



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Discretionary Review Abbreviated Analysis

HEARING DATE: APRIL 27, 2017

Date: April 20, 2017
Case No.: 2015-007765DRP
Project Address: 1369 Sanchez Street
Zoning: RH-2 [Residential – House, Two-Family]
40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 6579/027
Project Sponsor: William Pashelinsky
1937 Hayes Street
San Francisco, CA, 94117
Staff Contact: Elizabeth Jonckheer – (415) 575-8728
elizabeth.gordon-jonckheer@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 the remodel of the front elevation, a horizontal addition and the reconfiguration of the existing two-unit residence by relocating Unit 1 from the second floor to the ground floor behind the garage and combining habitable space on second and third floors into one residential unit. The project fills in alley space/ side yard at the south front of the building on all floors.

SITE DESCRIPTION AND PRESENT USE

The project is located on east side of Sanchez Street, between 27th and Cesar Chavez Streets. Block 6579, Lot 027. The subject property is located within the RH-2 (Residential – House, Two Family) and the 40-X Height and Bulk District. The property is developed with a three-story building with two flats above the garage. The subject property has a front setback of 7 feet 10 inches and a rear yard of 26 feet and 8 inches.

SURROUNDING PROPERTIES AND NEIGHBORHOOD

The adjacent properties are single-family and two-unit structures, also located within the RH-2 Zoning District. There are three clusters of NC-1 (Neighborhood Commercial Cluster) zoned parcels near the subject property at the following intersections: Cesar Chavez and Church Streets, Sanchez and 26th Streets, and Church and 27th Streets.

BUILDING PERMIT NOTIFICATION

TYPE	REQUIRED PERIOD	NOTIFICATION DATES	DR FILE DATE	DR HEARING DATE	FILING TO HEARING TIME
311 Notice	30 days	July 26, 2016 – August 24, 2016	August 22, 2016	April 27, 2017	248

HEARING NOTIFICATION

TYPE	REQUIRED PERIOD	REQUIRED NOTICE DATE	ACTUAL NOTICE DATE	ACTUAL PERIOD
Posted Notice	10 days	April 17, 2017	April 17, 2017	10 days
Mailed Notice	10 days	April 17, 2017	April 17, 2017	10 days

PUBLIC COMMENT

	SUPPORT	OPPOSED	NO POSITION
Adjacent Neighbor			X
Other neighbors on the block or directly across the street		1	X
Neighborhood groups			X

During the 311-neighborhood notification period a neighbor across Sanchez Street voiced concerns regarding the roof deck. The Department has received correspondence from Noe Valley resident Georgia Schuttish supporting the DR requestor’s application. The Department has not received any other public comment pertaining to the requested Discretionary Review of the proposed project (as of the publication date of this packet).

DR REQUESTOR

Sue C. Hestor, 870 Market Street, San Francisco, CA 94102.

DR REQUESTOR’S CONCERNS AND PROPOSED ALTERNATIVES

See attached *Discretionary Review Application*, dated August 22, 2016.

PROJECT SPONSOR’S RESPONSE TO DR APPLICATION

See attached *Response to Discretionary Review*, dated April 5, 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).

PRESERVATION REVIEW

As outlined in the Planning Department's Preservation Team Review Form (signed December 21, 2015), according to the information provided in the Supplemental Information Form prepared by William Pashelinsky (dated October 10, 2015), research by Tim Kelley Consulting (dated April 2015), and additional research by Planning Department staff, the subject property at 1369 Sanchez Street was determined not to be eligible for listing in the California Register under any criteria individually or as part of a historic district. The Preservation Team Review (PTR) Form states that 1369 Sanchez Street was originally constructed in 1883 by an unknown architect. The building was likely originally constructed as a flat-front Italianate residence and was remodeled in the Art Deco style in 1935. Permit records and visual inspection indicate that the subject property underwent the following alterations: stucco front façade (1935), repair stairs and landings (1984). No known historic events occurred at the property and none of the owners or occupants were identified as important to history (California Register Criteria 1 & 2). The subject building is a mostly intact example of a Victorian-era residence modified with an Art Deco façade and is not architecturally distinct such that it would qualify individually for listing in the California Register. The Preservation Team Review Form incorrectly notes that the subject property is located at the southern edge of the Diamond Heights neighborhood, where it should indicate that the property is located at the southern edge of the Noe Valley neighborhood. Nevertheless, the determination correctly notes the block exhibits some conformity, but several of the buildings, including the subject building, have been heavily modified from their original appearance, and therefore, the area does not appear to qualify as a historic district under California Register Criterion 3 (Design)¹. The property was reclassified to Category C - No Historic Resource Present.

RESIDENTIAL DESIGN TEAM REVIEW

The Residential Design Team (RDT) reviewed the project 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 and privacy issues are within the tolerances to be expected when living in a dense, urban environment like San Francisco.
2. The building scale, massing and materials are appropriate as the project is located in a neighborhood of mixed visual character with regard to both scale and architecture.

¹ The closest potential historic district is the 27th and Noe St. Victorian Row Historic District, located on the south side of 27th Street and bounded by Noe Street to the west and Sanchez Street to the east. Per Case No. 2013.1590E, the 27th and Noe St. Victorian Row Historic District appears to be eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 3 (Architecture) as a collection of nine Queen Anne cottages that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type and period of design, containing a high concentration of architecturally cohesive intact buildings that were constructed between 1890 and 1913.

DEPARTMENT REVIEW

Prior to going out for neighborhood notification, the Department reviewed the proposal for the proposed unit relocation. At that time, the proposal included reducing the existing unit's square footage by 18%. The original unit was 881 square feet, and new unit was proposed to be 735 square feet. Planning Code Section 317(b)(7) requires that a new unit not be reduced by more than 25% of the original floor area. After the Discretionary Review was filed, on October 17, 2016, the project was discussed at the Department's Project Coordination Lite meeting. At that meeting, it was noted that the subject property's existing rear yard was not Code-complying, therefore the Department recommended modifications to the project to reconfigure the lower unit to meet exposure requirements. Other building and dwelling unit reconfiguration options were discussed and conveyed to the Project Sponsor. The Project Sponsor revised the project with street facing exposure and expanded the size of the relocated unit to 836 square feet – 95% of the original unit. On January 23, 2017, the proposal was again discussed at the Department's Project Coordination Lite meeting. At the meeting, the Department was supportive of the revised larger unit size and reallocation of space, and recommended front façade modifications to center the garage door and bay. These changes have been incorporated into the current plan set. Finally, on April 11, 2017, the proposal was reviewed at a Project Coordination meeting with the Planning Director. There was no change to the Department's recommendation.

The ground floor unit includes separate and distinct street access and dwelling unit exposure, as well as access to usable open space. As comparable to the existing unit, the new ground floor unit also includes a kitchen and full bath, as well as one bedroom. The Department also reviewed the proposal to ensure that the project is not tantamount to demolition. The proposal includes removing 39% of all exterior walls measured in lineal feet at the foundation level; and therefore does not meet the "and" clause for 317(b)(2)(B). Additionally, the proposal includes removing 37% of all vertical elements; and therefore does not meet the "and" clause for 317(b)(2)(C).

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

RECOMMENDATION: Do not take DR and approve project as proposed
--

Attachments:

Block Book Map

Sanborn Map

Aerial Photographs

Site Photographs

Link to interior photographs: <http://www.daleandalla.com/sold-1369-1371-sanchez-street/>

Zoning District Map

Section 311 Notice

CEQA Determination, including:

- Planning Department Preservation Team Review (PTR) Form signed December 21, 2015
- Supplemental Information Form for Historic Resource Determination by William Pashelinsky dated October 10, 2015 with research by Tim Kelley Consulting dated April 2015

DR Application dated August 22, 2016

Response to DR Application dated April 7, 2017

Executive Summary
April 20, 2017

CASE NO. 2015-007765DRP
1369 Sanchez Street

Public Correspondence
Reduced Plans
Rendering

(This page intentionally left blank)

Parcel Map


© COPYRIGHT SAN FRANCISCO
CITY & COUNTY ASSessor 1998

lot43 into lots46&47 for 1998 roll
lot36 into lots64&65 for 2013 roll
lot21 into lots61/63 for 2013 roll
Lot 19 into lots 66 & 67 for 2015 roll


6579

CORNER'S ADD.
BLK 93

REVISED 1991
Revised 1998
Revised 2013
REVISED 2015



CHURCH



3925-3927 ARMY ST.
A CONDOMINIUM

LOT	UNIT	% COMM. AREA
46	3927	50
47	3925	50

322-324 27TH ST.
A CONDOMINIUM


LOT	UNIT	% COMM. AREA
44	101	49.60
45	102	50.40

SUBJECT PROPERTY



Discretionary Review Hearing
April 27, 2017
Case Number 2015-007765DRP
1369 Sanchez Street
Block 6579 Lot 027

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
April 27, 2017
Case Number 2015-007765DRP
1369 Sanchez Street
Block 6579 Lot 027

Aerial Photo




SUBJECT PROPERTY



Discretionary Review Hearing
April 27, 2017
Case Number 2015-007765DRP
1369 Sanchez Street
Block 6579 Lot 027

Aerial Photo



SUBJECT PROPERTY



Discretionary Review Hearing
April 27, 2017
Case Number 2015-007765DRP
1369 Sanchez Street
Block 6579 Lot 027

Site Photo




Discretionary Review Hearing
April 27, 2017
Case Number 2015-007765DRP
1369 Sanchez Street
Block 6579 Lot 027

Site Photo



Discretionary Review Hearing
April 27, 2017
Case Number 2015-007765DRP
1369 Sanchez Street
Block 6579 Lot 027

Zoning Map



SUBJECT PROPERTY



Discretionary Review Hearing
April 27, 2017
Case Number 2015-007765DRP
1369 Sanchez Street
Block 6579 Lot 027



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1650 Mission Street Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

NOTICE OF BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION (SECTION 311)

On **August 20, 2015**, the Applicant named below filed Building Permit Application No. **2015.0819.47.09** with the City and County of San Francisco.

PROPERTY INFORMATION		APPLICANT INFORMATION	
Project Address:	1369 Sanchez Street	Applicant:	William Pashelinsky
Cross Street(s):	27th & Cesar Chavez Streets	Address:	1937 Hayes Street
Block/Lot No.:	6579/027	City, State:	San Francisco, CA 94117
Zoning District(s):	RH-2 / 40-X	Telephone:	(415) 379-3676 billpash@gmail.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		
<input type="checkbox"/> Demolition	<input type="checkbox"/> New Construction	<input type="checkbox"/> Alteration
<input type="checkbox"/> Change of Use	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Façade Alteration(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Front Addition
<input type="checkbox"/> Rear Addition	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Side Addition	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Vertical Addition
PROJECT FEATURES	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Building Use	Residential	Residential
Front Setback	7 feet 10 inches	No Change
Side Setbacks	3 feet 6 inches (south)	None
Building Depth	45 feet 6 inches	No Change
Rear Yard	26 feet 8 inches	No Change
Building Height	32 feet 6 inches	28 feet 6 inches (roof deck =3 feet 6 inches)
Number of Stories	3	3 stories + roof deck
Number of Dwelling Units	2	2
Number of Parking Spaces	1	1
PROJECT DESCRIPTION		
<p>The proposal is to reconfigure the existing two-unit residence by: (1) relocating Unit #1 from the second floor to the ground floor, (2) combining habitable space on the second and third floors into one residential unit, (3) infilling alley space/ side yard space at the south front of the building on all floors. The proposal also remodels the front elevation and adds a roof deck.</p>		
<p>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.</p>		

For more information, please contact Planning Department staff:

Planner: Elizabeth Gordon Jonckheer
 Telephone: (415) 575-8728
 E-mail: elizabeth.gordon-jonckheer@sfgov.org

Notice Date: **7/26/16**
 Expiration Date: **8/24/16**

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 www.communityboards.org 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 www.sfplanning.org. 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 www.sfplanning.org. If the project includes multiple building permits, i.e. demolition and new construction, a **separate request for Discretionary Review must be submitted, with all required materials and fee, for each permit that you feel will have an impact on you.**

Incomplete applications will not be accepted.

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

BOARD OF APPEALS

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

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

This project has undergone preliminary review pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). If, as part of this process, the Department's Environmental Review Officer has deemed this project to be exempt from further environmental review, an exemption determination has been prepared and can be obtained through the Exemption Map, on-line, at www.sfplanning.org. 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

CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Address		Block/Lot(s)	
1369-1371 Sanchez Street		6579/027	
Case No.	Permit No.	Plans Dated	
2015-007765ENV		05/12/2015	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addition/ Alteration	<input type="checkbox"/> Demolition (requires HRER if over 45 years old)	<input type="checkbox"/> New Construction	<input type="checkbox"/> Project Modification (GO TO STEP 7)
Project description for Planning Department approval. Reconfigure existing two-unit residence. Relocate unit 1 from second floor to ground floor. Combine habitable space on second and third floors into one residential unit. Fill in alley space/ side yard at south front of building on all floors. Add roof deck.			

STEP 1: EXEMPTION CLASS

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

Note: If neither Class 1 or 3 applies, an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i> is required.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Class 1 – Existing Facilities. Interior and exterior alterations; additions under 10,000 sq. ft.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Class 3 – New Construction/ Conversion of Small Structures. Up to three (3) new single-family residences or six (6) dwelling units in one building; commercial/office structures; utility extensions; change of use under 10,000 sq. ft. if principally permitted or with a CU.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Class _____

STEP 2: CEQA IMPACTS

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

If any box is checked below, an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i> is required.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	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 Exposure Zone? Does the project have the potential to emit substantial pollutant concentrations (e.g., backup diesel generators, heavy industry, diesel trucks)? <i>Exceptions: do not check box if the applicant presents documentation of enrollment in the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) Article 38 program and the project would not have the potential to emit substantial pollutant concentrations. (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Air Pollutant Exposure Zone)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	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>
<input type="checkbox"/>	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?
<input type="checkbox"/>	Archeological Resources: 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>
<input type="checkbox"/>	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>
<input type="checkbox"/>	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>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Slope = or > 20%: Does the project involve excavation of 50 cubic yards of soil or more, new construction, or square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint? <i>(refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography)</i> If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Seismic: Landslide Zone: Does the project involve excavation of 50 cubic yards of soil or more, new construction, or square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint? <i>(refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones)</i> If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Seismic: Liquefaction Zone: Does the project involve excavation of 50 cubic yards of soil or more, new construction, or square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint? <i>(refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones)</i> If box is checked, a geotechnical report will likely be required.
If no boxes are checked above, GO TO STEP 3. If one or more boxes are checked above, an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i> is required, unless reviewed by an Environmental Planner.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project can proceed with categorical exemption review. The project does not trigger any of the CEQA impacts listed above.
Comments and Planner Signature (<i>optional</i>): Jean Poling <small>Digitally signed by Jean Poling DN: cn=Jean Poling, o=San Francisco Planning Department, ou=San Francisco Planning Department, email=jean.poling@sfdph.org</small>	

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

PROPERTY IS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING: <i>(refer to Parcel Information Map)</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Category A: Known Historical Resource. GO TO STEP 5.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Category B: Potential Historical Resource (over 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 4.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Category C: Not a Historical Resource or Not Age Eligible (under 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 6.

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


Check all that apply to the project.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	1. Change of use and new construction. Tenant improvements not included.
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Regular maintenance or repair to correct or repair deterioration, decay, or damage to building.
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Window replacement that meets the Department's <i>Window Replacement Standards</i> . Does not include storefront window alterations.
<input type="checkbox"/>	4. 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.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5. Deck, terrace construction, or fences not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
<input type="checkbox"/>	6. Mechanical equipment installation that is not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
<input type="checkbox"/>	7. Dormer installation that meets the requirements for exemption from public notification under <i>Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 3: Dormer Windows</i> .
<input type="checkbox"/>	8. 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.
Note: Project Planner must check box below before proceeding.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project is not listed. GO TO STEP 5.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project does not conform to the scopes of work. GO TO STEP 5.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project involves four or more work descriptions. GO TO STEP 5.
<input type="checkbox"/>	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 all that apply to the project.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	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.
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Interior alterations to publicly accessible spaces.
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Window replacement of original/historic windows that are not "in-kind" but are consistent with existing historic character.
<input type="checkbox"/>	4. Façade/storefront alterations that do not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5. Raising the building in a manner that does not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.
<input type="checkbox"/>	6. Restoration based upon documented evidence of a building's historic condition, such as historic photographs, plans, physical evidence, or similar buildings.
<input type="checkbox"/>	7. Addition(s) , including mechanical equipment that are minimally visible from a public right-of-way and meet the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation</i> .

<input type="checkbox"/>	8. Other work consistent with the <i>Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties</i> (specify or add comments):
<input type="checkbox"/>	9. Other work that would not materially impair a historic district (specify or add comments): (Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator) _____
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	10. Reclassification of property status to Category C. (Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator) a. Per HRER dated: _____ (attach HRER) b. Other (specify): per PTR form dated 12/21/2015
Note: If ANY box in STEP 5 above is checked, a Preservation Planner MUST check one box below.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Further environmental review required. Based on the information provided, the project requires an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i> to be submitted. GO TO STEP 6.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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.
Comments (optional):	
Preservation Planner Signature:	

**STEP 6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

<input type="checkbox"/>	Further environmental review required. Proposed project does not meet scopes of work in either (check all that apply): <input type="checkbox"/> Step 2 – CEQA Impacts <input type="checkbox"/> Step 5 – Advanced Historical Review STOP! Must file an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i>.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No further environmental review is required. The project is categorically exempt under CEQA.	
	Planner Name: Gretchen A. Hilyard	Signature: 
	Project Approval Action: Building Permit If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project.	<small>Digitally signed by Gretchen Hilyard DN: dc=org, dc=sfgov, dc=cityplanning, ou=CityPlanning, ou=Current Planning, cn=Gretchen Hilyard, email=Gretchen.Hilyard@sfgov.org Date: 2015.12.22 09:29:59 -08'00'</small>
Once signed or stamped and dated, this document constitutes a categorical exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 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 than front page)		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 Description:		

DETERMINATION IF PROJECT CONSTITUTES SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

Compared to the approved project, would the modified project:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Result in expansion of the building envelope, as defined in the Planning Code;
<input type="checkbox"/>	Result in the change of use that would require public notice under Planning Code Sections 311 or 312;
<input type="checkbox"/>	Result in demolition as defined under Planning Code Section 317 or 19005(f)?
<input type="checkbox"/>	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

<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposed modification would not result in any of the above changes.
If this box is checked, the proposed modifications are categorically exempt under CEQA, in accordance with prior project approval and no additional environmental review is required. This determination shall be posted on the Planning Department website and office and mailed to the applicant, City approving entities, and anyone requesting written notice.	
Planner Name:	Signature or Stamp:



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW FORM

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Preservation Team Meeting Date:		Date of Form Completion	12/8/2015
--	--	--------------------------------	-----------

PROJECT INFORMATION:		
Planner:	Address:	
Gretchen Hilyard	1369 Sanchez Street	
Block/Lot:	Cross Streets:	
6579/027	Cesar Chavez and 27th Streets	
CEQA Category:	Art. 10/11:	BPA/Case No.:
B	n/a	2015-007765ENV

PURPOSE OF REVIEW:		PROJECT DESCRIPTION:		
<input checked="" type="radio"/> CEQA	<input type="radio"/> Article 10/11	<input type="radio"/> Preliminary/PIC	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Alteration	<input type="radio"/> Demo/New Construction

DATE OF PLANS UNDER REVIEW:	Received 6/22/2015
------------------------------------	--------------------

PROJECT ISSUES:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Is the subject Property an eligible historic resource?
<input type="checkbox"/>	If so, are the proposed changes a significant impact?
Additional Notes:	
Submitted: Supplemental Information Form for Historic Resource Determination by William Pashelinsky (dated 10/10/15) and research by Tim Kelley Consulting (dated 4/15)	
Proposed project: REMODEL FRONT ELEVATION/HORIZ. ADDITION AT SOUTH. PROVIDE 3 NEW BEDRMS & 2 NEW BATHRMS AT 3/F; REMODEL KITCHEN & ADD VANITY AT 2/F; RELOCATE UNIT #1 FROM FROM 2ND TO 1ST FLOOR; NEW ROOF DECK.	

PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW:			
Historic Resource Present		<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No *
		<input type="radio"/> N/A	
Individual		Historic District/Context	
Property is individually eligible for inclusion in a California Register under one or more of the following Criteria:		Property is in an eligible California Register Historic District/Context under one or more of the following Criteria:	
Criterion 1 - Event:	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	Criterion 1 - Event:	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Criterion 2 -Persons:	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	Criterion 2 -Persons:	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Criterion 3 - Architecture:	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	Criterion 3 - Architecture:	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Criterion 4 - Info. Potential:	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	Criterion 4 - Info. Potential:	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Period of Significance:	<input type="text"/>	Period of Significance:	<input type="text"/>
		<input type="radio"/> Contributor <input type="radio"/> Non-Contributor	

Complies with the Secretary's Standards/Art 10/Art 11:	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> N/A
CEQA Material Impairment:	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No	
Needs More Information:	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No	
Requires Design Revisions:	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No	
Defer to Residential Design Team:	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	

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

PRESERVATION TEAM COMMENTS:
<p>According to the information provided in the Supplemental Information Form prepared by William Pashelinsky (dated October 10, 2015), research by Tim Kelley Consulting (dated April 2015), and additional research by staff, the subject property at 1369 Sanchez is not an eligible historic resource.</p> <p>1369 Sanchez Street contains a two-story over garage, wood frame, multi-family residence originally constructed in 1883 by an unknown architect. The building was likely originally constructed as a flat-front Italianate residence and was remodeled in the Art Deco style in 1935. Permit records and visual inspection indicate that the subject property underwent the following alterations: stucco front façade (1935), repair stairs and landings (1984).</p> <p>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 mostly intact example of a Victorian-era residence modified with an Art Deco façade in 1935. The building is not architecturally distinct such that it would qualify individually for listing in the California Register under Criterion 3.</p> <p>The subject property is not located within the boundaries of any identified historic districts. The subject property is located at the southern edge of the Diamond Heights neighborhood on a block contains buildings primarily constructed in the bay-front and flat front Italianate architectural styles from 1900 to 1947. According to Tim Kelley Consulting, the block exhibits some conformity, but several of the building, including the subject building, have been heavily modified from their original appearance. The area does not appear to qualify as a historic district under Criterion 3 (Design).</p> <p>Therefore, the subject property is not eligible for listing in the California Register under any criteria individually or as part of a historic district.</p>

Signature of a Senior Preservation Planner / Preservation Coordinator:	Date:
	12-21-2015

ns of Subject Property



Primary façade, 1369-1371 Sanchez Street.

CASE NUMBER:
 For Staff Use only

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION FOR Historic Resource Determination

1. Current Owner / Applicant Information

PROPERTY OWNER'S NAME: Luba Troyanavsky	
PROPERTY OWNER'S ADDRESS: 26 25th Ave San Francisco, 94118	TELEPHONE: (415) 377 4147
	EMAIL: lubatroy@gmail.com

APPLICANT'S NAME: Same as Above <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
APPLICANT'S ADDRESS:	TELEPHONE: ()
	EMAIL:

CONTACT FOR PROJECT INFORMATION: William Pashelinsky Same as Above <input type="checkbox"/>	
ADDRESS: 1937 Hayes Street San Francisco, Ca, 94117	TELEPHONE: (415) 379 3676
	EMAIL: billpash@gmail.com

2. Location and Classification

STREET ADDRESS OF PROJECT: 1369-1371 Sanchez Street	ZIP CODE: 94131
CROSS STREETS: Cesar Chavez and 27th Streets	

ASSESSORS BLOCK/LOT: 6579 / 027	LOT DIMENSIONS: 26 x 80'	LOT AREA (SQ FT): 2,080	ZONING DISTRICT: RH-2	HEIGHT/BULK DISTRICT: 40-X
------------------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------

OTHER ADDRESS / HISTORIC ADDRESS: (if applicable) 1329-1329-1/2 Sanchez (until around 1910)	ZIP CODE:
--	-----------

3. Property Information

DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: 1883-84(per water tap)	ARCHITECT OR BUILDER: unknown (water tap was established April 1, 1884; 1st resident was in 1883)
---	--

IS PROPERTY INCLUDED IN A HISTORIC SURVEY? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SURVEY NAME:	SURVEY RATING:
---	--------------	----------------

DESIGNATED PROPERTY: Article 10 or Article 11 CA Register National Register

4. Permit History Table

Please list out all building permits issued from the date of construction to present. Attach photocopies of each.

PERMIT:	DATE	DESCRIPTION OF WORK
1.	5/22/1935	Stucco front.
2.	12/29/1958	CANCELLED - Install concrete piers under posts of back porch etc
3.	7/26/1984	Repair stairs and landings, replace stairs & landings 2 stories
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		

Please describe any additional projects or information about a particular project(s) that is not included in this table:

(Attach a separate sheet if more space is needed)

5. Ownership History Table

Please list out all owners of the property from the date of construction to present.

OWNER:	DATES (FROM - TO)	NAME(S)	OCCUPATION
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			

Please describe any additional owners or information about a particular owner(s) that is not included in this table:

See attached.

(Attach a separate sheet if more space is needed)

CASE NUMBER:
 For Staff Use only

6. Occupant History Table

Please list out all occupants/tenants of the property from the date of construction to present.

OCCUP:	DATES (FROM - TO)	NAME(S)	OCCUPATION
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			

Please describe any additional occupants or information about a particular occupant(s) that is not included in this table:

See attached.

(Attach a separate sheet if more space is needed)

7. Property / Architecture Description

Please provide a detailed narrative describing the existing building and any associated buildings on the property. Be sure to describe the architectural style and include descriptions of the non-visible portions of the building. Attach photographs of the building and property, including the rear facade.

See attached.

(Attach a separate sheet if more space is needed)

8. Adjacent Properties / Neighborhood Description

Please provide a detailed narrative describing the adjacent buildings and the buildings on the subject block and the block directly across the street from the subject property. Be sure to describe the architectural styles. Attach photographs of all properties.


(This area contains horizontal lines for writing a detailed narrative.)

(Attach a separate sheet if more space is needed)

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. I understand that other applications and information may be required.


Signature of Applicant

10/10/15
Date

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

William Paschelinsky
Owner / Authorized Agent (circle one)

CASE NUMBER:
 For Staff Use only

Submittal Checklist

The Supplemental Information for Historic Resource Determination must be complete before the Planning Department will accept it and begin review. Please submit this checklist along with the required materials.

CHECKLIST	REQUIRED MATERIALS	NOTES
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Form, with all blanks completed	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Photograph(s) of subject property: Front facade	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Photograph(s) of subject property: Rear facade	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Photograph(s) of subject property: Visible side facades	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Building Permit History (Question 4), with copies of all permits	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Historic Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ownership History (Question 5)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Occupant History (Question 6)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Descriptive narrative of subject building (Question 7)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Photos of adjacent properties and properties across the street along with a descriptive narrative of adjacent properties and the block (Question 8)	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Historic photographs, if applicable	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Original building drawings, if applicable	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other: Periodical articles related to the property, for example, articles on an owner or occupant of the building or of the architect; historic drawings of the building; miscellaneous material that will assist the Preservation Planner make the historical resource determination under CEQA.	

NOTE: Please note that some applications will require additional materials not listed above. The above checklist does not include material needed for CEQA review of other impacts and is solely limited to historic resource analysis. For further information about what must be submitted for CEQA review, please refer to the *Environmental Evaluation Application*.

For Department Use Only

Application received by Planning Department:

By: _____

Date: _____

1. Current Owner / Applicant Information

See primary form

2. Location and Classification

See primary form

3. Property Information

See primary form

4. Permit History Table

See primary form

5. Ownership History Table

Owner	Dates	Name	Occupation
1.	? - 7/29/1886	James Healy	
2.	7/29/1886-1908	Henry Nelson	engineer
3.	1908-11/16/1922	Martin & Bridget Curley	Teamster/driver
4.	11/16/1922-12/10/1924	Thomas & Sarah Sexton	
5.	12/10/1924-10/15/1928	Mary Murphy	
6.	10/15/1928-11/4/1949	Mary Ryan	
7.	11/4/1949-7/11/1950	Annie Magee 1/2 & Walter Magee 1/2	
8.	7/11/1950-4/22/1957	Annie & Matthew Magee	
9.	4/22/1957-1/24/1984	Helen Byrne	
10.	1/24/1984-2014	Irene C. Ellinger	

6. Occupant History Table

1369 Sanchez Street (Formerly addressed 1329 Sanchez until circa 1910)

Occup	Dates	Name	Occupation
1.	1883-1907	Henry C. Nelson	engineer
2.	1908-1922	Martin (Bridget) Curley	driver, teamster
3.	1909	James J Keegan	clerk
4.	1909-1920	William Keegan	porter
5.	1912	Wilson Martin	driver
6.	1921	Thomas Curley	messenger, 1st Nat'l Bank of SF
7.	1932-1935	Hugh (Loretta) Sullivan	cab driver
8.	1937-1982	Loretta Sullivan	widow Hugh
9.	1977	Loretta Sullivan	
10.	1977-1982	Irene C. Ellinger (1369a Sanchez)	

1371 Sanchez Street (Formerly addressed 1329 1/2 Sanchez until circa 1910)

Occup	Dates	Name	Occupation
1.	1899	Bartholomew C Lally	clerk, Murphy, Grant & Co
2.	1901	Erick Cederberg	bricklayer
3.	1902	Patrick Mahoney	porter
4.	1904	William J. Dwyer	shoemaker
5.	1907	William Bodey	plumber Morris Stulsaft Co
6.	1909	John J Ryan	carpenter
7.	1911-1913	Patrick J. Crowley	laborer
8.	1913	Patrick Crowley	
9.	1914	Mrs. Hannah Crowley	widow
10.	1915	Ferdinand (Amelia) Dueball	
11.	1917	Eugene (Anegela M) Killean	boilermaker
12.	1918	Daniel Driscoll	driver
13.	1919-1920	Thomas J Keegan	boilermaker
14.	1920	William Keegan	laborer
15.	1921	Albert B (Calista) Wilgus	
16.	1953	Robert Johnston	
17.	1954	Julius A Rose	
18.	1958	Julius A Rose	
19.	1961-1982	Mrs. Edna Olivera	

7. Property / Architecture Description

1369-1371 Sanchez Street sits on a 2,080 square foot lot on the east side of Sanchez between Cesar Chavez and 27th Streets. This block of Sanchez is level, and the lot slopes down to the east. The building sits back slightly from the front lot line, as do the surrounding buildings. The subject building is detached from its neighbors by a few feet. On the right side, a stuccoed wall with a shaped top houses a paneled wood pedestrian door accessing the side yard area.

1369-1371 Sanchez Street is a two-story over basement rectangular plan two-family residence clad in stucco and capped with a front gable roof concealed behind a parapet. On the left side, a wide terrazzo stair with stucco cheek walls leads to the first-story primary entrance, a shallow vestibule topped by a corbeled arch with raised Art Deco-style stucco ornamentation. The entry vestibule houses two paneled wood doors, both with three vertical lites. Above the primary entrance, there is a wood sash double hung window on the second story. On the right side, a driveway slopes down to a slightly below grade garage entrance featuring a paneled garage door. Above the garage, a square bay spans the right side first and second stories. Below the bay, two posts extend to the ground, framing the driveway. The front facet of the bay

is fenestrated with paired wood sash double hung windows on both stories; the sides of the bay are fenestrated with single windows of the same type. The primary façade terminates with a flat parapet ornamented at the center of the left side and the corners of the bay with raised Art Deco-style stucco devices. The visible portions of the secondary façades are clad in asbestos siding.


8. Adjacent Properties / Neighborhood Description

The subject block contains buildings primarily constructed in the bay-front and flat front Italianate style, with a handful of vernacular buildings. The block was developed between 1900 and 1947. There is some uniformity, but several of the buildings, including the subject building have been heavily modified from their original appearance.

Photographs of Subject Property



Primary façade, 1369-1371 Sanchez Street.



Details, primary entrance, bay windows, and garage.

Permits

BUREAU OF FIRE PREVENTION AND PUBLIC SAFETY
 Construct and Install on Building to Satisfaction of Bureau of Fire Prevention the Following Fire Protection Equipment and Appliances

APPROVED: _____
 Superintendent Bureau of Building Inspection

APPROVED: *5-23-35*
AMK
 City Planning Commission

APPROVED: _____
 Director of Public Health

APPROVED: _____
 Department of Electricity

APPROVED: _____
 Bureau of Engineering

APPROVED: _____
 Art Commission

APPROVED: _____
 Fire Marshal

BUREAU OF FIRE PREVENTION AND PUBLIC SAFETY
 Construct and Install on Building to Satisfaction of Bureau of Fire Prevention the Following Fire Protection Equipment and Appliances

F. D. (Dry) Standpipes _____

Wet Standpipes _____

Hose Reels _____

Tanks _____

Downpipes _____

Automatic Fire Pumps _____

Automatic Sprinkler System _____

Water Service Connection _____

Groundfloor Pipe Ceilings _____

Refrigeration _____

Inclinators _____

APPROVED: _____
 Bureau of Fire Prevention and Public Safety

APPROVED: _____

BLDG. FORM: 3 No. **12376**

APPLICATION OF *P. M. Mager* **Owner**

FOR PERMIT TO MAKE ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS TO BUILDING

Location *369 Larchmont St*

Cost *\$500.00*

Filed **MAY 22 1935** 19

APPROVED: _____
 Superintendent Bureau of Building Inspection

Permit No. _____

Issued _____ 19

Favorable!
Provided
a 6x8 girder
set on 4x6 posts
install in garage, set
on concrete base.
as present floor
joists are unspanned
W.C. Hoffman
5-22-35

P. M. Mager
John Quinn

Write in Ink—File Two Copies

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
BLDG. FORM

CENTRAL PERMIT BUREAU

APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT

3

ALTERATION

1935

Application is hereby made to the Department of Public Works of the City and County of San Francisco for permission to build in accordance with the plans and specifications submitted herewith and according to the description and for the purpose hereinafter set forth:

- (1) Location 1369 Sanchez St.
- (2) For what purpose is present building now used? Swelling
- (3) For what purpose will building be used hereafter? Swelling
- (4) Total Cost \$ 25000
- (5) Description of work to be done. Stucco front

- (6) Contractor (DOES) carry Workmen's Compensation Insurance.
(DOES NOT)
- (7) Supervision of construction by owner

Address

I hereby certify and agree, if a permit is issued, that all the provisions of the BUILDING LAW, THE BUILDING ZONE ORDINANCES, SET BACK LINE REQUIREMENTS AND THE FIRE ORDINANCES OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO and the STATE HOUSING ACT OF CALIFORNIA will be complied with, whether herein specified or not; and I hereby agree to save, indemnify and keep harmless the City and County of San Francisco against all liabilities, judgments, costs and expenses which may in anywise accrue against said city and county in consequence of the granting of this permit, or from the use or occupancy of any sidewalk, street or sub-sidewalk placed by virtue thereof, and will in all things strictly comply with the conditions of this permit.

- (8) Architect none
Certificate No. _____ License No. _____
State of California _____ City and County of San Francisco _____

Address

- (9) Engineer none
Certificate No. _____ License No. _____
State of California _____ City and County of San Francisco _____

Address

- (10) Plans and specifications prepared by none
Other than Architect or Engineer
Address _____

- (11) Contractor San Works
License No. _____ License No. _____
State of California _____ City and County of San Francisco _____

Address

- (12) Owner J. Magee
Address 2160 - 15th St San Francisco

By _____ Owner's Authorized Agent.

THE DEPARTMENT WILL CALL UP TELEPHONE NO. _____
IF ANY ALTERATIONS OR CHANGES ARE NECESSARY ON THE PLANS SUBMITTED.

OFFICIAL COPY

BLDG. FORM
 No. 657
 3 APPLICATION OF
 [Signature]

FOR PERMIT TO MAKE
 ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS or REPAIRS
 TO BUILDING

Location 1217 Broadway St
San Francisco

Total Cost \$ 2,500.00

Filed 1918

Approved: _____

CANCELLED

see report

Supervisor, Bureau of Building Inspection
 Permit No. _____
 Issued _____

REFER TO:
 Bureau of Engineering
 FBI Struct. Engineer
 Boiler Inspector
 Art Commission
 Dept. of Public Health

Approved 6-17 1917

I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various Bureaus or Departments noted herein.
 [Signature]
 Building Inspector, Bureau of Building Inspection
 Officer or Authorized Agent

Approved: _____
 Department of Public Health

Approved: _____
 Electrical Inspector

Approved: _____
 Art Commission

Approved: _____
 Boiler Inspector

Approved: _____
 Bureau of Engineering

Approved: [Signature]
 Zone _____
 CPC Subvaca.
 FOR RESIDENTIAL USE ONLY.
 NO INCREASE IN DWELLING UNITS
 WITHOUT CORRESPONDING INCREASE
 IN OFF-STREET PARKING SPACES
 JUN 14 1958
 Department of City Planning

Approved: [Signature]
 Bureau of Fire Prevention & Public Safety
 JUN 6 20 58

Approved: _____
 Structural Engineer, Bureau Building Inspection

OFFICIAL COPY

Write in Ink—File Two Copies

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
CENTRAL PERMIT BUREAU

RECEIVED
DEPT. OF PUBLIC WORKS
CENTRAL PERMIT BUREAU
JUN 19 AM 8:29

APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS, OR REPAIRS

INSPECTION

Application is hereby made to the Department of Public Works of San Francisco for permission to build in accordance with the plans and specifications submitted herewith and according to the descriptions and for the purpose hereinafter set forth:

- (1) Location 1369 Sundry St.
- (2) Total Cost \$ 2,500.00 (3) No. of stories 2 (4) Basement Yes
- (5) Present use of building Residential (6) No. of families 2
- (7) Proposed use of building Res. (8) No. of families 2
- (9) Type of construction 5 (10) #18 Building Code Occupancy Classification
- (11) Any other building on lot 30 (Must be shown on plot plan if answer is Yes.)
Yes or No
- (12) Does this alteration create an additional floor of occupancy Yes
Yes or No
- (13) Does this alteration create an additional story to the building Yes
Yes or No
- (14) Electrical work to be performed Yes Plumbing work to be performed Yes
Yes or No Yes or No
- (15) Ground floor area of building _____ sq. ft. (16) Height of building _____ ft.

(17) Describe Work to be done (in addition to reference to drawings & specifications).
Install concrete fire under parts of back porch, concrete step under stairs, remove any and all party is rotten

- (18) No portion of building or structure or scaffolding used during construction, to be closer than 6'0" to any wire containing more than 750 volts. See Sec. 365, California Penal Code.
- (19) Supervision of construction by _____ Address _____
- (20) General contractor W. S. Lawson California License No. 42438 B1
Address 846 Bellona Ave.
- (21) Architect _____ California Certificate No. _____
Address _____
- (22) Engineer _____ California Certificate No. _____
Address _____

(23) I hereby certify and agree that if a permit is issued for the construction described in this application, all the provisions of the permit and all laws and ordinances applicable thereto will be complied with. I further agree to save San Francisco and its officials and employees harmless from all costs and damages which may accrue from use or occupancy of the sidewalk, street or subsidewalk space or from anything else in connection with the work included in the permit. The foregoing covenant shall be binding upon the owner of said property, the applicant, their heirs, successors and assignees.

- (24) Owner Paul Ellinger (Phone _____) (For Contact by Bureau)
Address 1369 Sundry St. San Francisco
By _____ Address _____
Owner's Authorized Agent to be Owner's Authorized Architect, Engineer or General Contractor.

OFFICIAL COPY



APPROVED FOR ISSUANCE
DATE: JUL 23 1984
APPROVED BY: (Signature)

FILE NO: 318
APPROVAL NUMBER: 00000100

CONTACT DISTRICT INSPECTOR NAMED ON FACE OF APPLICATION AT START OF WORK (TELEPHONE NO. 861-5000). THIS APPLICATION IS APPROVED WITHOUT THE INSPECTOR'S AND DOES NOT CONSTITUTE AN ENDORSEMENT OF THE WORKING WORK AUTHORIZED HEREIN OR ANY OTHER ACCORDANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE CODES.

APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

FORM 3 PRE-APPROVAL SITE INSPECTION REQUIRED
FORM 8 OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUANCE
NUMBER OF PLAN SETS: 2

APPLICATION IS APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS TO BE BUILT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PERMITS SUBMITTED HEREIN AND ACCORDING TO THE DESIGN AND FOR THE PURPOSES INDICATED SET FORTH HEREIN.

OWNER: Sanchez 1369
JOB NO: 518603
JOB PERIOD COST: 7/26/84
JOB PERIOD COST: 9,000
JOB PERIOD COST: SP

INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY ALL APPLICANTS

DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING: 2 Garage
DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION: 2 Wood Deck
Richard Gardner, 18507 CLIFTON WY Castro Valley, CA 94546
REPAIR STAIRS and landings, REPLACE STAIRS & LANDING & STAIRS

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION - FORM 3 APPLICANTS ONLY

YES - NO
17) DOES THE APPLICANT OWN THE BUILDING? YES
18) IS THIS A RES. USE? YES
19) DOES THE ALTERATION CREATE OR INCREASE THE EXISTING TO BE REPAIR? YES
20) WILL BUILDING BEING REPAIR BE USED FOR BUSINESS OR PROFESSIONAL PURPOSES? NO
21) IS THIS A RES. USE? YES
22) ARE OTHER EXISTING BLDG ON ADJACENT LOTS? NO
23) DOES THE APPLICANT OWN THE BUILDING? YES

IMPORTANT NOTICES

No change shall be made in the character of the occupancy or use without first obtaining a Building Permit authorizing such change. See San Francisco Building Code and San Francisco Planning Code. No portion of building or structure or scaffolding used during construction, to be above 40' or any one containing more than 750 sq. ft. See Sec. 383, California Penal Code.

NOTICE TO APPLICANT

HOLD HARMLESS CLAUSE: The Permittee(s) by acceptance of the permit, agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the City and County of San Francisco from and against any and all claims, demands and actions for damages resulting from operations under the permit, regardless of negligence of the City and County of San Francisco, and to assume the defense of the City and County of San Francisco against all such claims, demands and actions.

CHECK APPROPRIATE BOX
OWNER ARCHITECT ENGINEER
LESSOR AGENT WITH POWER OF ATTORNEY
CONTRACTOR ATTORNEY IN FACT

Richard Gardner 7/26/84
Date

OFFICIAL COPY

SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF
BUILDING INSPECTION

CONDITIONS AND STIPULATIONS

APPROVED:	BUILDING INSPECTOR, BUR. OF BLDG. INSP.	DATE: _____ REASON: _____ NOTIFIED MR. _____
APPROVED:	DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING	DATE: _____ REASON: _____ NOTIFIED MR. _____
APPROVED:	BUREAU OF FIRE PREVENTION & PUBLIC SAFETY	DATE: _____ REASON: _____ NOTIFIED MR. _____
APPROVED:	CIVIL ENGINEER, BUR. OF BLDG. INSPECTION	DATE: _____ REASON: _____ NOTIFIED MR. _____
APPROVED:	BUREAU OF ENGINEERING	DATE: _____ REASON: _____ NOTIFIED MR. _____
APPROVED:	DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH	DATE: _____ REASON: _____ NOTIFIED MR. _____
APPROVED:	REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY	DATE: _____ REASON: _____ NOTIFIED MR. _____
APPROVED:	RESIDENTIAL INSPECTOR, DIV. OF APT. & HOTEL INSP. B.E.I.	DATE: _____ REASON: _____ NOTIFIED MR. _____
APPROVED:		DATE: _____ REASON: _____ NOTIFIED MR. _____

OFFICE COPY


HOLD SECTION — NOTE DATES AND NAMES OF ALL PERSONS NOTIFIED DURING PROCESSING

I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various bureaus or departments noted on this specification, and attached statements of conditions or stipulations, which are hereby made a part of this application.


Notional signature

OWNER'S AUTHORIZED AGENT


Sanborn Maps




1886 Sanborn Map: Subject property noted with arrow (listed as 1329 Sanchez)




1900 Sanborn Map: Subject property noted with arrow (listed as 1329-1329 1/2 Sanchez)




1905 Sanborn Map: Subject property noted with arrow (listed as 1329-1329 1/2 Sanchez)



1914 Sanborn Map: subject property noted with arrow.




1938 Aerial photograph: Subject property noted with arrow.



1950 Sanborn Map: subject property noted with arrow

Adjacent and Facing Properties


East Side of Sanchez Street




West Side of Sanchez Street



1886 Sanborn vol 5 sheet 135b



1900 Sanborn vol sheet 648



(This page intentionally left blank)

APPLICATION FOR Discretionary Review

1. Owner/Applicant Information

DR APPLICANT'S NAME: SUE C. HESTOR		
DR APPLICANT'S ADDRESS: 870 MARKET STREET	ZIP CODE: 94102	TELEPHONE: (415) 846-1024
PROPERTY OWNER WHO IS DOING THE PROJECT ON WHICH YOU ARE REQUESTING DISCRETIONARY REVIEW NAME: WILLIAM PASHELINSKY		
ADDRESS: 1937 HAYES STREET SF CA	ZIP CODE: 94117	TELEPHONE: (415) 379-3676
CONTACT FOR DR APPLICATION: Same as Above <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
ADDRESS:	ZIP CODE:	TELEPHONE: ()
E-MAIL ADDRESS: hestor@earthlink.net		

2. Location and Classification

STREET ADDRESS OF PROJECT: 1369 SANCHEZ STREET		ZIP CODE: 94131
CROSS STREETS: 27th + CESAR CHAVEZ STREETS		
ASSESSORS BLOCK/LOT: 6579 1027	LOT DIMENSIONS:	LOT AREA (SQ FT): 2,098
ZONING DISTRICT: RH-2		HEIGHT/BULK DISTRICT: 40 X

3. Project Description

Please check all that apply
Change of Use Change of Hours New Construction Alterations Demolition Other

Additions to Building: Rear Front Height Side Yard

Present or Previous Use: **TWO UNIT RESIDENCE**

Proposed Use: **ONE VERY LARGE UNIT + ONE SMALL UNIT**

Building Permit Application No. **2015.0819.47.09**

Date Filed: **8.20.2015**

RECEIVED

AUG 22 2016

CITY & COUNTY OF S.F.
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
PIC

4. Actions Prior to a Discretionary Review Request

Prior Action	YES	NO
Have you discussed this project with the permit applicant?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Did you discuss the project with the Planning Department permit review planner?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Did you participate in outside mediation on this case?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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.

N/A

Discretionary Review Request

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

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

SEE ATTACHED
PAGES 1-4

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

SEE ATTACHED
PAGE 4

3. What alternatives or changes to the proposed project, beyond the changes (if any) already made would respond to the exceptional and extraordinary circumstances and reduce the adverse effects noted above in question #1?

SEE ATTACHED
PAGE 4-5

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: *Sue C Heston*

Date: 8/23/14

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

SUE C HESTON
Owner Authorized Agent (circle one)

CASE NUMBER:
For Staff Use only

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Address labels (original), if applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Address labels (copy of the above), if applicable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Photocopy of this completed application	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Photographs that illustrate your concerns	<input type="checkbox"/>
Convenant or Deed Restrictions	<input type="checkbox"/>
Check payable to Planning Dept.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Letter of authorization for agent	<input type="checkbox"/>
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)	<input type="checkbox"/>

NOTES:

Required Material.

Optional Material.

Two sets of original labels and one copy of addresses of adjacent property owners and owners of property across street.

RECEIVED

AUG 22 2016

CITY & COUNTY OF S.F.
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
P I C

For Department Use Only

Application received by Planning Department:

By: _____

Date: _____

B | 22 | 16

Question 1

Planning Code Section 209.1 defines housing in the RH-2 Districts as follows:

"These Districts are devoted to one-family and two-family houses with the latter commonly consisting of two large flats, one occupied by the owner and the other available for rental."

The reconfiguration of these flats at 1369-1371 Sanchez Street by the proposed project completely contradicts this definition in the Planning Code for RH-2 zoning. If approved as proposed this project will be transformed into one very large unit, comparable to a single family home and one very small, marginal unit comparable to what was formerly known as an in-law unit, now known as ADUs.

This fact alone makes this proposed project Extraordinary and Exceptional and justifies the San Francisco Planning Commission accepting this Request for Discretionary Review.

The project will reduce the square footage of the family sized flat, currently located above the ground floor, located above the garage and the basement storage space, into a marginal unit. The flat will become a unit reduced in size and re-located to the ground level, located behind the garage and primarily within the footprint of the existing basement storage space, thereby transformed by this alteration permit application into a very small one bedroom unit, unsuitable for a family. The existing flat will be lost. Right now each flat at 1369-1371 Sanchez Street is just like family units that have been approved in new large, multi-unit residential buildings. The new and reduced unit in this proposed project, due to its size and location, is more like an ADU, with reduced access to light and air, as well as reduced in size.

The existing lower flat at 1371 Sanchez Street is currently suitable for a family per the Planning Code definition of family housing which is contained in the

Housing Element of the SF Master Plan, just as the upper existing flat at 1369 Sanchez Street which will be enlarged, is currently in its layout and square footage equally suitable as family housing.

It is very concerning that the new, smaller unit as proposed by the project would potentially *not* be available for rental on the open market, even in the reduced size, but would more likely be used as an extension of the enlarged second unit, either as guest quarters or work space/home office space or potentially be used as a short term rental. In any of these scenarios the two flats would become a single family home.

It is common sense to assume this would happen. This has happened with similar projects, thereby becoming basically a de facto unit merger, regardless of the provisions of Section 317 (b) (7) which is ostensibly to prevent a unit merger even while allowing for a reduction in unit size. This is a loophole that requires the discretion of the Planning Commission to prevent the loss of this flat and the loss of a unit of family-sized housing.

Additionally it is Extraordinary and Exceptional that the design of the project changes the character of the block and conflicts with the Preservation Policies of the Planning Code Section 101.1 to preserve neighborhood character.

With regard to the RDGs, the proposed project changes the character of the street with the radical facade alteration from a very classic, well maintained, Art Deco facade that dates from 1935; the complete transformation of the windows located on the public street; the use of conflicting materials on the facade compared with the adjacent properties and the entire block. Also there is a prevailing pattern on the block, with spacing between the property and the home immediately to the south due to the filling in of what the project description on the Section 311 Notice calls, the alley space/side yard space. (see attached photos.)

The specific RDGs that are not met by this project are on pages 44-45, 47, 15, and 9 of the Guidelines.

Page 44-45: The proposed windows do not contribute to architectural character, as the window size is out of proportion and the windows are not comparable with other windows on the block face.

Page 47: The modern facade material will not be comparable with surrounding material on the existing block face. These building facades and form currently are pre-WW II, not the current generic style.

Page 15: The proposed project does not respect the existing side spacing due to the loss of the side alley/side yard.

Page 9: The defined visual character is an obvious and unified character based on age, proportions, form, and texture. It is a very nice block, of older, modest homes that complement one another. There is a unity in roof lines as well.

Additionally the Categorical Exemption Preservation Comments from 2015, incorrectly identified the location of this site, stating it was on the southern edge of the Diamond Heights neighborhood. The only relation to Diamond Heights would be that these flats are in Noe Valley which is primarily to the east of Diamond Heights. While the zip code for this area is 94131, which is the Diamond Heights Post Office, this pair of flats is situated the heart of Noe Valley, sometimes more specifically called, Upper Noe Valley which is the name of the nearby Recreation and Park facility at Day Street several blocks to the south. These flats are on Sanchez Street, located at the bottom of the hilly part of the neighborhood that is also Noe Valley, all in the heart of the historic Horner's Addition.

Further, the Planning Department in 2014 concluded that a section of homes on 27th Street near Noe Street, which is less than 2 blocks away, is a Potential Historic District. This 1300 block of Sanchez Street could also be a potential Historic District. This pair of flats with their 1935 facade complements the Victorian cottages to the south of the site. This is currently a very historically

intact block with a frontage that has an integrity between all the homes that would be greatly compromised by the demo of the current facade. Please see page 9 of the RDGs regarding Defined Visual Character as also mentioned above.

Question 2

The proposed project includes a roof deck. There are no adjacent roof decks, or apparently any other roof decks nearby. By filling in the alley space/side yard space on the south side of this pair of flats, a change is created in the pattern on the block face that will cause the loss of the historic semi-detached spacing between the proposed project and the house to the south at 1375 Sanchez, which raises privacy issues as well as design issues. Additionally there are other houses on this block that have side spacing or modified breeze ways between them. (See attached photos)

Question 3

The Commission should take DR and approve an alteration permit for the project that maintains the existing square footage of both units and keeps them as a pair of flats...full sized, stacked flats. The address of this project is 1369-1371 Sanchez Street, not just 1369 Sanchez as listed in the 311 Notice. Or another change could be an alteration permit that allows the increase in size of the lower flat within the footprint of the structure. Or an alteration permit that allows an ADU under the recently passed legislation, while maintaining the existing square footage of each flat at 1369 and 1371. If such an ADU was approved by the Planning Commission given the existing alley space/ side yard space, there could easily be a separate entrance for this unit, which is a criterion for ADUs in the ADU handbook.

The 1935 facade should be retained. It should not be demolished. This would

include the gabled roof behind the false parapet. This gabled roof is currently visible from Sanchez Street. (See attached photos). The adjacent home to the north at 1363 Sanchez Street also has a gabled roof behind a parapet. The alley space/side yard space should also be maintained on the south side of the flats as it currently is due to the pattern on the block as discussed above.

SUPERBAM
1369-1371
SANTANA

CABLE BOX

POTENTIAL
HISPANIC BIRTH
VICINIAN
CROSSINGS

08/15

SPACED
SPACED
BETWEEN
BUILDINGS

~~SPACED~~
SPACE
BETWEEN
BUILDINGS

SUBJECT
PAPER
1309-1371
SANDER
CLASSIC
ALG-DE SO FAYARD

~~SPACED~~
SPACED



08/15



SLIP
PERAPEN
BUILDINGS
ON PUSK

08/15



PROPERTY ON SUBJECT 1371
PROPERTY ON SUBJECT
STANISLAW STANCIK
1369
PROPERTY ON SUBJECT 1369
STANISLAW STANCIK
PROPERTY ON SUBJECT 1369
STANISLAW STANCIK
PROPERTY ON SUBJECT 1369
STANISLAW STANCIK
PROPERTY ON SUBJECT 1369
STANISLAW STANCIK

08/15

**Before the
San Francisco Planning Commission**

**PROJECT SPONSOR'S SUBMITTAL IN OPPOSITION TO
APPLICATION FOR DISCRETIONARY REVIEW REGARDING
TWO - FAMILY HOME ALTERATION**

1369 Sanchez Street

Project Sponsor:

Luba Troyanovsky

Building Permit Application 2015.08.19.4709

Hearing Date: April 27, 2017

Attorneys for Project Sponsors:

REUBEN, JUNIUS & ROSE, LLP

One Bush Street, Suite 600, San Francisco, CA 94104
t] 415 567 9000 f] 415 399 9480

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. INTRODUCTION 1

B. SITE INFORMATION 1

C. THE DR APPLICANT HAS FAILED TO SATISFY HER BURDEN OF PROOF – THERE ARE NO EXCEPTIONAL OR EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES THAT JUSTIFY DISCRETIONARY REVIEW2

D. RESPONSE TO DISCRETIONARY REVIEW APPLICANT’S CONCERNS2

E. CONCLUSION3

LIST OF EXHIBITS5

A. INTRODUCTION

Luba Troyanovsky (“**Project Sponsor**”) proposes to alter a two-family home (“**Project**”) at 1369 Sanchez Street (“**Project Site**”) to add 91 sq. ft. on each of three floors, for a total of 273 sq. ft., all within a side yard, and rearrange the space. The proposed addition is in context with the other homes on the block, and is permitted as of right by the Planning Code. Many of the homes on this block have substantially the same height and larger massing than the proposal.

The remodel project includes three new bedrooms and two new bathrooms at the third floor, and a horizontal expansion of the first floor. The first floor unit will maintain 95% of the area of the current second floor unit, which substantially addresses the DR Applicant’s concerns.

But for the DR Applicant's application for discretionary review, this addition would have been administratively approved. The Residential Design Team (“**RDT**”) has reviewed and approved the proposed Project twice. Further, the RDT, Planning staff and management are presenting the DR request to the Commission as an abbreviated DR, indicating that they find the DR request to be without merit.

No DR Applicant from the neighborhood is involved. The only address given for the DR applicant is “870 Market Street”. The person who filed the DR has never contacted the Project Sponsor nor responded to email. This alone should disqualify the DR Applicant and certainly justifies dismissal. The DR process is intended to provide an opportunity to neighbors to participate in the design review process. We are not aware of any neighbors being involved in this DR.

B. SITE INFORMATION

Street Address:	1369 Sanchez Street
Cross Streets:	Cesar Chavez and 27 th Street
Assessor's Block/Lot:	6579/027
Zoning District:	RH-2 (Residential – two-family)
Height and Bulk District:	40-X
Proposed Use:	Residential, two-family (No change)
Proposed Addition:	Horizontal Side yard addition, 3ft. 6” x 26 ft. (Total 91 sq. ft.)

C. THE DR APPLICANT HAS FAILED TO SATISFY HER BURDEN OF PROOF - THERE ARE NO EXCEPTIONAL OR EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES THAT JUSTIFY DISCRETIONARY REVIEW

The Planning Commission's authority to review permits on a case-by-case basis under "Discretionary Review" (Municipal Code of the City and County of San Francisco, Part III, Section 26(a)¹ must be carefully exercised. In 1943, the California Supreme Court held that the San Francisco Board of Permit Appeals, pursuant to the above-referenced Section 26(a), had the authority to exercise its "sound discretion" in granting or denying building permits (*See Lindell Co. v. Board of Permit Appeals* (1943) 23 Cal.2d 303). In 1954, then San Francisco City Attorney Dion R. Holm issued Opinion No. 845, in which he opined that the Planning Commission has similar discretion to grant or deny building permits. However, the City Attorney cautioned the Planning Commission with respect to the judicious exercise of this discretion. In his opinion, the City Attorney stated as follows:

"I think it is entirely plain, on the authority of the above-enunciated general principles, that the reservation of authority in the present ordinances to deal in a special manner with exceptional cases is unassailable upon constitutional grounds . . . this is, however, a sensitive discretion and one which must be exercised with the utmost restraint."

(City Attorney Opinion No. 845, p. 8, emphasis in original).

The discretionary review handout provided to the public by the Planning Department reiterates this underlying foundation of the discretionary review power. That publication provides that "discretionary review is a special power of the Commission, outside the normal building permit application approval process. It is supposed to be used only when there are exceptional and extraordinary circumstances associated with a proposed project. The Commission has been advised by the City Attorney that the Commission's discretion is sensitive and must be exercised with utmost constraint." In this case, the Planning Commission should exercise such constraint by approving the Project.

There are no exceptional and extraordinary circumstances in this case that would justify the Planning Commission's exercise of its discretionary review powers. Each of the issues raised by the DR Applicant is meritless. The professional planning staff (Residential Design Team or "RDT") has approved the project twice.

D. RESPONSE TO DISCRETIONARY REVIEW APPLICANT'S CONCERNS

The proposed Project is sensitively designed, and will significantly improve the living space, the interior design, and the structural integrity of the home. No variances have been requested. The proposed Project is consistent with the policies and objectives of the General Plan

¹ Section 26(a) provides that "[I]n the granting or denying of any permit, or the revoking or the refusing to revoke any permit, the granting or revoking power may take into consideration the effect of the proposed business or calling upon surrounding property and upon its residents and inhabitants thereof; and in granting or denying said permit, or revoking or refusing to revoke a permit, may exercise its sound discretion as to whether said permit should be granted, transferred, denied or revoked."

and the Planning Code. The Project will upgrade the home to comply with current Building Code standards, and add livable space at the top. The Project will also allow the removal of the non-conforming egress stair that currently encroaches into the rear yard, thereby improving the mid-block open space.

1. Unit Size

The DR applicant's primary concern is the size of the two units. At the request of the Planning Department staff, the Project Sponsor has recently revised the internal spatial division to expand the lower unit to be substantially the same size as the original second floor unit. The ground floor unit will be 95% of the original size of the second floor unit. The Project Sponsor has also centered the bay and the garage door.

2. Front Alley Fill-in

The DR Applicant asserts a claim that there is a pattern of alleyways on the block. There is no such thing. Of the six buildings on the block, the only other alley is between the last house to the south and its adjacent neighbor. There is one alley on the opposite side of the block.

The Project will therefore provide an upper full- size family units and a lower full –size unit of substantially the same size as the existing upper unit. With these changes incorporated, the claims made by the DR Applicant as to unit size have been fully addressed.

The plan revisions made by Project architect William Pashelinsky are set forth in detail in his attached letter to the Planning Department dated December 14, 2016.

3. Front Façade

The DR Applicant asserts a variety of claims regarding the front façade. In reality, the front façade is not original, is not historic, and is not particularly well done.

E. CONCLUSION

The Project Sponsor's proposed alterations are allowed as a matter of right by the Planning Code, are appropriately sized, are in context with the block, comply with the residential design guidelines, and will improve the design and functionality of the two-family home. The Project will upgrade the home to comply with current Building Code standards, and to add livable space at the top of the home. But for the application for discretionary review, the Project would have been approved administratively.


The DR Applicant has failed to demonstrate any exceptional or extraordinary circumstances that would justify discretionary review. The addition will bring the Project Sponsor's home to approximately the same height as the adjacent homes. The massing of the Project Sponsor's home will continue to be substantially smaller than other homes on the block. There will not be any impact to the DR Applicant, who does not live in the neighborhood.

Accordingly, the Project Sponsor respectfully requests that the Planning Commission deny the request for discretionary review.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully Submitted,

REUBEN, JUNIUS & ROSE, LLP

By: 

David Silverman, Attorney for
Project Sponsor Luba Troyanovsky

Dated: April 5, 2017

Exhibit List

Exhibit A. Project Plans and Renderings

Exhibit B. Photograph of the Existing Structure

Exhibit C. Letter from William Pashelinsky to Planning Department dated December 14, 2017

is of Subject Property



Primary façade, 1369-1371 Sanchez Street.

William Pashelinsky
Architect
1937 Hayes Street
San Francisco, California 94117
(415) 379 3676
Email billpash@gmail.com

December 14th, 2015

San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street
San Francisco, Ca. 94103

Re: 1369 Sanchez Street
Addition and Alterations
San Francisco Ca.94117

P.A. 2015 08 19 4709

Comparison between new (relocated) and existing Unit #1.

The current unit has 114 sq ft of window/glazed door area.
The relocated unit will have 160 sq ft window glazed area.

The rear kitchen window looks into stair with 2 posts directly in front of the window. A 3 sq ft window is located above the shower. The current window at the bedroom and dining room look into the back of the alleyway.

The relocated unit will have a 96 sq ft glazed sliding door that opens into a private landscaped rear yard. There will be a 42 sq ft window at the proposed bedroom.

The current windows are single glazed. The new windows to be thermally glazed and will meet all T 24 Energy requirements.

The area of the existing unit is 881 sq ft
The relocated unit will be 836 sq ft.95% of the original unit.

The building will be upgraded to meet current seismic standards. The existing unit does not.

The plumbing, heating, and electrical systems to be upgraded to meet or exceed current standards. The existing electrical, heating, and plumbing date either to the 1930's or are original.

The building to be upgraded so that the required 1 hour fire resistance separation between units and garage will be provided. The exterior property line walls also to be upgraded to 1 hour construction.

The proposed design will allow for a 3 bedroom design for the upper unit. The upper floor has 2 bedrooms currently. This unit to be moderate sized at 2,349 sq ft. Ideal for family housing in an area that is family focused

April 19, 2017

President Rich Hillis and Members of the Planning Commission
City Hall
Room 400

Re: 1369-1371 Sanchez Street
Request for Discretionary Review.
BPA # 2015.0819.47.09

Dear President Hillis and Fellow Members of the Planning Commission:

This letter is in support of the Request for Discretionary Review. **The proposed project will change a pair of flats into a large single family home. The alteration will consign one full floor flat to the rear of the garage.** This has become the modus operandi in these types of remodels. It is also an important and sensitive issue for the residents of the City and County of San Francisco.

Given the San Francisco housing crisis and the discussions by the Planning Commission concerning densification, Discretionary Review is warranted per the 1954 San Francisco City Attorney Opinion No. 845.

This loss of a full floor, above the garage flat, within a traditional, San Francisco “stacked” pair of flats is Extraordinary and Exceptional. It meets the standard for the Planning Commission to take Discretionary Review. The Planning Commission should revise the project, to resolve the housing issues here, issues that the Commission discusses and votes on week in and week out.

Here are three potential Solutions to resolve the problem of this proposed project that the Commission could use to pass a Motion taking DR:

Solution #1, Maintain the existing pattern of two full sized, stacked units at 1369 Sanchez (top floor or unit #2 per the Project Sponsor’s proposal) and 1371 Sanchez (lower or unit #1 per Project Sponsor’s proposal) and do not move 1371 (unit #1) to the ground level behind the garage.

Solution #2. Approve above Solution #1 and also create an ADU on the ground level, behind the garage, while maintaining the open passage way to the new ADU from Sanchez Street.

Solution #3. Maintain the top floor unit at 1369 Sanchez. Take 1371 Sanchez and incorporate the square footage below this unit (or the space behind the garage on the ground level) to increase the square footage of this unit, which would become a two-level unit.

These solutions are potentially much more conducive to resolving housing issues in San Francisco than the project proposed by the Project Sponsor, as there will be two attractive *family sized units*, with any of the above. In Solution #3, one unit would be larger than the other, with direct access to the backyard. Or under Solution #2, two good sized, traditional units, a pair of flats, with an Accessory Dwelling Unit could be the outcome. And there would still be a garage. Two units or three units. Not one.

In Section 209.1 the definition of RH-2 allows for both single family and two unit building as the zoned neighborhood is:

“....devoted to one-family and two-family houses with the latter commonly consisting of two large flats, one occupied by the owner and the other available for rental.”

As proposed by the Project Sponsor, the reconfiguration of these flats at 1369-1371 Sanchez Street contradicts this definition in the Planning Code for RH-2 zoning.

If approved *as proposed* this project will be transformed into one very large unit, comparable to a single family home and one very small marginal unit that is not required to be marketed and most likely will not be, as Section 317 has no requirement for the reduced unit to be either rented or sold or occupied. Or it could become a short term rental unit.

While Section 317 (b) (7) allows for this to be approved Administratively by Staff, this apparent conflict with Section 209.1 is a collision point that cries out for the Commission to use their powers of Discretionary Review to revise the proposed project. This is the heart of the matter for this DR.

There is one more thing. Please see the four attached photos.

It is also important to consider the impact on neighborhood character of the design of the proposed alteration.

This is a 1935 remodel that is closer to the spirit and the original time of the adjacent buildings on Sanchez Street which are from the first decade of the 20th century. Currently this building is a very nice example of vernacular Art Deco, which is somewhat unusual in Noe Valley and unusual for these Victorians as they are often covered in Kaiser siding or some such thing.

It has very nice stucco work as well, which is often increasingly harder to find good examples of, as these skills are often from an earlier generation of workman. The detail at the roofline (parapet) is very attractive, evocative of the Art Deco era of the 1935 remodel.

It does not obscure the peaked roof, which is visible from Sanchez Street and which will now become a flat roof under the proposal. The fenestration is fine and appropriate for the streetscape. If one were to walk by this site, or even drive by, it is even more apparent than from the photos, what an attractive building this pair of flats is and its compatibility with the other buildings on this side of Sanchez.

As discussed in the DR Request, this proposed project is adjacent to three homes that have the potential to be a Historic District. There is a setback along the south side of the Project Site as there is on the south side of the adjacent property at 1363 Sanchez which also has a peaked roof behind the front parapet.

There is also a street front spacing at the other end of the block nearer to 27th Street. These setbacks and spacings on the side complement the facades of the three cottages, which are a full story lower than 1369-1371 and 1363 Sanchez. Additionally 1363 Sanchez which does have some original details has recently sold. The facade changes of 1369-1371 Sanchez will have a direct determination on any facade changes to 1363. Two 21st century facades may be too much for this block and the Planning Commission should consider this.

These factors are important for compliance with the Residential Design Guidelines. Pages 44-45 (windows on block face); Page 47 (Material on the facade); Page 15 (Side Spacing) and Page 9 (Conflicts with Defined Visual Character over age, proportions, form and texture). And therefore, the proposed design does not meet Neighborhood Character criteria for Section 101.1 (b).

Additionally the roof deck is out of character as there are no roof decks nearby and in order to build the roof deck the historic peaked roof will need to be flattened. Also, by not building a roof deck, more square footage will be available for living space, on the top floor unit, 1369 Sanchez Street.

Sincerely,

Georgia Schuttish
460 Duncan Street

cc: Jonas Ionin
Elizabeth Gordon-Jonckheer
Commissions Secretary

SPACE
~~BETWEEN~~
BETWEEN
BUILDINGS

SUBJECT
PROPERTY
1369-1371
SANTOZ
CLASSIC ART-DECO FACADE

SIDE
ALLEY



08/15

SUBJECT ON 1364-1371
RICHARD SANCHEZ

APARTMENT 1365
RICHARD SANCHEZ

APARTMENT 1366
RICHARD SANCHEZ



08/15

SUBJECT
PROPERTY
1369-1371
SANDWICH

Garage

POTENTIAL
HISTORIC BUICK
VICTORIAN
CARRIAGES



08/15

SPACE
BETWEEN
BUILDINGS
ON
BLOCK



08/15

GENERAL NOTES:

INTENT OF DOCUMENTS:

It is the intent of these Contract Documents to establish a high quality of material and workmanship, but not necessarily to note and call for every last item of work to be done. Any item not specifically covered but deemed necessary for satisfactory completion of the work shall be accomplished by the Contractor in a manner consistent with the quality of the work without additional cost to the Owner. All materials and methods of installation shall be in accordance with industry standards and manufacturers recommendations.

A. All materials and workmanship shall conform to the requirements of the following codes and regulations and any other local and state laws and regulations:

- San Francisco Building Code 2013 Edition
- San Francisco Fire Code 2013 Edition
- San Francisco Plumbing Code 2013 Edition
- San Francisco Electrical Code 2013 Edition
- San Francisco Mechanical Code 2013 Edition

- Verify all existing conditions and dimensions at the project site. Notify the Architect and/or Engineer of any discrepancies before beginning construction.
- B. Provide adequate and proper shoring and bracing to maintain safe conditions at all times. The contractor shall be solely responsible for providing adequate shoring and bracing as required for protection of life and property during the construction of the project.
- C. At all times the Contractor shall be solely and completely responsible for all conditions at the jobsite, including safety of persons and property, and all necessary independent engineering reviews of these conditions. The Architects jobsite reviews are not intended nor shall they be construed to include a review of the adequacy of the contractors safety measures.
- D. Unless otherwise shown or noted, all typical details shall used where applicable.
- E. All details shall be construed typical at similar conditions.
- F. All Drawing conflicts shall be brought to the attention of the Architect and/or Consulting Engineer for clarification before work proceeds.
- G. The Contractor shall supply all labor, materials, equipment and services, including water and power, necessary for the proper execution of the work shown on these drawings. All materials shall be new and workmanship shall be good quality. All workman and subcontractors shall be skilled in their trade. Any inspections, special or otherwise, that are required by the building codes, local building departments, on these plans shall be done by an independent inspection company.
- H. Finishes: Replace patch, repair and refinish all existing surfaces affected by the new work. All new finishes shall match the adjacent surface. all surfaces shall align.
- I. The General Contractor shall visit the site and familiarize themselves with the existing site conditions prior to finalizing of any proposal to the owner. The general Contractor shall be responsible to inform the owner or Architect of potential existing conditions that need to be addressed and or modified in order to complete the work as herein described in these Drawings.
- J. The General Contractor shall be responsible for all means and methods of construction including but not limited to leveling, shimming, and blocking. The General Contractor shall make specific note of such items that can not be known prior to the commencement of construction.

DRAWING INDEX:

- A 1.01 SITE AND ROOF PLAN, GENERAL NOTES, AND DRAWING INDEX
- A 1.02 SITE AND ROOF PLANS
- A 1.03 DEMOLITION ANALYSIS
- A 2.01 FLOOR PLANS EXISTING
- A 2.02 FLOOR PLANS PROPOSED
- A 2.03 FLOOR PLANS PROPOSED
- A 3.01 EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS
- A 3.02 EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS
- A 3.03 EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS
- A 3.04 EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS
- A 4.01 BUILDING SECTIONS

PROJECT INFORMATION:

ZONING: RH-2
 OCCUPANCY R-3
 PROPOSED USE: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE
 CONSTRUCTION TYPE: 5-B
 BLOCK 6579 LOT 027
 SCOPE OF WORK:
 REMODEL FRONT ELEVATION.
 HORIZONTAL ADDITION AT SOUTH.
 PROVIDE 3 NEW BEDROOMS AND 2 NEW BATHROOMS AT 3RD FLOOR.
 REMODEL KITCHEN AND ADD VANITY AT 2ND FLOOR.
 RELOCATE UNIT #1 FROM 2ND TO 1ST FLOOR.
 NEW ROOF DECK.

ABBREVIATIONS:

@	AT	HGT./HT.	HEIGHT
CL	CENTERLINE	INSUL.	INSULATION
Ø	DIAMETER OR ROUND	MFG.	MANUFACTURING
(E)	EXISTING	MAX.	MAXIMUM
(N)	NEW	MTL.	METAL
(R)	REPLACE	MIN.	MINIMUM
AFF	ABOVE FINISH FLOOR	O.C.	ON CENTER
BM.	BEAM	PR.	PAIR
BLDG.	BUILDING	PKT.	POCKET
CBC	CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE	P.T.	PRESSURE TREATED
CLR.	CLEAR	REF.	REFRIGERATOR
CLOS.	CLOSET	REQ'D	REQUIRED
CONC.	CONCRETE	REQ'T	REQUIREMENT
DECK'G	DECKING	RTG.	RETAINING
DET.	DETAIL	R & S	ROD AND SHELF
DIA.	DIAMETER	RM.	ROOM
DISP.	DISPOSAL	SIM.	SIMILAR
DW.	DISHWASHER	S.C.	SOLID CORE
DR.	DOOR	SQ. FT.	SQUARE FOOT/FEET
DBL.	DOUBLE	STOR.	STORAGE
DN.	DOWN	STRUCT.	STRUCTURAL
DRWGS.	DRAWINGS	TEMP.	TEMPERED
D	DRYER	TRANS.	TRANSPARENT
EA.	EACH	TYP.	TYPICAL
F	FAHRENHEIT	U.O.N.	UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED
FIN.	FINISH	V.I.F.	VERIFY IN FIELD
F.R.	FIRE RATED	W	WASHER
FLR.	FLOOR	WH.	WATER HEATER
FT.	FOOT OR FEET	WP	WATERPROOF
FR.	FRENCH	WDO.	WINDOW
FURN.	FURNISH	W/	WITH
FURR.	FURRING	WD.	WOOD
GA.	GAUGE		
GL.	GLAZING		
GYP.	GYP SUM		
GYP.BD.	GYP SUM BOARD		

DRAWING SYMBOLS

- DOOR NUMBER
- WINDOW NUMBER
- SKYLIGHT NUMBER
- DRAWING REVISION
- DETAIL NUMBER AND DRAWING REFERENCE
- NOTE/ITEM NUMBER
- GRADE
- PROPERTY LINE
- ELEV. NO. DRAWING REFERENCE

WILLIAM PASHELINSKY ARCHITECT
 1937 HAYES STREET
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94117
 415 379 9676

ADDITION AND ALTERATIONS
 1389 SANCHEZ STREET
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA.


**BUILDING TO BE FULLY FIRE SPRINKLERED PER NFPA 13-R.
 WORK TO BE DONE BY SEPERATE PERMIT**

PROJECT STATISTICS

	UNIT 1	UNIT 2	STORAGE/GARAGE	TOTAL
EXISTING:				
1ST FLOOR	0	0	851 SQ FT	851 SQ FT
2ND FLOOR	887 SQ FT	106 SQ FT	33	1,015 SQ FT
3RD FLOOR	0 SQ FT	1,035 SQ FT	0	1,035 SQ FT
TOTAL BUILDING:	887 SQ FT	1,141 SQ FT	884 SQ FT	2,912 SQ FT
NEW:				
1ST FLOOR	836 SQ FT	46	217 SQ FT	1,099 SQ FT
2ND FLOOR	0 SQ FT	1,094 SQ FT	0	1,094 SQ FT
3RD FLOOR	0 SQ FT	1,209 SQ FT	0	1,209 SQ FT
TOTAL BUILDING:	836 SQ FT	2,349 SQ FT	217 SQ FT	3,402 SQ FT

EXISTING HABITABLE SPACE: 2,061 SQ FT
 NEW HABITABLE SPACE: 3,133 SQ FT
 TOTAL INCREASE: 1,072 SQ FT

RELOCATE UNIT 1 TO 1ST FLOOR. EXISTING UNIT 1-881 SQ FT
 881X.75= 660 SQ FT REQUIRED MIN
 PROPOSED RELOCATED UNIT IS 836 SQ FT EXCEEDS MIN SQ FT REQUIRED
 836/881=95% OF EXISTING UNIT





VICINITY MAP

ALL IDEAS, DESIGNS, ARRANGEMENTS AND PLANS AS INDICATED OR REPRESENTED BY THIS DRAWING ARE OWNED BY AND ARE THE PROPERTY OF WILLIAM PASHELINSKY ARCHITECT AND WERE CREATED, EVOLVED AND DEVELOPED FOR USE ON, AND IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SPECIFIC PROJECT. NONE OF THESE IDEAS, DESIGNS, ARRANGEMENTS OF PLANS SHALL BE USED BY OR DISCLOSED TO ANY PERSON, FIRM, OR CORPORATION FOR ANY PURPOSE WHATSOEVER WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF WILLIAM PASHELINSKY ARCHITECT

NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION
1	4/1/16	REV


PROJECT NO. 2015.20
 SHEET



ALL IDEAS, DESIGNS, ARRANGEMENTS AND PLANS AS INDICATED OR REPRESENTED BY THIS DRAWING ARE OWNED BY AND ARE THE PROPERTY OF WILLIAM PASHELINSKY ARCHITECT AND WERE CREATED, EVOLVED AND DEVELOPED FOR USE ON, AND IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SPECIFIC PROJECT. NONE OF THESE IDEAS, DESIGNS, ARRANGEMENTS OF PLANS SHALL BE USED BY OR DISCLOSED TO ANY PERSON, FIRM, OR CORPORATION FOR ANY PURPOSE WHATSOEVER WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF WILLIAM PASHELINSKY ARCHITECT


NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION
1	4/1/16	REV
2	4/30/16	REV
3	5/3/16	REV
4	12/14/16	REV

LINEAR FOOTAGE MEASUREMENT




1ST FLOOR PLAN (E)
1/8"=1'-0"

AREA MEASUREMENT HORIZONTAL ELEMENTS




2ND FLOOR PLAN (E)
1/8"=1'-0"


3RD FLOOR PLAN (E)
1/8"=1'-0"




ROOF PLAN (E)
1/8"=1'-0"




WEST ELEVATION (E)
1/8"=1'-0"



EAST ELEVATION (E)
1/8"=1'-0"



NORTH ELEVATION (E)
1/8"=1'-0"



SOUTH ELEVATION (E)
1/8"=1'-0"

LEGEND

- EXISTING TO REMAIN
- DEMOLISH

TABULATION FOR LINEAR FOOTAGE MEASUREMENT

WALL	REMOVED	LENGTH TO REMAIN
A1	0	22.5'
A2	3.5'	0'
B1	0	18'
B2	27.5'	0'
C	26'	0'
D	0	45.5'
TOTAL	57.0'	86.0'

LINEAR FOOTAGE MEASUREMENT

ELEMENT	LENGTH	REMOVED	PERCENT
A FRONT FACADE	26'-0"	3'-6"	14%
C REAR FACADE	26'-0"	26'-0"	100%
TOTAL (B,C)	52'-0"	29'-6"	56%
B SIDE FACADE 1	45'-6"	26'-6"	0%
D SIDE FACADE 2	45'-6"	0	100%
GRAND TOTAL (A,B,C,D)	143'-0"	56'-0"	39% < 65%

AREA MEASUREMENTS

VERTICAL ELEMENTS

ELEVATION	SQ FT	DEMOLISH	PERCENT
FRONT	836 SQ FT	539 SQ FT	64%
REAR	846 SQ FT	116 SQ FT	14%
SIDE 1 NORTH	1,606 SQ FT	244 SQ FT	15%
SIDE 2 SOUTH	1,606 SQ FT	981 SQ FT	61%
VERTICAL TOTAL	4,888 SQ FT	1,880 SQ FT	38% < 50%

HORIZONTAL ELEMENTS

FLOOR	EXISTING	DEMOLISH	PERCENT
2ND FLOOR	1,122 SQ FT	0 SQ FT	0%
3RD FLOOR	1,122 SQ FT	0 SQ FT	0%
ROOF	1,122 SQ FT	1,046 SQ FT	87%
HORIZONTAL TOTAL	3,336 SQ FT	1,046 SQ FT	31% < 50%

DEMOLITION ANALYSIS

WILLIAM PASHELINSKY ARCHITECT
1937 HAYES STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94117
415 379 3676
wpash@gmail.com


ADDITION AND ALTERATIONS
1388 SANCHEZ STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA

ALL IDEAS, DESIGNS, ARRANGEMENTS AND PLANS AS INDICATED OR REPRESENTED BY THIS DRAWING ARE OWNED BY AND ARE THE PROPERTY OF WILLIAM PASHELINSKY ARCHITECT AND WERE CREATED, EVOLVED AND DEVELOPED FOR USE ON, AND IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SPECIFIC PROJECT. NONE OF THESE IDEAS, DESIGNS, ARRANGEMENTS OF PLANS SHALL BE USED BY OR DISCLOSED TO ANY PERSON, FIRM, OR CORPORATION FOR ANY PURPOSE WHATSOEVER WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF WILLIAM PASHELINSKY ARCHITECT


NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION
1	4/1/16	REV
2	4/30/16	REV
3	1/03/17	REV

PROJECT NO. 2014.41
SHEET


ADDITION AND ALTERATIONS
 1389 SANCHEZ STREET
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA.



1ST FLOOR PLAN (E)
 1/4"=1'-0"



2ND FLOOR PLAN (E)
 1/4"=1'-0"



3RD FLOOR PLAN (E)
 1/4"=1'-0"



WALL LEGEND


EXISTING WALL:

DEMOLISH:



ALL IDEAS, DESIGNS, ARRANGEMENTS AND PLANS AS INDICATED OR REPRESENTED BY THIS DRAWING ARE OWNED BY AND ARE THE PROPERTY OF WILLIAM PASHELINSKY ARCHITECT AND WERE CREATED, EVOLVED AND DEVELOPED FOR USE ON, AND IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SPECIFIC PROJECT. NONE OF THESE IDEAS, DESIGNS, ARRANGEMENTS OF PLANS SHALL BE USED BY OR DISCLOSED TO ANY PERSON, FIRM, OR CORPORATION FOR ANY PURPOSE WHATSOEVER WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF WILLIAM PASHELINSKY ARCHITECT

NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION
1	4/1/16	REV


ADDITION AND ALTERATIONS
 1389 SANCHEZ STREET
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA



1ST FLOOR PLAN (N)
 1/4"=1'-0"




2ND FLOOR PLAN (N)
 1/4"=1'-0"



ALL IDEAS, DESIGNS, ARRANGEMENTS AND PLANS AS INDICATED OR REPRESENTED BY THIS DRAWING ARE OWNED BY AND ARE THE PROPERTY OF WILLIAM PASHELINSKY ARCHITECT AND WERE CREATED, EVOLVED AND DEVELOPED FOR USE ON, AND IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SPECIFIC PROJECT. NONE OF THESE IDEAS, DESIGNS, ARRANGEMENTS OF PLANS SHALL BE USED BY OR DISCLOSED TO ANY PERSON, FIRM, OR CORPORATION FOR ANY PURPOSE WHATSOEVER WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF WILLIAM PASHELINSKY ARCHITECT

NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION
1	4/1/16	PLANNING REV
2	12/14/16	PLANNING REV



ALL IDEAS, DESIGNS, ARRANGEMENTS AND PLANS AS INDICATED OR REPRESENTED BY THIS DRAWING ARE OWNED BY AND ARE THE PROPERTY OF WILLIAM PASHELINSKY ARCHITECT AND WERE CREATED, EVOLVED AND DEVELOPED FOR USE ON, AND IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SPECIFIC PROJECT. NONE OF THESE IDEAS, DESIGNS, ARRANGEMENTS OF PLANS SHALL BE USED BY OR DISCLOSED TO ANY PERSON, FIRM, OR CORPORATION FOR ANY PURPOSE WHATSOEVER WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF WILLIAM PASHELINSKY ARCHITECT


NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION
1	4/1/16	REV
2	4/30/16	REV
3	5/02/16	REV
4	12/14/16	REV



WEST ELEVATION (E)
 1/4"=1'-0"



WEST ELEVATION (N)
 1/4"=1'-0"



1 TYP WINDOW DETAIL


WINDOW SCHEDULE

- DH DOUBLE HUNG
- F FIXED
- C CASEMENT


ALL WINDOWS TO BE
 ALUM CLAD WOOD WINDOWS

ALL IDEAS, DESIGNS, ARRANGEMENTS AND PLANS AS INDICATED OR REPRESENTED BY THIS DRAWING ARE OWNED BY AND ARE THE PROPERTY OF WILLIAM PASHELINSKY ARCHITECT AND WERE CREATED, EVOLVED AND DEVELOPED FOR USE ON, AND IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SPECIFIC PROJECT. NONE OF THESE IDEAS, DESIGNS, ARRANGEMENTS OF PLANS SHALL BE USED BY OR DISCLOSED TO ANY PERSON, FIRM, OR CORPORATION FOR ANY PURPOSE WHATSOEVER WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF WILLIAM PASHELINSKY ARCHITECT

NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION
2	12/5/16	PLANNING REV




EAST ELEVATION (E)
 1/4"=1'-0"




EAST ELEVATION (N)
 1/4"=1'-0"

ALL IDEAS, DESIGNS, ARRANGEMENTS AND PLANS AS INDICATED OR REPRESENTED BY THIS DRAWING ARE OWNED BY AND ARE THE PROPERTY OF WILLIAM PASHELINSKY ARCHITECT AND WERE CREATED, EVOLVED AND DEVELOPED FOR USE ON, AND IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SPECIFIC PROJECT. NONE OF THESE IDEAS, DESIGNS, ARRANGEMENTS OF PLANS SHALL BE USED BY OR DISCLOSED TO ANY PERSON, FIRM, OR CORPORATION FOR ANY PURPOSE WHATSOEVER WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF WILLIAM PASHELINSKY ARCHITECT

NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION




NORTH ELEVATION (E)
 1/4"=1'-0"




NORTH ELEVATION (N)
 1/4"=1'-0"

ALL IDEAS, DESIGNS, ARRANGEMENTS AND PLANS AS INDICATED OR REPRESENTED BY THIS DRAWING ARE OWNED BY AND ARE THE PROPERTY OF WILLIAM PASHELINSKY ARCHITECT AND WERE CREATED, EVOLVED AND DEVELOPED FOR USE ON, AND IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SPECIFIC PROJECT. NONE OF THESE IDEAS, DESIGNS, ARRANGEMENTS OF PLANS SHALL BE USED BY OR DISCLOSED TO ANY PERSON, FIRM, OR CORPORATION FOR ANY PURPOSE WHATSOEVER WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF WILLIAM PASHELINSKY ARCHITECT

NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION




SOUTH ELEVATION (E)
 1/4"=1'-0"



SOUTH ELEVATION (N)
 1/4"=1'-0"

ALL IDEAS, DESIGNS, ARRANGEMENTS AND PLANS AS INDICATED OR REPRESENTED BY THIS DRAWING ARE OWNED BY AND ARE THE PROPERTY OF WILLIAM PASHELINSKY ARCHITECT AND WERE CREATED, EVOLVED AND DEVELOPED FOR USE ON, AND IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SPECIFIC PROJECT. NONE OF THESE IDEAS, DESIGNS, ARRANGEMENTS OF PLANS SHALL BE USED BY OR DISCLOSED TO ANY PERSON, FIRM, OR CORPORATION FOR ANY PURPOSE WHATSOEVER WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF WILLIAM PASHELINSKY ARCHITECT

NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION




SECTION A-A (N)

1/4"=1'-0"

SECTION TAKE AT MIDPOINT OF SITE

ALL IDEAS, DESIGNS, ARRANGEMENTS AND PLANS AS INDICATED OR REPRESENTED BY THIS DRAWING ARE OWNED BY AND ARE THE PROPERTY OF WILLIAM PASHELINSKY ARCHITECT AND WERE CREATED, EVOLVED AND DEVELOPED FOR USE ON, AND IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SPECIFIC PROJECT. NONE OF THESE IDEAS, DESIGNS, ARRANGEMENTS OR PLANS SHALL BE USED BY OR DISCLOSED TO ANY PERSON, FIRM, OR CORPORATION FOR ANY PURPOSE, WHATSOEVER WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF WILLIAM PASHELINSKY ARCHITECT

NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION



SECTION A-A (E)

1/4"=1'-0"

SECTION TAKE AT MIDPOINT
OF SITE

ALL IDEAS, DESIGNS, ARRANGEMENTS AND PLANS AS INDICATED OR REPRESENTED BY THIS DRAWING ARE OWNED BY AND ARE THE PROPERTY OF WILLIAM PASHELINSKY ARCHITECT AND WERE CREATED, EVOLVED AND DEVELOPED FOR USE ON, AND IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SPECIFIC PROJECT. NONE OF THESE IDEAS, DESIGNS, ARRANGEMENTS OF PLANS SHALL BE USED BY OR DISCLOSED TO ANY PERSON, FIRM, OR CORPORATION FOR ANY PURPOSE, WHATSOEVER WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF WILLIAM PASHELINSKY ARCHITECT

NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION

