuge (1007.6, 1007.8)? Can we consider the elevator as an Accessible Means of Egress (1007.4) if provided with emergency/standby power? If the above is not acceptable, can we put the Wine Cellar (an unoccupiable/storage space) lowest level, and the Playroom off of the existing Media Room (with access to the main stair)? We would then maintain an exit from the relocated Wine Cellar to the rear yard garden.

ANSWER: Jeff Ma clarified that Section 1007.4 pertained only to buildings where a required accessible floor is four or more stories above/below the exit level. This not being the case, the proposed new basement level will require an egress path to the street. Jeff further clarified that this can be 1) a spiral stair (ref: 1009.8), and 2) pass through the proposed wine cellar (ref: 10142.2, exception 5). See Additional Discussion Items for possible alternative. Accessible means of agress per Section 1007 Accessible means of agrees project is not required for this project with ma

ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION ITEMS:

- 4. <u>Studio Unit Exiting</u>: Since the existing studio unit currently exits through a garage, it constitutes a non-conforming condition. The relocated unit will therefore be allowed to continue using the same egress path.
- 5. Relocated Studio Unit Separation: The 'new construction portion' of the relocated unit's perimeter (walls, floor & ceiling) will have to be 1-hr rated construction to separate it from the main dwelling. As per code, one of its windows will have to meet the Emergency Escape minimum size requirements.
- 6. Existing Media Room: Since the existing Media Room will become fully enclosed, the current natural ventilation will have to be replaced by new mechanical ventilation (as per all pertinent mechanical codes).
- 7. <u>New Basement Exiting</u>: The new basement level can possibly exit via the backyard if 1) an easement can be obtained for a path to the street, and 2) an opening provided at the rear wall/fence of the property. This would then obviate the need for an egress stair (see item #3).
- 8. <u>Elevator Size</u>: The elevator is acceptable as shown, as it does not travel 4, or more, stories above/below grade plane (ref: 3002.4).

Building Inspection Signature

END OF SUMMARY

2

ഗ

 $\mathbf{\Sigma}$

GENERAL NOTES

1. All work to be in conformance with the 2007 CBC and all other applicable codes.

2. The documents describe intent. Contractor is responsible to provide complete, operational systems and installations. No claims for additional work will be awarded for work which is described in these documents or which is reasonably inferable from them.

3. All dimensions, notes and details shown on a portion of a drawing shall apply typically to all opposite hand and/or similar conditions, U.O.N.

4. Details shown are typical. Similar details apply to similar conditions.

5. Contractor is responsible for the thorough coordination of all trades. No claims for additional work will be awarded for work related to such coordination.

6. The Contractor shall examine the contract documents and shall inform himself as to the entire contents thereof before submitting his proposal. Any errors or ambiguities noted by him during said examination should immediately be called to the attention of the Architect before submitting a bid thereto. The Architect will issue an addendum or interpretation of the cited error or ambiguity. No subsequent claim for extra work will be allowed on account of claimed misunderstanding of the meaning or intent of the contract documents or any portion thereof if the item occasioning the claim appeared in, or was inferable from, said documents as furnished for bidding purposes.

7. The Contractor should visit the work site to ascertain by inspection pertinent local conditions such as location, character and accessibility of the site, availability of the facilities, character of existing building, etc.

8. Where a structural element is removed as indicated on drawings, verify location and dimensions with structural and architectural documents. Shore and brace as required.

9. Electrical, mechanical Design/Build subcontractors will be responsible for obtaining permits for their scope of work from the agencies having jurisdiction.

10. One copy of all building permits shall be submitted to the Architect.

11. All dimensions are to finish face of masonry, face of concrete, centerline of steel, face of mill work, or fixtures U.O.N. Dimensions are not adjustable without Architect's approval unless noted as "±". Verify dimensions marked "V.I.F." prior to commencement of construction and notify architect in writing of any inconsistencies.

12. Contractor shall not scale drawings. Dimensions shall govern. Drawings at a large scale shall take precedence over drawings of a small scale. Details shall govern over plans, sections and elevations.

13. Contractor shall verify rough opening requirements with manufacturers unit dimensions and prevent provision of required rough opening, specifics of the situation shall be reported in writing to the Architect.



14. All mounting of equipment, fixtures or accessories - including wall, floor and ceiling installation - shall be as required to meet provisions of the 2001 California Building Code, the 2001 San Francisco Amendments, the requirements of all other agencies having jurisdiction, and manufacturers instructions. In cases of differences contractor shall notify architect in writing. All casework shall be secured to support blocking at walls.

15. Contractor shall notify Architect immediately of all utilities determined in the course of construction as being necessary to be removed which have not otherwise been noted for removal. Contractor shall remove such utilities only after the consultation with the Architect and Owner. All utilities removed shall be disconnected, cut back to source, and capped. All penetrations created by the removal of utilities shall be sealed to match adjacent construction and finishes.

16. Delays resulting from failure to supply submittals and information shall be the responsibility of the General Contractor. Appropriate steps shall be taken to make up for lost time.

17. Contractor shall protect area and new or existing materials and finishes from damage which may occur from construction, demolition, dust, water, etc. and shall provide and maintain temporary barricades, closure walls, etc., as required to protect the public during the period of construction. Damage to new and existing materials, finishes, structures, and the equipment shall be repaired or replaced to the satisfaction of the Owner at the expense of the General Contractor.

18. Work areas to remain secure and lockable during construction

19. Contractor shall remove all rubbish and waste materials of all subcontractors and trades on a daily basis and shall exercise strict control over job cleaning to prevent any dirt, debris or dust from affecting any finished areas in or outside the job site. Burning of debris on the site shall not be permitted.

20. Upon completion, the Contractor shall leave the premises and all affected areas clean and in an orderly manner ready for move-in. This is to include cleaning of all glass (including inside of exterior glass) and frames, both new and existing.

21. Security provisions are part of this contract. Contractor shall review work and coordination requirements prior to start of construction.

22. Contractor shall not proceed with any work requiring additional compensation beyond the contract amount without written authorization from the architect or owners representative. Failure to obtain written authorization shall invalidate any claim for additional compensation.

VICINITY MAP





Site

- Parcel Number:
- Zoning:
- Lot Area:
- Maximum Height:
- Setbacks:

Project Description: Usage Type: Applicable Codes:

House Area:

Property Owner:

Owner's Representative:

Architect:

Structural Engineer:

SITE INFORMATION

2705 Larkin Street, San Francisco, CA 94109
0477 / 004
RH-2 (Residential House, Two Family)
3,712.5 sf
40-x (35ft / Section 261.b.2)
Front = 12 ft Rear = 34'-5" / 25% + 36'-6" / Average Line Sides = 0 ft

PROJECT INFORMATION

4 Story + Basement Addition at Rear of Building Residential 2007 California Building Code * 2007 California Electrical Code * 2007 California Mechanical Code * 2007 California Plumbing Code * City and County of San Francisco, Municipal Code * includes all San Francisco Amendments Sub-Basement 504 sf

1,353 sf Basement 1st Level 1,514 sf 1,739 sf 2nd Level 1,828 sf 3rd Level 766 sf 4th Level TOTAL 7,704 sf

PROJECT DIRECTORY

Peter and Laura Fenton 2705 Larkin Street San Francisco, CA 94109

Building Momentum 305 Grant Avenue San Francisco, CA 94108

> Lundberg Design 2620 3rd Street San Francisco, CA 94107

GFDS Engineers 543 Howard Street San Francisco, CA 94105 **DRAWING INDEX**

Cover Sheet
Existing Site Plan
Proposed Site Plan
(N) Basement Plan
(N) 1st Level Plan
(E) Basement Demo Plan
(N) 2nd Level Plan
(E) 1st Level Demo Plan
(N) 3rd Level Plan
(E) 2nd Level Demo Plan
(N) 4th Level Plan
(E) 3rd Level Demo Plan
(N) Roof Plan
(E) 4th Level Demo Plan
Site Photographs
(E) Front Elevation
(E) South Elevation
(E) North Elevation
(E) Rear Elevation
(N) South Elevation
(N) North Elevation
(N) Rear Elevation
(N) Cross Sections
(N) Longitudonal Section
(N) 3D Renderings

2705 Larkin Street

San Francisco, CA

	Print Date	12.06.2011
6	Site Permit - Revision 6	12.06.2011
5	Site Permit - Revision 5	08.22.2011
4	Site Permit - Revision 4	05.31.2011
3	Site Permit - Revision 3	05.03.2011
2	Site Permit - Revision 2	04.27.2011

1	Site Permit - Revision 1 Site Permit	03.22.2011 12.22.2010	
#	# Issues * Revisions Da		
Dra	wn by:	LB	
Che	ecked by:	TOL	
Sca	Scale: As N		
All drawings and written material appearing herein constitutes original and unpublished work of the Architect and may not be duplicated, used or disclosed without written consent of the Architect.			







tel: 650-854-8180 email: pfenton@benchmark.com

Contact: Paul Keenan tel: 650-714-1269 email: paul.keenan@buildingmomentum.com

Contact: Lev Bereznycky tel: 415-695-0110 x25 email: lev@lundbergdesign.com

Contact: Larry Wong tel: 415-512-1301 x34 email: lwong@gfdseng.com





AREA CALCULATIONS

Site Area :	3,712.5 sf
Sub-Basement:	(N) 504 sf
Basement:	(E) 838 sf (N) 515 sf
1st Level:	(E) 1,482 sf (N) 32 sf
2nd Level:	(E) 1,551 sf (N) 188 sf
3rd Level:	(E) 1,640 sf (N) 188 sf
4th Level:	(E) 578 sf (N) 188 sf
<u>Sub-Total</u> :	(E) 6,089 sf (N) 1,615 sf (27.2% of existing)
	7,704 sf (less than 10,000 sf)

2705 Larkin Street San Francisco, CA



- (E) <u>SIGNIFICANT TREE TO REMAIN</u> TRUNK 17" Ø CANOPY 22' Ø HEIGHT 42'
- (E) STREET TREE TO REMAIN TRUNK $3\frac{1}{2}$ "Ø CANOPY 6'Ø HEIGHT 15'

-(2)

— (E) <u>SIGNIFICANT TREE TO REMAIN</u> TRUNK 8" Ø CANOPY 24' Ø HEIGHT 31'



	78'-0"(TOTAL PROPOSED BUILDING LENGTH)		D 12'-0" (E) FRONT SETBACK	
	68'-6" (TOTAL EXISTING BUILDING LENGTH)			
		(IN STREET / 002 (RH-2) (IN STREET / 003 (RH-2)		
	64'-5" (TOTAL EXISTING BUILDING LENGTH)			
·				
(E) ROOF DECK	(E) ROOF			
125'-7"(TOTAL EXIS	TING BUILDING LENGTH)			
		2701 LARKIN STREE	T / 005 (RM-3)	STREET
and the second second	3'-2" = 75% TOTAL BUILDING LOT LENGTH			LARKIN STREET
DEPTH = 137'-6" (LOT DEPTH IS T	THE SAME FOR 2701, 2705 & 2707 LARKIN ST.)		/	

CHESTNUT STREET



2705 Larkin Street			
San Francisco, CA			
	Print Date	04.19.2012	
#	Issues * Revisions	Date	
	wn by:	LB	
Dia	•	TOL	

Proposed Site Plan w/ Rear Yard Comparison







 $1 \frac{\text{Neighborhood Plan - Rear Yard Analysis}}{1/8" = 1'-0"}$

Empty Lot 2705 Larkin St Yard Proposed Addition

Image U.S. Geological Survey



2705 Larkin Street

San Francisco, CA

#	Issued for	Date
		04.19.2012
	'n By:	LB
Chec	ked By:	LB TOL
	ked By:	













LB

TOL






2705 & 2707 Larkin Street - Rear Facades







2701 Larkin Street - Rear & South Facades





2701 Larkin Street - North Facade

2705 Larkin Street

San Francisco, CA



	Print Date	12.06.2011
6	Site Permit - Revision 6	12.06.2011
5	Site Permit - Revision 5	08.22.2011
4	Site Permit - Revision 4	05.31.2011
3	Site Permit - Revision 3	05.03.2011
2	Site Permit - Revision 2	04.27.2011
1	Site Permit - Revision 1	03.22.2011
	Site Permit	12.22.2010
#	Issues * Revisions	Date
Dra	wn by:	LB
Che	ecked by:	TOL
Scale:		As Noted
con: Arc	Irawings and written material appea stitutes original and unpublished v nitect and may not be duplicated losed without written consent of the	work of the d, used or



Site Photographs





















Cross Section 1/4" = 1'-0"

2705 Larkin Street San Francisco, CA 12.06.2011 Print Date 12.06.2011 6 Site Permit - Revision 6 5 Site Permit - Revision 5 08.22.2011 4 Site Permit - Revision 4 05.31.2011 05.03.2011 04.27.2011 03.22.2011 3 Site Permit - Revision 3 2 Site Permit - Revision 2 1 Site Permit - Revision 1 Site Permit 12.22.2010 Date # Issues * Revisions Drawn by: TOL Checked by: As Noted Scale: All drawings and written material appearing herein constitutes original and unpublished work of the Architect and may not be duplicated, used or disclosed without written consent of the Architect. Proposed Cross Sections **A**4.00

LUNDBERGDESIGN 2620 THIRD STREET SAN FRANCISCO CA 94107-3115 T 415.695.0110 F 415.695.0379









View from Rear Yard





View from 2709 Larkin St.

Bird's Eye View





	Print Date	12.06.2011
6	Site Permit - Revision 6	12.06.2011
5	Site Permit - Revision 5	08.22.2011
4	Site Permit - Revision 4	05.31.2011
3	Site Permit - Revision 3	05.03.2011
2	Site Permit - Revision 2	04.27.2011
1	Site Permit - Revision 1	03.22.2011
	Site Permit	12.22.2010
#	Issues * Revisions	Date
Dra	wn by:	LB
Che	ecked by:	TOL
Scale: As Note		As Noted
con Arc	frawings and written material appea stitutes original and unpublished hitect and may not be duplicate losed without written consent of th	work of the d, used or

