

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Discretionary Review Abbreviated Analysis

HEARING DATE: APRIL 14, 2016

Date:	April 7, 2016
Case No.:	2015-009100DRP-02
Project Address:	161 HAMERTON AVENUE
Permit Application:	2015.06.23.9711
Zoning:	RH-1 [Residential House, One-Family]
	40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot:	6759/019
Project Sponsor:	Peter Zepponi, Architect
	211 Bella Vista Way
	San Francisco, CA 94127
Staff Contact:	Andrew Perry – (415) 575-9017
	Andrew.Perry@sfgov.org
Recommendation:	Do not take DR and approve as proposed

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

Reception: 415.558.6378

Fax: 415.558.6409

Planning Information: **415.558.6377**

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposal is to construct a horizontal and vertical addition to the existing 2-story over basement, single-family dwelling. At the rear of the building, the project proposes an additional 9'-6" of depth, set back from the southern side property line by 5 feet. Additionally, new decks and stairs to grade at the first and second levels extend beyond the new rear building wall by 16 feet. The new proposed third story would occupy the full building footprint, with the exception of a 7-foot setback from the front building wall, where a roof deck is proposed with 3'-6" width. At the basement level, additional habitable space will be created through excavation at the rear of the building. Lastly, changes to the finish materials and entry sequence are proposed for the front façade.

SITE DESCRIPTION AND PRESENT USE

The project site is located on Lot 019 in Assessor's Block 6759 on the east side of Hamerton Avenue, between Mangels Ave. and Bosworth St. The subject lot is of standard size, measuring 25' x 100', with slight downward and lateral slopes. The existing building was originally constructed in 1947 in Daly City, and moved to its current location in 1966 to make way for the Daly City BART station. The existing building is a two-story over basement, single-family dwelling with one off-street parking space.

SURROUNDING PROPERTIES AND NEIGHBORHOOD

The subject property is located within the Outer Mission neighborhood, in close proximity to the Glen Park neighborhood. The areas surrounding the project site are predominantly residential, characterized by single-family homes, with a few two-family structures also nearby. Buildings are generally between two and three stories in height; the subject block and opposite side of Hamerton Ave. both contain examples of three-story structures. The building immediately to the right (south) is a two-story, single-family dwelling, while the building to the left (north) is a three-story, single-family dwelling.

The Glen Park NCT, Glen Park BART Station, and Glen Park Recreation Center on the southern end of Glen Canyon Park are all within a quarter-mile of the project site.

BUILDING PERMIT NOTIFICATION

ТҮРЕ	REQUIRED PERIOD	NOTIFICATION DATES	DR FILE DATE	DR HEARING DATE	FILING TO HEARING TIME
311 Notice	30 days	December 1, 2015 – December 31, 2015	December 31, 2015	April 14, 2016	105 days (3 months, 14 days)
311 Notice	30 days	December 1, 2015 – December 31, 2015	December 29, 2015	WITHDRAWN	N/A

HEARING NOTIFICATION

ТҮРЕ	REQUIRED PERIOD	REQUIRED NOTICE DATE	ACTUAL NOTICE DATE	ACTUAL PERIOD
Posted Notice	10 days	April 4, 2016	April 4, 2016	10 days
Mailed Notice	10 days	April 4, 2016	April 4, 2016	10 days

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

The comments received in opposition to the project find the proposal to be out of context and out of character with the majority of surrounding dwellings. Specifically, there is opposition to the project's height and depth, believing it will result in a loss of sunlight and privacy, and opposition to the fenestration at the rear of the proposed building, as it will increase light pollution. A second Discretionary Review had originally been filed by the adjacent neighbor to the south; however, additional mullions have been proposed for the windows that face onto the southern property line, which resulted in the withdrawal of the DR. The neighbor to the south has now submitted a letter in support of the project.

DR REQUESTOR

Carrie Messina of 142 Chilton Avenue (6759/005), located to the rear of the subject property and 50 feet to the north.

DR REQUESTOR'S CONCERNS AND PROPOSED ALTERNATIVES

The DR application states that the proposed rear and vertical addition is out of character and context, and incompatible with 90% of the surrounding dwellings. The proposed vertical addition will result in a 4-story mass at the rear of the building, and with the proposed depth of the building will have a significant impact on the DR requestor's property and others on the block. The project will reduce the amount of sunlight in the midblock open space and detract from private enjoyment of neighboring properties. The rear windows and resulting mass will reduce privacy to neighbors and increase light pollution.

As an alternative to the project, the DR requestor suggests eliminating or reducing the size of the upper floor, by setting it back at the rear. Other suggestions include reduction of the height of the deck by one story, and reduction in the size and number of rear windows.

See attached *Discretionary Review Application*, dated December 31, 2015, for more information.

PROJECT SPONSOR'S RESPONSE TO DR APPLICATION

The project is neither exceptional nor extraordinary as there are other buildings on the block and opposite block face that are also three stories in height. Specifically, the neighbor to the north at 149 Hamerton Ave. has a similar mass to the proposed project; the project has no additional effect on the DR requestor's property due to its location behind the existing adjacent structure. Additional mullions have been added to address privacy concerns of the immediate adjacent neighbors, but the project will not otherwise affect privacy beyond what is reasonable in a dense urban environment.

See attached Response to Discretionary Review, dated January 27, 2016, for more information.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

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

RESIDENTIAL DESIGN TEAM REVIEW

The Residential Design Team (RDT) found that the proposed project meets the standards of the Residential Design Guidelines (RDGs) and that the project does not present any exceptional or extraordinary circumstances. The project's massing and scale are compatible with the neighborhood and open railings have been provided for the rear decks, in keeping with the Guidelines.

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

RECOMMENDATION: Do not take DR and approve project as proposed

Attachments: Block Book Map Sanborn Map Zoning Map Aerial Photographs Context Photographs Section 311 Notice CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination DR Application dated December 31, 2015 Response to DR Application dated January 27, 2016 Reduced Plans 3D Renderings Letter in Support of Project

AP: G:\Plan Checks\161 Hamerton Ave\DR Case Report\161 Hamerton Ave_DR - Abbreviated Analysis.doc

Exhibits

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT



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

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Zoning Map



Aerial Photo (oriented north)



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Aerial Photo (oriented west)



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Site Photo (from Hamerton Avenue)



(from Chilton Avenue looking at the rear of the property)



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1650 Mission Street Suite 400 San Francisco. CA 94103

NOTICE OF BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION (SECTION 311)

On **June 23**, **2015**, the Applicant named below filed Building Permit Application No. **2015.06.23.9711** with the City and County of San Francisco.

PROP	ERTY INFORMATION	APPL	ICANT INFORMATION
Project Address:	161 Hamerton Avenue	Applicant:	Peter Zepponi
Cross Street(s):	Bosworth / Mangels	Address:	211 Bella Vista Way
Block/Lot No.:	6759/019	City, State:	San Francisco, CA 94127
Zoning District(s):	RH-1 / 40-X	Telephone:	(415) 334-2868

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

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

PROJECT SCOPE				
Demolition	New Construction	□ Alteration		
Change of Use	Façade Alteration(s)	Front Addition		
☑ Rear Addition	□ Side Addition	Vertical Addition		
PROJECT FEATURES	EXISTING	PROPOSED		
Building Use	Residential	Residential		
Front Setback	4 feet	No Change		
Building Depth	45 feet	54' – 6"		
Rear Yard	51 feet	41' - 6"		
Building Height	23 feet	32' – 6"		
Number of Stories	2	3		
Number of Dwelling Units	1	No Change		
Number of Parking Spaces	1	No Change		
PROJECT DESCRIPTION				

The proposal is to construct a horizontal and vertical addition to the existing 2-story single-family dwelling. At the rear of the building, the project proposes an additional 9'-6" of depth, set back from the southern side property line by 5 feet for the length of the addition. Additionally, new decks and stairs at the first and second levels extend beyond the new rear wall by an additional 16 feet. The proposed third story would occupy the full building footprint, with the exception of a 7-foot setback from the front building wall; a 4-foot deep roof deck is proposed in the setback. Additional habitable space at the basement level will be created through excavation at the rear of the building. In total, the project will result in a 3,390 square foot dwelling. Lastly, changes are proposed to the front façade finished materials and entry sequence. See attached plans.

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

For more information, please contact Planning Department staff:

 Planner:
 Andrew Perry

 Telephone:
 (415) 575-9017

 E-mail:
 andrew.perry@sfgov.org

 中文詢問請電:
 (415) 575-9010

Notice Date: Expiration Date:

Para información en Español llamar al: (415) 575-9010

GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT PROCEDURES

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

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

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

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

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

BOARD OF APPEALS

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

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

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

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



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Address	Project Address		Block/Lot(s)	
161	Hamerton Avenue	6759/019		
Case No.	Case No. Permit No.		Plans Dated	
2015-009100ENV	201506239711	6/22/2015		
Addition/	Demolition	New	Project Modification	
Alteration (requires HRER if over 45 years old)		Construction	(GO TO STEP 7)	
Project description for Planning Department approval.				
Proposed addition of 3rd level. Remodel/alteration of 1st & 2nd floors. Minor excavation at basement level. Replace exterior rear deck. Upgrade windows, green roof & planer at front of house.				

STEP 1: EXEMPTION CLASS TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

Note: If neither Class 1 or 3 applies, an Environmental Evaluation Application is required.				
\checkmark	Class 1 – Existing Facilities. Interior and exterior alterations; additions under 10,000 sq. ft.			
	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.			
	Class_			

STEP 2: CEQA IMPACTS

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

If any box is checked below, an Environmental Evaluation Application is required.				
	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>			
	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. 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).			
	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?			
	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>)			
	Noise: Does the project include new noise-sensitive receptors (schools, day care facilities, hospitals, residential dwellings, and senior-care facilities) fronting roadways located in the noise mitigation area? (<i>refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Noise Mitigation Area</i>)			
	Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment: Does the project site involve a subdivision or lot line adjustment on a lot with a slope average of 20% or more? (<i>refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography</i>)			
	Slope = or > 20%: Does the project involve excavation of 50 cubic yards of soil or more, 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.			
	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.			
	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 Environmental				
Evaluation	Application is required, unless reviewed by an Environmental Planner. Project can proceed with categorical exemption review. The project does not trigger any of the			
	CEQA impacts listed above.			
Comments a	and Planner Signature (optional): Jeanie Policy			

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

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

.

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 that	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:

	Result in expansion of the building envelope, as defined in the Planning Code;
Is any information being presented that was not known and could not have been know	
	Result in demolition as defined under Planning Code Section 317 or 19005(f)?
no longer qualify for the exemption?	Is any information being presented that was not known and could not have been known at the time of the original determination, that shows the originally approved project may no longer qualify for the exemption?

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

DETERMINATION OF NO SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

The proposed 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 environme	approval and no additional environmental review is required. This determination shall be posted on the Planning						
Department website and office and m	Department website and office and mailed to the applicant, City approving entities, and anyone requesting written notice.						
Planner Name:	Signature or Stamp:						
Planner Name:	Signature or Stamp:						
Planner Name:	Signature or Stamp:						
Planner Name:	Signature or Stamp:						

,

STEP 4: PROPOSED WORK CHECKLIST

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

Che	ck all that apply to the project.
	1. Change of use and new construction. Tenant improvements not included.
	2. Regular maintenance or repair to correct or repair deterioration, decay, or damage to building.
	3. Window replacement that meets the Department's Window Replacement Standards. Does not include storefront window alterations.
	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.
	5. Deck, terrace construction, or fences not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
	6. Mechanical equipment installation that is not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of- way.
	7. Dormer installation that meets the requirements for exemption from public notification under <i>Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 3: Dormer Windows</i> .
	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.
Not	e: Project Planner must check box below before proceeding.
	Project is not listed. GO TO STEP 5.
	Project does not conform to the scopes of work. GO TO STEP 5 .
	Project involves four or more work descriptions. GO TO STEP 5.
	Project involves less than four work descriptions. GO TO STEP 6.

\$

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

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

_	8. Other work consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (specify or add comments):
	9. Other work that would not materially impair a historic district (specify or add comments):
	(Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator)
\checkmark	10. Reclassification of property status to Category C. (<i>Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator</i>)
	a. Per HRER dated: (attach HRER)
	b. Other (specify): Per PTR form signed September 1, 2015.
Note:	If ANY box in STEP 5 above is checked, a Preservation Planner MUST check one box below.
	Further environmental review required. Based on the information provided, the project requires an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i> to be submitted. GO TO STEP 6.
\checkmark	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.
Comm	ents (optional):
comm	
Preser	vation Planner Signature: Stephanie Cisneros de la contra
STED	6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION
	COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER
	Further environmental review required. Proposed project does not meet scopes of work in either (check all the
	apply):
	Step 2 – CEQA Impacts
	Step 5 – Advanced Historical Review
	STOP! Must file an Environmental Evaluation Application.
	No further environmental review is required. The project is categorically exempt under CEQA.
	Signature:

 Planner Name: Stephanie A. Cisneros
 Signature:

 Project Approval Action:
 Stephanie Cisneros

 Building Permit
 It Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project.
 Stephanie Cisneros

 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.



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW FORM

reservation Team Meeting Date:		Date of Form Co	mpletion 8/21/201	5
PROJECT INFORMATION:	Address:			
Planner:				
 The second s	tephanie Cisneros 161 Hamerton			
Block/Lot: Cross Streets: 759/019 Mangels Avenue				
n an	Art. 10/11:	DDA /	Case No.:	
CEQA Category:	N/A		Case No.: 2009100ENV	and the second of the second s
	, <u>]</u>			
PURPOSE OF REVIEW:		PROJECT DESCR		
CEQA C Article 10/11	C Preliminary/PIC	Alteration	C Demo/New Co	onstruction
ATE OF PLANS UNDER REVIEW:	6/22/2015			
		1944 - The American State State Carlos Carlos and a second		
PROJECT ISSUES:	N 3777 - 2 2	N in Hello - Million Lender Discrete Lin	sterio de la companya	dina ja
Is the subject Property an elig	-			
If so, are the proposed changes a significant impact?				
Additional Notes:				1
Submitted: Supplemental In Peter Zepponi (dated July 14		toric Resource D	etermination pre	pared by
	4, 2015). addition of 3rd le ent level. Replace	evel. Remodel/al	teration of 1st & 2	nd floors.
Peter Zepponi (dated July 14 Proposed Project: Proposed Minor excavation at baseme	4, 2015). addition of 3rd le ent level. Replace t of house.	evel. Remodel/al exterior rear dec	teration of 1st & 2 k. Upgrade windo	nd floors. ows,
Peter Zepponi (dated July 14 Proposed Project: Proposed Minor excavation at baseme green roof & planter at front PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW:	4, 2015). addition of 3rd le ent level. Replace t of house.	evel. Remodel/al exterior rear dec	teration of 1st & 2	nd floors. ows,
Peter Zepponi (dated July 14 Proposed Project: Proposed Minor excavation at baseme green roof & planter at front	4, 2015). addition of 3rd le ent level. Replace t of house.	evel. Remodel/al exterior rear dec	teration of 1st & 2 k. Upgrade windo	nd floors. ows,
Peter Zepponi (dated July 14 Proposed Project: Proposed Minor excavation at baseme green roof & planter at front PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW: Historic Resource Present	4, 2015). addition of 3rd le ent level. Replace t of house.	evel. Remodel/al exterior rear dec Histo Property is in an e	teration of 1st & 2 k. Upgrade windo Yes	nd floors. ows,
Peter Zepponi (dated July 14 Proposed Project: Proposed Minor excavation at baseme green roof & planter at front PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW: Historic Resource Present Individual Property is individually eligible f California Register under one or	4, 2015). addition of 3rd le ent level. Replace t of house.	evel. Remodel/al exterior rear dec Histo Property is in an e Historic District/C	teration of 1st & 2 k. Upgrade windo Yes • No * ric District/Context ligible California Reg ontext under one or r eria:	nd floors. ows,
Peter Zepponi (dated July 14 Proposed Project: Proposed Minor excavation at baseme green roof & planter at front PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW: Historic Resource Present Individual Property is individually eligible f California Register under one or following Criteria:	4, 2015). addition of 3rd le ent level. Replace t of house. for inclusion in a more of the	evel. Remodel/al exterior rear dec exterior rear dec rear dec exterior rear dec exte	teration of 1st & 2 k. Upgrade windo Yes • No * ric District/Context ligible California Reg ontext under one or r eria:	nd floors. Dws, CN/A ister nore of
Peter Zepponi (dated July 14 Proposed Project: Proposed Minor excavation at baseme green roof & planter at front PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW; Historic Resource Present Individual Property is individually eligible f California Register under one or following Criteria: Criterion 1 - Event:	4, 2015). addition of 3rd le ent level. Replace t of house. for inclusion in a more of the C Yes (No	evel. Remodel/al exterior rear dec Histo Property is in an e Historic District/C the following Criterion 1 - Event	teration of 1st & 2 k. Upgrade windo Yes • No * ric District/Context ligible California Reg ontext under one or r eria: :: • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	nd floors. ows, (N/A ister nore of s (No
Peter Zepponi (dated July 14 Proposed Project: Proposed Minor excavation at baseme green roof & planter at front PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW: Historic Resource Present Individual Property is individually eligible f California Register under one or following Criteria: Criterion 1 - Event: Criterion 2 -Persons:	4, 2015). addition of 3rd le ent level. Replace t of house. for inclusion in a more of the C Yes (No C Yes (No	evel. Remodel/al exterior rear dec exterior rear dec c f f f Histor Property is in an e Historic District/C the following Criter Criterion 1 - Event Criterion 2 - Perso	teration of 1st & 2 k. Upgrade windo Yes • No * ric District/Context ligible California Reg ontext under one or r eria: ::	nd floors. Dws, CN/A ister more of s (• No s (• No
Peter Zepponi (dated July 14 Proposed Project: Proposed Minor excavation at baseme green roof & planter at front PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW: Historic Resource Present Individual Property is individually eligible f California Register under one or following Criteria: Criterion 1 - Event: Criterion 2 -Persons: Criterion 3 - Architecture:	4, 2015). addition of 3rd le ent level. Replace t of house. for inclusion in a more of the C Yes (No C Yes (No C Yes (No	evel. Remodel/al exterior rear dec exterior rear dec exterior rear dec exterior rear dec exterior content exterior content criterion 1 - Event Criterion 1 - Event Criterion 2 - Perso Criterion 3 - Archi	teration of 1st & 2 k. Upgrade windo Yes (No * ric District/Context ligible California Reg ontext under one or r eria: :: (Ye: ns: (Ye: tecture: (Ye: Potential: (Ye:	nd floors. Dws, C N/A ister nore of s (No s (No s (No

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

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

PRESERVATION TEAM COMMENTS:

According to the Supplemental Information for Historic Resource Determination prepared by Peter Zepponi (dated July 14, 2015) and information found in the Planning Department files, the subject property at 161 Hamerton Avenue contains a one-story over garage wood-frame single-family residence moved to its current location in 1966. The subject property appears to have been constructed in a vernacular style and is finished in a faux stone facade. The building was originally constructed at 252 Los Olivos Avenue in Daly City as part of a residential development, but was purchased by Walter V. Hart at an auction from the Bay Area Rapid Transit District in 1966 to make way for the new Daly City Bart Station (source: San Francisco BART Building Sales letter). Walter Hart and his wife Alice owned a double lot at 149 and 161 Hamerton Avenue and hired Coast House Movers to move the house to the 161 Hamerton lot. The subject property has remained in the Hart family since 1967 and is now occupied by Walter and Alice's son, William. Known exterior alterations include: reroofing (1996); removing and replacing the rear deck (2001); replacing windows and repairing siding (2003); replacing the front window (2003); relocating skylight above kitchen (2003); underpinning (2004); and shoring the back side of the property between 161 and 149 Hamerton (2005). Visual inspection also reveals that the faux stone facade has been painted from its original appearance.

No known historic events occurred at the subject property (Criterion 1). None of the owners or occupants have been identified as important to history (Criterion 2). The building is minimally detailed and is not architecturally distinct such that it would qualify individually for listing in the California Register under Criterion 3.

The subject property is not located within the boundaries of any identified historic district. The subject property is located in the Glen Park neighborhood on a block with much larger, contemporary/modern single-family homes. The building has been moved from its original location in Daly City and is out of context with the surrounding neighborhood. The neighborhood does not retain a consistency of architectural styles and construction dates that would identify it as a historic district.

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

Signature of a Senior Preservation Planner / Preservation Coordinator: Date:

9-1-2015

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT



Application for **Discretionary Review**

å

CASE NUMBER: 2015-009 100 02-0-02

APPLICATION FOR Discretionary Review

1. Owner/Applicant Information

CODE: 1131 EVIEW NAME: CODE:	TELEPHONE: (415)269-5600 TELEPHONE:
131 EVIEW NAME: CODE:	(415)269-5600
EVIEW NAME: CODE:	
CODE:	TELEPHONE:
	TELEPHONE:
	TELEPHONE:
131	(415) 505-9041(Waltr)
CODE:	TELEPHONE:
	()
	• CODE:

2. Location and Classification

STREET ADDRESS OF PROJECT: 161 Hamerton CROSS STREETS:			zip code: 9413 j
Bosworth +	Mangels		
0, -10		IONING DISTRICT:	HEIGHT/BULK DISTRICT:
3. Project Description Please check all that apply Change of Use Change o	f Hours 🗌 New Construct	ion 🗌 Alterations 🛛	Demolition 🗌 Other 🗌
0	r 🔀 Front 🛛 Height Ie-family dwelling	🔀 Side Yard 🗌	
Proposed Use: Horizontal (rea	r) and vertical addition to ex	kisting 2-story single-fam	ily home.
Building Permit Application N	2015.06.23.9711	Date	Filed: June 23, 2015

RECEIVED

DEC 3 1 2015

CITY & COUNTY OF S.F. PLANNING DEPARTMENT NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING

4. Actions Prior to a Discretionary Review Request

Prior Action	YES	NO
Have you discussed this project with the permit applicant?	3	
Did you discuss the project with the Planning Department permit review planner?	X	
Did you participate in outside mediation on this case?		8

1

1

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. No changes have been proposed or made.



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT V.08.07.2012

Discretionary Review Request

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

 What are the reasons for requesting Discretionary Review? The project meets the minimum standards of the Planning Code. What are the exceptional and extraordinary circumstances that justify Discretionary Review of the project? How does the project conflict with the City's General Plan or the Planning Code's Priority Policies or Residential Design Guidelines? Please be specific and site specific sections of the Residential Design Guidelines. The proposed rear and vertical addition's is out of character, out of context and incompatible with 90% of the surrounding dwellings which doesn't conform to the stated Design Guideline principles (pg 5). Per Design Guidelines, the proposed rear addition will significantly impact light (pg16) and privacy (pg 17). Additionally,

the scale and form of the proposed rear of the building is not compatible with the height and depth of

surrounding dwellings (pgs 23-25) contributing to lack of privacy, increased light pollution; reduced sunlight.

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

The increased height (4 stories in rear!) and depth of proposed building plus the massive scale poses significant, disruptive, and exceptional impact to my family's quality of life: Reduced sunlight darkens my yard, makes it colder impacting my garden, amount of time we can enjoy sunlight in the yard, and limit backyard entertaintment.; the occupants will have clear views into the interior spaces at the rear of my home where our bedrooms are located; the increased light pollution to emanate from 4 stories will impact our sleep!

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?

Eliminate the 4th story and extend living space out to maximum depth allotted. Alternatively, set-back top floor to mitigate scale and mass, privacy, light pollution; limit railing/stairs for access to backyard to lower 2 floors only. Reduce the size and number of windows and use window materials to mitigate light pollution at night. Avoid use of recessed can ceiling lighting and use window shades to mitigate light pollution.

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.

arrie Messina Signature:

12.31.15 Date:

1

å

ŧ

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

Carrie Messina Owner / Authorized Agent (circle one)

RESPONSE TO DISCRETIONARY REVIEW (DRP)





SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT 1650 MISSION STREET, SUITE 400 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103-2479 MAIN: (415) 558-6378 SFPLANNING.ORG

Project Information

Property Address: 161 Hamerton Ave.

Building Permit Application(s): 2015.06.23.9711

Record Number: 2015-009 100 DRP-02

Assigned Planner: Andrew Perry

Project Sponsor

Name: Peter Zepponi, Architect

Phone: (415) 334-2868

Zip Code: 94131

Email: peter@zepponi-architects.com

Required Questions

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

See attached Response.

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

See attached Response.

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

See attached Response.

Project Features

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

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Dwelling Units (only one kitchen per unit - additional kitchens count as additional units)	1	1
Occupied Stories (all levels with habitable rooms)	2	4
Basement Levels (may include garage or windowless storage rooms)	1	1
Parking Spaces (Off-Street)	1	1
Bedrooms	3	5
Height	23'-0"	32'-6"
Building Depth	44'-10"	54'-3"
Rental Value (monthly)	N/A	N/A
Property Value	\$1,300,000	\$2,000,000

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

Signature: Peter A. Zepponi Dictally signed by Peter A. Zepponi Di	Date:	1/27/16
Printed Name: Peter A. Zepponi	Property OwnAuthorized A	

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

RESPONSE TO: DISCRETIONARY REVIEW (DRP)

DRP #: 2015-009 100 DRP-02

Property Address: 161 Hamerton Ave, SF CA 94131 Building Permit Application #: 2015.06.23.9711 DRP #: 2015-009 100 DRP-02 Date: January 27, 2016

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

RESPONSE: This is a response solely to Application for Discretionary Review Case 2015-009 100 DRP-02 as additional Applications have been withdrawn.

By definition of the Planning DR process the project meets minimum standards of the planning code hence response will focus on "Exceptional and Extraordinary Circumstance" as it relates to 142 Chilton.

Regarding complaint form item #1:

<u>Complaint Text:</u> The proposed rear and vertical addition's is out of character, out of context and incompatible with 90% of the surrounding dwellings which doesn't conform to the stated Design Guideline principles (pg 5). Per Design Guidelines, the proposed rear addition will significantly impact light (pg16) and privacy (pg 17). Additionally, the scale and form of the proposed rear of the building is not compatible with the height and depth of surrounding dwellings (pgs 23-25) contributing to lack of privacy, increased light pollution; reduced sunlight

161 Hamerton Response

- 161 Hamerton proposed scale is not Exceptional for Hamerton Ave.
 - a) Hamerton already has 8 homes that are 2 story over garage (3 stories from street)
 - b) 161 Hamerton will be 9th such home matching the context of the adjacent property and the row of 3 story homes directly across the street.
- 161 Hamerton proposed mass and depth is not Extraordinary by definition.
 - a) 161 Hamerton is directly next door and across from homes of larger size and form.
 - b) 161 Hamerton and the adjacent 149 Hamerton are the only ones to incorporate a 3 story front setback. The other 3 story homes on Hamerton have no 3rd floor setback.
 - c) 161 Hamerton will be the 4th property on the eastern side of Hamerton with similar mass (Height and depth)
- 161 Hamerton does not have exceptional or extraordinary impact on light or privacy as can be expected with a building expansion.

RESPONSE TO: DISCRETIONARY REVIEW (DRP)

DRP #: 2015-009 100 DRP-02

- a) The complainant property at 142 Chilton is 3 lots over to the Northeast and 1 street back. (Further East) Given the distance away and orientation of the streets and houses there is minimal impact on light.
- b) 161 Hamerton is located farther away and behind the existing 3 story home at 149 Hamerton. The mass and form of the existing neighbor is larger than the proposed project at 161 Hamerton
- c) 161 Hamerton has already incorporated design elements which include setbacks, no parapets, open deck and stair railings, and the elimination of a 3rd floor deck.
- d) This is not a "Special Situation" regarding privacy at 142 Chilton and therefore not applicable. There are 5 other existing properties on Hamerton that are closer and have greater or at least similar impact on her existing privacy. In a dense urban environment where building expansions are expected some loss of privacy is expected.

Regarding complaint form item #2:

<u>Complaint Text:</u> The increased height (4 stories in rear!) and depth of proposed building plus the massive scale poses significant, disruptive, and exceptional impact to my family's quality of life: Reduced sunlight darkens my yard, makes it colder impacting my garden, amount of time we can enjoy sunlight in the yard, and limit backyard entertainment.; the occupants will have clear views into the interior spaces at the rear of my home where our bedrooms are located; the increased light pollution to emanate from 4 stories will impact our sleep!

161 Hamerton Response

This answer focuses on the specific property in the complaint as the wording in item #2 was as such:

- Complainant property is 3 lots Northeast and 1 street over. Given it's distance away, orientation and context of being beyond another larger structure, 161 Hamerton will have minimal impact to the existing conditions that is both reasonable and to be expected. It is not an extraordinary situation.
- Given the location of 142 Chilton privacy is not unreasonably impacted. 161 Hamerton has a similar view of 142 Chilton today. Due to the offset of property lots the siteline is very indirect, being oblique and downhill, and thus not extraordinary and is reasonable. Additionally, 161 Hamerton does not have a top floor deck as does 149 Hamerton, which further lessens any impact.
- In response to the reference of 4 stories, 161 Hamerton is an existing 2 story home with a partial basement at the rear. The proposed project will add one additional level to make it a 3 story home with a habitable partial basement at the rear. It is aligned in height to other properties on Hamerton as noted in previous responses.

RESPONSE TO: DISCRETIONARY REVIEW (DRP)

DRP #: 2015-009 100 DRP-02

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

RESPONSE: Project sponsor believes the Application for Discretionary Review in question has no merit when measured against the defined standard of "Exceptional and Extraordinary Circumstance"; any impact is reasonable thus project sponsor is not willing to make any changes in respect to that complaint

- Project Sponsor has agreed to minor changes and considerations regarding the Directly Southern property – 167 Hamerton – specifically, installation of Mullion's to Southern facing windows to break up sight lines to back of adjacent property.
- 161 Hamerton has already included several RDG recommended, but not required, light and privacy design considerations in the proposed project. Incorporation of these features exceeds the minimum standards of the Planning Code. In consideration that 161 Hamerton does not merely meet, but rather exceeds the Planning Code requirements and that the proposed project is actually smaller in mass and form than the allowable building envelope per code, the proposed project is reasonable.

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

RESPONSE: Project sponsor believes the Application for Discretionary Review 2015-009 100 DRP-02 has no merit when measured against the defined standard of "Exceptional and Extraordinary Circumstance"; any impact is reasonable thus project sponsor is not willing to make any changes in respect to that complaint

- In consideration that 161 Hamerton does not merely meet, but rather exceeds the Planning Code requirements and that the proposed project is actually smaller in mass and form than the allowable building envelope per code, the proposed project is reasonable and does not have any adverse effect on surrounding properties beyond what is to be considered normal and expected with construction in a dense urban environment.
- The Owner has need of the additional space for a growing multi-generational family, in addition to lifestyle, work and activities that require additional space for the full enjoyment and use of their property.







M6.1

S1.0

USE:



HEET NO A0.

	R	DOM FINIS	SH SCHE	DULE						
BASEMENT										
ROOM	FLOOR	BASE	WALL	CEILING	GENERAL NOTES					
BASEMENT/STORAGE	CORK	WOOD	GYP.BD.	GYP.BD.	5					
BATH 5	CERAMIC TILE	-	GYP.BD.	GYP.BD.	FINISH NOTE 4					
		1st.	FLOOR							
PORCH	STONE	STONE	STUCCO	STUCCO	4					
ENTRY	STONE-2	WOOD	GYP.BD.	GYP.BD.	5					
STAIRS	WOOD	WOOD	GYP.BD.	GYP.BD.	5					
LAUNDRY	CERAMIC TILE	CERAMIC TILE	GYP.BD.	GYP.BD.	FINISH NOTE 4					
GARAGE	CONCRETE	-	GYP.BD.	GYP.BD.	FINISH NOTE 3					
BATH 4	CERAMIC TILE	CERAMIC TILE	GYP.BD.	GYP.BD.	FINISH NOTE 4					
BEDRM 4	WOOD	WOOD	GYP.BD.	GYP.BD.	5					
REC. RM/BEDRM 5	WOOD	WOOD	GYP.BD.	GYP.BD.	5					
DECK	WOOD	-	-	-	5					
		2nd.	FLOOR							
LIVING/DINING	WOOD	WOOD	GYP.BD.	GYP.BD.	5					
PWDR RM	CERAMIC TILE	CERAMIC TILE	GYP.BD.	GYP.BD.	FINISH NOTE 4					
KITCHEN	WOOD	WOOD	CERAMIC TILE	GYP.BD.	4					
FAMILY	WOOD	WOOD	GYP.BD.	GYP.BD.	5					
DECK	WOOD	-	-	-	5					
		3rd.	FLOOR							
BEDRM 2	WOOD	WOOD	GYP.BD.	GYP.BD.	5					
BEDRM 1	WOOD	WOOD	GYP.BD.	GYP.BD.	5					
HALL 3	WOOD	WOOD	GYP.BD.	GYP.BD.	5					
BATH 2	CERAMIC TILE	CERAMIC TILE	GYP.BD.	GYP.BD.	FINISH NOTE 4					
WALK-IN CLOSET	WOOD	WOOD	GYP.BD.	GYP.BD.	5					
MASTER BEDRM	WOOD	WOOD	GYP.BD.	GYP.BD.	5					
M. BATH	CERAMIC TILE	CERAMIC TILE	CERAMIC TILE	GYP.BD.	FINISH NOTE 4					

DOOR SCHEDULE

FINISH NOTES:

WINDOW NOTES:











_		-					SOLICO					-	
ROOM NAME		FLOOR	TYPE	DOOR			FRAME DETAILS			<u>e</u> eg	NOTEC		
				SIZE WIDTH HEIGHT THK.			MATL	MATL	HEAD	JAMB	SILL	HDWR. GROUP	NOTES
001	BATH 5	в	F	2'-8"	6'-8"	1 3/8"	WD	WD					5
002	BASEMENT/STORAGE	в	F	6'-0"	5'-9"	1 3/8"	WD	WD					7
003	BASEMENT/STORAGE	в	SL	6'-0"	6'-8"	-	WD	WD					8
101	ENTRY	1	M/G	3'-0"	6'-8"	1 3/4"	WD	WD					6
102	COATS	1	F	5'-4"	6'-8"	1 3/8"	WD	WD					11
103	GARAGE	1	M/FG	10'-0"	6'-8"	1 3/4"	WD	WD					1, 9
104	HALL 1	1	F	3'-0"	6'-8"	1 3/4"	WD	WD					10
105	LAUNDRY	1	F	2'-8"	6'-8"	1 3/8"	WD	WD					5
106	LINEN	1	F	2'-4"	6'-8"	1 3/8"	WD	WD					5
107	BEDRM 4	1	F	2'-8"	6'-8"	1 3/8"	WD	WD					5
108	BATH 4	1	F	2'-6"	6'-8"	1 3/8"	WD	WD					5
109	REC ROOM/BEDRM 5	1	F	3'-0"	6'-8"	1 3/8"	WD	WD					7
110	CLO 6	1	F	5'-0"	6'-8"	1 3/8"	WD	WD					12
111	CLO 4	1	F	2'-8"	6'-8"	1 3/8"	WD	WD					12
112	REC ROOM/BEDRM 5	1	SL	6'-0"	6'-8"	-	WD	WD					7
201	PWDR RM	2	F	2'-6"	6'-8"	1 3/8"	WD	WD					5
202	KITCHEN	2	STRFRNT	15-0"	8'-8"	1 3/4"							7, SIM.
301	BEDRM 1	3	F	2'-8"	6'-8"	1 3/8"	WD	WD					5
302	BEDRM 2	3	F	2'-8"	6'-8"	1 3/8"	WD	WD					5
303	W/D	3	F	2'-8"	6'-8"	1 3/8"	WD	WD					11
304	BATH 2	3	F	2'-6"	6'-8"	1 3/8"	WD	WD					5
305	STOR	3	F	2'-0"	6'-8"	1 3/8"	WD	WD					5
306	WALK-IN CLOSET	3	F	2'-6"	6'-8"	1 3/8"	WD	WD					5
307	MASTER BEDROOM	3	F	2'-8"	6'-8"	1 3/8"	WD	WD					5
308	M.BATH	3	F	2'-8"	6'-8"	1 3/8"	WD	WD					5
309	WC	3	F	2'-6"	6'-8"	1 3/8"	WD	WD					5
310	CL0.1	3	F	6'-0"	6'-8"	1 3/8"	WD	WD					12
311	CL0.2	3	F	5'-0"	6'-8"	1 3/8"	WD	WD					12
312	BEDRM 1	3	FR	5'-0"	6'-8"	1 3/4"	WD	WD					8, 11
313	BEDRM 2	3	FR	5'-0"	6'-8"	1 3/4"	WD	WD					8, 11

$\langle \rangle$				WINE	OW S	CHEDUL	.E		
WINDOW	ROOM NAME	FLOOR	TYPE	WIDTH	HIGH	HEAD HT.	FRAME	GLASS	NOTES
1	REC ROOM	В	С	3'-0"	4'-6"	6'-8"	ALUM	CLEAR	2
2	REC ROOM	В	С	3'-0"	4'-6"	6'-8"	ALUM	CLEAR	2
3	ENTRY	1	в	2'-0"	4'-6"	6'-8"	ALUM	CLEAR	2, 6
4	BEDRM 4	1	D	3'-0"	4'-6"	6'-8"	ALUM	CLEAR	2
5	REC ROOM/BEDRM 5	1	С	3'-0"	4'-6"	6'-8"	ALUM	CLEAR	2
6	REC ROOM/BEDRM 5	1	С	3'-0"	4'-6"	6'-8"	ALUM	CLEAR	2
7	LIVING	2	G	2'-6"	6'-0"	8'-0"	ALUM	CLEAR	2
8	LIVING	2	G	2'-6"	6'-0"	8'-0"	ALUM	CLEAR	2
9	LIVING	2	G	2'-6"	6'-0"	8'-0"	ALUM	CLEAR	2
10	LIVING	2	G	2'-6"	6'-0"	8'-0"	ALUM	CLEAR	2
11	DINING	2	E	9'-6"	6'-0"	8'-0"	ALUM	CLEAR	2
12	FAMILY	2	D	3'-0"	6'-6"	8'-8"	ALUM	CLEAR	2
13	FAMILY	2	A	8'-0"	6'-6"	8'-8"	ALUM	CLEAR	2
14	NOT USED	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
15	M. BATH	3	D	3'-0"	4'-6"	6'-8"	ALUM	OBSCURE	2, 6
16	MASTER BEDRM.	3	н	8'-0"	4'-6"	6'-8"	ALUM	CLEAR	2
17	NOT USED	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
18	MASTER BEDRM.	3	D	2'-2"	4'-6"	6'-8"	ALUM	CLEAR	2,4
19	MASTER BEDRM.	3	В	5'-6"	4'-6"	6'-8"	ALUM	CLEAR	2
20	MASTER BEDRM.	3	В	5'-6"	4'-6"	6'-8"	ALUM	CLEAR	2
21	MASTER BEDRM.	3	D	2'-2"	4'-6"	6'-8"	ALUM	CLEAR	2,4
22	WALK-IN CLOSET	3	-	2'-6"	x1'-2"		ALUM	CLEAR	10
23	STAIRS	3	-	5'-0"	<2'-6"		ALUM	CLEAR	10
24	BATH 2	3	-	2'-0>	2'-0"		ALUM	CLEAR	10



ENCINEERED WOOD FLOORS OVER VAPOR BARRIER AT 1ST FLOOR.
 NEW HARDWOOD FLOORING TYPICAL AT 2ND AND 3RD FLOORS, U.N.O.
 PROVIDE 1 HR SEPARATION (5/8" GYP BD TYPE X) BETWEEN GARAGE AND HABITABLE SPACES
 ALL TILE TO BE SELECTED BY OWNER
 NEW TRIM AND BASEBOARD THROUGHOUT, TYP.
 G. GYP. BD WALLS TO BE A LEVEL 5 FINISH, TYP

GYP. BD WALLS TO BE A LEVEL 5 FINISH, TYP <u>DOOR_NOTES:</u>
 GARAGE DOORS TO BE SOLID CORE WOOD DOOR W/ SELF CLOSING HINGES AND SEALS.
 CLEAR TEMPERED GLASS SHOWER DOOR WITH CHROME HINGES AND CLEAR NEOPRENE GASKETS. SELECT STANDARD HEIGHT FROM MANUF. APPROX. 5'-8" 4. REPLACE ALL DOORS AND TRIM WITH NEW.
 INTERIOR DOORS TO BE SELECTED BY OWNER, TYP.
 EXTERIOR DOORS TO DATCH WINDOW MANUF'R, OR EQUAL.
 SLIDING 2 LEAVES, SAFETY GLASS.
 SAFETY GLASS.
 OVERHEAD.
 20 MIN. FIRE RATED.
 21 SLIDING 2 LEAVES.

WINDOW NOTES:
OWNER TO NAKE FINAL WINDOW SELECTION/APPROVAL.
WINDOWS TO BE ARCHITECTURAL GRADE ALUMINUM, WITH THERMAL BREAK DUAL PANE, LOW-E, ARGON FILLED.
MANUFACTURERS TO BE BONELLI, BLOMBERG, FLEETWOOD, OR EQUAL.
WINDOW ALTERNATE TO BE MARVIN WOOD, WOOD, WOOD, AD EQUAL.
OWNER TO SELECT FINISH COLORS,
TO MEET EGRESS REQUIREMENTS.
REPLACE ALL WINDOW TRIM WITH NEW
PROVIDE SAFETY GLASS AT ALL REQUIRED LOCATIONS
MAX U=0.32, MAX SHGC=0.25 FOR ALL NEW WINDOWS, GLASS DOOR, SKYLIGHTS
GLAZING TO BE TS³ WIN. ABOVE FINISHED FLOOR OR ELSE TEMPERED.
OWNER TO APPROVE WINDOW AND DOOR TRIM STYLE PRIOR TO INSTALLATION. PROVIDE FLOAR OR REQUIRE LOCATIONS.
NEW FIXED VELUX CURB MOUNTED FCM OR EQUAL SKYLIGHTS FOR FLAT ROOF INSTALLATION. RECOMMENDATIONS.
TYPICALLY MIN 15' CURB SLOPE. PROVIDE FINISHE TRIM TO CLOSE ANY INTERIOR GAPS.
























CONSTRUCTION FOR NOT >ЗÜ \triangleleft Ч. \exists ZO ODE Ч Ч R HAME 4 ш \bigcirc SED BUILDING SEC ANS AND SSEC HEET NO. A3.2



(1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1)
PETER A. ZEPPONI
108 No. 1417 108 No. 1417 108 PAZ 0404 047 047 047 047 044 22, 2016 16 16
311 / SITE PERMIT SUBMITTAL SET - NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION A RESIDENTIAL REMODEL FOR: 161 HAMERTON AVE. SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94131 161 HAMERTON AVE, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94131
SHEET TILE EXISTING AND PROPOSED FRONT ELEVATIONS SHEET NO.

















STUCCO WALL -----

ANODIZING ALUMINUM FRAME -----

EXTERIOR

DECK

SCALE: 1 1/2"=1'-0"

V 4 1/2"

 Π^{Π}

Т

4 de la

1 RETAINING WALL

SCALE: 6"=1'-0"

2 ALUMINUM WINDOW FRAME SCALE: 6"=1'-0"













January 27, 2016

Re: 161 Hamerton Avenue

Support for Building Permit

To Whom It May Concern:

I own 167 Hamerton Avenue, the residential property immediately south of 161 Hamerton Avenue. I write to confirm that I support the prompt issuance of all necessary building permits for construction of the project per the plans as noticed by notice dated December 1, 2016 from Peter Zepponi as applicant, with inclusion of vertical mullions at least 4.5 inches deep, spaced no more than 2 inches apart, and either perpendicular to the wall or angled further to the east, on the south-facing windows of the rear addition to 161 Hamerton to address privacy concerns.

Very truly yours,

Daved Lawson

David Lawson 167 Hamerton Avenue