

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Discretionary Review Abbreviated Analysis

HEARING DATE: JULY 13, 2017

Date:	July 3, 2017
Case No.:	2014.0870DRP
Project Address:	891 CAROLINA STREET
Permit Application:	2014.02.11.8267
Zoning:	RH-2 [Residential-House, Two Family] Zoning District
	40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot:	4097/027
Project Sponsor:	Daren Iguchi, John Lum Architecture
	3246 17 th Street
	San Francisco, CA 94110
Staff Contact:	Natalia Kwiatkowska – (415) 575-9185
	natalia.kwiatkowska@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 includes a renovation and addition to an existing two-story-over-basement, single-family building. The project consists of an expansion of the existing attic floor, a one-story vertical addition, expansion of the existing floors at rear, façade modifications, and the addition of a second dwelling unit to a two-story-over-basement, single-family dwelling. The overall height will increase from approximately 27 feet to approximately 37 feet, as measured from top of curb. The existing building depth will increase from approximately 48 feet to approximately 75 feet as part of this project.

SITE DESCRIPTION AND PRESENT USE

The project site is located on the east side of Carolina Street between 20th and 22nd Streets in the Potrero Hill neighborhood. The subject parcel measures 25 feet wide by 100 feet deep with an area of approximately 2,500 square feet. The property is developed with a two-story-over-basement, single-family building constructed in 1907.

SURROUNDING PROPERTIES AND NEIGHBORHOOD

This portion of the Potrero Hill neighborhood is characterized by two- to three-story, single- and multifamily residential buildings. The adjacent properties are also located within the RH-2 Zoning District. There is one cluster of NC-2 (Neighborhood Commercial Cluster) zoned parcels surrounding the subject property at the intersection of 20th and Arkansas Streets.

ISSUES & CONSIDERATIONS

• On May 25, 2001, the Project Sponsor filed a Building Permit Application No. 2001.05.25..0005 proposing demolition of the existing building and new construction of a three-story, two-unit building, which was withdrawn on October 7, 2002.

- On May 8, 2002, the Project Sponsor filed a Building Permit Application No. 2002.05.08.6090 proposing alteration and additions to the existing structure consisting of vertical and horizontal additions and changes to the front façade. The project was also seeking a Variance from the front setback requirements of Planning Code Section 132 per Case No. 2002.0933V.
- On August 20, 2002, Kristine Gardner filed an application with the Planning Department for Discretionary Review (2002.0933D) of Building Permit Application No. 2002.05.08.6090, requesting significant design modifications that would reduce the proposed buildings scale and massing, minimizing potential impacts on light and privacy to the adjacent neighbors.
- On June 19, 2003, the San Francisco Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on Discretionary Review Application 2002.0933D. The project consisted of an expansion of the existing attic floor and a one-story vertical addition, expansions of the existing floors at the rear, façade changes, and the addition of a second dwelling unit. The Planning Commission Took DR and requested the following modifications to the project:
 - Reduce the overall building height by either eliminating the top floor or reducing by the amount equivalent of a story.
 - Reduce the second floor above the garage to comply with the required front setback area.
 - Incorporate a pitched roof on the second floor to preserve the façade and thereby reinforce the immediate and broader neighborhood context.
- On August 20, 2003, Building Permit Application No. 2002.05.08.6090 and related Variance Application No. 2002.0933V were disapproved by the Planning Department per the Project Sponsor's request since the Project Sponsor was unwilling to make the modifications requested by the Planning Commission.
- On September 2 and 4, 2003, the Project Sponsor filed Appeal No. 03-132, 03-137, and 03-155 of the Planning Commission's decision and the Variance Decision Letter. The Appeals were withdrawn in May of 2004.
- On February 11, 2014, the Project Sponsor filed the subject Building Permit Application No. 2014.02.11.8267 proposing a code-complying alteration and addition to the existing building.
- On March 28, 2017, Kristine Gardner filed an application with the Planning Department for Discretionary Review (2014.0870DRP) of Building Permit Application No. 2014.02.11.8267.

The proposed project is similar to the 2002 proposal as it consists of an expansion of the existing attic floor and a one-story vertical addition, expansion of the existing floors at the rear, façade changes, and the addition of a second dwelling unit; however, the proposal has been revised as follows:

• All new building volume has been setback from the existing front building wall and is not seeking a variance from the front setback requirements.

- A pitched roof has been incorporated to the proposal to reduce any potential impacts on adjacent properties and better respond to the character of the block and immediate context.
- The Department reviewed the proposal and has determined the subject property is not a historic resource for the purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).
- The Department reviewed the proposal to ensure that the project is not tantamount to demolition. The project includes removal of 48.95% of the front and rear facades and removal of 42.01% of all exterior walls measured in lineal feet at the foundation level, and removal of 42.28% of the vertical envelope elements and removal of 37.98% of the horizontal elements of the existing building as measured in square feet of actual surface area; and therefore does not meet the definition of demolition in Planning Code Section 317.

BUILDING PERMIT NOTIFICATION

TYPE	REQUIRED PERIOD	NOTIFICATION DATES	DR FILE DATE	DR HEARING DATE	FILING TO HEARING TIME
311 Notice	30 days	February 27, 2017 – March 29, 2017	March 29, 2017	July 13, 2017	106 days

HEARING NOTIFICATION

ТҮРЕ	REQUIRED PERIOD	REQUIRED NOTICE DATE	ACTUAL NOTICE DATE	ACTUAL PERIOD
Posted Notice	10 days	July 3, 2017	July 3, 2017	10 days
Mailed Notice	10 days	July 3, 2017	July 3, 2017	10 days

PUBLIC COMMENT

	SUPPORT	OPPOSED	NO POSITION
Adjacent neighbor(s)	1	5 (including 1 DR requestors)	
Other neighbors on the block or directly across the street	2	7	
Neighborhood groups			
Neighbors outside of the subject block or directly across the street	5	7	

A list of all public comment is provided below:

Support:

- 1. Shufina K. English, 2245 18th Street
- 2. Pete Loscutoff, 951 Carolina Street
- 3. Kieran O'Donoghue, 900 Carolina Street

CASE NO. 2014.0870DRP 891 Carolina Street

Discretionary Review – Abbreviated Analysis July 13, 2017

- 4. Joan L. King, 813 Rhode Island Street
- 5. Marla Jurosek, 877 Carolina Street
- 6. Michael Caulfield, 901 Wisconsin Street
- 7. Karen C. Byrnes, 883 Carolina Street
- 8. Dan Cremins, 1 Southern Heights Avenue

Opposition:

- 1. Katherine Lambert, 874 Carolina Street
- 2. Joanna Garratt-Rodriguez, 897b Carolina Street
- 3. Naphtali Rodriguez, 897b Carolina Street
- 4. Lisa Bach, 898 Carolina Street
- 5. Christiane Robbins, 874 Carolina Street
- 6. Walker Bass, 906 Wisconsin Street
- 7. Abbott Paul Sayre, 898 Carolina Street
- 8. Dick Millet, 250 Connecticut Street
- 9. Kathy Pagan Quadros, 934 Carolina Street
- 10. Rajiv Raja, 897 Carolina Street
- 11. Mridula Kulkarni, 897 Carolina Street
- 12. Cathryn Blum, 928 Carolina Street
- 13. Christopher Cole, 769 De Haro Street
- 14. Sandra Cook, 829 Carolina Street
- 15. Julie Jackson, 890 Carolina Street
- 16. Peggy Snider, 922 Carolina Street
- **17.** Alison Heath, Mississippi Street
- 18. Ria McIntosh, 855 Carolina Street
- 19. Robin Bishop & Kristine Gardner, DR Requestors, 897 Carolina Street

DR REQUESTORS

Robin Bishop c/o Kristine Gardner, owner of 897 Carolina Street, adjacent to the subject property.

DR REQUESTOR'S CONCERNS AND PROPOSED ALTERNATIVES

See attached Discretionary Review Application, dated March 28, 2017.

PROJECT SPONSOR'S RESPONSE TO DR APPLICATION

See attached Response to Discretionary Review, dated May 9, 2017.

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 ADVISORY TEAM REVIEW

The Residential Design Advisory Team (RDAT) reviewed the project prior to and following the submittal of the Request for Discretionary Review and 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 for the following reasons:

- 1. The project proposal is appropriately located and configured within the limits of the buildable area.
- 2. The proposal meets the Residential Design Guidelines requirements for mid-block open space connection by providing a notch at the rear yard structure. The adjacent structure currently and will continue to have a connection to significant open space.
- 3. Due to the mixed character, there is no predominant pattern and the proposal responds with an appropriate scale that meets the Residential Design Guidelines.
- 4. The DR Requestor's property is a non-conforming structure located at the rear of the lot.

RECOMMENDATION: Do Not Take DR and Approve Project As Proposed

Attachments:

Parcel Map Sanborn Map Zoning Map Height & Bulk Map **Aerial Photographs** Context Photograph **CEQA** Determination Section 311 Notice **DR** Notice **DR** Application DR Requestor's Submittal, including: Neighborhood Photos _ Email from DR Requestor to Zoning Administrator -Petition _ Articles -Public Comment during Planning Commission in 2016 _ **Project Timeline** Response to DR Application dated May 9, 2017 Previous Project's Reduced Plans (BPA #2002.05.08.6090)

Project Sponsor Submittal, including:

- Reduced Plans
- 3D Renderings
- Exhibits

Public Comment

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.



Discretionary Review Hearing Case Number 2014.0870DRP 891 Carolina Street

Zoning Map



R

Discretionary Review Hearing Case Number 2014.0870DRP 891 Carolina Street











Discretionary Review Hearing Case Number 2014.0870DRP 891 Carolina Street

Site Photo



SUBJECT PROPERTY

DR REQUESTOR'S PROPERTY

Discretionary Review Hearing Case Number 2014.0870DRP 891 Carolina Street



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Address		Block/Lot(s)		
891	Carolina Street	4097/027		
Case No. Permit No.		Plans Dated		
2014.0870E 201402118267		02/07/14		
Addition/	Demolition	New	Project Modification	
Alteration	(requires HRER if over 50 years old)	Construction	(GO TO STEP 7)	
Project description for Planning Department approval.				
Convert single-family residence into two family residence. The project includes a vertical and horizontal addition at the rear of the building. The existing 1,587sf single-family building would be converted into a 3,929 two-family dwelling, for a net increase of 2,342sf.				

STEP 1: EXEMPTION CLASS TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

STEP 2: CEQA IMPACTS

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

If any box is checked below, an Environmental Evaluation Application is required.

Transportation: Does the project create six (6) or more net new parking spaces or residential units? Does the project have the potential to adversely affect transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle safety (hazards) or the adequacy of nearby transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities?
Air Quality: Would the project add new sensitive receptors (specifically, schools, day care facilities, hospitals, residential dwellings, and senior-care facilities) within an air pollution hot spot? (<i>refer to EP _ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Air Pollution Hot Spots</i>)
Hazardous Materials: If the project site is located on the Maher map or is suspected of containing hazardous materials (based on a previous use such as gas station, auto repair, dry cleaners, or heavy manufacturing, or a site with underground storage tanks): Would the project involve 50 cubic yards or more of soil disturbance - or a change of use from industrial to residential? If yes, this box must be checked and the project applicant must submit an Environmental Application with a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. <i>Exceptions: do not check box if the applicant presents documentation of enrollment in the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) Maher program, a DPH waiver from the Maher program, or other documentation from Environmental Planning staff that hazardous material effects would be less than significant (refer to EP_ArcMap > Maher layer).</i>

	Soil Disturbance/Modification: Would the project result in soil disturbance/modification greater than two (2) feet below grade in an archeological sensitive area or eight (8) feet in a non-archeological sensitive area? (<i>refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Archeological Sensitive Area</i>)
	Noise: Does the project include new noise-sensitive receptors (schools, day care facilities, hospitals, residential dwellings, and senior-care facilities) fronting roadways located in the noise mitigation area? (<i>refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Noise Mitigation Area</i>)
	Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment: Does the project site involve a subdivision or lot line adjustment on a lot with a slope average of 20% or more? (<i>refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography</i>)
	Slope = or > 20%: : Does the project involve excavation of 50 cubic yards of soil or more, square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft., shoring, underpinning, retaining wall work, or grading on a lot with a slope average of 20% or more? <i>Exceptions: do not check box for work performed on a previously developed portion of site, stairs, patio, deck, or fence work. (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required and a Certificate or higher level CEQA document required</i>
	Seismic: Landslide Zone: Does the project involve excavation of 50 cubic yards of soil or more, square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft., shoring, underpinning, retaining wall work, grading –including excavation and fill on a landslide zone – as identified in the San Francisco General Plan? <i>Exceptions: do not check box for work performed on a previously developed portion of the site, stairs, patio, deck, or fence work. (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones)</i> If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required and a Certificate or higher level CEQA document required
	Seismic: Liquefaction Zone: Does the project involve excavation of 50 cubic yards of soil or more, square footage expansion greater than 1000 sq ft, shoring, underpinning, retaining wall work, or grading on a lot in a liquefaction zone? <i>Exceptions: do not check box for work performed on a previously developed portion of the site, stairs, patio, deck, or fence work. (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones)</i> If box is checked, a geotechnical report will likely be required
	Serpentine Rock: Does the project involve any excavation on a property containing serpentine rock? <i>Exceptions: do not check box for stairs, patio, deck, retaining walls, or fence work. (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Serpentine)</i>
	s are checked above, GO TO STEP 3. <u>If one or more boxes are checked above, an <i>Environmenta</i>l Application is required, unless reviewed by an Environmental Planner.</u>
\checkmark	Project can proceed with categorical exemption review. The project does not trigger any of the CEQA impacts listed above.
Comments	and Planner Signature (optional): Joy Navarrete

STEP 3: PROPERTY STATUS – HISTORIC RESOURCE TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

PROPERTY IS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING: (refer to Parcel Information Map)

	Category A: Known Historical Resource. GO TO STEP 5.
\mathbf{X}	Category B: Potential Historical Resource (over 50 years of age). GO TO STEP 4.
	Category C: Not a Historical Resource or Not Age Eligible (under 50 years of age). GO TO STEP 6.

STEP 4: PROPOSED WORK CHECKLIST TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

Che	Check all that apply to the project.			
	1. Change of use and new construction. Tenant improvements not included.			
	3. Regular maintenance or repair to correct or repair deterioration, decay, or damage to building.			
	4. Window replacement that meets the Department's Window Replacement Standards. Does not include storefront window alterations.			
	5. Garage work . A new opening that meets the <i>Guidelines for Adding Garages and Curb Cuts</i> , and/or replacement of a garage door in an existing opening that meets the Residential Design Guidelines.			
	6. Deck, terrace construction, or fences not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.			
	7. Mechanical equipment installation that is not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of- way.			
	8. Dormer installation that meets the requirements for exemption from public notification under <i>Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 3: Dormer Windows.</i>			
	9. Addition(s) that are not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way for 150 feet in each direction; does not extend vertically beyond the floor level of the top story of the structure or is only a single story in height; does not have a footprint that is more than 50% larger than that of the original building; and does not cause the removal of architectural significant roofing features.			
Not	Note: Project Planner must check box below before proceeding.			
R	Project is not listed. GO TO STEP 5.			
	Project does not conform to the scopes of work. GO TO STEP 5.			
	Project involves four or more work descriptions. GO TO STEP 5.			
	Project involves less than four work descriptions. GO TO STEP 6.			

STEP 5: CEQA IMPACTS – ADVANCED HISTORICAL REVIEW TO BE COMPLETED BY PRESERVATION PLANNER

Check a	Check all that apply to the project.			
	1. Project involves a known historical resource (CEQA Category A) as determined by Step 3 and conforms entirely to proposed work checklist in Step 4.			
	2. Interior alterations to publicly accessible spaces.			
	3. Window replacement of original/historic windows that are not "in-kind" but are consistent with existing historic character.			
	4. Façade/storefront alterations that do not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.			
	5. Raising the building in a manner that does not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.			
	6. Restoration based upon documented evidence of a building's historic condition, such as historic photographs, plans, physical evidence, or similar buildings.			
	7. Addition(s), including mechanical equipment that are minimally visible from a public right-of-way and meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.			

	8. Other work consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (specify or add comments):		
	9. Reclassification of property status to Category C. (Requires approval by Senior Preservation <i>Planner/Preservation Coordinator</i>)		
	a. Per HRER dated: (attach HRER)		
	b. Other (specify): per ptp form dasted 6-30-2014		
Not	e: If ANY box in STEP 5 above is checked, a Preservation Planner MUST check one box below. Further environmental review required. Based on the information provided, the project requires an		
	Environmental Evaluation Application to be submitted. GO TO STEP 6.		
	Project can proceed with categorical exemption review . The project has been reviewed by the Preservation Planner and can proceed with categorical exemption review. GO TO STEP 6 .		
Com	ments (optional):		
O	Autha a. And I /2/14		
Prese	evation Planner Signature:		
STE	9 6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION		
	SE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER		
	Further environmental review required. Proposed project does not meet scopes of work in either (<i>check</i>		
	all that apply): Step 2 – CEQA Impacts		
	Step 5 – Advanced Historical Review		
	STOP! Must file an Environmental Evaluation Application.		
Ø	No further environmental review is required. The project is categorically exempt under CEQA.		
	Planner Name: I Muly Signature or Stamp:		
	Project Approval Action: Building Permit *If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary		
	*If Discretionary Review better the Planning		
	Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the $f/2/2014$		
	project. / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /		
	and Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code.		
	In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, an appeal of an exemption determination can only be filed within 30 days of the project receiving the first approval action.		

STEP 7: MODIFICATION OF A CEQA EXEMPT PROJECT

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, when a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exempt project changes after the Approval Action and requires a subsequent approval, the Environmental Review Officer (or his or her designee) must determine whether the proposed change constitutes a substantial modification of that project. This checklist shall be used to determine whether the proposed changes to the approved project would constitute a "substantial modification" and, therefore, be subject to additional environmental review pursuant to CEQA.

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Address (If different	Block/Lot(s) (If different than front page)	
Case No.	Previous Building Permit No.	New Building Permit No.
Plans Dated	Previous Approval Action	New Approval Action
Modified Project Descriptio	n:	

DETERMINATION IF PROJECT CONSTITUTES SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

Compare	ed to the approved project, would the modified project:
	Result in expansion of the building envelope, as defined in the Planning Code;
	Result in the change of use that would require public notice under Planning Code Sections 311 or 312;
	Result in demolition as defined under Planning Code Section 317 or 19005(f)?
	Is any information being presented that was not known and could not have been known at the time of the original determination, that shows the originally approved project may no longer qualify for the exemption?

If at least one of the above boxes is checked, further environmental review is required CATEX FORM

DETERMINATION OF NO SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

The proposed modif	ication would not result in any of the above changes.
If this box is checked, the proposed me	odifications are categorically exempt under CEQA, in accordance with prior project
approval and no additional environme	ental review is required. This determination shall be posted on the Planning
Department website and office and m	ailed to the applicant, City approving entities, and anyone requesting written notice.
Planner Name:	Signature or Stamp:
Planner Name:	Signature or Stamp:
Planner Name:	Signature or Stamp:



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW FORM

Preservation Team Meeting Date:		Date of F	orm Coi	mpletion 6/30/2014	Suite 400 San Franci
		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		ł	┘ CA 94103- ᄀ
PROJECT INFORMATION:	1	<u> </u>		na na santa da santa Internet da santa da s Tana da santa	Reception:
Planner:	Address:	· · · · · ·			415.558.0
Gretchen Hilyard	891 Carolina Street	t			Fax: 415.558.0
Block/Lot:	Cross Streets:	나는 것이 같이 있다. 			415.556.0
4097/027	20th and 22nd Stre	eets			Planning Informatior
CEQA Category:	Art. 10/11:		BPA/C	Case No.	415.558.0
В	n/a		2014.0	870E	
PURPOSE OF REVIEW:		PROJECT	DESCR	PTION	7
	Preliminary/PIC	(Alter		C Demo/New Construction	
DATE OF PLANS UNDER REVIEW:	2/7/2014				
					<u> </u>]
PROJECT ISSUES:					-
- IN/I I is the subject Property on elig					
Is the subject Property an elig					_
If so, are the proposed change					_
Image: Second	es a significant impa	oct?			-
If so, are the proposed change Additional Notes: Submitted: Supplemental Interview	es a significant impa	oct?	by Tim	Kelley Consulting (dated	
Image: Second	es a significant impa	oct?	by Tim	Kelley Consulting (dated	
Additional Notes: Submitted: Supplemental Inf February 2014).	es a significant impa formation Form p	orepared l		Kelley Consulting (dated	
If so, are the proposed change Additional Notes: Submitted: Supplemental Interview	es a significant impa formation Form p	orepared l		Kelley Consulting (dated	
Additional Notes: Submitted: Supplemental Inf February 2014).	es a significant impa formation Form p	orepared l		Kelley Consulting (dated	
If so, are the proposed change Additional Notes: Submitted: Supplemental Inf February 2014). Proposed project: Vertical and	es a significant impa formation Form p	orepared l		Kelley Consulting (dated	
Image: Constraint of the proposed change Additional Notes: Submitted: Supplemental Inf February 2014). Proposed project: Vertical an PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW:	es a significant impa formation Form p	orepared l			
If so, are the proposed change Additional Notes: Submitted: Supplemental Inf February 2014). Proposed project: Vertical an PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW: Historic Resource Present	es a significant impa formation Form p	orepared l		/es (•No * (`N/A	
Image: Constraint of the proposed change Additional Notes: Submitted: Supplemental Inf February 2014). Proposed project: Vertical an PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW:	es a significant impa formation Form p	orepared l			
If so, are the proposed change Additional Notes: Submitted: Supplemental Inf February 2014). Proposed project: Vertical an PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW: Historic Resource Present	es a significant impa formation Form p nd horizontal rear	orepared b r additions	s. Histor	/es (•No * (`N/A	

Criterion 1 - Event:		Criterion 1 - Event:	🔿 Yes 🔎 No
Criterion 2 -Persons:	🔿 Yes 🔎 No	Criterion 2 -Persons:	
Criterion 3 - Architecture:		Criterion 3 - Architecture:	🔿 Yes 🔎 No
Criterion 4 - Info. Potential:		Criterion 4 - Info. Potential:	
Period of Significance:		Period of Significance:	
		C Contributor C Non-Con	tributor

Complies with the Secretary's Standards/Art 10/Art 11:	C Yes	C No	• N/A
CEQA Material Impairment:	C Yes	(No	
Needs More Information:	C Yes	No	
Requires Design Revisions:	C Yes	No	
Defer to Residential Design Team:	• Yes	C No	

* If No is selected for Historic Resource per CEQA, a signature from Senior Preservation Planner or Preservation Coordinator is required.

PRESERVATION TEAM COMMENTS:

According to the Supplemental Information Form for Historic Resource Determination prepared by Tim Kelley Consulting (dated February 2014) and information found in the Planning Department files, the subject property at 891 Carolina Street contains a 1-1/2-story-over garage; wood frame single-family residence constructed in 1907 in a vernacular architectural style. The original owner and builder was J. F. Brady.

The building has undergone substantial alterations over time. Known alterations to the property include: house moved forward on lot and addition of porch, terrazzo steps, garage and basement (1925); demolition of rear building (sometime after 1950); original wood shingle primary façade re-clad with stucco (unknown date).

No known historic events occurred at the property (Criterion 1). None of the owners or occupants have been identified as important to history (Criterion 2). The subject building is a substantially altered example of a vernacular style single-family property. The building is not architecturally distinct such that it would qualify individually for listing in the California Register under Criterion 3.

The subject property is not located within the boundaries of any identified historic districts. The subject property is located within the Potrero Hill neighborhood on a block that exhibits a great variety of architectural styles, construction dates, and subsequent alterations that compromise historic integrity. The area surrounding the subject property does not contain a significant concentration of historically or aesthetically unified buildings.

Therefore, the subject property is not eligible for listing in the California Register under any criteria individually or as part of a historic district.

Signature of a Senior Preservation Planner / Preservation Coordinator:	Date:
Imaja	7-2-2014

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

HISTORICAL RESOURCE EVALUATION

891 CAROLINA STREET

 T_1

3

1

ţ

3

İ

l

1

ä

1

ł

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA



TIM KELLEY CONSULTING, LLC HISTORICAL RESOURCES 2912 DIAMOND STREET #330. SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94131 415.337-5824 TIM@TIMKELLEYCONSULTING.COM



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1650 Mission Street Suite 400 San Francisco. CA 94103

NOTICE OF BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION (SECTION 311)

On **February 11, 2014**, the Applicant named below filed Building Permit Application No. **2014.02.11.8267** with the City and County of San Francisco.

PROJ	ECT INFORMATION	APPL	ICANT INFORMATION
Project Address:	891 Carolina Street	Applicant:	Daren Iguchi
Cross Street(s):	20th and 22nd Streets	Address:	3246 17 th Street
Block/Lot No.:	4097/027	City, State:	San Francisco, CA 94110
Zoning District(s):	RH-2 / 40-X	Telephone:	(415) 558-9550
Record No.:	2014.0870	Email:	daren@johnlumarchitecture.com

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 Use	Residential	No Change
Front Setback	None	No Change
Side Setbacks	None	No Change
Building Depth	+/- 48 feet	+/- 75 feet
Rear Yard	+/- 52 feet	+/- 25 feet
Building Height	+/- 27 feet	+/- 37 feet
Number of Stories	2 over Basement	3 over Basement
Number of Dwelling Units	1	2
Number of Parking Spaces	1	3
	PROJECT DESCRIPT	

The project includes a one-story vertical addition, an expansion of the existing basement, first, and second floors at the rear of the existing two-story-over-basement building, and an addition of a second dwelling unit within the existing single-family dwelling. 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:	Natalia Kwiatkowska
Telephone:	(415) 575-9185
E-mail:	natalia.kwiatkowska@sfgov.org

 Notice Date:
 2/27/17

 Expiration Date:
 3/29/17

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.

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.



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 • San Francisco, CA 94103 • Fax (415) 558-6409

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Hearing Date:Thursday, July 13, 2016Time:Not before 12:00 PM (noon)Location:City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 400Case Type:Discretionary ReviewHearing Body:Planning Commission

PROPERTY INFORMATION

Project Address:
Cross Street(s):891 Carolina
22nd StreetBlock /Lot No.:
Zoning District(s):4097 / 027
RH-2 / 40-X
Showplace S

891 Carolina Street 22nd Street 4097 / 027 RH-2 / 40-X Showplace Square/Potrero Case No.: Building Permit: Applicant: Telephone: E-Mail:

2014.0870DRP 2014.02.11.8267 Daren Iguchi (415) 558-9550 x 0010

APPLICATION INFORMATION

daren@johnlumarchitecture.com

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Request is a for a Discretionary Review of Building Permit Application No. 2014.02.11.8267 proposing construction of a one-story vertical addition atop the existing two-story-over-basement building, expansion of the existing basement, first, and second floors at the rear, façade modifications, and the addition of a second dwelling unit to a single-family dwelling.

A Planning Commission approval at the public hearing would constitute the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section 31.04(h).

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

ARCHITECTURAL PLANS: If you are interested in viewing the plans for the proposed project please contact the planner listed below. The plans of the proposed project will also be available prior to the hearing through the Planning Commission agenda at: <u>http://www.sf-planning.org</u>

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.

FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE CONTACT PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF: Planner: Natalia Kwiatkowska Telephone: (415) 575-9185 E-Mail: <u>natalia.kwiatkowska@sfgov.org</u>

GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT PROCEDURES

HEARING INFORMATION

You are receiving this notice because you are either a property owner or resident that is adjacent to the proposed project or are an interested party on record with the Planning Department. You are not required to take any action. For more information regarding the proposed work, or to express concerns about the project, please contact the Applicant or Planner listed on this notice as soon as possible. Additionally, you may wish to discuss the project with your neighbors and/or neighborhood association as they may already be aware of the project.

Persons who are unable to attend the public hearing may submit written comments regarding this application to the Planner listed on the front of this notice, Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103, by 5:00 pm the day before the hearing. These comments will be made a part of the official public record and will be brought to the attention of the person or persons conducting the public hearing.

Comments that cannot be delivered by 5:00 pm the day before the hearing may be taken directly to the hearing at the location listed on the front of this notice. Comments received at 1650 Mission Street after the deadline will be placed in the project file, but may not be brought to the attention of the Planning Commission at the public hearing.

APPEAL INFORMATION

An appeal of the approval (or denial) of a **building permit application** by the Planning Commission may be made to the **Board of Appeals within 15 calendar days** after the building permit is issued (or denied) by the Director of 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.

MAR 2 9 2017

CITY & COUNTY OF C PLANNING DEPARTMENT NEIGHBORHOLE COMMUNIC

APPLICATION FOR Discretionary Review

1. Owner/Applicant Information

DR APPLICANT'S NAME:		
Robin K Bishop		
DR APPLICANT'S ADDRESS:	ZIP CODE:	TELEPHONE:
3548 1/2 19th Street	94110	(415)575-0406
PROPERTY OWNER WHO IS DOING THE PROJECT ON WHICH YO	OU ARE REQUESTING DISCRETIONARY REVIEW NAME:	
William Canihan		
ADDRESS:	ZIP CODE:	TELEPHONE:
P.O. Box 29269	94129	(415) 558-9550
CONTACT FOR DR APPLICATION:		VIII
Same as Above		
ADDRESS:	ZIP CODE:	TELEPHONE:
		()
E-MAIL ADDRESS:		
MissRobinBishop@gmail.com		

2. Location and Classification

STREET ADDRESS OF PROJECT:				ZIP	CODE:
391 Carolina Street				94	107
CROSS STREETS:					500 - S
20th and 22nd Streets					
ASSESSORS BLOCK/LOT:	LOT DIMENSIONS:	LOT AREA (SQ FT):	ZONING DISTRICT:	HEIGHT/BULK DIST	RICT:
4097 /027	100' x 25'	2500'	RH-2	40-X	
3. Project Description lease check all that apply Change of Use Cha	ange of Hours 🗌	New Constru	uction 🗌 Alterations 🛛	Demolition 🗌	Other [
lease check all that apply	ange of Hours 🗌 Rear 🗵 Fro	New Constru ont 🗌 Heigl		Demolition 🗌	Other 🗌
lease check all that apply Change of Use Cha	ange of Hours 🗌			Demolition 🗌	Other 🗌
lease check all that apply Change of Use Cha Additions to Building:	ange of Hours 🗌 Rear 🛛 Fra Residential			Demolition 🗌	Other 🗌
tease check all that apply Change of Use Cha Additions to Building: Present or Previous Use: Residen	Rear A Fro Rear Fro Residential	ont 🗌 Heigl	nt 🛛 Side Yard 🗌	Demolition Demolition te Filed: 2/11/14	

4. Actions Prior to a Discretionary Review Request

Prior Action	YES	NC
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?		D

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. The DR Applicant, Robin Bishop, personally met with the Property Owner, William Canihan, to discuss the

intrusive structural and cultural effects of the proposed project as currently designed. Please see the attached

document for details.



Discretionary Review Request

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

 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.

This Discretionary Review is being requested because the proposed structure at 891 Carolina Street conflicts with the Planning Department Priority Policies #2, #3, #8, and the Residential Design Guidelines Building Scale at the Mid-Block Open Space, Building Scale at the Street, Site Design, and Building Scale and Form. Please see the attached document for details.

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:

The proposed project results in unreasonable adverse impacts to the property at 897 Carolina Street by "boxing out" or "cutting off" the home and its inhabitants from the community, as well as a reduction in sunlight and airflow. Potrero Hill will be negatively affected due to a reduction in watershed and air quality and a decline of communal scenery due to the extreme proposed expansion that is unreasonably out of scale in both height and volume for its immediate and broader neighborhood context. Please see the attached document for details.

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?

To reduce the adverse effects of the project, the DR Applicant proposes an alternative structure that is 60 feet deep and 3 levels high. Please see the attached document for details.

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: 3-28-17

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

ROBIN BISHOP

Discretionary Review Application Submittal Checklist

Applications submitted to the Planning Department must be accompanied by this checklist and all required materials. The checklist is to be completed and **signed by the applicant or authorized agent**.

REQUIRED MATERIALS (please check correct column)	DR APPLICATION
Application, with all blanks completed	5
Address labels (original), if applicable	Ø
Address labels (copy of the above), if applicable	e e 🖉
Photocopy of this completed application	
Photographs that illustrate your concerns	
Convenant or Deed Restrictions	-
Check payable to Planning Dept.	
Letter of authorization for agent	Ð
Other: Section Plan, Detail drawings (i.e. windows, door entries, trim), Specifications (for cleaning, repair, etc.) and/or Product cut sheets for new elements (i.e. windows, doors) SMGX Steed, mod S.	

NOTES: Prequired Material. Optional Material. O Two sets of original labels and one copy of addresses of adjacent property owners and owners of property across street.

plication received by Planning Department:				
- voper	Date: _	3	29	11

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

The DR Applicant, Robin Bishop, personally met with the Property Owner, William Canihan, to discuss the intrusive structural and cultural effects of the proposed project as currently designed. The DR Applicant presented the Property Owner and the Project Architect with detailed drawings suggesting a thoughtful and considerate alternative to the proposed project that is more suitable for the context of the neighborhood and more in line with the City's Priority Policies and Residential Design Guidelines. The DR Applicant's proposed solution involves a 3-level building extending to 60 feet depth in the lot. This proposed alternative would allow the Property Owner to enjoy 2 spacious units compatible in scale and mass of the neighborhood, while permitting more mid-block open space for a more equal sharing of light and privacy, maintaining neighborhood community inclusion and character, and offering affordable units of housing in Potrero Hill. In response, the Property Owner offered measly mitigation in the form of skylights to be installed in the DR Applicant's house (a structural intrusion to the roof of a 1907 house) and living walls or light-colored walls on the proposed building to mitigate for the extreme reduction of light and mid-block open space. No changes were made to the proposed project.

Discretionary Review Request

1. What are the reasons for requesting Discretionary Review? The project meets the minimum standard 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.

This Discretionary Review is being requested because the proposed structure at 891 Carolina Street conflicts with the Planning Department Priority Policies #2, #3, #8, and the Residential Design Guidelines Building Scale at the Mid-Block Open Space, Building Scale at the Street, Site Design, and Building Scale and Form.

First, the project exploits the unusual and extraordinary positioning of 891 Carolina and 897 Carolina Street on their lots. Particularly, 891 Carolina is set forward toward Carolina street (an unusual limited front setback), and the project is being presented as an alteration/addition rather than new construction, thereby allowing the limited front setback to be retained. Additionally, the neighboring building at 897 Carolina is set to the extreme rear of the lot, thereby allowing Planning Code 134 to calculate a very (very) large building footprint. In fact, the proposed structure plans to be built back into the lot an additional 27 feet deep, and then the majority of the remaining 25 feet of the rear of the lot will be paved over with an excavated patio. This severely impacts the mid-block open space, conflicting with the Planning Code's Priority Policies #8 (open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development) and RDG regarding Building Scale at the Mid-Block Open Space (pg 25-27). Furthermore, this exceptional calculation will not be confined to the proposed project lot, but will set a precedent resulting in a potential domino effect of a radical diminishing of mid-block open space down the 800 block of Carolina Street. **The plan for the proposed structure is exceptionally deep for the site.** The solution is to not allow the extraordinarily situated adjacent dwelling at 897 Carolina Street in the calculation of the rear yard, but to build the proposed structure to a depth of 60 feet, equal to the rear wall of the other adjacent building, 883 Carolina Street, therefore promoting the encroachment into the mid-block open space to 12 feet instead of 27 feet. This change to the plan will benefit the following: (1) allow for sunlight and airspace at adjacent duplex's existing windows to be protected, (2) maintain permeable land at the top of the Hill, and (3) retain a bit more of the mid-block open space.

Additionally, the proposed structure is in conflict with the Planning Code's Priority Policies #2 (existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected) and RDG Building Scale at the Street (pg 24-25) and RDG Site Design (pg 11) with regards to form on a sloped site. The proposed project site is located on the very crest of Potrero Hill, and while not on the corner lot, it does not have an adjacent dwelling covering its Southern façade. This extraordinary circumstance causes this proposed structure to have an exceptional prominence from the intersection of 22nd and Carolina Streets. In a neighborhood context of 109 properties consisting of one-to three-story homes, as identified by Planner Gretchen Hilyard, a four level structure with exceptional visual prominence is inappropriate. There are zero four-story dwellings identified in the study, and according to page 3 of the RDG, "A single building out of context with its surroundings can be disruptive to the neighborhood character and, if repeated often enough, to the image of the City as a whole." So, while the 40 foot tall proposed structure may meet the minimum standards of the Planning Code, this extraordinary context (hillcrest lot and unobstructed on the Southern side) makes the proposed 4th floor inharmonious with its surroundings with regards to scale and mass. "On this block face of two-story buildings, it is possible to preserve the building scale at the street by setting back the third floor. However, an additional setback for a proposed fourth floor is not sufficient. The fourth floor must be eliminated to respect the neighborhood scale." (RDG, pg 25). The plan for the proposed structure is exceptionally tall for the site. The solution is to disallow the fourth floor of the proposed project to conserve neighborhood character, as initially required by the Planning Department for this project in 2014 as well as opined by the Planning Commission for a similar project for the same property in 2003.

The DR Applicant is still uncertain why the 2003 DECISION by the Planning Commission regarding the height of the proposed structure is not being upheld by the Planning Department for 891 Carolina Street. In the 2003 Discretionary Review Hearing the then project architect did not expand the building footprint beyond 60 feet as the Planning Department guidance determined that to have the front yard 15 feet of the originally situated building (under the rules for 'Alteration" versus demolition) was NOT to allow an additional 15' in the rear yard as this was taking double advantage of the Planning Code. Therefore the hearing did not include discussion of the rear yard as the project proposed at that time did not advance into the rear yard. That project employed use of one 15' in the front of the lot, but did not seek to have the other 15' of building in the rear yard. It was one or the other, but NOT both. This project proposes to take undo advantage of the Planning Code and propose 15' in the front yard according to Alteration rules for Front Setback, and 15' in the rear yard according to Rear Yard calculation for averaging adjacent properties.

We ask the Planning Commissioners to allow the use of only one 15' of building footprint, and NOT both.

Lastly, the proposed project is in conflict with RDG Building Scale and Form, "Design the scale of the building to be compatible with the height and depth of surrounding buildings" (pg 23) and Planning Code's Priority Policies #3 (that the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced). The Property Owner is proposing to "remodel" a one-story-over-basement single family dwelling into a two family dwelling that is a whopping 300% of the original building envelope. This is *new construction being masked as an alteration/addition*, and is an exceptional increase in square footage which requires additional scrutiny with regards to scale. Both proposed units are well above average in size for Potrero Hill, diverging from the City's policy to enhance the supply of affordable housing. **The plan for the proposed structure is exceptionally large for the site**. The solution is to reduce the depth and height of the proposed project to 60 feet deep and three levels tall, whereby the project sponsor would successfully expand a currently uninhabitable 1,311 square feet into 2 very livable units totaling 2,526 square feet, a 193% increase overall. This proposed alteration to the project would still increase the number of urban units of housing on Potrero Hill by 2, and at a more appropriate size and cost per unit.

As described, the project proposes the construction of a dwelling that exceeds all norms in regards to footprint, height and size, yet is permitted by the Planning Code due to the extraordinary placement of the neighboring building at 897 Carolina Street. The DR Applicant is suggesting a modification of the proposed plans to involve a maximum build depth of 60 feet into the lot, as shown in the attached document, which has been shared with the Property Owner, Project Architect, and Planning both in person and by email. The proposed alternate plan would allow for ample square footage for 2 new urban units, especially considering the limited setback the house already enjoys from Carolina Street.

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:

The proposed project results in unreasonable impacts to the property at 897 Carolina Street, particularly as discussed in Building Scale at the Mid-Block Open Space of the RDG by "boxing out" or "cutting off" the home and its inhabitants from the mid-block open space. "Even when permitted by the Planning Code, building expansions into the rear yard may not be appropriate if they are uncharacteristically deep or tall, depending on the context of the other buildings that define the mid-block open space. An out-of-scale rear yard addition can leave surrounding residents feeling "boxed-in" and cut off…" (RDG pg 26). The proposed building is both too deep and too tall for the site, and would cause residents of 897 Carolina to be unreasonably cut off from the neighborhood. With the entrances and driveways for both units at 897 Carolina facing 22nd street, and no neighbors next door or across the street in the old water tower lot, the only current connection residents of 897 Carolina have to the surrounding community is through the mid-block open space. The proposed structure at 891 Carolina will sever the sliver of community connection the two families at 897 Carolina currently enjoy. The placement of the 897 Carolina Street duplex on its lot and its immediate context already create an isolated effect; the massive scale of the proposed building and the dramatic elimination of mid-block open space behind the

proposed structure would greatly exacerbate this situation and result in unreasonable negative impacts on families by further isolating them and their homes from the community.

Additionally, the proposed project would cover up nearly 85% of the existing mid-block open space due to the rear yard calculation and additional excavated patio. This is permeable land that can never be restored, reducing the City's ability to reach environmental sustainability, while minimizing the urban forest and negatively affecting watershed and air quality. These are unreasonable impacts that the entire City population must bear if this project proceeds as planned.

Furthermore, the proposed project reduces sun and light for the upper unit inhabitants of 897 Carolina Street. The Subject Property Owner already enjoys unimpeded access to light on the south side of the front 50% of the lot at 891 Carolina, ordinarily blocked by an adjacent property. Despite this luxury, the proposed structure, grossly out of scale with the two story buildings lining Carolina Street, will extend 75% of the way into the lot depth, dramatically reducing light, airflow and ventilation to 897 Carolina by covering existing windows and dramatically impinging on the mid-block open space. The Residential Design Guidelines indicate new structures must "minimize impact on light to adjacent cottages" (pg 21), and while 897 Carolina Street is not a cottage, its placement in the lot is exactly like that of an in-law unit, and the DR Applicant feels this clause applies in this situation.

Finally, for all of the neighborhood residents who enjoy the open sky at the intersection of 22nd and Carolina Streets, the scenery will be changed to include a big obtrusive wall at the top of the hill; an obfuscation of the sky on par with the size of the Coca-Cola billboard.

Please observe that the proposed alteration and expansion of the existing building is out of scale in both height and volume for the immediate and broader context of the neighborhood. This project's diversion from the scale of the neighborhood will most definitely change the context for future developments, leading to an eventual change of the neighborhood as a whole. This obvious degradation of neighborhood character and an inflation of total scale, initially observed by the Planning Department for this project in 2014 and opined by the Planning Commission for a similar project for the same property in 2003, adversely affect neighboring properties and the neighborhood as a whole.

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 notes above in question #1?

To reduce the adverse effects of the project, the DR Applicant proposes an alternative structure that is 60 feet deep and 3 levels high. This structure would have a rear yard exactly like the house to its North, 883 Carolina. No light or existing windows would be covered up for the residents of 897 Carolina. No families would be structurally excluded from the neighborhood. The mid-block open space and the light it provides would be preserved for the immediate community to enjoy. The people of Potrero Hill are eager for the Property Owner to build a structure in a lot that has been allowed to fall in disrepair for far too long. The DR Applicant is requesting the Planning Commission to uphold the decision it made in

2003 and consider the thoughtful and considerate alternative to the proposed project that the DR Applicant proposes. A structure 60 feet deep and 3 levels high would improve the community that already lives there by providing 2 spacious, habitable, appropriate-sized units of "affordable" housing on Potrero Hill. The alternative dwelling the DR Applicant is suggesting is suitable for the context of the neighborhood and promotes the City's Priority Policies and Residential Design Guidelines.

We ask You, our Planning Commissioners, to vote to approve the project *with modifications*. These modifications are illustrated in the attached plan initially presented to Mr. Canihan, and would be as follows:

Build the project with its 'Alteration' distinction for allowance of 15 feet of house in the front yard setback area.

Build the project with a building depth of 60 feet, thus disallowing the proposed 15 feet in the rear yard.

Build the project with a rear yard depth of 40 feet, thus preserving the mid-block open space and maintaining the adjacent duplex at 897 Carolina to continue its connection to the community, as well as existing sunlight, airflow and ventilation.

These modifications would result in a building that is in accordance with the Planning Department Priority Policies #2, #3, #8, and the Residential Design Guidelines Building Scale at the Mid-Block Open Space, Building Scale at the Street, Site Design, and Building Scale and Form such that it contributes positively to the community and the City as a whole.



Carolina Street, 941

9


PROPOSED PROJECT

- Extreme elimination of mid-block open space
 - Further isolates 897 Carolina from the community
- Reduces sunlight and airflow at 897 Carolina
- Conflicts with SF Priority Principles and RDG
- Reduces watershed and air quality on Potrero Hill
- Massive blockage of skyline and communal scenery at the intersection of 22nd and Carolina Streets
 - Will set an adverse precedent that will forever change the neighborhood landscape

391 Carolina Street, 94107

Existing Site Conditions



footprint, height and size, yet is permitted by the Planning Code due to the extraordinary The project proposes the construction of a dwelling that exceeds all norms in regards to placement of the neighboring building at 897 Carolina Street.





391 Carolina Street, 94107



The Envelope Outline of the Proposed Structure, filled in.

The proposed project is extreme in many ways. It is too big, to deep and too tall for a neighborhood of 1-3 story homes.

It will look extraordinarily large when it is situated at the very top of Potrero Hill.

This project will box-out and exclude 897 Carolina from the community by severing its current 10 sliver of connection, including other adverse affects to the neighborhood.



91 Carolina Street, 94107



1 Carolina Street, 94107



891 Carolina Street, 94100



L Carolina Street, 9410

3/28/17

I, Kristine Gardner, owner of 897 Carolina Street, authorize my daughter, Robin Bishop, to act as the agent for this Discretionary Review.

Thank you.

Kroparla

Looking East at the Intersection of Carolina and Southern Heights at 22nd Street



Carolina Street in 2002 Original Discretionary Review Photo Collage

Looking East at the Intersection of Carolina and Southern Heights at 22nd Street



Carolina Street in 2008

Looking East at the Intersection of Carolina and Southern Heights at 22nd Street



Carolina Street in 2011

Looking East at the Intersection of Carolina and Southern Heights at 22nd Street



Carolina Street in 2017

Apr 22, 2016 email to Scott Sanchez

Good Morning Scott,

I continue to be recommended to outreach to you by several in the community. Thus I appeal to you.

I continue to have concerns over the use of my 2-unit building at the above address and location. This house was built in 1907, the year after the earthquake. It was built with permit, and was legal for its time. The house today is deemed legally non-conforming. (I am aware that you consider my parcel as 'fronting on' Carolina Street and so the code 134(c)4B is not applicable). Today, in its non-conforming status, is useful in a very negative way. Its location is providing an advantage (privilege?) not available to most project sponsors in that it sits with a rear building wall almost to the rear property line. It is indeed an outlier in terms of its location on the lot.

My concern is that my building is being used to reduce the rear yard and the mid block open space behind the proposed project on block 4097, Lot 27, address: 891 Carolina Street. My building's location on the parcel is a problem. It is a problem because it sets up the domino for parcel owners and project sponsors throughout the block to halve their existing rear yard and mid-block open space. This happens one parcel at a time. Buildings endure, as mine has endured for 109 years. Mid-block gone is permeable earth and greenery gone.

I am requesting that my building not be allowed to be used for this purpose.

The project sponsor has used every method possible to establish a footprint over 75% of this parcel #27. The mid-block is paying the price for my building being used to establish rear yard setback.

My building started the reduction of mid-block open space way back in 1907. Being a corner lot, it provides others on the street the open space of the front yard of trees and greenery. I hope this compensates in some small way for its location on the parcel.

Please consider removing my building from being allowed to start the erosion of the midblock open space.

Additional information, thoughts and considerations:

The unfortunate part of my building's site location is that it is providing the adjacent building's remodel-and-addition project with the 'right' to build deep into the rear yard [by using the 'averaging' method as described in PC 134 (c) 1-2-and 3]. While this is 'code compliant' the result is to allow the 'addition' to extend 28 feet into the rear yard, while leaving only 25 feet of rear yard open space. This is due to the unusual site layout of both adjacent parcels. This reduces the mid-block by more than 50% from original. It is interesting to note that the PC 134 section's opening paragraph states: "These requirements are intended to assure the protection and continuation of established mid-block, landscaped open spaces, and maintenance of a scale of development appropriate to each district...." In this case, the code does not achieve its intent. That is why the RDG must be applied: to insure the preservation of this precious mid-block urban forest.

My concern is for the shrinking of this mid-block open space that is made up of rear yards behind most houses. This is the green open-space that is not seen from the street, but provides connection to nature by residents living in the homes on each neighborhood

block. While providing environmental benefits, this greenery also enhances the quality of our daily lives.

I believe the covering over of this rear vard/mid-block open space happens one parcel at a time. As it says in the Residential Design Guidelines (RDG), "A single building out of context with its surroundings can be disruptive to the neighborhood character and, if repeated often enough, to the image of the City as a whole."

On Potrero Hill I see housing being approved that is disrupting the health of the urban forest in the mid block open space. This is due to the fact that buildings are being approved and built that are out of context with surroundings, and stomping a large footprint into the rear yard open space. This is indeed disturbing as, while people come and go, buildings endure. When buildings out of scale with neighborhood character endure, the reduction of rear vard open space is the price of this additional horizontal expansion. When the green and permeable ground is gone, it is gone forever. This happens one parcel at a time.

The project at 891 Carolina that was proposed in 2002, (the project sponsor--same family-abandoned because he was denied a fourth level-being allowed now) was held to 45% for rear yard. Why not today?

In this age of global warming, every inch of greenery we can preserve will long serve the environmental benefits of filtering air pollution, reducing storm water runoff, slowing climate change by storing carbon (CO2), and creating/maintaining the habitat for birds and insects in the City.

San Francisco, CA 94107

PETITION

NEIGHBORS **OPPOSED** TO A PROPOSAL TO BUILD A POTRERO HILL HOUSE THAT **DOES NOT PRESERVE THE CHARACTER** OF OUR NEIGHBORHOOD NEIGHBORS **OPPOSED** TO A PROPOSAL TO BUILD A POTRERO HILL HOUSE THAT IS **OUT OF SCALE** IN OUR POTRERO HILL NEIGHBORHOOD

REDUCE THE HEIGHT—REDUCE THE SIZE/DEPTH *TOO HIGH – TOO BIG* PROJECT: **891 CAROLINA STREET-**Lot #27

- Proposed Project Expansion: from 1311 to 3917 Square Feet
- Almost 4000 Square Feet –FOUR STORIES
- From Single Family to Two Unit Condominium 75% Lot Coverage
 - Save Our Mid-block Greenery and Open-Space -vote NO

NAME

ADDRESS

EMAIL or PHONE

Walker. Basis () gmenil. BASS WISLONSIN 906 120 0 olina An azer AROLINA 12 CANA Sandvacooke mac. win solutor St@ginal achlle AROLINA C 411.5 350 8 er Carolina 10 50 375-5000 aymon arolma 0 P INTON DAA O 926 DAN CHANG CANOLINA 9 10 11 mn 12 13 14 alla RODEITH Valint 10Mail 15 NASHTALICE MAL. (UM A DUTTNERN HEIGNA AVE 06 HEIGHTS AVE MMINARDI @ AOL: COM SOUTHERN 15 LARD 415-285.554 d15 800 1

PETITION

NEIGHBORS **OPPOSED** TO A PROPOSAL TO BUILD A POTRERO HILL HOUSE THAT **DOES NOT PRESERVE THE CHARACTER** OF OUR NEIGHBORHOOD NEIGHBORS **OPPOSED** TO A PROPOSAL TO BUILD A POTRERO HILL HOUSE THAT IS **OUT OF SCALE** IN OUR POTRERO HILL NEIGHBORHOOD

REDUCE THE HEIGHT—REDUCE THE SIZE/DEPTH

PROJECT: 891 CAROLINA STREET-Lot #27

- Proposed Project Expansion: from 1311 to 3917 Square Feet
- Almost 4000 Square Feet –FOUR STORIES
- From Single Family to Two Unit Condominium 75% Lot Coverage
- Save Our Mid-block Greenery and Open-Space –vote NO

NAME ADDRESS EMAIL or PHONE NJJ 20. anti-210 Com 22. CND 23 24 Cath 25 CINS 16, 10 Ъ 22 250 TONYKU Louiun (A) ASTONNO. NOT MAG to 28 SCARE CAROLION 3 155 MWIN855@ASTACONG- Nel 29 porolena 30 7 AM BASCING! We 3 AN VERIA 4 CARO LINA ADRIAN . G. VERA & PWC. CCM 32 81 aimps 274 415-641-7 NG 33 FONNI Danon 12204 work 34 m 36.

PETITION

NEIGHBORS **OPPOSED** TO A PROPOSAL TO BUILD A POTRERO HILL HOUSE THAT **DOES NOT PRESERVE THE CHARACTER** OF OUR NEIGHBORHOOD NEIGHBORS **OPPOSED** TO A PROPOSAL TO BUILD A POTRERO HILL HOUSE THAT IS **OUT OF SCALE** IN OUR POTRERO HILL NEIGHBORHOOD

REDUCE THE HEIGHT—REDUCE THE SIZE/DEPTH TOO HIGH – TOO BIG PROJECT: **891 CAROLINA STREET**-Lot #27

- Proposed Project Expansion: from 1311 to 3917 Square Feet
- Almost 4000 Square Feet –FOUR STORIES
- From Single Family to Two Unit Condominium 75% Lot Coverage
- Save Our Mid-block Greenery and Open-Space -vote NO

NAME ADDRESS EMAIL or PHONE dds 800 134 993 CA 2000 41 0 1096 Carol Karena - H2 a 43 AUC. WW Juj 1930(2) DI MM ros 8-41 45 leng. Manc SFOR SA 46. 10 3 SI. STOM HT 48. 10 49 173 50. MANUE J. 95-2341 - 51 410 52

The Potrero View

Features the 891 Carolina Street Expansion Project in a Two-Part Series Article

Bourne, Jacob. "'Monster Homes' Pit Neighbors Against One Another." *The Potrero View* [San Francisco] March 2016. Print.

Bourne, Jacob. "Carolina Project Creeps Forward." The Potrero View [San Francisco] April 2016. Print.

Both articles are attached here for your consideration.

Thank you.

Menu



SERVING THE POTRERO HILL, DOGPATCH, MISSION BAY, & SOMA NEIGHBORHOODS SINCE 1970



"Monster Homes" Pit Neighbors Against One Another

Published on March, 2016 — in Uncategorized — by Jacob Bourne

W ith average square footage home prices hovering at \$1,100 in Potrero Hill, property owners have a rich incentive to max-out expansions, extensions, and construction of new structures. High demand and scarce supply of housing has led to the steady development of what some longtime Hill residents consider to be Monster Homes. And while City ordinances don't guarantee that existing views from a given home or flat will be protected, there's significant wiggle room in municipal guidelines to enable clever architects to design buildings that take advantage of every inch of buildable space.

Built in 1910, the single-family home at 891 Carolina Street shows clear signs of having been neglected for many years. Bill Canihan, Jr., the property's owner, sought to tear-down the structure in the early-2000s, and replace it with a large four-story home with sweeping views, designed by Walters Architecture. That project was rejected by the San Francisco Planning Department due to its proposed scale. More than a decade later, in 2014, new plans were drafted by John Lum Architecture to develop a roughly 4,000 square feet, four-story, building.

The current home rests atop a hill on a residential stretch of Carolina Street, near 22nd. Many of the surrounding houses are one or twostories, with 2,000 square feet of space. Some Hill residents feel that new developments should conform in size and design to the rest of the neighborhood. And, according to the Planning Department's *Residential Design Guidelines*, published in 2003, "Proposed projects must be responsive to the overall neighborhood context." The *Guidelines* are intended to help preserve community characteristics and contribute to the City's aesthetic appeal and quality of life.

According to Planning Code Section 311(c)(1), "The construction of new residential buildings and alteration of existing residential buildings in R districts shall be consistent with the design polices and guidelines of the General Plan and with the "Residential Design Guidelines" as adopted and periodically amended for specific areas or conditions by the City Planning Com-mission." The Guidelines cover a number of design elements, including expectations associated with the development and proportion of corner buildings.

Although the Planning Code allows for heights of up to 40 feet, given that 891 Carolina Street is on a hilltop, some neighbors feel that a fourstory building would loom large over adjacent edifices, and erode the block's character. "The design itself is not bad, but for this location, it's out of scale both in footprint and in height," said Kris Gardner, a longtime resident of the block. "I'm concerned about the size and scope in relation to the rest of the neighborhood. The proposed building is extremely large for the area. Four-stories is a departure from keeping in character with the neighborhood. We have to ask ourselves if this is an appropriate way to build."

The project is in the final review process with the Planning Department. In mid-March John Lum Architecture will present what it hopes will be the last set of plans. Residents close to the property can expect a meeting notice via mail.

Gardner believes that the Planning Department's treatment of the project will be prece-dent-setting for the neighborhood. "There needs to be more collaboration between developers and residents. People need to be heard," she said.

This is the first of a two-part series.

FACEBOOK

TWITTER

GOOGLE

PINTEREST

Search...

SUBSCRIBE

THE VIEW. DELIVERED.

ARCHIVES

June 2017				
May 2017			OR OR	
April 2017				
March 2017	4.25			
February 2017				(* 1.1 ⁴ 744)
January 2017	i de	A	al a sea	
December 2016				ang
November 2016		100	eth ¹ property	1 - 161
October 2016				
September 2016				
August 2016				
July 2016				
June 2016				
May 2016				
April 2016				
March 2016				
February 2016	1229	Sec.		
January 2016				
December 2015				
November 2015				10
October 2015				
September 2015		6		
August 2015				
July 2015				
June 2015				

Menu



SERVING THE POTRERO HILL, DOGPATCH, MISSION BAY, & SOMA NEIGHBORHOODS SINCE 1970

Carolina Project Creeps Forward

Published on April, 2016 - in News - by Jacob Bourne

B ill Canihan has spent the last two and a half years working to secure permits to redevelop his 891 Carolina Street property. His father, William Canihan, Senior, acquired the single-family home as a rental in 1952, and unsuccessfully sought to renovate it more than a decade ago. Bill Canihan hoped his project would move swiftly through the planning process, but it met with resistance from the San Francisco Planning Department and community members as a result of the proposed structure's scale, including a prominent fourth floor, which was identified as not conforming to surrounding properties.

The project is now on its fifth round of major revisions. Canihan is optimistic that current plans will be approved, though some neighbors continue to question if all issues, such as the proposal to build on 75 percent of the lot, have been sufficiently addressed.

The Canihan family owns property in Novato, San Rafael, and Sonoma, as well as throughout San Francisco, including in the Marina, Western Addition, and Twin Peaks. They purchased their 20-acre Sonoma property in 1973, and began using it to operate the Canihan Family Cellars winery in 1998. A commercial real estate broker, Bill Canihan told neighbors that he planned to redevelop 891 Carolina Street at least in part to accommodate his family's needs, with himself and his sick wife to occupy the upper unit and selling or renting the lower one. However, Canihan's wife passed away in 2015; he now says he wants to keep the plan's accessibility aspects so as to be able to provide care for his elderly mother-in-law and father.

Canihan claimed that since there's been little redevelopment on the block in the last 30 or 40 years his proposal seems large, but that's likely to change as plans emerge for surrounding properties. "I've recently been encouraged by ten neighbors who think the current structure is an eye sore," Canihan said. "I want to make it as acceptable to everyone as possible."

In response to claims from Hill residents that he's allowed the property to fall into an extreme state of disrepair, he offered, "It's been vacant for the past two and a half years. My grandmother had rented it to tenants who agreed to perform maintenance on the property in exchange for reduced rent. The house deteriorated because of the tenants who weren't taking care of it."

Canihan's present plans are for a two-unit structure with a combined square footage of 3,748 square feet, with four levels serviced by an elevator, rising to 34.6 feet. According to John Lum, the project's architect, major space reductions have been made in response to community concerns. "We've cut back the front of the building, the back of the building, as well as part of the top floor. Technically it's a basement with three stories," he said. "The design matches the pattern of the rest of the hilltop. It's definitely within the height limit and we're being sensitive to the neighbor's views."

Chris Hansen, who owns and resides at 782 Wisconsin Street, a condominium located northeast of the proposed development, disagreed that original plans have been substantially changed. "Because it's at the top of the hill the property it is going to be monolithic," Hansen said. "Due to the elevation, a four-story building is essentially a five-story building from my vantage point, because it's so much higher than my property based on the way that it's situated. This project will greatly impact the amount of open space, and will cast shadows on others' properties. The height could be mitigated by

having a more modest footprint and not having such a large house towering over everyone else's home."

Former Potrero Hill resident and owner of nearby 896 Carolina, Kris Gardner, feels that development at the site is made more complicated due to the unusual layout of the parcels on the block. She maintained that in addition to height issues, the proposed structure will establish a deep footprint into the rear yard and mid-block open space, which separates houses on different streets for privacy, light, and shared greenery. She's concerned that the structure's height and closeness would reduce the amount of sunlight that reaches a neighbor's rear yard. Gardner believes that Canihan misrepresented crucial plan details to gain an advantage in the municipal approval process.

"The planned project unfairly benefits precisely from this most unusual layout of dwellings," Gardner offered. "The result is that the proposed building creates an obstruction deep into the rear yard. Due to the owner-developer taking advantage of existing conditions, the intent of the Code, Section 134, that seeks to protect the mid-block passage open space is not achieved. Any application of Residential Design Guidelines for protection of rear yard and mid-block open space has not been used by Planning or by the owner-developer."

Carol Singh and her husband, who live further down the hill, at 1 Southern Heights Avenue, have a different perspective. "We believe it is good for two reasons," Singh commented. "The house has long been derelict and is in need of renovation. The sidewalk in front of the house was often piled with junk and barely passable. Since it has been boarded up, it is an eyesore and impacts the quality of experience on our street. Though the Canihans should have better maintained the property, that doesn't prevent them from developing it now. The second reason we support the renovation is that the owner will be living in the house. We heard that the family has a special needs member and that has driven some of the requirements of the project. You just have to have a certain footprint when you're dealing with wheelchairs and elevators."

One of Gardner's Carolina Street tenants sees the project as symptomatic of housing problems across the City. "I'm not against building or someone trying to make money, but there are right ways to do it," Naphtali Rodriguez said. "I feel that the developers are valuing profit more than the good of the environment of the neighborhood. The proposed development is for four stories, which is pretty high for Potrero Hill, and it will block the neighbors' views. I feel that it is going to devalue the property where I live. Even if it's scaled back to three stories and a basement level, the actual size of the footprint is going to block our windows."

Rodriguez wishes that the existing structure had been maintained, which would have allowed for smaller scale renovations. However, due to the owner's negligence it's beyond repair. He explained that the extent of deterioration has led to rat infestations over the years; members of his family have been bitten by mites from the rats.

Hansen tries to keep a balanced perspective about the development, hoping that neighbors' views will be taken into consideration. "The whole concept of preserving the Hill is sort of a battle cry. It doesn't mean anything unless we work together to come up with solutions. I'm hoping for an open mind on the part of the owner, developer, and neighborhood," Hansen added.

This is the second of a two-part series.

FACEBOOK	TWITTER	GOOGLE	PINTEREST
Search	- (Sec	a s a persoa	and the second of the

SUBSCRIBE

Public Comment Regarding the Proposed Project at 891 Carolina Street

Four presentations were heard by the Planning Commission during the Public Comment forum in 2016.

The attached 4 documents dated 2/11/16, 2/25/16, 2/25/16, and 3/18/16 are the written form of the presentations delivered during Public Comment to the Planning Commission by concerned neighbors.

The attached figures are the powerpoint slides which accompanied the presentation on 3/18/16 showing the DR Applicant's suggested modifications to the project to comply with the Planning Commission ruling of 2003:

3 stories tall

60 foot depth

Pitched roof

Please use these documents to refresh your memory of the presentations you heard in 2016 regarding the proposed project.

Thank you.

2/11/16 Presented to Planning Commissioners during Public Comment

Good afternoon Commissioners,

My name is Robin Bishop and I am a lifelong resident of San Francisco. I was born at 897 Carolina Street on Potrero Hill.

I come before you representing concerned neighbors regarding a project currently in the Planning process. The project address is 891 Carolina Street. A similar project for this same property, and same ownership, came before you in a Discretionary Review in 2002.

At that time, Residential Design Guidelines were applied strictly, particularly where a project is out of scope for the existing neighborhood. At that time, respect of heights in relation to block face, and preservation of rear yard open space was highly regarded. Your decision at that hearing for the project at 891 Carolina Street was that the proposed alteration and expansion of the existing building was out of scale in both height and volume for the immediate and broader context of the neighborhood. The owner refused this requirement as he wanted only to build a four story building that was 235% of the original building, as so he abandoned the project for 12 years.

It seems times have changed, and build-out of height and footprint is in favor, thus putting preservation of a neighborhood's character to the sidelines.

The current project at 891 Carolina Street has been in Planning for 2 years. During that time, there have been 6 NOPDRs whereby the Project Architect has returned minimal or non-responsive plans for re-review. There has been other less formal communications with the Project Sponsor and Architect to attempt to bring this project to a respectful design and size for the context of the neighborhood. The 891 Carolina Project Architect wants to get a plan approved that will be the same size as the proposed plan in 2002-3. He is close to achieving that goal.

For example, The Planning Department NOPDR #1, #2, and #3 required that the fourth floor be removed—the same as this Commission's decision in 2002. By NOPDR #4, the fourth floor was being allowed. It was recently discovered by a neighborhood architect that drawings submitted for review had discrepancies and inaccurate depictions of existing conditions of one adjacent parcel and the existing square footage for the subject building. Both of these misrepresentations has provided the Project Architect with advantages for expansion of the building envelope beyond the scope of the neighborhood, and maximum coverage of the rear yard, this, in disrespect of the mid-block open space.

A crucial point that has permitted the proposed project to be so massive is the Planning Department's interpretation that the neighboring building at 897 Carolina Street "faces" Carolina Street and therefore the building 'fronts on' Carolina Street, greatly impacting the calculation of the rear yard for the proposed project.

I am sharing this with you because the Notice 311 is soon to be issued for 891 Carolina Street and neighbors believe the scope and size is too big for the neighborhood, as ruled by the Commission in 2003. We ask for renewed scrutiny for decisions made with respect to height in relation to the immediate context, and preservation of rear yard and mid-block open space by requiring 60% of lot coverage instead of 75% as currently proposed.

On behalf of neighbors on Potrero Hill, I thank you for listening to me today.

February 25, 2016 --- Presented during Public Comment at Planning Commission meeting

Good afternoon commissioners. I come before you in opposition to the project that is currently with the planning department for 891 Carolina St.

The proposed building is too big for the site because it is taller than all other houses down my street and across my street. It just is not going to fit in.

My wife and I moved to Potrero Hill two years ago when we were expecting our first child. We presently reside on the upper dwelling unit of <u>897 Carolina St.</u> which is next door to this planned remodel and addition of 4000sf.

While new to the neighborhood and exploring the area we were immediately impressed by the attractive 2 story houses that make up the neighborhood's unique character.

Since living here I have come to see that Potrero Hill residents move here and stay here because they are very content with the size and style of these homes. Planning conditions have proven to be highly efficient while preserving the indigenous qualities of the neighborhood for several decades. Adopting fractured gentrification is no way capable of building long term, remotely affordable housing that has maximum compatibility with existing neighborhoods.

Besides the issue of too high for its location on the Hill, the 891 Carolina project would put up a wall over 2/3rd of existing window area on the north side of my house. This obstruction would block significant daylight and breeze into my study room, which I rely heavily on while working from home a good portion of the week. The same would be true for my daughter's bedroom which otherwise has been a great way of saving energy during all seasons for natural ways to heat, cool or light up these living spaces.

For a nuclear family of 3 like ours even with additional guests staying over occasionally for a couple nights, we have found that the ~1100 sq ft living space that our upper unit on <u>897 Carolina st</u> offers has been plentiful. I firmly believe that this space is adequate enough to raise a family of 3 or 4 without having to compromise on living conditions. This is also evident from the fact that families who have lived here prior to us have lived here for several years together before moving out. I don't see a reason compelling enough to justify building ~2000 sqft living units in a neighborhood where several families have been thriving in half that amount of space per unit. If and when my family feels there is any reason to upsize, we would gladly chose to move away to an accommodating modern housing unit elsewhere in the city or to some other suburban outfits elsewhere in the bay area. But we would not resort to having to up-zone indigenous San Francisco homes at the cost of disrupting the essential character of the neighborhood around us.

I hope you will talk to your colleagues in the planning department to retain our neighborhood character by making this building smaller in scale with the neighborhood. I hope you may encourage the planning department not to allow a wall to be built in front of my study window

I Thank you for letting me voice my concern to you today.

Rajiv Raja 897 Carolina Street—Upper Unit

February 25, 2016 - Presented during Public Comment at Planning Commission meeting

Good afternoon, Commissioners.

My name is Chris Hansen and I live at 782 Wisconsin Street in Potrero Hill. The property is directly to the Northeast of 891 Carolina Street, the location of a controversial project that's currently in the Planning process. A similar project at the same address was submitted by the same ownership in 2002 and came before you in a Discretionary Review.

In that Review, it was determined that the proposed alteration and expansion of 891 Carolina Street was out of scale in both height and volume not only for the immediate neighbors, but also the broader context of preserving open spaces in Potrero Hill.

The project was abandoned for over a decade. Two years ago, a slight variant of the original proposal reemerged and has been back in Planning ever since. Like its predecessor, this proposal is still out of character for the neighborhood – even after fourteen years of interim real estate development in Potrero Hill.

From my vantage point at 782 Wisconsin, the proposed project would create a four-story monolith towering over my back yard. From my living room and bedroom windows, I would see both the entirety of the east and north facing sides of 891 Carolina. There is no other property on the entire block that would have such an invasive rear yard setback. Due to the height and close proximity to the property line, the building would block out the sun in early afternoon, creating a negative impact to my open space and that of my neighbors.

The controversy surrounding 891 Carolina has been raised to this Commission before by other concerned neighbors. At issue is the interpretation of various sub-sections of Planning Code Section 134. The Zoning Administrator made a determination that the rear yard may be calculated using the alternate method of averaging under Section 134(c)(2) and (3) due to the non-conforming house to the South of 891 Carolina. However, the non-conforming property has no access points on Carolina, and instead has doorways and garages facing 22nd Street.

Thus, it was up to the Zoning Administrator to make a subjective judgment on the matter, based in part on the good faith assumption that the owner of 891 Carolina intended to move his family into the unit once it was built.

I'm here to suggest that the owner is operating in bad faith, and ask that the project receive a heightened level of scrutiny. In three minutes, I can't give you all the details of misrepresentations on submitted architectural drawings, or the pack of raccoons that lived in the attic for two years, or the fact that an ivy vine is literally the only thing holding up the fence on our property line.

There is a big difference between responsible development and stubborn development. Since 2002, the owner has put forward essentially the same plan over and over again, and it has been tied up in the same process. This time around, I ask the Commission to look at all sides of 891 Carolina Street, not just the West and the South. The back yard areas between Carolina and Wisconsin and 20th and 22nd are one big, shared open space. In fact, the corridor of open space extends from the corner of Carolina all the way South to 26th Street. But not with the proposed structure at 891 Carolina.

I am not a purist who believes that Potrero Hill should stay exactly like it was at some imagined time in the past. We need responsible development, especially in the Southeast Corridor. But there is nothing to suggest that the owner intends to act responsibly. In the rush to create luxury housing for the booming tech industry – which is, indeed, necessary and desirable – I ask that the Commission step back to look at the broader context, to see if it passes the "smell test."

Does the owner intend to become a born again caretaker of the land once the project is completed? I don't know.

Does he plan to create the biggest, boldest structure he can get away with, flip it, and move into the house next door, which he also owns? I sincerely hope we don't have to find out.

3/18/16 --- Presentation to Planning Commission during Public Comment

Good Afternoon Commissioners:

My name is Robin Bishop and I am a lifelong resident of San Francisco. I was born at 897 Carolina Street on Potrero Hill.

I come before you representing concerned neighbors regarding a project currently in the Planning process. The project address is 891 Carolina Street. A similar project for this same property, and the same ownership, came before you in a Discretionary Review in 2002. Your decision at that hearing was that the proposed alteration and expansion of the existing building was out of scale in both height and volume for the immediate and broader context of the neighborhood.

The current project, by the same owner, now in planning for 2 years, is again proposing to build a four story building with an enormous footprint. The current proposed structure at 891 Carolina exploits the unusual character of the adjacent corner lot at 897 Carolina. As you can see, the Southern side of the subject property is completely unobstructed due to the placement of 897 Carolina in the very Eastern part of its lot. This unusual setting allows the calculation of the rear yard for the proposed project to be biased so that the new structure can be build very deeply into the lot. The project sponsor already enjoys unimpeded access to light on the south side of the front 50% of the lot, ordinarily blocked by the adjacent property. Despite this luxury, the proposed structure, grossly out of scale with the two-story homes on Carolina Street, will extend 75% of the way into the lot depth, dramatically reducing light to 897 Carolina and impinging on the mid-block open space.

This unequal sharing of light, access to privacy, and available open space harms the neighboring residents. For this project, the Residential Design Guidelines are of utmost importance for governing the development of 891 Carolina. By building to a height of 39 feet and building to a depth of 60 feet, the project sponsor would successfully expand square footage 159% increase from current conditions. 897 Carolina, a property we've owned for more than 40 years, would then not exist in the literal shadow of a monstrosity that, notably, failed to achieve the support of the Planning Commission in 2002. We ask for renewed scrutiny for decisions made with respect to, but not limited to, height in relation to the immediate context, and preservation of rear yard and mid-block open space to reduce harm to other residents.

Thank you for considering this matter.

Excessive Expansion at 891 Carolina Street

Planning Commission Hearing on 3/18/16 Public Comment Presentation by Robin Bishop

Unusual Site Characteristics





Satellite View












891 Carolina Street: A History Timeline

Discretionary Review on July 13, 2017

1910—A two story (one story over garage), single-family (1,311 ft²) house is built.

1952— The Canihan Family purchased the home. No maintenance was ever performed on the property, and **6 decades of deterioration** commenced.

1952 – The Canihan Family rents to Eve Milton, a single mother who raises her two sons in the home.

May 2001—Demolition permit for existing dwelling and New Construction permit filed to erect a 3 story, 2-unit building.

May 2002—Alterations with Plans permit filed for Addition of a Top Story. The proposed project was for a 4 story building (in excess of 4000 ft² and extending to 60' lot depth).

July 2002—DR filed requesting modifications to remove the 4th floor.

June 2003-- **Discretionary Review Hearing**; **Commission ruled to approve with modifications**, and instructed Planning Department Staff to obtain revisions to the building permit application to achieve:

- Reduce overall building height by eliminating the top floor
- Reduce the second floor above the facade to comply with required setback area
- Incorporate a pitched roof on the second floor to preserve the façade and thereby reinforce the immediate and broader neighborhood context.

August 2003—Canihan Family files an appeal but then withdraws the building permit.

2010—**Ellis Act eviction** of the Milton family. The house is left abandoned except for the rat infestation and homeless squatters on the front porch.

February 2014—Alterations with Plans permit filed for a 4 story, 2-unit building (3917 ft²) that extends to 75 feet deep into the lot (**300% increase in ft**²), including an excavated patio which will eliminate an extraordinary amount of the current mid-block open space and potentially all of the permeable land.

August 8 and 25, 2014—NOPDR#1 and #2, RDT requires "**Remove the 4th floor** to better relate to existing building scale at the street."

November 2014—NOPDR#3, RDT requires "Even with the proposed shaping, **the fourth floor is out of scale** with the surrounding two story buildings. **Remove the fourth floor** to better relate to the existing building scale at the street." RDGs, p. 23-25

November 2014 through March 2015—Planning Department decisions are made for the project but no NOPDRs are prepared. This results in a 4th floor counsel:

March 2015—NOPDR#4, RDT requires "**Please further shape the fourth floor** with either a hip or gable..." "Please consider shaping the fourth floor with dormers..." Please consider moving the fourth floor gable forward..."

March 2015—DR Applicant organizes a meeting with the Project Sponsor to express her concerns about the height and depth of the project as proposed. The DR Applicant presents him with a compromise including detailed drawings of a structure that will not harm neighbors, yet will provide 2 new urban units to be built on Potrero Hill. The compromise is 3 stories tall and 60 feet deep and based on the ruling of the 2003 Planning Commission.

April 2015—SF Planner states that "the Department finds the 4th floor to be acceptable", yet no documentation of the correspondence between the Planning Department and the Architect are provided as to why the 4th floor is now acceptable in a 2-3 story neighborhood at all, considering it is **against the 2003 DR ruling and the numerous requests of the current RDT** (ref: NOPDR#1-3).

March 2016—A neighborhood meeting is held on Potrero Hill with the Project Architect. A story pole was requested by the neighborhood due to **height and mass concerns**. This request was not mandated by the Planning Department.

May 2016—Appendix D checklist to demonstrate compliance with the RDG is not available in the Project file and is requested to be completed by the DR Applicant. The primary concern is the drastic elimination of the mid-block open space, the domino effect it with ignite down block, and the harm induced by cutting off and blocking out 897 Carolina from the neighborhood due to the **extreme mass and encroachment into the rear yard** of the proposed building.

August 2015—NOPDR#5 states that the RDT reviewed the proposed revisions on May 21, 2015 for RDG compliance: "...a stepped building form is disruptive to the block-face and is not in keeping with neighborhood character. Please revise massing...."

September 2015—NOPDR#6—RDT does not support Option A or Option B; ...please eliminate the third story mass to provide a two-story volume on the first and second floors and a two-story volume on the third and fourth floors, thus eliminating the perception of a stepped massing along front building wall.

October 2015 - February 2017 (16 months) NOTE: **no further NOPDRs were produced for this project**.

February 2017—**311 Notice is posted** for a project that includes a 4th floor and is covering 75% of the lot. This project is still grossly out of scale with the immediate and broader neighborhood context, as determined previously by the San Francisco Planning Commission.

July 13, 2017—Discretionary Review Hearing for 891 Carolina Street.

Please ensure consistency and uphold the previous decision by the Commission in 2003 by deciding to APPROVE WITH MODIFICATIONS:

- 3 stories high
- 60 feet deep (equal to back wall of neighboring 883 Carolina)
- 2 habitable units totaling ~3000 ft² (225% increase in square footage)

This timeline demonstrates the relentless harassment of the SF Planning Department by the Project Sponsor and Architect and blatant disregard of the requests of the RDT and the SF Planning Commission. Please do not condone or reward this misbehavior. Protect the Planners that serve us to ensure good buildings in our great city. Please rule to require a reduction of height and mass and **approve with modifications** a building that is **3 stories high and 60 feet deep**. THANK YOU.

RESPONSE TO DISCRETIONARY REVIEW (drp)

Project Information

Property Address: 891 Carolina Street Building Permit Application(s): 2014.02.11.8267 Record Number: 2014.0870DRP Assigned Planner: Natalia Kwiatkowska

Project Sponsor

Name: Daren Iguchi Email: <u>daren@johnlumarchitecture.com</u>

Required Questions

1. Given the concerns of the DR requester and other concerned parties, why do you feel your proposed project should be approved? (If you are not aware of the issues of concern to the DR requester, please meet the DR <u>requester in addition to reviewing the attached DR</u> <u>application.)</u>

The design of our proposed project complies with the Planning code, the Planning Department Priority Policies, and the Residential Design Guidelines and has evolved over the course of 3 ½ years of multiple design reviews by the Residential Design Team (RDT) and four neighborhood outreach meetings with the community. The proposed design increases the current building in height and depth, but the impact is mitigated by setbacks in mass from the front, sides and rear, including a front gabled roof form.

These design strategies are supported by the Residential Design Guidelines and were implemented under the scrutiny of the RDT.

The DR requester states that the proposed project conflicts with Planning Department Priority Policies # 2, #3, and #8. Priority policy #2 states that existing housing and neighborhood character be preserved. Given the eclectic nature of the styles and the sizes of buildings in the neighborhood (ranging from 2-story to 4-story) the scale and use of finish materials on the proposed project are in keeping with the neighborhood character.

Priority Policy #3 states that the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced. This project is not an affordable housing project and is being constructed by the property owner to live in with his family while also adding a second, three-bedroom unit designed to house another

family. The units are small enough in square footage to be considered affordable although they are market-rate housing.

Priority Policy #8 states that our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development. Open space as defined by the code is public property. Our project as designed has no impact on parks and open space. Apparently, the DR requester does not understand that a private backyard is not legally defined as open space.

Project Depth

The requester claims that our project is "exceptionally deep for the site" and sets a precedent for "radical diminishing of mid-block open space. Our project is code complying and meets the required rear yard of 25% of the lot, whereas the requester's building is non-conforming, and occupies a majority of the required rear yard, extending almost to the rear property line.

In addition, our project has been stepped to reduce further impact to the mid-block open space. The upper stories are set back an additional 9'-6" from the lower two-story rear wall. The existing mid-block open space is not contiguous and is intruded upon by several buildings, including the requester's own, that extend to the very rear of their lots. Our proposed project does not represent an exceptional impact on the mid-block open space. The depth of the proposed project matches the depth of the opposite property on Wisconsin. Please refer to Exhibit 2 which shows an aerial image of the southern end of the block with diagram of the proposed addition.

The requester claims that the retained non-conforming front facade, which we are retaining since the existing front walls are being retained, is unusually limited. Having the building face the front property line is consistent with the existing context and is the predominant pattern on the eastern side of Carolina St.

Demolition

This is not a demolition and the reference to a demolition is incorrect. Please see demo calculations included in drawing set.

Previous Proposed project

This is not the proposed project submitted in 2002 and is irrelevant to the current proposed project, That was a different project sponsor, different architect, and different architectural aesthetic. It also sought a front setback variance which is not required for the current proposed project.

Project Height

The requester claims that the project is exceptionally tall for the site. Our project is below the height restrictions and is 36'-11 tall, as determined by the Planning code. By stepping the mass at the front of the building and using a gabled roof form, the building is compatible with the scale of the surrounding buildings. Our 3-story-over basement project is in no way an anomaly for the neighborhood. On this block of Carolina St. there are seven buildings with four stories. There is also a four-story building directly to the northeast which fronts on Wisconsin Street.

Size of dwelling units

The requester claims that the project is "well above average" in size for Potrero hill. This is incorrect. The lower unit in our project is 1,909 gross square feel and the upper unit is 2,008 gross square feet.

The DR requestor claims that the project is growing by 300% which is incorrect. The habitable space of the building is increasing from 1,712 gross sq. ft. to 3,917 gross sq. ft. which is an increase of 229%. The total square footage including non-habitable space is increasing from 2,646 gross sq. ft. to is 5,006, which is an increase of 189%.

Coverage of lot.

The DR Applicant claims that the project covers 80% of the lot. This is incorrect. The actual lot coverage is 1,694 sq. ft. which is 67.76% of the lot. Note that the entirety of the proposed rear yard patio and terraced areas will be a permeable material, to assist with permeability concerns. Note also that there is no codified requirement for permeability in the rear yard.

2. What alternatives or changes to the proposed project are you willing to make in order to address the concerns of the DR requester and other concerned parties? If you have already changed the project to 36'-meet neighborhood concerns, please explain those changes and indicate whether they were made before or after filing your application with the City.

The requester claims that our project dramatically reduces light, airflow and ventilation to 897 Carolina by "covering existing windows". Our proposed expansion does not obstruct any of the DR requester's windows. In fact, In the design of our project, we have set back the south wall of the rear of the building four feet in order to <u>not</u> block two (non-conforming) property-line

windows on the neighboring building. Note that one of the windows in question is a front bedroom that has another large window towards the west, facing the front garden. The second window is a bathroom window.

The current building code only allows non-operating fire rated windows at the property line with a deed restriction requiring the property owner to remove such windows in the event that the adjacent property owner builds an addition up against the property line that blocks these windows.

We believe that the concern of the applicant is based solely on preserving their view of our client's backyard and toward the northeast.

As the proposed project is set back four feet from the property line and is located to the north of the DR requestor's property, the claims of loss of sunlight and air are not based in fact.

We have offered the following proposals to mitigate the partial loss of their view and perceived loss of light with the following:

1) Provide and pay for installation of skylights

2) Install and maintain a "Living wall" of appropriately selected plantings on our south-facing wall opposite the property line windows at 897 Carolina St.3) Substitute an open guardrail for the current solid parapet on the second floor rear deck

4) Specify that all south-facing windows on the lower three floors have obscure glass.

5) Offer the owner of 897 Carolina St. the choice of paint color on the wall opposite her windows.

We have met with both the requester, Robin Bishop and her mother, property owner Kris Gardner, numerous times. They have rejected all of these proposals and remain opposed to any compromise except to demand further reductions to the project.

3. If you are not willing to change the proposed project or pursue other alternatives, please state why you feel that your project would not have any adverse effect on the surrounding properties. Include an explanation of your needs for space or other personal requirements that prevent you from making the changes requested by the DR requester.

We have progressively reduced both the square footage and mass of the proposed design over the course of 3 ½ years of review by the Planning Department in general and the Residential Design Team specifically.

Please refer to Exhibit 1 that shows the evolution of the design of the project. The project as currently designed is respectful of the scale and street character of its neighborhood context while meeting the needs of our client /homeowner.

In addition to the numerous design modifications which have reduced both square footage and building mass, the mitigating proposals we have offered the requester have all been met with rejection and an unwillingness to compromise. The only proposal the requester has put forward as acceptable is to reduce the depth of the building by 15' and remove the top floor.

Removing this 1,117.5 gross sq. ft. (28.5% of the proposed habitable space) would remove at least one bedroom from both units and removes the entire kitchen, dining and living room from the upper unit which would then need to be incorporated into the lower floor. At best, this would result in two, two-bedrooms apartments. This would result in a significant decrease in income related to the lower unit, which Mr. Canihan is depending on to finance the project, and would result in an upper unit that no longer serves the needs of his family.

Mr. Canihan wishes to reside with his daughter, 82-year old father and would like to have a spare (4th) bedroom for a guest or live-in caregiver for his father should he require one. When the project began Mr. Canihan's wife was still alive and required two full-time caregivers. Eventually, his daughter wants to raise a family in one of the new residences.

The project addresses a property in great need of renovation and adds an additional housing unit. The size of the proposed units are between 3%-9% of the average square footage for comparable units sold in the neighborhood within the last three years. (Refer to Exhibit 3). The proposed project complies with the Planning Code and incorporates recommended design strategies from the Residential Design Guidelines. The size of the project is not exceptional and the project has been designed to mitigate its impact on neighboring properties.

Project Features

Please provide the following information about the project for both the existing and proposed features. Please attach an additional sheet with project features that are not included in this table.

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Dwelling Units (only one kitchen per unit - additional kitchens count as additional units)	1	2
Occupied Stories (all levels with habitable rooms)	2	4
Basement Levels (may include garage or windowless storage rooms)	1	1
Parking Spaces (Off-Street)	1	3
Bedrooms	3	7
Height	26'-10	36'-11"
Building Depth	47'-10"	75'-0"
Rental Value (monthly)	N/A	TBD
Property Value	\$624,138	TBD

I attest that the above information is true to the best of my knowledge.

Signature:	Darendgeh.	Date:	5.09.17
Printed Name	Daren Iguchi e:	Property OwnerAuthorized Age	

If you have any additional information that is not covered by this application, please feel free to attach additional sheets to this form.

Building Permit Application No. 2002.05.08.6090 Plans















CANIHAN RESIDENCE - REMODEL & ADDITION

891 CAROLINA STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107



BLOCK / LOT: 4097 / 027











2 SUBJECT PROPERTY FRONT W/ NEIGHBORING PROPERTIES- VIEW EAST



3 NEIGHBORING PROPERTY 897 CAROLINA- VIEW NORTH





6 OPPOSITE SIDE OF CAROLINA ST.- VIEW NORTHWEST



7 OPPOSITE SIDE OF CAROLINA ST.- VIEW SOUTHWEST



8 NEIGHBORING PROPERTY 897 CAROLINA- VIEW SOUTH



(10) NEIGHBORING PROPERTY 897 CAROLINA- VIEW EAST



11______SUBJECT PROPERTY - VIEW WEST



12 NEIGHBORING PROPERTY 897 CAROLINA- VIEW EAST





plot date : file name :



4 NEIGHBORING PROPERTY 897 CAROLINA- VIEW NORTHEAST



9 NEIGHBORING PROPERTY 897 CAROLINA- VIEW SOUTHEAST



14 NEIGHBORING PROPERTY 883 CAROLINA - VIEW NORTH

bill canihan 891 carolina st san francisco, ca 94107

JOHN LUM ARCHITECTURE INC. 3246 SEVENTEENTH STREET SAN TEL 415 558 9550 Fax 415 558 0554

CANIHAN RESIDENCE REMODEL & ADDITION 891 CAROLINA STREET 5AN FRANCISCO, CA 94107 800 K LIOT: 4097/ 027

date :	issues/ revisions :	by :
07.23.13	planning project rev mtg	ds
08.28.13	pre-application mtg.	di
02.07.14	site permit submittal	di
03.22.16	neighborhood mtg.	di
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
project r	iame :	CANIHAN
project number :		00000
project r	00000	
scale :		

SITE PHOTOS





		JOHN LUM ARCHITECTURE INC. 200HN LUM ARCHITECTURE INC. 2246 SEVENTERINH STREET SAN FRANCISCO. CA 9410 TEL 415 568 0560 FW 415 558 0554
D. SITE / ROOF PLAN	N (CANIHAN RESIDENCE REMODEL & ADDITION 891. CAROLINA STREET SAN FRANCISCO. CA 94107 BLOCK / LOT: 4497/ 027 BLOCK / LOT: 4497/ 027 BLOCK / LOT: 4497/ 027 BLOCK / LOT: 4497/ 027 Block (Cotting of the state of the stat
		date : issues/ revisions : by : 07.23.13 planning project rev mg ds 08.20.13 pre-application outreach di 08.28.13 pre-application outreach di 01.21.14 neighborhood flow-up rd 02.07.14 site permit revisions di 03.09.14 responset to planning mm 11.12.15 site permit revisions di 03.22.16 neighborhood mg di 03.22.16 neighborhood mg di 03.22.16 site permit revisions di 03.22.16 neighborhood mg di 03.22.16 neighborhood mg di 03.22.16 site permit revisions di 03.22.16 neighborhood mg di 03.22.16 site permit revisions di 04.16.17 site permit revisions di 05.21.6 site permit revisions di 05.21.6 site permit revisions di 1 - -<
/ ROOF PLAN	N D	EXISTING / PROPOSED SITE / ROOF PLAN
		A0.2



EASTERN SIDE OF CAROLINA STREET CONTAINS:







(EXISTING) 2 STORY (PROPOSED) 3 STORY

WESTERN SIDE OF CAROLINA STREET CONTAINS:



2 SATELITE VIEW2 OF SUBJECT PROPERTY'S STREET - LOOKING WEST

plot date : lie name :



(EXISTING) 2 STORY - (PROPOSED) 3 STORY

5 3-STORY STRUCTURES 4 4-STORY STRUCTURES 2 OVER-SIZED 3-STORY STRUCTURES ATOP LARGE ROCK OUTCROPPINGS THAT BRING THEM TO THE HEIGHT OF 5-STORY STRUCTURES

JOHN LUM ARCHITECTURE INC. 3246 SEVENTEENTH STREET SAN TEL 415 558 9550 Fax 415 558 0554 891 CAROLINA STREET SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107 BLOCK / LOT: 4097 / 027 bill canihan 891 carolina st Incisco, ca 94107 CANIHAN RESIDENCE REMODEL & ADDITION an fra date : issues/ revisions 07.23.13 planning project rev mtg 08.28.13 pre-application mtg. 02.07.14 site permit submittal 03.22.16 neighborhood mtg. CANIHAN project name : project number 00000 scale :

SATELITE VIEWS

A0.3



JOHN LUM ARCHITECTURE INC. 3246 SEVENTEENTH STREET SAN TEL 415 558 9550 Fax 415 558 0554 891 CAROLINA STREET SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107 BLOCK / LOT: 4097 / 027 bill canihan 891 carolina st Incisco, ca 94107 CANIHAN RESIDENCE REMODEL & ADDITION an fra date : issues/ revisions : 07.23.13 planning project rev mtg 08.28.13 pre-application mtg. 02.07.14 site permit submittal 03.22.16 neighborhood mtg. CANIHAN project name : 00000 project number scale :

STREET PHOTOS





plot date : file name :



2 PROPERTIES OPPOSITE SUBJECT PROPERTY





1 SUBJECT PROPERTY & ADJACENT NEIGHBORS





JOHN LUM ARCHITECTURE INC. 3246 SEVENTEENTH STREET SAN TEL 415 558 9550 Fax 415 558 0554

bill canihan 891 carolina st san francisco, ca 94107

891 CAROLINA STREET SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107 BLOCK / LOT: 4097 / 027 CANIHAN RESIDENCE REMODEL & ADDITION

date : issues/ revisions : 07.23.13 planning project rev mtg 08.28.13 pre-application mtg. 02.07.14 site permit submittal 01.25.16 site permit revisions I neighborhood mtg. 03.22.16

CANIHAN project name : 00000 project number

STREET PHOTOS

A0.5

scale :



· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Revisions:
N	Date: 10/2000 Scale: 1 [#] =8 ¹ Surveyed: P.C. Drawn: P.C. Checked: P.C,
LEGEND Sever manhole Joint Pole Gas Valve Hater Pieter B Sever Vante B Sever Vent S Combined Subjere H Kater E ELECTRIC G Gas Line T ELEPHONE T ELEPHONE T FELEPHONE T FELEPHONE FL FLOG OF CURB FL FLOG OF PARAPET BLDG, BUILDING P INCERTAIN BUILDING LINE LIGHT WELL	- PERI COSSEBOOM LICENSED LAND SURVEYORS 1686 UNION STREET, Ste. 209 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94123 (415) 391-9900 FAX (415) 391-9906
BOMT. BASEMENT	SURVEY OF LOT 27, ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 4097 FOR BILL CANIHAN SAN FRANCISCO BILL CANIHAN CALIFORNIA
GRAPHIC SCALE	A0.6



DEMOLITION NOTES

CONTRACTOR TO PATCH & REPAIR SURFACES AS REQD. FOR A
COMPLETE INSTALLATION.
 CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL EXISTING UTILITY LOCATIONS &
DIMENSIONS PRIOR TO STATING WORK & SHALL PROVIDE
APPROPRIATE CONSTRUCTION TO PROTECT THE EXISTING UTILITIES
AS NECESSARY.

DEMOLITION LEGEND
EXISTING WALL TO REMAIN
EXISTING WALL TO BE REMOVED:
CTHER (E) ITEMS TO BE REMOVED
(E) DOOR TO BE REMOVED, TYP.
(E) WINDOW TO BE REMOVED,
(E) FLOOR, CEILING OR ROOF TO
BE REMOVED, TYP.
(E) FLOOR, CEILING OR ROOF TO

JOHN LUM ARCHITECTURE INC. 3246 SEVENTEENTH STREET SAN TEL 415 558 9550 Fax 415 558 0554 891 CAROLINA STREET SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107 BLOCK / LOT: 4097 / 027 bill canihan 891 carolina st san francisco, ca 94107 CANIHAN RESIDENCE REMODEL & ADDITION date : issues/ revisions : by : 04.18.13 client review 07.23.13 planning proje planning project rev mtg pre-application outreach 08.20.13 08.28.13 pre-application mtg. 02.07.14 site permit submittal 03.22.16 neighborhood mtg. CANIHAN project name : 00000 project number scale : EXISTING / DEMO. BASEMENT & IST

FLOOR PLANS

AI.0





	× 111 /			
/	DEMOLITION NOTES			
	CONTRACTOR TO PATCH & REPAIR SURFACES AS REQ'D. FOR A COMPLETE INSTALLATION. COMPLETE INSTALLATION. CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL EXISTING UTILITY LOCATIONS DIMENSIONS PRIOR TO STARTING WORK & SHALL PROVIDE APPROPRIATE CONSTRUCTION TO PROTECT THE EXISTING UTILITIE AS NECESSARY.			
	DEMOLITION LEGEND			
	EXISTING WALL TO REMAIN			
	EXISTING WALL TO BE REMOVED:	222220202		
/	OTHER (E) ITEMS TO BE REMOVED SHOWN DASHED, TYP.			
	(E) DOOR TO BE REMOVED, TYP.			
	(E) WINDOW TO BE REMOVED, TYP.	pq		
	(E) FLOOR , CEILING OR ROOF TO BE REMOVED, TYP.			

JOHN LUM ARCHITECTURE INC. 3246 SEVENTEENTH STREET SAN TEL 415 558 9550 Fax 415 558 0554 891 CAROLINA STREET SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107 BLOCK / LOT: 4097 / 027 bill canihan 891 carolina st Incisco, ca 94107 CANIHAN RESIDENCE REMODEL & ADDITION an frar date : issues/ revisions : by : 04.18.13 client review 07.23.13 planning project rev mtg pre-application outreach 08.20.13 08.28.13 pre-application mtg. 02.07.14 site permit submittal 03.22.16 . neighborhood mtg. project name : CANIHAN 00000 project number scale :

EXISTING/ DEMO 2ND FLOOR PLAN





CONSTRUCTION NOTES

1. CONTRACTOR IS TO VERIFY ALL (E) DIMENSIONS AND CONDITIONS PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION

2. CARE SHALL BE TAKEN TO ELIMINATE DAMAGE TO (E) MATERIALS AND SURFACES DURING CONSTRUCTION. ANY DAMAGES TO EXISTING CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE REPLACED OR REPAIRED AT NO ADDITIONAL COST.

3. CONTRACTOR SHALL REPAIR ANY DAMAGE TO (E) WALLS AND FLOORS CAUSED BY DEMOLITION OF (E) PARTITIONS & CEILINGS.

4. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TO FACE OF FINISH OR CENTERLINE, U.N.O. 5. ALL BLOCK'G AND FURRING SHALL BE FIRE TREATED AS REQ. BY BLDG. CODE

6. ALL PARTITIONS ABUTTING EXISTING BLDG. CONSTRUCTION SHALL ALIGN FINISH FACE TO FINISH FACE. U.N.O.

7. ALL PARTITIONS SHALL BE BRACED PER THE REQUIREMENTS OF CURRENT LOCAL SEISMIC CODE

8. ALL DOORS TO BE UNDERCUT AS REQ. TO CLEAR FINISH FLOOR BY 1/4"

9. ALL WORK TO BE INSTALLED PLUMB, LEVEL, SQUARE, AND TRUE AND IN PROPER ALIGNMENT

++++++++++++

10. CONTRACTOR TO PROTECT FINISHES IN PATH OF TRAVEL TO AREA OF WORK

WALL TYPE LEGEND

EXISTING WALL

EXISTING 1 HR. FIRE-RATED WALL

NEW INTERIOR WALL: 5/8" GYPSUM BOARD, 0/ 2X4 WD. STUDS, 0/ STRUCTURAL PLYWD. (WHERE OCCURS, S.S.D) 0/ 5/8" GYPSUM BOARD

NEW PARTIAL HEIGHT WALL

NEW 1-HOUR FIRE-RATED PARAPET WALL: ASSEMBLY SAME AS 1-HR. RATED WALL, ABOVE

NEW EXTERIOR WALL (NON-RATED); (N) FINISH MATERIAL (REFER TO EXTERIOR ELEVS.) 0/ 2 LAYERS GRADE "D" BUILDING PAPER, 0/ EXTERIOR GRADE PLYWOOD, 0/ 2X6 WD. STUDS W/ R19 THERMAL INSULATION, 0/ 5/8" GYPSUM BOARD (INTERIOR FACE)

NEW 1-HOUR FIRE-RATED EXTERIOR WALL: (N) FINISH MATERIAL (REFER TO EXTERIOR ELEVS.) 0/ 2LAYERS GRADE "D' BUILDING PAPER, 0/ 587 "TYPE"X (SPSUM SHEATHING, 0/ 587 WTDE YL (SHEATHING, 0/ 587 WTDE YL (SHEATHING, HOLD, 0/ 587 "TYPE"X (SHEATHING) COMPARENCE 0.587 "TYPE"X (SHEATHING) COMPARENCE 0.587 "TYPE"X (SHEATHING) COMPARENCE (SHEATHING) COMPAR

GRADE PLANE CALCULATION POINT HEIGHT LENGTH AVE. HEIGH LXH 122.5" 16047.5 SOIN 9492 SOIN 4576 SOIN 0 SOIN 9492 SOIN 4576 SOIN 0 SOIN 6811.5 SOIN 6811.5 SOIN 0 SOIN 8585 SOIN 11394 SOIN 11394 SOIN 11394 SOIN 6811.5 SOIN 125.5" 119.5" AB BB' 65" 48.5" F'G GG' G'H HH' H'I 0" 140 31" 202 JÄÄ LAZP POQK 0" 62.5" 125" 125" 95.5" 66" 95.5" 125" 91.5" 53" 48" 0" 48" 42" 63" 220 125 125 66" 66" 125 125 58" 48" 0" 252" 0" 105" 166" 404" 224" 48" 73.5" 61" 99.5"

AVERAGE HEIGHT OF FINISH FIRST FLOOR ABOVE GRADE: HEIGHT = SUM (LENGTH X HEIGHT) / SUM (LENGTH) HEIGHT = 165933 SQIN / 2379" HEIGHT = 69.7"

69.7"<72" THEREFORE BASEMENT

PER 2013 CBC DEFINITIONS: STORY ABOVE GRADE PLANE. ANY STORY HAVING ITS FINISHED FLOOR SURFACE ENTIRELY ABOVE GRADE PLANE, OR IN WHICH THE FINISHED SURFACE OF THE FLOOR NETY A ROVE IS: NEXT ABOVE IS ABOVE IS: 1. MORE THAN 6' ABOVE GRADE PLANE; OR 2. MORE THAN 12' ABOVE GRADE PLANE AT ANY POINT



PROPOSED BASEMENT & IST FLOOR PLANS

AI.2



CONSTRUCTION NOTES

1. CONTRACTOR IS TO VERIFY ALL (E) DIMENSIONS AND CONDITIONS PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION

2. CARE SHALL BE TAKEN TO ELIMINATE DAMAGE TO (E) MATERIALS AND SURFACES DURING CONSTRUCTION. ANY DAMAGES TO EXISTING CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE REPLACED OR REPAIRED AT NO ADDITIONAL COST.

3. CONTRACTOR SHALL REPAIR ANY DAMAGE TO (E) WALLS AND FLOORS CAUSED BY DEMOLITION OF (E) PARTITIONS & CEILINGS.

4. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TO FACE OF FINISH OR CENTERLINE, U.N.O. 5. ALL BLOCK'G AND FURRING SHALL BE FIRE TREATED AS REQ. BY BLDG. CODE

6. ALL PARTITIONS ABUTTING EXISTING BLDG. CONSTRUCTION SHALL ALIGN FINISH FACE TO FINISH FACE, U.N.O.

7. ALL PARTITIONS SHALL BE BRACED PER THE REQUIREMENTS OF CURRENT LOCAL SEISMIC CODE

8. ALL DOORS TO BE UNDERCUT AS REQ. TO CLEAR FINISH FLOOR BY 1/4"

9. ALL WORK TO BE INSTALLED PLUMB, LEVEL, SQUARE, AND TRUE AND IN PROPER ALIGNMENT

++++++++++++

10. CONTRACTOR TO PROTECT FINISHES IN PATH OF TRAVEL TO AREA OF WORK

WALL TYPE LEGEND

EXISTING WALL

EXISTING 1 HR. FIRE-RATED WALL

NEW INTERIOR WALL: 5/8" GYPSUM BOARD, 0/ 2X4 WD. STUDS, 0/ STRUCTURAL PLYWD. (WHERE OCCURS, S.S.D) 0/ 5/8" GYPSUM BOARD

NEW PARTIAL HEIGHT WALL:

NEW 1-HOUR FIRE-RATED PARAPET WALL: ASSEMBLY SAME AS 1-HR. RATED WALL, ABOVE

NEW EXTERIOR WALL (NON-RATED); (N) FINISH MATERIAL (REFER TO EXTERIOR ELEVS.) 0/ 2 LAYERS GRADE "D" BUILDING PAPER, 0/ EXTERIOR GRADE PLYWOOD, 0/ 2X6 WD. STUDS W/ R19 THERMAL INSULATION, 0/ 5/8" GYPSUM BOARD (INTERIOR FACE)

NEW 1-HOUR FIRE-RATED EXTERIOR WALL: (N) FINISH MATERIA (REFER TO EXTERIOR ELEVS.) 0/ 2LAYERS GRADE "D' BUILDING PAPER, 0/ 587 VTPE"X (SPSUM SHEATHING, 0/ 587 VTPE YA (SPSUM SHEATHING, 0/ 587 VTPE X (SPSUM BOARD 0/ 567 VTPE X (SPSUM BOARD



10.24.14	site permit revisions	mm
09.03.15	updated design	di
11.12.15	site permit revisions	di
01.26.16	site permit revisions I	di
03.22.16	neighborhood mtg.	di
06.24.16	site permit revisions 2	di
02.06.17	site permit revision 3	di
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
project n	ame :	CANIHAN
project number :		00000
scale :		

FLOOR PLANS

PROPOSED 2ND & 3RD

AI.3







1' DI

,





0" 06









2 891 CAROLINA ST.: FRONT PERSPECTIVE - VIEW NORTHEAST A3.5 Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0"



	JOHN LUM ARCHITECTURE INC. 3246 SEVENTERNTH STREET SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110 TEL 415 658 9580 Fax 415 558 0554
CANIHAN RESIDENCE REMODEL & ADDITION 891 CAROLINA STREET SAN FRANCISCO. CA 94107 BLOCK / LOT: 4097 / 027	891 carolinati 891 carolinati 8an francisco. ca 94 07
date : issues/ revisions : 01.26.16 site permit revisions 1 03.22.16 neighborhood mtg. 06.24.16 site permit revisions 2 - - <tr< th=""><th>by : di di - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -</th></tr<>	by : di di - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
PERSPECTIVE VI	EW


A3.6

CANIHAN RESIDENCE - DEMOLITION CALCULATIO

891 CAROLINA STREET, SAN F

BL

DRAWING INDEX:

- 1. DC.0 TITLE SHEET: DEMOLITION CALCULATION
- DC.1 DEMOLITION CALCULATIONS: LINEAR FOOTAGE 2.
- DC.2 DEMOLITION CALCULATIONS: HORIZONTAL ELEMENTS 3.
- DC.3 DEMOLITION CALCULATIONS: VERTICAL ENVELOPE ELEMENTS 4

DEMOLITION CALCULATIONS PER SECTION 317

1.	1/DC.1	EXTERIOR WALL AT FRONT AN	D REAR FACADES TOTAL LINEAR FEET: TOTAL TO BE REMOVED: TOTAL TO BE RETAINED:	45'-10" 22'- 5 1/4" 23'- 4 3/4"
2.	2/DC.1	SUM OF ALL EXTERIOR WALLS	TOTAL LINEAR FEET: TOTAL TO BE REMOVED: TOTAL TO BE RETAINED:	129'-10" 54'- 6 1/2" 75'- 3 1/2"

DC.2 HORIZONTAL ELEMENTS TOTAL HORIZONTAL ELEMENTS: 2763.48 TOTAL HORZ. ELEMENTS REMOVED: 1049.51 TOTAL HORZ. ELEMENTS RETAINED: 1713.97

4. DC.3 VERTICAL ELEMENTS

TOTAL VERTICAL ELEMENTS:2519.25TOTAL VERT. ELEMENTS REMOVED:1065.25TOTAL VERT. ELEMENTS RETAINED:1454.00

RAN	CISC	CK8 0, CA 94 T: 4097	4107			JOHN LUM ARCHITECTURE INC. 2249 SEVENTEENTH STREET SAN FRANCISCO. CA 94110 TEL 415 558 9550 Fax 415 558 0554
<mark>7 (b)(2)</mark> " 1/4" 3/4"	48.95% 51.05%	PASSED SEC. 311 THE SUM OF THE REAR FACADE REM MEASURATION L THE FOUNDATION L THAN 50% OF THE T THE FRONT AND RE	AL FEETAT EVEL, IS LESS OTAL SUM OF AR FACADE.	CANIHAN RESIDENCE REMODEL & ADDITION	891 CAROLINA STREET SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107 BLOCK / LOT: 4097 / 027	bill carolina st B91 carolina st san francisco ca 94107
" 1/2" 1/2"	42.01% 57.99%	PASSED SEC. 317 : THE SUM OF ALL F EXTERIOR WALLS M LINEAL FEET AT THE LEVEL IS LESS THAI TOTAL SUM OF ALL I WALLS	REMOVED IEASURED IN E FOUNDATION N 65% OF THE	date : 09.04.14 01.26.16 - -	issues/ revisions : demolition calculati site permit revisions - -	
3 SQ. FT. I SQ. FT. 7 SQ. FT.	37.98% 62.02%	PASSED SEC. 317 : THE SUM OF ALL F HORIZONTAL ELEME MEASURED IN SQU/ ACTUAL SURFACE A THAN 50% OF THE T ALL HORIZONTAL EL	REMOVED ENTS ARE FEET OF IREA IS LESS OTAL SUM OF		-	-
5 SQ. FT. 5 SQ. FT. 9 SQ. FT.	42.28% 57.72%	PASSED SEC. 317 : LESS THAN 50% O VERTICAL ENVELOF TO BE REMOVED		- - - - project scale :	name : DEMOLITIC	- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
					CALCULATIC TITLE SHEE	ons et





100%

0%

51.05%



V	

100%

0%

84.06%

32.84.34%

57.99%

23'-4 3/4"

0"

39'-10 3/4"

12'-0"

75'-3 1/2"

0%

100%

15.94%

67.16%

42.01%

PASSED SEC. 317 (2) (B) : THE SUM OF ALL EXTERIOR WALLS REMOVED, MEASURED IN LINEAL FEET AT THE FOUNDATION LEVEL, IS LESS THAN 65% OF THE TOTAL SUM OF ALL EXTERIOR WALLS.

		JOHN IUM ARCHITECTURE INC. 3246 SEVENTEENTH STREET SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110 TEL 415 558 9550 Fxx 415 558 0554
CANIHAN RESIDENCE REMODEL & ADDITION	891 CAROLINA STREET SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107 BLOCK / IOT: 4097 / 027	bill carihan 891 carolina st san francisco ca 94107
date : 09.04.14 01.26.16 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	issues/ revisic demolition ca site permit re - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	lculations mm
scale :	DEMOLI CALCULA INEAR FC	TION ATIONS DOTAGE







SYMBOLS:	
TO BE RETAINED	
TO BE REMOVED	

SEC. 317 (2) (C) REMOVAL OF MORE THAN 50% OF THE HORIZONTAL ELEMENTS OF THE EXISTING BUILDING, AS MEASURED IN SQUARE FEET OF ACTUAL SURFACE AREA.

AREA MEASUREMENT

HORIZONTAL ELEMENTS	(E) AREA (sq. ft.)	TO BE REMOVED (sq. ft.)	% TO BE REMOVED	TO BE RETAINED (SQ. FT.)
(E) 2ND FLOOR	980.91	13.13	1.34%	967.78
(E) 3RD FLOOR	968.23	222.04	22.93%	746.19
(E) ROOF	814.34	814.34	100%	0
HORIZONTAL TOTAL:	2763.48	1049.51	37.98%	1713.97

N

N

N

JOHN LUM ARCHITECTURE INC. 3246 SEVENTEENTH STREET SAN FRANCISCO, C TEL 415 558 9550 FAX 415 558 0554

)	% TO BE RETAINED
	98.66%
	77.07%
	0%
	62.02%

PASSED SEC. 317 (2) (C) : THE SUM OF ALL REMOVED HORIZONTAL ELEMENTS MEASURED IN SQUARE FEET OF ACTUAL SURFACE AREA IS LESS THAN 50% OF THE TOTAL SUM OF ALL HORIZONTAL ELEMENTS

CANIHAN RESIDENCE REMODEL & ADDITION	891 CAROLINA STREET SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107	BLOCK /LOT: 4497 / 027	991 carried and the contract of the contract o	
date :	issu	es/ revisions :	by :	
09.04.14	den	nolition calculations	mm	
01.26.16	site	permit revisions I	di - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	
-	-			
:			-	
-	-		-	
-	-		-	
			-	
	-		-	
	-		-	
-			-	
:	2		-	
-	-		-	
2	-		-	
-	-		-	
project	name	:	CANIHAN	
project	numbe	er:	00000	
scale :				
demolition calculations horizontal elements DC.2				







REDESIGN BASED ON RDT COMMENTS - 11/6/14



REDESIGN BASED ON RDT COMMENTS - 12/16/14



REDESIGN BASED ON RDT COMMENTS - 4/6/15

ORIGINAL SITE PERMIT SUBMITTAL - 2/7/14



REDESIGN BASED ON RDT COMMENTS - 9/16/15



REDESIGN BASED ON RDT COMMENTS - 1/21/16



bill canihan 891 carolina st ancisco, ca 94107

3246 SEVEN

CANIHAN RESIDENCE REMODEL & ADDITION

891 CAROLINA STREET SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107 BLOCK / LOT: 4097 / 027

date : 05.09.17 dr res project name : CANIHAN project number : 0000 scale :

EXHIBIT I DESIGN ITERATIONS



EX.01





plot date : file name :

ITECTURE IN VTH STREET JOHN LUM ARCHI 3246 SEVENTEEN TEL 415 558 9550 F bill canihan 891 carolina st francisco, ca 94107 891 CAROLINA STREET SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107 BLOCK / LOT: 4097 / 027 **REMODEL & ADDITION** san **CANIHAN RESIDENCE** issues/ revisions date : by 05.09.17 dr response CANIHAN project name project number 00000

EXHIBIT 2 SATELITE VIEW

scale :

EX.02

Condo/Coop/TIC/Loft CMA Report

Listings as of 05/01/17 at 5:17pm Street Address 898 carolina

SOLD Properties

file name :

Potrero Hill Potrero Hill Potrero Hill Potrero Hill Potrero Hill Potrero Hill Potrero Hill Potrero Hill	3 3 3 3 3 3 5	1 2 2 2 2 2 3 3	0 2 1 2 1 1 1	1,537 1,385 1,305 1,408 1,153 1,756 0	676.64 776.17 835.25 781.25 954.03 630.41	12/11/15 04/02/14 03/05/14 06/30/14 05/12/16 06/23/14	373.79 0.00 306.00 623.66 243.00 330.00	66 46 21 12 14 17	959,000 849,000 799,000 988,000 829,500 999,000	1,0 1,0 1,0 1,0
Potrero Hill Potrero Hill Potrero Hill Potrero Hill Potrero Hill Potrero Hill Potrero Hill	3 3 3 3 3 3 5	2 2 2 2 3	1 2 1 1	1,305 1,408 1,153 1,756	835.25 781.25 954.03	03/05/14 06/30/14 05/12/16	306.00 623.66 243.00	21 12 14	799,000 988,000 829,500	1, 1,
Potrero Hill Potrero Hill Potrero Hill Potrero Hill Potrero Hill Potrero Hill	3 3 3 5	2 2 2 3	2 1 1	1,408 1,153 1,756	781.25 954.03	06/30/14 05/12/16	623.66 243.00	12 14	988,000 829,500	1,
Potrero Hill Potrero Hill Potrero Hill Potrero Hill	3 3 5	2 3	1	1,756						
Potrero Hill Potrero Hill Potrero Hill	3 5	3			630.41	06/23/14	330.00	17		- 1,
Potrero Hill Potrero Hill	5		1			05/01/15	310.00	28	4 040 000	- 10
Potrero Hill			1	2,354	488.53	03/24/14	165.00	20 51	1,249,000 1,348,000	1, 1,
	3	2.50	2	1,943	617.60	01/09/15	689.06	216	1,279,000	- 12
Potrero Hill		2	ī	1,090	1,110.09	03/20/17	243.00	17	929,500	- 13
		2.50	1	1,443	844.59	04/28/14	608.44	14	949,000	- 1, - 1,
		2	1	1,568	781.89	10/31/16	0.00	18	1,199,000	1,
					709 22					1) 1,2
		1			100.22	02/14/14				1,
	3	ż	2	1,372	918.37	05/05/15	655.37	13	1,049,000	- 1.:
			2	2,125	592.94	12/12/14	325.00	0	1,260,000	1,
0001011111	3	3		0					129,800,000	1,
									1,150,000	1
	3	2			027 54	09/10/14	560.00		1,095,000	1) 1,
							275.00		1.249.000	12
				1.753						- i,
Potrero Hill	3	2	1	1,498	867.82	03/11/16		32	1,325,000	- 1,
	3	2	1	1,469			261.00		1,295,000	1,
	3	2		1,094						1.
			-	4,4/1					1,296,000	1, 1,
				1,775						- 1,
			1	1.535	912.05	03/12/15	333.80			- i/
	3	3	1	2,252	624.52	06/27/14	727.37	7	1,299,000	- 1,
	3	2	1		851.65			8	1,200,000	- 1/
					4 040 40				1,395,000	- 1/
	-									- 1/ 1/
		ž			830.11				1,499,000	- 1/
	3	2	1	0		10/23/14	190.00	22	1,348,000	1,
	3	2	1		1,025.30	04/23/15	431.00		1,275,000	1,
					1,104.12					1,
					905 49					1,/ 1,/
	4	2	5	1,801			376.00			- 1,
	3	3	2	3.438	472.66	01/14/16	905.75	77	1,649,000	1.
			2	1,751		09/01/15	701.00	11	1,399,000	1,
			2							1,
			1	1,4/8						1,0 1,0
									1,495,000	- 1,
		2.50	2	1,856	916.53	09/17/15	714.03	12	1,299,000	1,
000101111			1	1,587	1,077.50	05/19/15	313.00	12	1,450,000	- 1 <u>,</u>
										- 15
				2,247					1,499,000	- 1
					601.82				1,699,000	1,
										Ξï,
			2	2,044	905.09	08/16/16	400.00	18	1,699,000	1,
		2	2	1,971	939.88	08/05/15	268.00	35	1,695,000	- 1,
000101111			1			06/16/15				2,
				1,///						2,
			2							2,
			2	0	.,	06/19/15	268.00	13	1,710,000	2.
	3	2	1	2,307	1,014.30	03/03/17	275.00	13	2,195,000	2,
0001011111	4	3			1,064.75			83		2,
	-	-		-	4 500 00					2,
Potrero Hill		3	2	1,788	1,593.96	06/16/16	688.59	12 32	2,195,000	2,
	Ave				853 860.	20			1,567,992	: 1 1,48
		ordereo Hill 3 ordereo Hill 3	horeno Hill 3 1 horeno Hill 3 3.50 horeno Hill 3 1 horeno Hill 3 1 horeno Hill 3 1 horeno Hill 3 2 horeno Hill 3 3 horeno Hill 3 3 horeno Hill 3 3 horeno Hill 3 2 horeno Hill 3 3 horeno Hill 3 2 horeno Hill 3	Votrero HIII 3 1 1 Votrero HIII 3 3,50 1 Votrero HIII 3 2 2 Votrero HIII 3 2 2 Votrero HIII 3 3 2 Votrero HIII 3 3 1 Votrero HIII 3 2 1 Votrer	observe Hill 3 1 1 0 observe Hill 3 3.50 1 765 observe Hill 3 1 1 0 observe Hill 3 1 1 0 observe Hill 3 2 2 1,765 observe Hill 3 2 2 1,765 observe Hill 3 3 2 1 00 observe Hill 3 2 1 1,500 observe Hill 3 2 1 1,580 observe Hill 3 2 1 1,682 observe Hill 3 2 1 1,686 observe Hill 3 2 1 1,685 observe Hill 3 2 1 1,686 observe Hill 3 2 1 1,687 observe Hill 3 2 1 1,687 observe Hill 3 2 1	Ordered Hill 3 1 1 0 Portero Hill 3 3.50 1 1,765 708.22 Portero Hill 3 1 1 0 1 Portero Hill 3 1 1 0 0 Portero Hill 3 1 1 0 0 Portero Hill 3 2 2 0 0 Portero Hill 3 2 1,860 643.33 0 Portero Hill 3 2 1,860 643.33 0 1,642 782.58 Portero Hill 3 2 1 1,469 884.96 733.03 0 1 1,753 733.03 1 1,775 788.73 1 1,656.45 1 1,656.45 1 1,656.45 1 1,656.45 1 1,656.45 1 1,656.45 1,049.12 1 1,556.45 1,049.12 1 1,556.45 1,049.12 1 1,556.45 1,049.12	Orbite of Hill 3 1 1 0 01/30/14 Orbitero Hill 3 3.50 1 1,765 708.22 02/28/14 Orbitero Hill 3 1 1 0 02/14/14 Orbitero Hill 3 2 1,772 918.37 05/08/15 Orbitero Hill 3 3 2 0 03/09/17 Orbitero Hill 3 3 1,960 643.33 12/21/16 Orbitero Hill 3 2 1,850 850.00 09/18/14 Orbitero Hill 3 2 1,460 867.82 03/11/16 Orbitero Hill 3 2 1,475 783.03 03/28/17 Orbitero Hill 3 2 1,475 788.713 05/18/16 Orbitero Hill 3 2 1,475 788.73 03/11/16 Orbitero Hill 3 1,252 62/4.52 06/27/14 Orbitero Hill 3 1 1,765 788.73	Orbite of Hill 3 1 1 0 01/30/14 2000 Orbitero Hill 3 3.50 1.765 708.22 02/28/14 372.00 Orbitero Hill 3 2 1.372 918.37 05/05/16 655.37 Orbitero Hill 3 2 0 02/14/14 255.00 02/04/14 255.00 Orbitero Hill 3 1 1,960 643.33 12/21/16 170.00 Orbitero Hill 3 2 1,380 927.54 07/09/14 685.00 Orbitero Hill 3 2 1,480 884.96 11/16/14 285.00 Orbitero Hill 3 2 1.498 884.96 11/18/14 245.00 Orbitero Hill 3 2 1.775 788.73 05/18/16 33.00 0.000 Orbitero Hill 3 2 1.655 912.05 03/12/14 243.00 Orbitero Hill 3 1 1.555 912.05 03/12/14	Dotreso Hill 3 1 1 0 01/30/14 200.00 19 Potreso Hill 3 3.50 1.765 708.22 02/24/14 250.00 17 Potreso Hill 3 1 1 0 02/14/14 250.00 17 Potreso Hill 3 2 0 03/09/17 0.00 49 Potreso Hill 3 1 1,960 643.33 12/21/16 17.00 14 Potreso Hill 3 2 1,380 927.54 07/09/14 650.00 18 Potreso Hill 3 2 1,468 864.96 11/16 465.00 32 Potreso Hill 3 2 1,094 1,211.15 10/28/16 243.00 35 Potreso Hill 3 1 1,775 787.13 05/18/16 33.80 42 Potreso Hill 3 1 1,775 787.33 05/171/14 243.00 35 Potreso Hill	Orbero HIII 3 1 0 01/20/14 200.00 19 985,000 Orbero HIII 3 3.50 1 1,765 706.22 02/24/14 372.00 14 1,100,000 Orbero HIII 3 2 2 1,377 05/05/16 655.37 13 1,049,000 Voltero HIII 3 2 1,377 05/05/16 655.37 13 1,049,000 Voltero HIII 3 2 1,360 850.00 09/18/14 638.72 7 1,095,000 Orbero HIII 3 3 1 1,642 782.56 07/07/14 255.00 21 1,249,000 Orbero HIII 3 2 1 1,498 867.82 03/11/16 33.00 325.673,000 Orbero HIII 3 2 1 1,498 867.82 03/11/16 33.00 325.673,000 Orbero HIII 3 2 1 135.51 12.247,000 33 1,228,000 Orbero HIII 3 2 1 1,555 14/1.211.51 10/221/14 2



EXHIBIT 3 PROPERTY INFORMATION EX.03

date :	issues/ revisions :	by :
05.09.17	dr response	di
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
project n	ame :	CANIHAN
project n	umber :	0000
scale :		

CANIHAN RESIDENCE REMODEL & ADDITION

891 CAROLINA STREET SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107 BLOCK / LOT: 4097 / 027

JOHN LUM ARCHITECTURE INC. 3246 SEVENTEENTH STREET SAN I TEL 415 558 9550 FaX 415 558 0554

bill canihan 891 carolina st san francisco, ca 94107

Page: 1

OM	Orig \$	Sale \$SP%LP
66 46	959,000 849,000	1,040,000 100.10 1,075,000 126.62
21	799,000	1,090,000 136.42
12	988,000	1,100,000 111.34
14	829,500	1,100,000 132.61
17 28	999,000 1,249,000	1,107,000 110.81 1,125,000 97.91
51	1,348,000	1.150.000 105.70
216	1,279,000	1 200 000 100 00
17	929,500	1,210,000 130.18 1,218,750 128.42 1,226,000 102.25
14 18	949,000 1,199,000	1,218,750 128.42 1,226,000 102.25
19	995,000	
14	1,100,000	
17 13	1,095,000	1,252,500 114.38
0	1,049,000 1,260,000	1,260,000 120.11 1,260,000 100.00
49	129,800,000	1,260,000 101.86
14	1,150,000	1,252,5000 113.84 1,252,500 114.38 1,260,000 120.11 1,260,000 100.00 1,260,917 109.64 1,275,000 1128.64 1,285,000 1128.84 1,285,000 102.88 1,285,000 102.80 1,300,000 98.11
7 18	1,095,000	1,275,000 116.44 1,280,001 128.64
21	995,000 1,249,000	1.285.000 102.88
31	1,299,000	1,285,000 102.80
32	1,325,000	
33 35	1,295,000 879,000	1,300,000 100.39 1,325,000 150.74
14	1,298,000	1,375,000 105.93
57	1,399,000	1,399,000 96.48
13	1,249,000	1,400,000 112.09
42 7	7,500 1,299,000	1,400,000 98.25 1,406,411 108.27
8	1,200,000	1,418,000 118.17
22	1,395,000	1,475,000 105.73
27 32	1,495,000	1,495,000 100.00
32 58	1,499,000 1,499,000	1,499,000 100.00 1,500,000 100.07
22	1,348,000	1,505,000 111.65
12	1,275,000	1,540,000 120.78
26 108	1,499,000	1,580,000 105.40 1,583,000 99.00
38	1,850,000 1,650,000	1,583,000 99.00 1,585,000 96.06
29	1,495,000	1,600,000 107.02
77	1,649,000	1,625,000 98.54
11 28	1,399,000 1,649,000	1,625,000 116.15 1,649,000 100.00
17	1,395,000	1,662,000 119.14
61	1.795.000	1,665,000 100.94
15 12	1,495,000 1,299,000	1,675,000 112.04 1,701,078 130.95
12	1,450,000	1,701,078 130.95 1,710,000 117.93
49	1,550,000	1.725.000 111.29
11	1,499,000	1,725,000 115.08
13 20	1,699,000 1,649,000	1,750,000 103.00 1,788,000 108.43
14	1,495,000	1,811,000 121.14
18	1,699,000	1,850,000 108.89
35	1,695,000	1,852,500 95.00
12 69	1,895,000 1,595,000	2,000,000 105.54 2,100,000 131.66
117	2,195,000	2,100,000 97.90
6	1.995.000	2,250,000 112.78
13 13	1,710,000	2,250,000 131.58 2,340,000 106.61
13 83	2,195,000 1,895,000	2,340,000 106.61 2,450,000 129.29
22	2,795,000	2,795,000 100.00
12	2,195,000	2,850,000 129.84
3		1,548,396110.34 1,485,000.00

Public Comment

Shufina K English

2245 18th Street #3 - San Francisco CA 94107

March 16, 2016

Re Canihan Residence - 891 Carolina Street San Francisco CA

To Whom It May Concern:

I live in and manage (as owner) a four unit building near the above referenced proposed two unit development. I have reviewed the plans and I feel the proposed development is sensitive and responsive to the prevailing neighborhood character and concerns.

Mr Canihan has invested significant resources and made multiple concessions in response to the neighboring property that go beyond satisfying codes and compliances of the City of San Francisco. This modest two unit development will enable the Canihans to continue to live in the neighborhood that their family has called home for over 100 years. The added benefit is that by replacing a single family home with a duplex, the Canihans will be *adding* to our housing stock instead of reducing it.

The present dwelling is in a state of deterioration and not only an eyesore, but potentially dangerous to the neighborhood at large. I urge you to allow this development to proceed unimpeded by any additional hearings, reviews, etc.

Regards,

Shufina K. English 415 505 0451 shufina@gmail.com April 18, 2017

Ms. Natalia Kwiatkowska Planner San Francisco Planning Department City & County of San Francisco 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: 891 Carolina Street / Permit Appl # 2014-0211-8267

Dear Ms. Kwiatkowska,

The purpose of this letter is to express our support for the proposed renovation of 891 Carolina Street.

This property has been an eye sore to the block, and to the neighborhood for more than 30 years, neglected by the occupants.

I have reviewed the plans for the proposed renovation and addition of a second dwelling residence, and the plans are reasonable and conform with City Planning requirements.

Mr. Canihan has attempted to please the adjacent neighbors by offering setbacks, and height reductions, all at considerable expense.

The proposed project is consistent in design and quality with the remaining homes located on the block, and will fit-in and compliment the block and the neighborhood, along with providing a new duplex.

I support the approval and construction of this proposed project.

Sincerely,

Pete Loscutoff

Carolina Strit resident for 87 years

Peter Wm Locketoff 951 Carelina Stret San Francisco California 94107-3336

May 2, 2017

Ms. Natalia Kwiatkowska Planner San Francisco Planning Department City & County of San Francisco 1650 Mission Street Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: 891 Carolina Street / Permit Appl # 2014-0211-8267

Dear Ms. Kwiatkowska,

I am writing to you to express my support for the proposed renovation of 891 Carolina Street by William Canihan.

This property has been an eye sore on the block, and to the neighborhood for more than 30 years, neglected by the former occupants.

I have reviewed the plans for the proposed renovation and addition of a second dwelling residence, and the plans are reasonable and conform with City Planning requirements, as well as match the character of the 800 block of Carolina Street, and the Potrero Hill neighborhood.

Mr. Canihan has diligently worked with his architect for 7 years (and prior to that his father began the Planning process for the remodel back in 2000) and have proposed several versions of the new 2-dwelling residence.

The current version fits the neighborhood well, conforms with the City's Planning requirements, and provides two new residences (as the current house has been vacant for many years) to San Francisco, which needs more family housing dwellings.

I support the approval and construction of this proposed project.

Sincerely, Kieran O'Donoghue 900 Carolina st

May 3, 2017

Ms. Natalia Kwiatkowska Planner San Francisco Planning Dept. City and County of San Francisco 1650 Mission St., Ste 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: 891 Carolina St./Permit Appl # 2014-0211-8267

Dear Ms. Kwiaatkowska,

I am writing to you today to urge your approval of the above referenced property.

This project has been in the planning stages for a very long time. The existing single family residence is in extremely bad condition and has been vacant and uninhabitable, attracting vermin and squatters.

Although this proposed construction is totally in compliance with the city building codes and conforms with the rest of the neighborhood in both size and style, it continues to be delayed, despite the fact that numerous concessions and changes have been made to satisfy his neighbor.

I urge your support for the granting of the permit on this property. Thank you for you consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

oan L. King

813 Rhode Island St. San Francisco, CA 94107

Maria Jurosek Property Owner 877 Carolina Street San Francisco, CA 94107 Mjurosek2@sbcglobal.net

May 20, 2017

Ms. Natalia Kwiatkowska Planner San Francisco Planning Department City & County of San Francisco 1650 Mission Street Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: 891 Carolina Street / Permit Appl # 2014-0211-8267

Dear Ms. Kwiatkowska,

I am writing to you to express my support for the proposed renovation of 891 Carolina Street by William Canihan.

This property has been an eye sore on the block, and to the neighborhood for more than 30 years, neglected by the former occupants.

I have reviewed the plans for the proposed renovation and addition of a second dwelling residence, and the plans are reasonable and conform with City Planning requirements, as well as match the character of the 800 block of Carolina Street, and the Potrero Hill neighborhood.

Mr. Canihan has diligently worked with his architect for 7 years (and prior to that his father began the Planning process for the remodel back in 2000) and have proposed several versions of the new 2-dwelling residence.

The current version fits the neighborhood well, conforms with the City's Planning requirements, and provides two new residences (as the current house has been vacant for many years) to San Francisco, which needs more family housing dwellings.

I support the approval and construction of this proposed project.

Sincerely,

Marla Jurosek



901 Wisconsin St. San Francisco, CA 94107 May 21st 2017

Natalia Kwiatkowska San Francisco Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: Permit 2014-0211-8267 (891 Carolina)

To whom it may concern,

I support the renovation/remodel currently proposed by Bill Canihan at 891 Carolina St.

I have discussed and reviewed the plans with Mr. Canihan. The proposed structure fits with the neighborhood, adds badly needed San Francisco housing, and will impact the street and the neighborhood for the better. Furthermore, I understand that the proposed project complies with city planning regulations entirely.

Sincerely,

Coulfinh.

<u>/</u> Michael Caulfield

5/21/17

June 4, 2017

Natalia Kwiatkowska, Planner San Francisco Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: Permit 2014-0211-8267 (891 Carolina Street)

Dear Ms. Kwiatkowska,

The current SFR located at 891 Carolina St. has stood vacant and deteriorated significantly over the past decade. As a resident of the neighborhood, it is with full confidence that I state that neighbors in the immediate vicinity of 891 Carolina would prefer that the current derelict and seemingly abandoned building be replaced with a newly constructed residence. That being said, the current proposal by the developer, Bill Canihan, owner of 891 Carolina Street, is not a project that I can support in its current proposed plans. As such I stand in opposition to the current project proposal.

Over a decade ago, the Planning Commission issued a determination resulting from a previous Discretionary Review process for the subject property located at 891 Carolina Street, owned by Mr. Canihan. The Planning Commission had then ruled and delineated the parameters of an acceptable building envelope for 891 Carolina Street. Your Commission's ruling and determination regarding the design parameters of these two parcels need not be revisited denigrated or disregarded by Mr. Canihan. The issues that affect the unique and specific planning codes and design guidelines of these two parcels has not changed in the intervening years that the building has laid dormant, abandoned and derelict. During the numerous intervening years of your previous Discretionary Review decision and recommendations, Mr. Canihan has seemingly and purposefully chose to leave this blighted building vacant, denying both the city and neighborhood of potential housing, tax revenue, and causing distress to the immediate neighbors to live near to such a disaffected building for well over a decade.

Following a review of current proposed building plans for 891 Carolina Street, I must concur that the height and depth of the building in the rear yard are in significant excess of the recommendations of the Planning Commission's previous rulings. If these were to be accepted by this current Planning Commission, they would substantially inflict harm on the property rights of the Discretionary Review applicant as well as the neighborhood. As such, I support the arguments put forth by the Discretionary Review applicants, Kris Gardner and Robyn Bishop.

Mr. Canihan has now commissioned a new and different over-scaled project. In so doing he has disregarded your findings and recommendations in hopes that a new Planning Commission will overturn it's previous ruling. To reiterate, little to nothing has changed in the planning code that would warrant any change by the Planning Commission to their previous determination. It remains in the best interest of the Planning Commission, the city at large, and the neighborhood specifically that the Commission fully abide by its previous rulings in this case.

I request that the current proposed design for 891 Carolina be scaled back to actually conform with the previously recommendations of the Planning Commission, rulings that the Discretionary Review applicant and neighborhood have deemed acceptable for well over a decade.

I ask for your full consideration and assistance in restoring confidence in our neighborhood and City Planning Processes by adhering and upholding your previous DR determinations and decisions in regard to 891 Carolina St.

Sincerely,

Katherine Lambert, AIA, IIDA Professor of Architecture California College of the Arts San Francisco, CA 94107

Resident: 874 Carolina St. San Francisco, CA 94107 Natalia Kwiatkowska, Planner

San Francisco Planning Department

1650 Mission Street, Suite 400

San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: Permit 2014-0211-8267 (891 Carolina Street)

Letter OPPOSED to the remodel/renovation as currently proposed for 891 Carolina Street.

Dear Natalia Kwiatkowska,

I am writing to tell you that I am opposed to the project as proposed. I honestly believe the house should be considerably smaller to blend with the neighborhood and the street's character. The plans for the building show a considerable loss of open green space in their garden and in turn will particularly affect the loss of light and air to the windows of 897 and 897b Carolina St.

Bill Canihan (the owner) has NEVER taken care of 891 Carolina Street and it's a blight to the neighborhood. It's been a rat and vermin breeding ground for the last 6 1/2 years since he evicted the residents who had lived there since 1952, via the Ellis act. I see and hear rats every day. 891 is absolutely the reason for this.

Of course we want this disgusting, derelict house replaced, but what is being proposed is just outrageously large for the intended location. The lot is completely exposed to the intersection of Carolina and 22nd St. because our house is set back on the lot which makes the proposed size for 891 Carolina St. GINORMOUS in relation to other structures in the neighborhood, all down our block on Carolina.

Height of 40' is higher than typical residences/or two unit buildings in the neighborhood. Yes, it may be code but it doesn't fit into the neighborhoods mostly two-story buildings and single family homes.

My main concern is that my 3 young children play in the yard right next to what will be a major construction site and so I want to go on record that broken roof tiles, rusty nails, glass and other debris have been flying into the yard for years as the owner has never taken care of his property. We ask that extreme care and caution must be taken for protecting any debris from falling into the 897 Carolina yard where my kids play not to mention the amount of pollutants that myself and my children would be breathing in once demolition commences. The house is a health hazard. If tenting the building is an option, then I ask that Bill and his team work to make that happen.

Thank you very much for your time and attention to this matter. I will also be sending this email in letter form.

Joanna Garratt-Rodriguez.

Resident 897b Carolina Street

Get Outlook for Android

Natalia Kwiatkowska, Planner San Francisco Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: Permit 2014-0211-8267 (891 Carolina Street)

Letter OPPOSED to the remodel/renovation as currently proposed for 891 Carolina Street.

Dear Natalia Kwiatkowska,

I am writing to tell you that I am opposed to the project. I believe the house should be smaller to blend with the neighborhood and the street's character. I don't want to live next to a skyscraper. The plans for the building show a considerable loss of open green space in their garden and in turn will particularly affect the loss of light and air to the windows of 897 and 897b Carolina St.

Bill Canihan (the owner) has NEVER taken care of 891 Carolina Street. Which has turned it into a vermin breeding ground for the last 6 1/2 years since he evicted our old neighbors who had lived there since 1952, with the Ellis Act. I see and hear rats, skunks, possums, and raccoons every day. 891 is absolutely the reason for this.

I want this disgusting, fire hazard, derelict house gone, but what is being proposed is a skyscraper. The lot is completely exposed to the intersection of Carolina and 22nd St. because our house is set back on the lot which makes the proposed size for 891 Carolina St. GIANT in relation to other structures in the neighborhood, all down our block on Carolina.

Height of 40' is higher than typical residences/or two unit buildings in the neighborhood. It may be code but it doesn't fit into the neighborhoods mostly two-story buildings and single family homes.

My concern is that my 3 young children play in the yard right next to what will be a major construction site that has the potential to release toxicity from old materials and mold into our space. I want to go on record that broken roof tiles, rusty nails, glass and other debris have been flying into the yard daily for years as the owner has never taken care of his property which leads me to believe that he will be negligent on the safety of his neighbors when construction eventually commences. We ask that extreme care and caution must be taken for protecting any debris from falling into the 897 Carolina yard where my kids play not to mention the amount of pollutants that myself and my children would be breathing in once demolition commences. The house is a health and fire hazard. If tenting the building is an option, then I ask that Bill and his team work to make that happen.

Thank you very much for your time and attention to this matter. I will also be sending this email in letter form.

Naphtali Rodriguez. Resident 897b Carolina Street

2130 Lyon Avenue Belmont, CA 94002 June 11, 2017

Natalia Kwiatkowska San Francisco Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

RE: Permit 2014-0211-8267 (891 Carolina St.)

To Whom It May Concern:

I am part owner of the property next door to 891 Carolina Street at 883 Carolina Street. The property at 891 Carolina Street is in dire need of renovation. Not only is it an eye sore to the neighborhood, but also the structure is unsafe.

I have reviewed the plans with Mr. Canihan. They will greatly improve the appearance, the livability and value of the neighborhood.

I understand that the proposed project complies with city planning regulations.

Sincerely,

Karen C. Byrnes

Karen C. Byrnes

June 11, 2017

Re: Permit #2014-0211-8267 891 Carolina Street

Natalia Kwiatkowska, Planner San Francisco Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103 natalia.kwiatkowska@sfgov.org

Dear Ms. Kwiatkowska,

I **oppose** the project plan *as proposed*. I live at 898 Carolina Street, which is diagonally across the street from the subject property: 891 Carolina Street. I live in the white one story with attic on the corner in Photo A. We are on the west side of Carolina Street.



ΡΗΟΤΟ Α





As you can see, homes in our neighborhood are mostly one and two stories; few three stories exist; and only one four story built in the 70's—it's an apartment—big and square in the 700 block of Carolina, down the hill.

Photo B is the east side of Carolina Street in the 800 block. The house that is set back on the corner is 897 Carolina Street—the one whose front yard has the beautiful tree. The subject property—891 Carolina Street-- is the salmon colored house that is at the front of its lot—second house in from the corner. The lot is FLAT. It is inappropriate to build a four story building there as it will tower over all the adjacent homes and cast shadows on the two houses to the north—especially 883 Carolina (left side of photo B). 883 Carolina St. will lose ALL of the sun that now shines on their back deck.

I want the owner to build a size of building that will respect the neighborhood residents and blend into our mostly two and three story homes.

Please: Reduce it to three stories, and shorten the length/depth into the rear yard so as NOT to isolate neighbors and reduce/eliminate the sunshine they currently enjoy.

Sincerely,

Lisa Bach 898 Carolina Street

June 12, 2017

Natalia Kwiatkowska, Planner San Francisco Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: Permit 2014-0211-8267 (891 Carolina Street)

Dear Ms. Kwiatkowska,

Please accept this letter in support of the Discretionary Review Application submitted by Robyn Bishop and Kristine Gardner regarding Mr. Canihan and Mr. Lum's proposed development of 891 Carolina Street. My concerns with Mr. Canihan's proposal remain focused on a number of key issues that warrant the Planning Commission's considered attention.

In my understanding of his most recent proposal and the attendant Discretionary Review Application, previous concerns remain which have not been satisfactorily addressed by Mr. Canihan. These concerns are significant in their ramifications upon not only the adjoining four properties (one of which is also owned by Mr. Canihan,) but also the neighborhood at large.

This proposed development will ignite a domino effect for the quick passage of other proposed development projects at the top of Potrero Hill in the never ending quest for heights and mass affording expansive views, light and privacy. As such, it is crucial to maintain a reasonable balance of a proportionate neighborhood sensibility with pressing urban issues such as the City's overall need for truly affordable housing

Additional concerns regarding the structural integrity of the current building and the developer/architect's intention to salvage structural elements of the original structure in order to build upon and intensify this existing structure are salient to this continuing DR process in their attempts to convince the City and the neighborhood of the basis for their newly proposed "renovation." With this in mind, I submit the following:

Proposed Renovation/Integrity/Viability of Current Building Structure Vs. New Construction

A thorough and considered analysis of the submitted drawings indicate that the current proposal seems to comprise more than 50% new construction thereby invalidating any credible premise for the Proposed Project in accordance with Section 317, Sec. B. The motivation for the project sponsor's application is clear. It is predicated upon Mr. Canihan's desire to maintain the pretense of the structural integrity of this building in order to secure considerable additional square footage – square footage which would not be allowed under the statutes governing new construction. The truth of the matter is that this project should be, for all intents and purposes, truly considered as **new construction** and adheres to those governing planning codes.

The structural integrity of the portion of the building that extends into the rear setback is dramatically challenging to any unequivocal approval by the Planning Commission.

891 Carolina St. has sustained a state of arrested deterioration for decades now. It has existed in this continuous state including a damaged, rotting exterior and roof, foundation, siding and windows. To date, my understanding is that Mr. Canihan, long time owner of 891 Carolina St., has not mitigated this deterioration and it had been left to rot and fester – ostensibly abandoned and becoming an increasing question mark on the neighborhood. Significantly, it had been severely neglected and suffered from a considerable lack of any and all maintenance for numerous decades – despite the intentions of the earlier tenants – one of whom was a respected long-term Potrero Hill citizen.

A truly accurate representation of the proposed subject property is that it is NOT a renovation but it **is new construction**. Only this representation speaks to the integrity of the Planning process and provides for

judicious fee payments to the City of San Francisco. Once this 891building has been striped of it's current exterior siding and interior finishes, the waning conditions of the existing foundation and existing perimeter framing would be found to be woefully inadequate to offer needed support to the proposed design. Were it not for the developer's keen desire to keep the structure to exploit the square footage for each proposed unit, the building would be seen for what it truly is - a "tear down" - and this is a site that requires new construction. Further to this point I wish to highlight a convincing probability of a defacto demolition under Planning Code Section 317.

If, indeed, the proposed project were considered to be in full compliance under a more accurate representation – that of new construction - it would then need to conform to the rear yard setback requirements of our district and/or by averaging the lot depth of the neighboring buildings - one of which (897) has an extraordinarily unique property site and irregular lot configuration.

Intensification of Structure in the Rear Setback

The project sponsor's proposes that he be granted unprecedented privileges that will result in a significant negative imbalance between his right to develop a property in direct relation to the significantly proportionate adverse impact of his current proposal on the rights of adjacent and near-by properties, occupants and the neighborhood.

The additional massing to the **rear structure** both raises and extends the structure by several feet along the adjoining property line between 891 and 897. My understanding is that code mandates that the proposed building should not be allowed to intensify the bulk or massing of the structure. The massing of the proposed project will substantively and significantly diminish light, unjustifiably intensify shading and block views to the neighboring properties, specifically of the much smaller adjacent neighbor to the South, 897 Carolina. The proposed building also significantly intensifies this denial of light, as 897 and 883 Carolina will (at that point in time) already be shaded by the accumulation of 2 substantive, additional stories. The dimensions approximate 40+ft. H and 75' ft. L representing approx. 75% of the lot of the adjoining southern boundary of 891 and 897 Carolina respectively.

I am aware that this massing is the maximum permissible by SF Planning Codes. However the significance of the cumulative effect of the intensification of this structure in addition to the previous determined permissible development (2003) is not supportable.

To deny this additional massing would not represent a hardship to Mr. Canihan. Rather, Mr. Canihan proposes that he be granted unprecedented privileges that will result in a significant negative imbalance between his right to develop a property in direct relation to the significantly proportionate adverse impact of his current proposal on the rights of adjacent and near-by properties, occupants and the neighborhood.

Property Line Windows sited along the northern wall and adjacent to the adjoining Property Line of 891 and 897 Carolina St.

With each submitted re-design, various windows have been designed and proposed along the northern property line of the subject property line. Clearly, the intention is to capture the coveted views of SF Downtown, East Bay and Twin Peaks. The current proposed plans of 891 depict 4 stories of which 2 stories are to be built higher than the residence at 897 Carolina. The fourth story of 891 has large windows that are set back only 4' ft. from the subject properties south property line. While these windows may be permissible, the DR applicants have requested that the developer work with them to address the real possibility that a portion of these windows, which will currently command views of the South/East Bay, may be at some future point be obstructed by similar development property development at 897 Carolina.

It may benefit the Planning Commission that the Planning Dept. further consider that they may not remain neutral on this issue, as it affects and infringes upon the adjoining property owner's rights and their existing values – as well as adds yet another element of an invasion of the privacy rights of 897 Carolina St.

Summary

Mr. Canihan's new proposal is not in keeping with the spirit of the intent expressed by the Planning Commission's previous decision of 2003. It appears that Mr. Canihan, has now submitted this current design proposal as one that undermines the earlier, more reasonable determinations of the Planning Commission. The requirements of New Construction would not allow for any developer's profits to achieve the maximum levels of financial gain should the existing building spaces be deemed for demolition. He may be doing so in hopes that with the intervening years and repetition of his submissions of this brazen design proposal, all parties will compromise on his current, expanded design proposal. This proposal is one that continues not to be in full compliance with SF Planning Commission's previous determination – not to mention the good faith considerations and efforts of the Planning Commission itself through its 2003 decision.

Again, with his submittal of this recent specific design proposal, SF Planning is being asked to accept a problematic compromise – one that undermines the integrity of the promise of our Planning Code itself. Without doubt, as the DR applicants indicate, the property at 897 Carolina is most directly affected negatively by his proposal. The height and depth of this 891 project is extraordinary in massing and dwarfs the adjacent residence in order to capitalize on the views afforded by these exceptional building site conditions.

For the past 14 years neighbors have been anticipating a new building at 891 Carolina that would adhere to the decision of the Planning Commission's 2003 deliberations. During recent neighborhood meetings called for this current proposal, Mr. Canihan has presented designs that address minor portions of our collective concerns and which continue to contort and distort the neighborhood process and planning code. These serve his purposes to amass a disproportionately large amount of square footage – square footage that would normally been denied to other property owners were it not for the misrepresentation of the considerably unique topographical conditions and irregular lot configurations of the building sites of 891 Carolina and 897 Carolina St.

The applicant's proposal represents plans that are daringly over-developed relative to the standards, codes, allowances and spirit of intent previously expressed by SF Planning Commission in 2003. Rather it portends future hardships and violations of planning codes on 897 Carolina, the future owners of the subject property 891, and the neighborhood at large.

As you are aware, the DR applicants have requested changes to the design and that the Planning Commission uphold their own earlier decision. As such, I support the DR Applicant's request that Mr. Canihan re-submit a newly designed proposal – one that complies appropriately with the previous decision rendered by the Planning Commission in 2003 - one that is compatible with the existing neighborhood character and is in full compliance with all applicable planning regulations, design guidelines and building codes. It is my sincere hope that the developer, Mr. Canihan, will abide in full to the earlier determinations of the SF Planning Commission and adhere to those directives in submitting a newly designed proposal.

Many thanks for your considered review of these concerns.

Sincerely,

Christiane Robbins 874 Carolina St. San Francisco, CA 94107 June 12, 2017

Natalia Kwiatkowska, Planner San Francisco Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: Permit 2014-0211-8267 (891 Carolina Street)

Dear Ms. Kwiatkowska,

I write today to oppose the project as currently outlined for 891 Carolina Street. While I do recognize, of course, that the building is in disrepair, I'm opposed to the proposed project for the following reasons:

- This proposed structure does not fit with the neighborhood in height and depth footprint on the lot.
- The proposed height of 40' is higher than typical residences or even two unit buildings in the neighborhood. This is happening throughout Potrero Hill, and it's really unfair to current residents, as well as sets a terrible precedent for the future allowing for these type of giant and unnecessary residences.
- The proposed depth of 75 feet is a severe reduction of the mid block, which would cause a significant loss of open space.
- I urge you to find a reasonable solution, given the unique mid-block residence next door and its open space. It seems to me that the owner of 891 Carolina could modify the plans to allow for a negotiated and more reasonable outcome with a smaller massing and less depth.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Kind regards, Malter Bass

906 Wisconsin St. San Francisco 94107 415.875.9575

June 13, 2017

Re: Permit #2014-0211-8267 891 Carolina Street

President Rich Hillis, Vice President Dennis Richards Fellow Members of the Planning Commission

Natalia Kwiatkowska, Planner San Francisco Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103 natalia.kwiatkowska@sfgov.org

Dear Commissioners and Ms. Kwiatkowska,

I oppose the planned renovation and remodel at 891 Carolina Street.

The house was taken out of San Francisco housing availability more than 7 years ago when the owner evicted the long time tenants. It is a sad story of not caring about others who are less fortunate.

The owner wants to build something that is too big for the neighborhood. This is an attractive San Francisco neighborhood, and I implore you to modify the existing proposal to one of more respect and in context with adjacent buildings.

The architect will tell you that the building behind on Wisconsin is 4 stories high....what he will *not* bother to tell you is that the LOT on which that is situated is about 16 feet LOWER in topography than the lots on Carolina Street. This is significant for designing for the site—specifically for a building site. This proposal for this big of a structure for the 891 Carolina building lot is way too big for that location.

I oppose this design and planned enormous size for this particular building lot.

Please modify to a respectful size—three floors—NOT four, and 60 feet deep at most!

Thank you.

Sincerely, Abbott Pew 1 Sayre Allot Balfayre

898 Carolina

FOR COMMISSIONER PACKET June 15, 2017

President Rich Hillis, Vice President Dennis Richards Fellow Members of the Planning Commission

c/o Natalia Kwiatkowska, Planner San Francisco Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103

Ref: Permit #2014-0211-8267 891 Carolina Street

Dear Commissioners and Planner Kwiatkowska,

I am a longtime resident of Potrero Hill. The building of "monster homes" has become epidemic in this neighborhood

I am opposed to the plan proposed by Mr. Canihan for two units at 891 Carolina Street. Two units is a good thing; the size of the units is TOO BIG by comparison to the surrounding houses in the neighborhood; and specifically for that specific parcel at the crest of the hill on Carolina at Southern Heights—It will appear massive.

A more modest size of units would be in the 1500 square foot range. This is plenty of space for a two or three bedroom place. This would be a total of about 3000 square feet and plenty big for that location.

Each unit of 1500 Square Feet would be more affordable than the 2000 square foot units that are proposed. And the building is too high—back in 2003, the Planning Commission made a decision for the 2-unit building for this same specific building site to remove the 4^{th} floor. This decision should be upheld.

Please recommend that the Commissioners take DR with modifications—smaller units of 1500 square feet will compliment the neighborhood.

Thank you.

hard Chillet

250 Connecticut #5 Potrero Hill 94107

San Francisco Planning Commission 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: 891 Carolina Street, Permit #2014-0211-8257 Letter in Support of DR/Oppose the plan as currently proposed.

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I am writing to express my concerns over the proposed building permit at 891 Carolina Street. I know this neighborhood well as my mother's family settled on Potrero Hill in 1906 and I was born and raised there as well. In 1958 my parents built an apartment building at 934 Carolina Street that we still own and maintain. Although we no longer live on Potrero Hill, my mother and I remain active on the Hill. We come up on a regular basis to maintain our apartment building and recently worked with neighbors and the San Francisco Parks Alliance to help create the new Carolina Island Park. We continue to volunteer on this park project to help make Carolina Street a safer place to live.

As such, my roots run deep on Potrero Hill, and Carolina Street in particular. I am also familiar with the unusual layout of the home at 897 Carolina, adjacent and to the south of 891 Carolina, as my aunt and uncle used to own that home. As you are likely aware, 897 Carolina is the corner lot and it has an unusual front setback of 56.5 feet from the sidewalk to the front of the house, with the rear of the house abutting the rear of the property. This unusual configuration does not lend well to the averaging of property depths, as suggested in this permit, as it does not take into consideration the very large setback at the front of the property.

I ask that you please consider an alternative method for determining the rear depth for 891 Carolina, given the configuration of 897 Carolina. It is my understanding that the current permit is averaging the rear depths of 897 and 883 Carolina (the buildings to each side of 891), and came up with a depth of 75 feet. This depth would effectively cut off and isolate 897 Carolina from the rest of the block, and also destroy the swath of open area/vegetation that runs behind the houses on that block.

I understand that the owner at 897 Carolina worked with the planning department in both 2003 and 2014 to come up with a more equitable way to determine the depth of 891 Carolina, which the city planner in 2003 agreed to. Apparently one of the reasons the 891 Carolina owners chose to pursue a remodel rather than a demolition is that they would be able to keep the front of their house at the sidewalk with no setback, and also use the averaging of surrounding houses to determine the depth of their remodeled house. This, in essence, gives the 891 Carolina owners a very deep house, 75 feet, which is not in keeping with the surrounding houses. They would be taking advantage of not only no setback at the curb, but also a depth in the back based

on averaging the two surrounding homes. It seems excessive that they should be able to use both of these criteria. Why not keep the front of the house with no setback and only allow 60 feet at the rear? This would go a long way in preserving the mid-block open space, thereby allowing 897 to not be isolated and further allow 897 their existing source of natural lighting.

I also ask that you please consider limiting the height of 891 Carolina to three stories with a third story setback. It seems like in the last 10 – 20 years there has been a worrisome proliferation of four story homes (or proposed four story homes) that are out of scale and not in character with this neighborhood. The topography on Potrero Hill (and Carolina Street in particular) is very hilly. The site at 891 Carolina is next to the corner, and virtually at the top of the hill. As such, allowing a tall and massive building at that site results in a very overpowering structure at the top of the hill, and at the intersection of four streets. The proposed building would be out of scale with the surrounding homes in the neighborhood in both height and mass.

I realize that there are zoning codes, but there are also Residential Design Guidelines to consider as well. It seems that the planning department defaults to the zoning codes and puts very little credence into the design guidelines. If that is the case, then what is the purpose of the design guidelines? I believe we must examine every proposed building on a case-by-case basis if we have any hope in retaining the charm, style and character of Potrero Hill, and San Francisco in general.

To me, there has been a very disturbing and distressful trend in replacing older homes of modest size and scale with "McMansions" or "Monster Homes". This concern was echoed in a recent article in the neighborhood Potrero Hill View newspaper. I believe this trend towards massive growth does a great disservice to our neighborhood and to the many long-term residents who have made Potrero Hill such a desirable area. We would like to keep our charm and residential feel. But with every four story, massive building that goes up, we see the character of our neighborhood diminished. I don't believe that anyone would object to older buildings in disrepair being replaced with newer buildings, but I would ask that we not degrade the neighborhood in doing so. The proposed plans for 891 Carolina would result in a structure that is 300% bigger and two stories higher than the current home.

In a city that is hurting for affordable housing, it boggles my mind to see new homes being built that will never be affordable for an average citizen to purchase. The proposed building at 891 will be for a 2 unit building, yet the square footage is larger than most existing 2 - 4 unit buildings in the neighborhood. My property at 934 Carolina is a 3-unit rental with less than 2100 square feet!

I hope that you will consider my input and that of other Carolina Street neighbors and encourage the owners of 891 and the city planners to develop a new set of plans that would help preserve the character of our neighborhood as well as still provide an ample sized home at the site. This could be accomplished by reducing the rear depth to 60 feet and lowering the height to three stories with a set back at the third story.

I see that the current owners have let the building fall into very bad disrepair which leads me to wonder how much the current owner cares about the neighborhood. Meanwhile, neighbors have continued to live on Carolina Street, keeping their homes in good condition, and playing by the rules. In my case, even though my building came under rent control many years after building it, my family has kept up the maintenance and repair and have provided affordable housing for numerous tenants since 1958. Rent control was not something we were planning on, and in fact in many years the cost of maintenance, repair and remodeling exceeds the income on the property (our rents are rarely at market rate, yet contractor and material costs continue to rise astronomically). We do this because we have pride of ownership and a long history on Potrero Hill, as do many of my neighbors. In your decision making, I ask that you please consider what impact this rampant growth is having on so many residents of Potrero Hill.

Finally, I realize that property owners want to make a profit in this hot housing market, but the excessive profit from construction of over-sized homes results in degrading the neighborhood in the long run. Profiteers often move on and never suffer the effects of the loss of character of the neighborhood. When my family built the apartment building at 934 Carolina in 1958, they could have built up to three stories. Instead, they settled on two stories after consulting with neighborhood. Obviously, my family has realized lost profits over the many years of rentals, as a two story building does not provide the same return on investment and rental income as a three story building. But my parents felt a connection with and pride in the neighborhood and took a long term view of wanting to better the neighborhood without destroying the character. I ask that the owners of 891 Carolina please consider a similar philosophy.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

Kathy Pagan Quadros Nancy Pagan 934 Carolina Street

Hello Natalia,

I'm writing in opposition to the project planned to begin at 891 Carolina St. We have been residents on 897 Carolina for the last 4 years and have raised our 3 year old girl in this house. The neighborhood has had a major impact in our daily lives. Although we wholeheartedly welcome new home construction in our neighborhood to address the ongoing housing crisis in the city, we urge builders around us to be mindful on the scale and scope of new buildings that may come to be forever a part of long term residential neighborhoods like Potrero Hill. Massive new constructions in heavily residential neighborhoods can have severe effects on immediate neighbors and overall community. Dwellings like 891 Carolina st, as per proposed plan stands to be built up around ~2000 sft. This would seem inconsistent with rest of the neighborhood around us. We found that for families of similar size like us, a ~1100 sft housing unit has been adequate enough to raise our families without any major issues while. I would welcome a proposal with modification to the plan for 891 Carolina St so that it fits the size of the neighborhood and encourage the planning committee to consider my plea to revise the proposed plan. Thank you.

Rajiv

From:	Mridula Kulkarni
To:	Kwiatkowska, Natalia (CPC)
Subject:	Vote opposing current building plan on 891 Carolina St
Date:	Thursday, June 22, 2017 12:24:20 AM

Hi,

I'm writing to oppose the construction of 891 Carolina st as per its current proposed plan. Being the immediate neighbor at 897 Carolina St, I have come to see that Potrero Hill residents move here and stay here because they are very content with the size and style of these homes. Planning conditions have proven to be highly efficient while preserving the indigenous qualities of the neighborhood for several decades. Adopting fractured gentrification is no way capable of building long term, remotely affordable housing that has maximum compatibility with existing neighborhoods. Besides the issue of too high for its location on the Hill, the 891 Carolina project would put up a wall over 2/3rd of existing window area on the north side of my house. This obstruction would block significant daylight and breeze into our study room, which my husband and I rely heavily on while working from home. The same would be true for my daughter's bedroom which otherwise has been a great way of saving energy during all seasons for natural ways to heat, cool or light up these living spaces. I don't see a reason compelling enough to justify building ~2000 sqft living unit in a neighborhood where several families have been thriving in half that amount of space per unit. I urge the planning commission to review the current proposed plan to re-build 891 Carolina St and would like to encourage the builders to retain our neighborhood character by making this building smaller in scale with rest of the neighborhood. Thank you for your consideration.

Regards, Mridula

22 June 2017

San Francisco Planning Commission 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: 891 Carolina Street, Permit #2014-0211-8257 Letter in Support of DR/Oppose the plan as currently proposed

Dear Planning Commissioners,

This letter is to share with you my thoughts and concerns regarding the scope and scale of the proposed project at 891 Carolina. I have lived at 928 Carolina Street since 1996, and one of the reasons I call Potrero Hill home is its sense of community and visual character. What I see happening both here on the Hill, and elsewhere throughout the many areas of the City (i.e. Mission Bay, SOMA, etc...), is **the destruction of many older buildings that are then replaced with large boxes that don't blend in appropriately to their surroundings**. I'm afraid that something similar may be the result, if the current plans of 891 Carolina Street are not modified to make the revamped building more aligned in size to those that it borders.

Specifically, the unusual configuration of 897 Carolina, the home just to the south, which has a deep 55'+ yard on the Carolina side of the lot, with the building set back behind it, should not be used as an example of where 891 Carolina should extend. A new building the depth of 60' is much more appropriate than one that has a 75' deep footprint, when this particular neighbor's property is taken into consideration. That, plus the fact that the current building at 891 Carolina starts at the street, with no set-back whatsoever, so it would be extraordinarily imposing if it was to be that long. Reducing the scope and depth of the building will also be a guarantee of helping to preserve both neighborhood green space, as well as mid-block open space.

The height of the proposed building should be limited to three-stories, as it is near the top of the hill, and, if not, would visually overpower the surrounding properties. The third story should also have some kind of a set back to, again, blend better alongside of the adjacent properties. Per San Francisco Residential Design Guidelines: "A single building out of context with its surroundings can be disruptive to the neighborhood character and, if repeated often enough, to the image of the City as a whole."

Thank you for your consideration of my trepidation that yet another "McMansion" would be built at 891 Carolina Street, promoting further the disintegration of the beloved character of Potrero Hill, and ultimately, San Francisco.

Kind Regards,

Cathryn Blum 928 Carolina Street

CHRISTOPHER COLE 769 De Haro Street San Francisco, CA 94107-2729

June 27, 2017

Natalia Kwiatkowska, Planner	RICH HILLIS, President
San Francisco Planning Department	San Francisco Planning Commission
email only to <u>natalia.kwiatkowska@sfgov.org</u>	email only to <u>richhillissf@yahoo.com</u>
DENNIS RICHARDS, Vice-President	RODNEY FONG, Commissioner
San Francisco Planning Commission	San Francisco Planning Commission
email only to <u>dennis.richards@sfgov.org</u>	email only to <u>planning@rodneyfong.com</u>
CHRISTINE D. JOHNSON, Commissioner	JOEL KOPPEL, Commissioner
San Francisco Planning Commission	San Francisco Planning Commission
email only to <u>christine.d.johnson@sfgov.org</u>	email only to joel.koppel@sfgov.org
MYRNA MELGAR, Commissioner	KATHRIN MOORE, Commissioner
San Francisco Planning Commission	San Francisco Planning Commission
email only to <u>myrna.melgar@sfgov.org</u>	email only to <u>kathrin.moore@sfgov.org</u>

RE: Planning Commission Hearing - Opposition to Subject Project Hearing Date: July 13, 2017

Discretionary Review, Permit #2014-0211-8267 Property Address: 891 Carolina Street

Dear Ms. Kwiatkowska, President Hillis, Vice-President Richards and Commissioners Fong, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar and Moore:

The Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) are the law, as important and mandatory as building codes and zoning ordinances. This was established 20 years ago by the <u>Williams v Board</u> <u>of Permit Appeals</u> decision, a San Francisco Superior Court decision making it clear that the RDG are <u>not</u> merely voluntary, but are "... mandatory established standards set forth in the planning code..." (A copy of the <u>Williams</u> decision is attached; the quoted language is on page 5.) Accordingly, the Planning Department, the Planning Commission, the Board of Appeals and other governmental bodies are mandated:

... not only to "consider" the "guidelines" but also to find that the new building is "consistent with ... the 'Residential Design Guidelines." Section 311 is clear on its face that its terms apply
> to all R Districts and the Residential Design Guidelines themselves state that they are meant to apply in all residential districts with a height limit of 40 feet or less. Therefore, these provisions apply with equal to RH-1, RH-2 and RH-3 districts.

(*Williams* decision, pp. 4 and 5 of the opinion, emphasis added.)

Based upon the requirements of the <u>*Williams*</u> decision, the height, bulk and mass of the 891 Carolina Street project (the "Subject Project") legally must be consistent with the law as stated in the RDG. This requirement is <u>in addition to</u> meeting the building code and zoning requirements requirements.

The Planning Department's analysis and its Residential Design Team Review (RDTR) are flawed and incorrectly conclude that the Subject Property is in compliance with the RDG. It is not. The Planning Department's conclusion that the Subject Project is in compliance is not supported by the plain language of the RDG or the facts.

The Design Principles must be applied to

- o Ensure that the building's scale is compatible with surrounding buildings.
- o Ensure that the building respects the mid-block open space.
- o Maintain light to adjacent properties by providing adequate setbacks.
- o Provide architectural features that enhance the neighborhood's character.

The following analyis, with references to the RDG, demonstrates that the Subject Project does not comply with the RDG's required standards.

1. <u>RDG, page 7:</u> This page of the RDG addresses the issue of neighborhood character and establishes the Design Principle that buildings must be responsive to the overall neighborhood context in order to preserve the existing visual character of the neighborhood.

The Subject Property is in no way responsive to the adjacent buildings, or to the heights of the majority of neighborhood homes. The surrounding buildings are mostly 2 level/story/floors, with some 3 levels. The surrounding buildings range from 26 feet tall to 34 feet tall. The Subject Property is nearly 40 feet tall, i.e. from 20% to 50% taller than the surrounding properties. Allowing such a tall building does not preserve the neighborhood's existing visual character.

2. <u>**RDG**</u>, <u>**page 10**</u>: This page of the RDG addresses the issue of Mixed Visual Character, stating that in areas with a mixed visual character, buildings must be designed to help define, unify and contribute positively to the existing visual context.

The Subject Property does not help to define the existing visual character of the

area because the Subject Property is out of scale with that existing visual character. The Subject Property does not help to unify or contribute positively to the existing visual context. To the contrary, it is disruptive to the existing visual character because it interrupts the cadence of existing visual context for height and comparable scale of the adjacent buildings and other buildings on the Carolina Street block.

3. <u>RDG, page 11:</u> This page of the RDG addresses the issue of Site Design, requiring that the placement of the building on its site must respond to and respect the topography of the site, its position on the block, the topography of the surrounding area and to the placement of surrounding buildings.

The Subject Property responds *negatively* to the topography of the site. Its position on the block is an interior flat lot. The proposed four levels and 39+ feet of height is much higher than the surrounding buildings. The topography and position on the east side of Carolina would tower over the 2 and 3 story buildings on the west side of Carolina (which is lower topographically) and will also tower over the adjacent buildings to the south and north and the firehouse on Wisconsin Street – which is about 20 feet below the topography of the subject site. There is nothing about the Subject Property that meets the RDG's requirement to respect and respond to the surrounding topography.

4. <u>RDG, pages 16, 17 and 21:</u> These pages of the RDG address the issue of Rear Yards and requires that a building such as the Subject Property be articulated to minimize impacts on light and privacy to adjacent properties, including rear yard cottages, and that the privacy of adjacent properties and cottages be respected by use of translucent glazing such as glass block or frosted glass on windows and doors facing openings on abutting structures.

The illustration for the rear yard cottage guideline is one example of such conditions in a San Francisco neighborhood. Rear yard cottages are more commonly on a lot where there is another building in the front of the lot, and typically interior to the lot (as illustrated). The configuration in this case is different because the rear cottage at 897 Carolina adjacent to the Subject Property is a configuration where the rear yard cottage is the sole building on the lot. The rear yard cottage, without a front building, makes this layout exceptional and extraordinary. The cottage is a two-unit dwelling and must be protected by the RDG, as the Planning Code does not protect it.

As discussed on page 21 of the RDG, although buildings located in rear yards are considered non-complying structures under the Planning Code, they are legal structures and may themselves have an impact on the rear yard open space. When a proposed project such as the Subject Property is adjacent to a lot that has a

> cottage used as a dwelling unit at the rear of the lot, modifications to the Subject Property's design may be necessary to reduce light impacts to that cottage specifically. The following modifications are specifically discussed in the RDG and the RDG recognize that other measures may also be appropriate depending on the circumstances of a particular project:

- o Provide side setbacks at the rear of the building.
- o Minimize rear projections such as decks and stairs.

The rear yard building at 897 Carolina Street (adjacent to the Subject Property) is a non-complying, but legal, structure. By its very location, it impacts the rear yard open space, as stated in the guideline above. Insufficient modifications are proposed to mitigate the impact on the light and air to the 897 Carolina cottage. This rear yard building has been used/applied within the Code 134 of the planning code which radically impacts light to this rear yard building. In the case of this sole existing building, it is necessary to implement other appropriate measures to reduce light impact to this cottage specifically. The 897 Carolina cottage's existence is exceptional and extraordinary. Reducing the Subject Property's footprint into the rear yard will achieve an appropriate reduction to the light impacts to the 897 cottage specifically (as indicated in the illustration on page 21 of the RDG) and minimizing the light impacts to the adjacent cottage will also increase the mid-block open space according to the RDG. Articulating the rear wall of the proposed building further to the north (as indicated in the illustration on page 21) will also reduce the impact on light to the rear yard cottage while protecting and preserving mid-block open space.

5. <u>RDG</u>, page 23: This page of the RDG requires the Subject Property be designed so that the scale and form are compatible with that of surrounding buildings so that neighborhood character is preserved. As stated in the RDG the building scale is established primarily by its height and depth. It is essential for a building's scale to be compatible with that of surrounding buildings, in order to preserve the neighborhood character. Poorly scaled buildings will seem incompatible (too large or small) and inharmonious with their surroundings.

The Subject Property is two to three times larger than adjacent buildings to the north and south and building across Carolina Street to the west. RDG mandates that it is *essential* for a building's scale to be compatible with that of surrounding buildings. The Subject Property fails the test and should not be approved without modifications of height and depth.

6. **RDG, page 24:** This page of the RDG addresses the issue of Building Scale at the public street level and *requires* that the height and depth of the building be compatible with the existing building scale at the street. If a proposed building is taller than surrounding buildings, or a new floor is being added to an existing building, the RDG state that it may be necessary to modify the building height or depth to maintain the existing scale at the street. The RDG explaint that by making these modifications, the visibility of the upper floor is limited from the street, and the upper floor appears subordinate to the primary facade. The key, says the RDG, is to design a building that complements other buildings on the block and does not stand out, even while displaying an individual design. The Subject Property fails these tests at every level.

The Subject Property is taller than surrounding buildings-by the proposed top floor, which is at the 4th level in this neighborhood that is comprised of two to three story buildings. The out-of-scale street appearance is quite apparent from the Carolina view (looking east) and is even much more apparent from the 22nd Street view (looking north) across the front-yard open space of 897 Carolina, the adjacent cottage building (on the corner) to the south, which is set in the rear of its lot. This topographical and existing building configuration makes the Subject Property an extremely imposing structure on the skyline at the top of Potrero Hill. If the height is reduced (as directed in the San Francisco Planning Commission's decision in June of 2003) this proposed building would be compatible with the existing building scale at the street.

7. <u>RDG, page 25:</u> This page of the RDG is an example of a block with conditions such as the 800 block on Carolina Street. The RDG demonstrate that it is possible to preserve the building scale at the street by setting back the third floor. <u>However</u>, an additional setback for a proposed fourth floor is not sufficient. The fourth floor must, as suggested by the RDG, be eliminated to respect the neighborhood scale.

The block of Carolina between 22nd Street and 20th Street (no 21st Street intersects between 22nd and 20th Streets, Carolina Street it is one long hill of the 700 and 800 blocks combined) has primarily one-story over a garage with attic, or 2-story buildings. This character defines the street. Along this long block, there is the Russian Church in the 800 block, and a 4 story apartment structure in the 700 block; both are out of scale in the neighborhood, one being a Church meant to accommodate member gatherings for worship, and the other was built in the 70s and would not be approved today. The RDG states that the "fourth floor must be eliminated to respect the neighborhood scale."

8. <u>RDG, page 26:</u> This page of the RDG addresses the issue of how the height and depth of a building expansion (such as the Subject Property's) into the rear yard can impact the mid-block open space. Even when expansions into a rear yard are permitted by the Planning Code, such expansions are not appropriate if they are uncharacteristically deep or tall in relation

to, and depending on, the context of the other buildings that define the mid-block open space. The RDG recognize that an out-of-scale rear yard addition can leave surrounding residents feeling "boxed-in" and cut-off from the mid-block open space. The RDG suggest that the following design modifications may reduce the impacts of rear yard expansions and recognize that other modifications may also be appropriate depending on the circumstances of a particular project:

- o Set back upper floors to provide larger rear yard setbacks.
- o Notch the building at the rear or provide setbacks from side property lines.
- o Reduce the footprint of the proposed building or addition.

The Subject Property significantly impacts the mid-block open space. Although the Planning Code may permit this intrusion based on Code 134 for averaging adjacent buildings, in this case the RDG make clear that the building expansion into the rear yard is not appropriate. It is not appropriate because the proposed expansion is uncharacteristically deep. For example, if the 897 Carolina rear yard cottage was not in the rear of the lot, the Subject Property expansion would be allowed to extend only to the depth of the other adjacent building to the north (883 Carolina Street). A reduced expansion to the same depth as 883 Carolina Street will protect and preserve the mid-block open space -a critical design element and an important neighborhood factor. The Subject Property should not be allowed to intrude on mid-block open space for its benefit and to the detriment of the neighborhood. The use of 897 Carolina, a non-complying structure, to reduce the otherwise required mid-block open space is wrong and would have an adverse, exceptional and extraordinary impact on the otherwise required mid-block open space. According to this RDG, appropriate modifications to reduce the footprint of the Subject Property must be required to protect the mid-block open space.

<u>The 2003 Decision To Take DR And Reduce Mass</u>: It is important to note that when this same size project was proposed nearly fifteen years ago the Planner then assigned (Mr. Ben Fu) determined it failed to comply with the RDG. At the March 20, 2003 DR hearing Mr. Fu presented the Department's opinion to the Planning Commission and recommended that the Commission *grant* the DR request and modify the project to (a) eliminate the top floor, (b) require a setback for the second floor and (c) incorporate a pitched roof on the second floor to preserve neighborhood context. After hearing testimony the Planning Commission accepted DR and followed the Planning Department's recommendations. The Project Sponsor declined to move forward with the project and now, more than fourteen years later, returns with essentially the same size project that the Department and Commission rejected in 2003.

Nothing material has changed about the proposed project and the passage of more than fourteen years has neither improved the project or brought it into compliance with the RDG.

In conclusion, I request the support of the Planning Department and the support of the Planning Commission, in assuring that the law is enforced so that projects that violate the Residential Design Guidelines are disapproved. The Planning Commission was right in 2003 when it rejected this project and the Planning Commission in 2017 should do the same.

Yours very truly,

life lite

Christopher Cole Attorney At Law (Bar no. 065493) Potrero Hill Resident

CJC/vw Enclosure cc: Robin Bishop (DR Applicant), by email only C:\Docs\TEXT\POTRERO\Kwiatkowska 2017-06-27 LT re 891 Carolina.wpd

Exhibit A Williams v Board of Appeals San Francisco Superior Court Case no. 987418 (Decision Filed Sept. 29,1997)

Exhibit A (Williams v Board of Appeals)

ENDORSED FILED San Francisco County Superior Court

SEP 2 9 1997

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIALAN CARLSON, Clerk FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO CARMENLI

)

Deputy Clerk

HONORABLE RAYMOND D. WILLIAMSON, JUDGE PRESIDING

DEPARTMENT EIGHT

STEPHEN M. WILLIAMS,

٧.

2

Petitioner,

BOARD OF PERMIT APPEALS, SAN FRANCISCO CITY PLANNING DEPARTMENT, DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTIONS,

ASHBOURNE CONSTRUCTION,

Real Party In Interest.

NO. 987418

STATEMENT OF DECISION AND ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE

This matter came on regularly before this Court on July 31, 1997, the Honorable Raymond D. Williamson, presiding. Stephen M. Williams, as petitioner in propria persona ("petitioner") appeared on behalf of himself. William M. Fleishhacker, Deputy City Attorney for the City and County of San Francisco appeared as attorney for respondent Board of Permit Appeals and the San Francisco Planning and Building Departments. Alice Suet Yee Barkley and Nancy Greenan Hamill of Reuben & Alter appeared as attorneys for real party in interest Ashbourne Construction. The record of the administrative proceedings having been received into evidence and examined by the Court, and additional evidence having been received by the Court,

arguments having been presented and the matter having been submitted for decision, the Court rendered its Statement of Intended ("Tentative") Decision on August 22, 1997. Subsequent thereto objections to the Tentative Decision were filed by both the City and the Real Party in Interest and response was filed by Petitioner. The Ex-Parte requests for hearing on the objections are denied.

The Court, being fully advised makes the following Statement of Decision:

At issue in this action are the demolition and building permits issued for the property located at 2617 Sutter Street, San Francisco, California.

In November, 1995, the San Francisco Planning Department approved the demolition and building permits for the above mentioned building. Petitioner then appealed the permit for new construction, but not the demolition permit, and the Board of Appeals ("Board") upheld the Planning Commission's approval of the permits. In this action, petitioner seeks a Peremptory Writ of Mandamus overturning the City's decision on both permits.

As to the demolition permit, this Court finds that petitioner has failed to exhaust his administrative remedies by failing to appeal the demolition permit to the Board. Therefore, review of the demolition permit is not properly before this Court. Accordingly, no Peremptory Writ shall issue regarding the demolition permit. In any event, there appears to be little concern over the demolition permit realizing the fate that brings to the structure currently located on the property. The controversy arises over the building that is to rise after the work occasioned by the demolition permit is completed.

The primary issue in this case is whether the Board properly used the Residential Design Guidelines when it approved the construction permit for the subject property.

Effective February 2, 1996, the Planning Code was amended with new Section 311, Article III replacing Article V, Section 505. These sections govern the way the Planning Department and the Board, conducting a de novo review on appeal, are to use the Residential Design Guidelines when considering applications for construction permits of new residential buildings in R Districts such as we have here.

The Residential Design Guidelines of the Planning Department are the result of a voter initiative ballot proposition ("Proposition M") from 1986 and were codified by the Planning Commission on November 2, 1989. Among other things Proposition M established as Master Plan Priority Policy, that existing neighborhood character be conserved and protected. In this regard, the Residential Design Guidelines set forth numerous provisions to ensure that new construction or alterations to existing buildings in older neighborhoods will be compatible with existing and adjacent buildings.

Former Planning Code Section 505(b)(3) set forth a non-mandatory standard of review for a permit application and required only that the Residential Design Guidelines, "shall be used as guidelines to review neighborhood compatibility of new construction and alterations." New Sections 311(c) and 311(c)(1) which replaced former Section 505(b)(3), substantially altered the statutory language requiring compliance with, and review of, the Residential Design Guidelines.

Unlike Section 505(b)(3), which only required use of the Residential Design Guidelines, "to review neighborhood compatibility," Section 311 now fully incorporates the Residential Design Guidelines into the Planning Code as part of the residential permit review procedure. Under new Section 311, the Planning Department shall determine that the project complies with the Residential Design Guidelines or the permit may not issue. Section 311 states in relevant part as follows:

(c) BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION AND REVIEW FOR COMPLIANCE AND NOTIFICATION. Upon acceptance of any application subject to this Section, the Department of City Planning shall review the proposed project for compliance with City Planning Code and any applicable design guidelines approved by the City Planning Commission. Applications determined not to be in compliance with the standards of Articles 1.2, 1.5, 2, 2.5 of the City Planning Code, Residential Design Guidelines, including design guidelines for specific areas adopted by the Planning Commission, . . . shall be held until either the application is determined to be in compliance, is disapproved, or a recommendation for cancellation is sent to the Department of Building Inspection.

(1) Residential Design Guidelines. The construction of new residential building in R districts shall be consistent with the design policies and guidelines of the Master Plan and with the "Residential Design Guidelines" as adopted and periodically amended for specific areas or conditions by the City Planning Commission. The Zoning Administrator may require modifications to the exterior of a proposed new residential building or proposed alteration of an existing residential building in order to bring it into conformity with the 'Residential Design Guidelines' and with the Master Plan. These modifications may include, but are not limited to, changes in siting, building envelope, scale, texture and detailing, openings and landscaping.

The new wording of Section 311 paints a different picture of the duties of the Planning Department and the Board when a permit is sought. With the insertion of the word "shall" into this section of the Planning Code the Board is now required, not only to "consider"

the "Guidelines," but also to find that the new building is "consistent with . . . the 'Residential Design Guidelines.'" Section 311 is clear on its face that its terms apply to all R districts and the Residential Design Guidelines themselves state that they are meant to apply in all residential districts with a height limit of 40 feet or less. Therefore, these provisions apply with equal force to RH-1, RH-2 and RH-3 districts.

The Board has an obligation to enforce the law which is in effect at the time in which a permit is issued. <u>Avco Community</u> <u>Developers, Inc. v. South Coast Regional</u>, (1976) 17 Cal.3d 785, 793. In this instance, the permits were issued on March 12, 1997 and the provisions of Section 311 apply. Further, it is also well established the Board's power must be exercised within the bounds of the statutes, code sections and ordinances that are applicable to the circumstances and facts of any matter which comes before it. <u>City and County of San Francisco v. Board of Permit Appeals</u>, (1989) 207 C.A. 3d 1099, 1105.

The Court has reviewed the transcript of the hearing before the Board. While several references are made therein to the "Guidelines," nothing in the record shows that the Board considered the Residential Design Guidelines and, exercising its discretion, found the proposed construction "consistent with" the Guidelines.

The Court finds that as a matter of law the Board may not refuse to implement specific, mandatory established standards set forth in the Planning Code and specifically, the Residential Design Guidelines in order to promote general and nonspecific policies

5

and the second sec

which do not, on their face, conflict with such specific standards. Although the application of the Residential Design Guidelines necessarily requires some flexibility, the respondent Board may not, in the exercise of its discretion, gloss over the Residential Design Guidelines.

The Court concludes that the Board has failed to establish, in its record, that it has adequately "considered" and "followed" the Residential Design Guidelines in evaluating the building permit application for 2617 Sutter Street.

In view of the foregoing, it is hereby ordered that a Peremptory Writ of Mandamus issue from this Court remanding this matter back to respondent and commanding respondent Board to set aside its decision on Appeal No. 97-044 and reconsider _the construction permit application in a manner consistent with this order.

DATED: Jestenber 29, 1997.

SAN FRANCISCO SUPERIOR COURT

0331u

From:Sandra CookTo:Kwiatkowska, Natalia (CPC)Cc:missrobinbishop@gmail.comSubject:891 CarolinaDate:Wednesday, June 28, 2017 12:03:14 AM

June 13, 2017

Re: Permit #2014-0211-8267 891 Carolina Street

Natalia Kwiatkowska, Planner San Francisco Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103 natalia.kwiatkowska@sfgov.org

Dear Ms. Kwiatkowska,

I live at 829 Carolina Street, just down the block from 891 Carolina Street. I share the mid-block open space with residents of this block. It is my observation that bigger and bigger projects are being approved by Planning. This impacts my neighborhood character, of single family homes and 2-unit houses that are mostly two stories, and a few three stories. It also produces negative impact resulting in a shrinking urban forest and greenery in our rear yards.

I oppose this project plan as proposed. It is too big and too deep into this level lot. It is excessive and out of scale to the neighboring single family and 2-unit houses that are here on our block. A reasonable sized building with two ample sized units is possible, while also protecting and preserving the mid-block that I and my neighbors currently enjoy.

The covering over of this rear yard/mid-block open space happens one parcel at a time. As it says in the Residential Design Guidelines (RDG), "A single building out of context with its surroundings can be disruptive to the neighborhood character and, if repeated often enough, to the image of the City as a whole." Preservation of the shrinking mid-block requires that the project sponsor reduce the proposed footprint to a 40 foot rear yard calculation—a reduction of 15 feet from that proposed. This would be a respectful and reasonable modification.

Housing is being approved that is disrupting the health of the urban forest in the mid block. This is due to the fact that buildings are being approved and built that are out of context with surroundings, and establishing a large footprint into the rear yard open space. This is indeed disturbing as, while people come and go, buildings endure. When buildings out of scale with neighborhood character endure, the reduction of this open space is the price of excessive horizontal expansion. When the green and permeable ground is gone, it is gone forever.

That being said, I oppose this project as it is currently proposed. A reduction in overall size is necessary.

Sincerely,

Sandra Cook 829 Carolina Street Hi -

My name is Dan Cremins and I live at 1 Southern Heights Boulevard in Potrero Hill, across the street from the proposed project.

I have reviewed the plans for 891 Carolina and I am in complete support of this project. It takes a derelict property and converts it into two family sized units, which the city desperately needs. I don't understand the opposition to this project, as what is proposed is not oversized home, but instead TWO-UNITS of new housing, replacing an abandoned house. As I understand it, one unit is about 2,000 sf and the other unit is 1,800 sf. These are not large spaces. They are just normal apartments. In fact these are the type of housing that everyone should be building.

The building follows the neighborhood pattern and steps up per the residential design guidelines. I also think it looks great and I hope that you will approve it as designed.

Dan Cremins

June 28, 2017

To: San Francisco Planning Commissioners

- From: Julie Jackson, AIA Owner, 890 Carolina Street
- RE: Discretionary Review of 891 Carolina Street #2014.0870DRP Letter in opposition to Proposed Project as designed

Dear Planning Commissioners,

While I am very excited to see the derelict property at 891 Carolina Street improved after many years of negligence and lack of maintenance by the long-time owner, there are 2 major aspects of the project as designed that I would like to request that the Planning Commission review and consider asking the Project Sponsor to revise the project. These issues are detailed further below and consist of the Proposed Project height/ massing which is inconsistent with the existing neighborhood pattern and the loss of mid-block open space.

I am highly concerned about the Planning Department and Residential Design Team's (RDT) dramatic change in perspective from previous published decisions that stated that a 4-level building was inappropriate for the neighborhood context at 891 Carolina Street. Due to the unique neighborhood context of 891 Carolina Street, the proposed building height and depth are significantly out of character with the surrounding neighborhood. The Zoning Administrator issued a decision in 2003 when reviewing a previous similar project for this site that stated that a 4-level building was inconsistent with the neighborhood scale and would inappropriately create a project that was 2 stories higher than many buildings on the block, which is remains the case at this time.

Previous to the 4th round of RDT comments on the current project, Planning Department responses were consistent in directing the Project Sponsor to <u>remove</u> the 4th level to ensure compliance with the Residential Design Guidelines and fit within the existing neighborhood context. After 3 rounds of RDT responses for the current project stipulating that the 4th level <u>should be removed</u>, an inexplicable change of direction was issued in the RDT's Notice of Planning Department Requirements (NOPDR) #4, which instead outlined that the Project Sponsor should "further shape" the 4th level addition. I am not clear why the Residential Design Team would change course so suddenly and encourage a project to go against the same Residential Design Guidelines that were previously consistently being enforced for this project to fit within the neighborhood context.

It is quite clear that, previous to NOPDR #4,the Planning Department Residential Design Team agreed with the previously issued Zoning Administrator ruling that a 4-level structure at 891 Carolina Street would not be appropriate in the context of mostly 2 and 3 level buildings that are adjacent to and across the street from the project. Following is a summary of the Zoning Administrator and RDT responses that outline why a 4-level building on this site is not appropriate for this location.

When a Discretionary Review was filed in 2003 against a previously similarly proposed project at the same address, the Zoning Administrator issued the attached Variance Decision, which the below quotes are extracted from. There is no

appreciable difference in this block between now and then, and the project remains as inconsistent and disruptive now as outlined by the Zoning Administrator for the previous project.

"The proposal is inconsistent with the neighborhood pattern in terms of scale and mass. The block consists of mostly single-family residential buildings varying in height of either one story or two stories over garage. Buildings on the block also vary in depth. The existing subject dwelling is a single-story over garage building with an attic level above. The project creates a building that is two stories higher than other buildings on the block."

"The proposal is not consistent with the general intent of the Planning Code and General Plan, in that it does not promote orderly and/or beneficial development. The project offers no benefit to the existing neighborhood by disrupting the existing neighborhood pattern, scale, and mass."

From NOPDR 2 - "On November 6, 2014, the proposed project was reviewed by the Planning Department's Residential Design Team (RDT) to ensure compliance with the Residential Design Guidelines (RDG)". *Comments from the RDT include:*

"Even with the proposed shaping, the fourth floor is out of scale with the surrounding two story buildings. <u>Remove the fourth floor</u> to better relate to the existing building scale at the street. (RDG, p23-25)"

From NOPDR 3 - "On August 21, 2014, the proposed project was reviewed by the Planning Department's Residential Design Team (RDT) to ensure compliance with the Residential Design Guidelines (RDG)". *Comments from the RDT include:*

<u>"Remove the 4th floor</u> to better relate to existing building scale at the street (RDGs, p. 23-25)"

The proposed project is out of character and scale with the neighborhood, as the Planning Department and Zoning Administrator have consistently noted in the past. The Planning Commission should compel the Project Sponsor to revise the project to a 3-level structure to complement, not overwhelm, the existing neighborhood context and conform with the Residential Design Guidelines. "Shaping" the 4th level as proposed (very small slivers of sloped roof with large flat dormers beyond) does little to reduce the impact of the large scale of the addition that will be more than 2 stories higher than the majority of the adjacent homes.

In terms of the depth of the proposed project, I strongly disagree with the Planning Department interpretation that the standard method of averaging the adjacent properties is the correct method to determine the required rear yard for the project at 891 Carolina Street. Planning Code section 134 (c)(4)(B) should be applied to this "Special Lot situation" as a project adjacent to an existing non-conforming duplex located at the rear of the corner property which has all pedestrian and vehicular access from 22nd Street. The intent of this section of the code appears to be to maintain the typical neighborhood open space at the rear yard to avoid allowing for an artificially expanded footprint due to the location of an adjacent existing non-conforming building at the rear of the property, which is a frequent occurrence in neighborhoods all over San Francisco. Per the overarching statement at the beginning of Sec. 134 - "These requirements are intended to assure the protection and continuation of established midblock...". By disregarding the application of 134 (c)(4)(B), the Planning

Department is allowing for an artificially expanded footprint that does not continue the established development pattern for this neighborhood. Basing the required rear yard off of the property to the North would already provide 891 Carolina Street with a rear yard reduction from the basic 45% requirement and to further expand the envelope the project sponsor could elect to comply with the requirements outlined in Sec. 136 which allow for a further expansion into the required rear yard, or they could seek a variance for a greater footprint. The expansion of the building to the extent that only a 25% rear yard remains has a detrimental impact on the adjacent properties and is not consistent with the maintenance and protection of mid-block open space that is mentioned in section 134 of the Planning Code.

I want to stress that as a neighbor and long-time Potrero Hill resident, my concerns are based on the precedent that this project is setting in terms of massing and height that is significantly out of context, and reducing the light and air in the rear yards of Potrero Hill that does not follow the mid-block pattern common in this neighborhood. I agree with my many neighbors and the other community members that urge the Planning Commission to review this project and require that the Project Sponsor provide a revised design that meets the Residential Guidelines and is a respectful addition that fits within the context of the Potrero Hill neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration. Please contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Julie Jackson, AIA

Owner, 890 Carolina Street

415-624-5047 cell

julie@jacksonliles.com

RE: PROJECT: Permit #2014-0211-8267 891 Carolina Street

Dear Natalia Kwiatkowska,

I am writing you to express my opposition to the proposed building at 891 Carolina Street. I have been the owner of my home on the next block (922 Carolina, kitty-corner to this property) since the 1960s. It distresses me to think that an overly large building is being considered for the very top of Potrero Hill. It is entirely alarming to see how the neighborhood is being overrun by buildings which do not fit in with the silhouettes of the older homes. Long-time citizens count on the Planning Department to protect their neighborhoods.

Look at the fronts of the surrounding properties: They are all 2 stories high. Please be respectful of the many people who have lived in this immediate neighborhood for generations. There is no excuse for putting an outsized 4 story, 4000 square foot structure on that lot. While the neighbors welcome the fixing up of a building which is in disrepair, a four level structure is highly inappropriate.

Thank you for your consideration,

Peggy Snider

From:	<u>Alison Heath</u>
To:	<u>Kwiatkowska, Natalia (CPC)</u>
Cc:	Kristine Gardner; Secretary, Commissions (CPC)
Subject:	891 Carolina DR
Date:	Thursday, June 29, 2017 10:30:16 AM

Dear Commissioners:

I have reviewed the plans for the proposed project and believe that Planning Staff didn't adequately consider the Residential Design Guidelines in their review.

Specifically, the proposed project is in conflict with requirements to respect the placement of surrounding buildings and existing neighborhood character. Furthermore Impacts on light and air have not been properly addressed.

I urge the Commission to take DR and insist on a more appropriate design that complies with the Guidelines and is an asset, rather than a detriment to the neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration,

Alison Heath Mississippi Street Good afternoon Commissioners.

My name is Ria McIntosh and I am opposed to the size of the proposed upgrade for 891 Carolina Street, San Francisco 94107 being classified as a remodel and addition. I believe it does not serve the needs of the normal and majority person living in San Francisco.

For 891 Carolina Street, the shrinking of mid-block open space is excessive. I urge you to cast your vote in favor of preservation of the shrinking mid block and require the project sponsor to reduce the proposed footprint to a 40 foot rear yard calculation—a reduction of 15 feet from that proposed.

The proposed project at 891 Carolina is a perfect example of reduction of mid-block. The adjacent 1907 built "non-conforming" cottage provides this remodel-and-addition project with the advantage to build deep into the rear yard. The result is to allow the remodel to extend 28 feet into the rear yard, while leaving only 25 feet of rear yard open space. This is coverage of 700 square feet of open space—a 3% loss of rear yard. This is not in keeping with preservation goals of our City's open space. Section 134 rear yard Planning Code's opening paragraph states: "These requirements are intended to assure *the protection and continuation* of established mid-block," In this case, the code does not achieve its intent.

I urge you to cast your vote in favor of preservation of the permeable mid block by disallowing the use of the non-conforming adjacent cottage and requiring the project sponsor to reduce the proposed footprint to a 40 foot rear yard calculation—a reduction of 15 feet from that proposed.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Ria McIntosh 855 Carolina Street San Francisco 94107