



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Discretionary Review Full Analysis

HEARING DATE OCTOBER 18, 2018

Date: October 8, 2018
Case No.: 2015-011216DRP
Project Address: 277 JUDSON AVENUE
Permit Application: 2015.08.12.3993
Zoning: RH-1 (Residential House, One-Family)
40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 3181/034
Project Sponsor: Tom Zhang
LZI International
P. O. BOX 11230
Oakland, CA 94611
Property Owner: Weiping Jia
277 Judson Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94112
Staff Contact: Natalia Kwiatkowska – (415) 575-9185
natalia.kwiatkowska@sfgov.org
Recommendation: **Take DR and Approve with Condition**

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 proposed project entails a rear and side addition to expand all floor levels, including excavation at the basement level, addition of exterior stairs to provide access to the usable open space, changes to the front façade, and an interior remodel including legalization of an unauthorized dwelling unit through the addition of an accessory dwelling unit at the lower level.

SITE DESCRIPTION AND PRESENT USE

The Project is located on the south side of Judson Avenue, between Phelan Avenue and Edna Street, on a mid-block, down-sloping, rectangular parcel (measuring approximately 37 feet by 130 feet) with frontage on Judson Avenue. The site is developed with a two-story residential structure which contains one authorized dwelling unit and one unauthorized dwelling unit at the lower level, constructed circa 1924.

SURROUNDING PROPERTIES AND NEIGHBORHOOD

The Project site is located within the Outer Mission neighborhood, directly east of City College of San Francisco (CCSF) Ocean Avenue Campus. The surrounding neighborhood, with the exception of CCSF, is primarily residential in character and consists of two-story, single-family dwellings, similarly configured as the subject property. The surrounding zoning includes RH-1 (Residential, House, One-Family) and P (Public) Districts.

BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION NOTIFICATION

TYPE	REQUIRED PERIOD	NOTIFICATION DATES	DR FILE DATE	DR HEARING DATE	FILING TO HEARING TIME
311 Notice	30 days	February 17, 2016 – March 18, 2016	March 16, 2016	October 18, 2018	946 days*

*A new architect was engaged after the DR request.

HEARING NOTIFICATION

TYPE	REQUIRED PERIOD	REQUIRED NOTICE DATE	ACTUAL NOTICE DATE	ACTUAL PERIOD
Posted Notice	10 days	October 8, 2018	October 8, 2018	10 days
Mailed Notice	10 days	October 8, 2018	October 8, 2018	10 days

PUBLIC COMMENT

	SUPPORT	OPPOSED	NO POSITION
Adjacent neighbor(s)	0	1 (DR filer)	0
Other neighbors on the block or directly across the street	0	0	13
Neighborhood groups	0	0	0

The Department has received a petition and a list of documented outreach conducted by the Project Sponsor showing 13 neighbors do not object to the proposal. Copies are included as an attachment.

DR REQUESTOR

Ivan Hudak, 277 Judson Ave, San Francisco, CA, 94112. Adjacent neighbor to the east.

DR REQUESTOR'S CONCERNS AND PROPOSED ALTERNATIVES

Issue #1: The proposal will result in loss of light and air to DR filer's property due to the height and scale of the rear addition. The DR filer has engaged the architect and proposed constructing a one-level extension continuing from the basement level on the southern side as an alternative.

Issue #2: The proposal will result in loss of private views from the DR filer's property.

Issue #3: The property has been used as student housing for CCSF students in the past. The DR filer is concerned the property will continue to function as student or group housing and increase parking congestion due to number of tenants in a single-family neighborhood.

Reference the *Discretionary Review Application* for additional information. The *Discretionary Review Application* is an attached document.

PROJECT SPONSOR'S RESPONSE

The Project Sponsor has clarified the property will be occupied by the property owner and their family once the renovation is completed and there is no intention to convert the property into a rental. The Sponsor has also submitted an affidavit signed by the property owners indicating the property will not be rented. A copy of this affidavit is included as an attachment. The proposal addresses the DR filer's concerns by providing approximately a 6 foot wide setback from the shared property line to minimize any adverse impacts. The project has undergone several modifications based on the communication with the DR filer including: removal of the initially proposed roof deck at the shared property line and reduction of proposed fenestration facing the DR filer's property to reduce privacy concerns.

Reference the *Response to Discretionary Review* for additional information. The *Response to Discretionary Review* is an attached document.

PROJECT ANALYSIS

The Project is generally consistent with Commission policy and the City's General Plan Goals and Policies in that the project proposes to legalize an unauthorized dwelling unit through the addition of an accessory dwelling unit. The Project also proposes to expand the primary unit while providing front and rear facing exposure for both units. The proposed side and rear additions were reviewed by the Residential Design Advisory Team (RDAT) and found to be consistent with the Residential Design Guidelines, as detailed in the attached checklist.

Upon review of the DR Application, Department staff requested the Project Sponsor to revise the proposal to feature an interior layout more appropriate for use of a dwelling unit to be occupied by a family, as defined by the Planning Code. During this time, Planning Code Section 317 was updated to require a Conditional Use Authorization for the removal of an unauthorized dwelling unit. Therefore, the proposal was subsequently revised to include the legalization of the existing unauthorized dwelling unit at the lower level through the addition of an accessory dwelling unit per Planning Code Section 207(c)(6).

Department staff recommends that the Commission take Discretionary Review to ensure the existing property remains a two-unit building and will not result in student or group housing use by applying the following condition to the project:

1. All interior work shall be reviewed by the Planning Department and shall not include the addition of any new bathrooms or bedrooms.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The Department has determined that the proposed project is exempt from environmental review, pursuant to CEQA Guideline Sections 15301(1)(4) and 15303(a).

BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- The Project is consistent with the Planning Code and the City's General Plan.
- The overall architectural expression of the Project is in keeping with the neighborhood's residential character.
- The proposed massing will be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood in height, scale and form.
- The Project legalizes and expands the existing unauthorized dwelling unit through the utilization of the accessory dwelling unit (ADU) program.
- The Project meets the requirements of the San Francisco Planning Code, and does not seek any additional entitlements or exceptions.

RECOMMENDATION: Take DR and approve the project with condition.

Attachments:

Exhibits

- Parcel Map
- Sanborn Map
- Zoning Map
- Aerial Photographs
- Context Photo

Section 311 Notice

CEQA Determination

DR Application

Response to DR Application dated August 13, 2018

Project Sponsor Submittal including:

- Affidavit
- Petition
- Neighbor Outreach
- Reduced Plans with Renderings and a Shadow Study, dated September 27, 2018

Design Review Checklist

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER (PAGES 7-10)

QUESTION	
The visual character is: (check one)	
Defined	X
Mixed	

Comments: The neighborhood architectural character is defined with residential buildings that are typically two-stories in height, similar configuration to the subject property, with the exception of the adjacent CCSF Ocean Avenue Campus directly west of the subject property.

SITE DESIGN (PAGES 11 - 21)

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A
Topography (page 11)			
Does the building respect the topography of the site and the surrounding area?	X		
Is the building placed on its site so it responds to its position on the block and to the placement of surrounding buildings?	X		
Front Setback (pages 12 - 15)			
Does the front setback provide a pedestrian scale and enhance the street?	X		
In areas with varied front setbacks, is the building designed to act as transition between adjacent buildings and to unify the overall streetscape?			X
Does the building provide landscaping in the front setback?	X		
Side Spacing (page 15)			
Does the building respect the existing pattern of side spacing?			X
Rear Yard (pages 16 - 17)			
Is the building articulated to minimize impacts on light to adjacent properties?	X		
Is the building articulated to minimize impacts on privacy to adjacent properties?	X		
Views (page 18)			
Does the project protect major public views from public spaces?			X
Special Building Locations (pages 19 - 21)			
Is greater visual emphasis provided for corner buildings?			X
Is the building facade designed to enhance and complement adjacent public spaces?	X		
Is the building articulated to minimize impacts on light to adjacent cottages?	X		

Comments: As proposed, the placement of the building on its site responds to the surrounding buildings, mid-block open space, and minimizes any adverse impacts on adjacent properties.

BUILDING SCALE AND FORM (PAGES 23 - 30)

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A
Building Scale (pages 23 - 27)			
Is the building's height and depth compatible with the existing building scale at the street?	X		
Is the building's height and depth compatible with the existing building scale at the mid-block open space?	X		
Building Form (pages 28 - 30)			
Is the building's form compatible with that of surrounding buildings?	X		
Is the building's facade width compatible with those found on surrounding buildings?	X		
Are the building's proportions compatible with those found on surrounding buildings?	X		
Is the building's roofline compatible with those found on surrounding buildings?	X		

Comments: As proposed, the Project scale is compatible with the height and depth of the surrounding buildings in the neighborhood.

ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES (PAGES 31 - 41)

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A
Building Entrances (pages 31 - 33)			
Does the building entrance enhance the connection between the public realm of the street and sidewalk and the private realm of the building?			X
Does the location of the building entrance respect the existing pattern of building entrances?	X		
Is the building's front porch compatible with existing porches of surrounding buildings?	X		
Are utility panels located so they are not visible on the front building wall or on the sidewalk?			X
Bay Windows (page 34)			
Are the length, height and type of bay windows compatible with those found on surrounding buildings?			X
Garages (pages 34 - 37)			
Is the garage structure detailed to create a visually interesting street frontage?	X		
Are the design and placement of the garage entrance and door compatible with the building and the surrounding area?	X		
Is the width of the garage entrance minimized?	X		
Is the placement of the curb cut coordinated to maximize on-street parking?			X
Rooftop Architectural Features (pages 38 - 41)			
Is the stair penthouse designed to minimize its visibility from the street?			X
Are the parapets compatible with the overall building proportions and other building elements?			X

Are the dormers compatible with the architectural character of surrounding buildings?			X
Are the windscreens designed to minimize impacts on the building's design and on light to adjacent buildings?			X


Comments: The proposed garage replacement and reduction in opening size is compatible with the building and the surrounding area.

BUILDING DETAILS (PAGES 43 - 48)

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A
Architectural Details (pages 43 - 44)			
Are the placement and scale of architectural details compatible with the building and the surrounding area?	X		
Windows (pages 44 - 46)			
Do the windows contribute to the architectural character of the building and the neighborhood?	X		
Are the proportion and size of the windows related to that of existing buildings in the neighborhood?	X		
Are the window features designed to be compatible with the building's architectural character, as well as other buildings in the neighborhood?	X		
Are the window materials compatible with those found on surrounding buildings, especially on facades visible from the street?	X		
Exterior Materials (pages 47 - 48)			
Are the type, finish and quality of the building's materials compatible with those used in the surrounding area?	X		
Are the building's exposed walls covered and finished with quality materials that are compatible with the front facade and adjacent buildings?	X		
Are the building's materials properly detailed and appropriately applied?	X		


Comments: The proportion and size of the proposed windows contribute to the architectural character of the neighborhood. The Project incorporates quality materials and finishes that relate well to the surrounding neighborhood, including horizontal wood siding and aluminum-clad-wood windows.

Parcel Map



Discretionary Review Hearing
Case Number 2015-011216DRP
 277 Judson Avenue

Sanborn Map*



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



Discretionary Review Hearing
Case Number 2015-011216DRP
277 Judson Avenue

Zoning Map



Discretionary Review Hearing
Case Number 2015-011216DRP
277 Judson Avenue

Aerial Photo



DR REQUESTOR'S
PROPERTY

SUBJECT PROPERTY



Discretionary Review Hearing
Case Number 2015-011216DRP
277 Judson Avenue

Aerial Photo




SUBJECT PROPERTY

**DR REQUESTOR'S
PROPERTY**



Discretionary Review Hearing
Case Number 2015-011216DRP
277 Judson Avenue

Aerial Photo




SUBJECT PROPERTY

**DR REQUESTOR'S
PROPERTY**



Discretionary Review Hearing
Case Number 2015-011216DRP
277 Judson Avenue

Aerial Photo



DR REQUESTOR'S
PROPERTY

SUBJECT PROPERTY



SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Discretionary Review Hearing
Case Number 2015-011216DRP
277 Judson Avenue

Site Photo



DR REQUESTOR'S
PROPERTY

SUBJECT PROPERTY

Discretionary Review Hearing
Case Number 2015-011216DRP
277 Judson Avenue



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1650 Mission Street Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

NOTICE OF BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION (SECTION 311)

On **August 12, 2015**, the Applicant named below filed Building Permit Application No. **2015.08.12.3993** with the City and County of San Francisco.

PROPERTY INFORMATION		APPLICANT INFORMATION	
Project Address:	277 Judson Avenue	Applicant:	Lisa Wong
Cross Street(s):	Edna Street & Phelan Avenue	Address:	1213 Folsom Street
Block/Lot No.:	3181/034	City, State:	San Francisco, CA 94103
Zoning District(s):	RH-1 / 40-X	Telephone:	(415) 621-1280

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alteration
<input type="checkbox"/> Change of Use	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Façade Alteration(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Front Addition
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rear Addition	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Side Addition	<input type="checkbox"/> Vertical Addition
PROJECT FEATURES	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Building Use	Residential	No Change
Front Setback	+/- 9 feet	No Change
Building Depth	+/- 41 feet	+/- 63 feet 6 inches
Rear Yard	+/- 71 feet 6 inches	+/- 48 feet 6 inches
Building Height	+/- 17 feet 6 inches	No Change
Number of Stories	2	2 over basement
Number of Dwelling Units	1	No Change
Number of Parking Spaces	1	2
PROJECT DESCRIPTION		
The project includes a three-story horizontal addition at the rear of the existing building, a two-story side addition at the western property line and minor front façade changes.		
The issuance of the building permit by the Department of Building Inspection or the Planning Commission project approval at a discretionary review hearing would constitute as the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.		

For more information, please contact Planning Department staff:

Planner: Natalia Kwiatkowska
Telephone: (415) 575-9185
E-mail: natalia.kwiatkowska@sfgov.org

Notice Date: 2/17/16
Expiration Date: 3/18/16

中文詢問請電: (415) 575-9010

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 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)
277 JUDSON AVE		3181034
Case No.		Permit No.
2015-011216PRJ		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addition/ Alteration	<input type="checkbox"/> Demolition (requires HRE for Category B Building)	<input type="checkbox"/> New Construction
Project description for Planning Department approval. The proposed project entails a rear and side addition to expand all floor levels, including excavation at the basement level, addition of exterior stairs to provide access to the usable open space, changes to the front façade, and an interior remodel including legalization of an unauthorized dwelling unit through the addition of an accessory dwelling unit at the lower level per Planning Code Section 207(c)(6).		

STEP 1: EXEMPTION CLASS

Note: If neither class 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. Up to three new single-family residences or six 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 32 - In-Fill Development. New Construction of seven or more units or additions greater than 10,000 sq. ft. and meets the conditions described below: (a) The project is consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations. (b) The proposed development occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than 5 acres substantially surrounded by urban uses. (c) The project site has no value as habitat for endangered rare or threatened species. (d) Approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality. (e) The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services. FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING USE ONLY
<input type="checkbox"/>	Class ____

STEP 2: CEQA IMPACTS

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

If any box is checked below, an *Environmental Evaluation Application* 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, etc.)? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Air Pollution Exposure Zone)
<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? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Archeological Sensitive Area)
<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? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Slope = or > 20%: Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Seismic: Landslide Zone: Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Seismic: Liquefaction Zone: Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones) 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.

Comments and Planner Signature (optional): Natalia Kwiatkowska

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

PROPERTY IS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING: (refer to Parcel Information Map)	
<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3. Window replacement that meets the Department's <i>Window Replacement Standards</i> . Does not include storefront window alterations.
<input checked="" 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project involves less than four work descriptions. GO TO STEP 6.

STEP 5: CEQA IMPACTS - ADVANCED HISTORICAL REVIEW
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT 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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	10. Reclassification of property status. (Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> Reclassify to Category A a. Per HRER dated b. Other (specify): </div> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> Reclassify to Category C (attach HRER) </div> </div>
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: Natalia Kwiatkowska	

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. There are no unusual circumstances that would result in a reasonable possibility of a significant effect.	
	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.	Signature: Natalia Kwiatkowska 10/04/2018
	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. Please note that other approval actions may be required for the project. Please contact the assigned planner for these approvals.	

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)
277 JUDSON AVE		3181/034
Case No.	Previous Building Permit No.	New Building Permit No.
2015-011216PRJ		
Plans Dated	Previous Approval Action	New Approval Action
	Building Permit	
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.	

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:

Application for Discretionary Review

CASE NUMBER:
For Staff Use only

MAR 16

APPLICATION FOR
Discretionary Review

1. Owner/Applicant Information

DR APPLICANT'S NAME: IVAN HUDAK		
DR APPLICANT'S ADDRESS: 171 Judson Avenue	ZIP CODE: 94112	TELEPHONE: (415) 861-9472
PROPERTY OWNER WHO IS DOING THE PROJECT ON WHICH YOU ARE REQUESTING DISCRETIONARY REVIEW NAME: Jia / Wang family		
ADDRESS: 136 Genessee Street	ZIP CODE: 94112	TELEPHONE: ()
CONTACT FOR DR APPLICATION: Same as Above <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
ADDRESS:	ZIP CODE:	TELEPHONE: ()
E-MAIL ADDRESS:		

2. Location and Classification

STREET ADDRESS OF PROJECT: 277 Judson Avenue		ZIP CODE: 94112
CROSS STREETS: Edna street & Thealan Avenue		
ASSESSORS BLOCK/LOT: 3181 / 034	LOT DIMENSIONS:	LOT AREA (SQ. FT.):
ZONING DISTRICT:		HEIGHT/BULK DISTRICT:

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: present use as tented for students

Proposed Use: move in 3 families

Building Permit Application No. 2015.08.12.3993

Date Filed: 08/12/2015

4. Actions Prior to a Discretionary Review Request

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

more of our concerns were taken in
consideration

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.

- this project will create "tunnel" for our property
 - loss of sun light due to height of the building (addition) in the tract; loss of daylight as well

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:

- 3 families are moving into single residential house - all the neighbours will be affected with parking issues
 - this project takes away from quality of life
 there is a reasonable expectation that property will stay on rental status with even more students (and more cars) living there

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?

- main issue is the height of the additional tract extension
 - secondary issue is that there is a real possibility that property will continue as rental. With added square footage, there will be increase of students taking the available space, which will lead to ~~more~~ bigger parking congestion.

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: Ivan Hudak
IVAN HUDAK

Date: 03/16/2016

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

Owner / Authorized Agent (circle one)

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"/>
Covenant or Deed Restrictions	<input type="checkbox"/>
Check payable to Planning Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Letter of authorization for agent	<input checked="" 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.

For Department Use Only

Application received by Planning Department:

By: A. XlineDate: 3/16/16



**SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING
DEPARTMENT**

**FOR MORE INFORMATION:
Call or visit the San Francisco Planning Department**

Central Reception

1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco CA 94103-2479

TEL: **415.558.6378**

FAX: **415 558-6409**

WEB: <http://www.sfplanning.org>

Planning Information Center (PIC)

1660 Mission Street, First Floor
San Francisco CA 94103-2479

TEL: **415.558.6377**

*Planning staff are available by phone and at the PIC counter.
No appointment is necessary.*

RESPONSE TO DISCRETIONARY REVIEW (DRP)



**San Francisco
Planning**

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

Project Information

Property Address: 277 Judson Ave, San Francisco

Zip Code: CA 94112

Building Permit Application(s):

Record Number:

Assigned Planner: Natalia Kwiatkowska

Project Sponsor

Name: Tom Zhang

Phone: (510) 759-4149

Email: lziarchitect@gmail.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.)

We feel that our proposed project should be approved because it meets all zoning requirements including setbacks, density and height limits. The DR requester (which is the adjacent neighbor to the east) concerns about losing sunlight and view from the southwest side. The proposed project has address his concerns by providing side yard setback (6'-0" on the lower level and 12'-0" on the upper level) adjacent to his property even though no side yard setback is required by the zoning code. The rear of both the houses are south facing. There is ample of sunlight for the south elevation. In fact, the shadow study shows that there very minimum shadow casted by our project. In fact, their own double level decks block their own light. Our setback intends to provide a view corridor for their southwest "view", but their tall trees have already been blocking their view to the southwest.

The house has been vacant for nearly a year. The owner intend to remodel the house to meet their family need. They will move-in after the renovation. The proposed and submitted floor plans shows the intended family use of the house. The DR requester's assumption that the owner wants to turn this house into a "hostel" is groundless.

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.

The project has gone through many rounds of communication and modifications with the DR requester. The current submittal has resulted from the discussions and compromises that the owner is willing to make. The changes we made after our filing our application with the City include changing the deck near their house to a roof to avoid looking over to their yard; eliminating windows and doors facing east to avoid privacy intrusion. These changes were requested by the DR requester.

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.


The owner of this project are senior citizens. They do want to fix the house and move in with their elder parents who are over 90 years old.

Project Features

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

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Dwelling Units (only one kitchen per unit - additional kitchens count as additional units)	1	2
Occupied Stories (all levels with habitable rooms)	2	2
Basement Levels (may include garage or windowless storage rooms)	1	1
Parking Spaces (Off-Street)	1	1
Bedrooms	7	7
Height	33'-6"	35'-0"
Building Depth	41'-2"	60'-9"
Rental Value (monthly)	0	0
Property Value	\$1,200,000	\$1,600,000

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

Signature: 	Date: 8/13/18
Printed Name: Tom Zhang	<input type="checkbox"/> Property Owner <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorized Agent

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

Affidavit

We, the property owners of 277 Judson Ave. San Francisco, CA 94112, promise that we will not rent out the property after the addition is built.

Jia, Weiqi

Signature: Weiqi Jia

Jia, Weiping

Signature: Weiping Jia

Nancy Po Chueng

Signature: Nancy Po Chueng

Jia, Weihua

Signature: Weihua Jia

Wang, Yaping

Signature: Yaping Wang

Jia, Weishan


Signature: Wei Shan Jia

Zhu, Xiaoyan

Signature: Xiaoyan Zhu

Date: 5/8/2016

We do not object the 277 Judson addition project



160 Marston Av



172 Marston
Ave 94/12



136 Marston Ave

Mae Weibel

148 MARSTON AVE



240 Judson Ave

258 Judson Ave



266 Judson Ave

Irving Hn

235 Judson Ave



242 Judson Ave

Visit Time	Address	Owner	Opinion
12:15	142 Marston Ave, San Francisco, CA 94112	A & S Powell	They have no objection to the the 277 addition project.
12:20	154 Marston Ave, San Francisco, CA 94112	Boly Lu	We met only the tenant. The owner is usually at the backyard of the property on Wednesdays after 12:0
12:31	160 Marston Ave, San Francisco, CA 94112	Arvind Krishnan	He has no objection to the the 277 addition project and signed the petition.
12:36	166 Marston Ave, San Francisco, CA 94112	Occupant	Nobody was at home.
12:38	172 Marston Ave, San Francisco, CA 94112	Jonas & Collins	They have no objection to the the 277 addition project and signed the petition.
12:43	188 Marston Ave, San Francisco, CA 94112	Veronica Li Trs	Nobody was at home.
12:46	136 Marston Ave, San Francisco, CA 94112	Llanes & Seoni	They have no objection to the the 277 addition project and signed the petition.
12:49	148 Marston Ave, San Francisco, CA 94112	Christine Begle	She has no objection to the 277 Judson addition project and signed the petition.
12:56	226 Judson Ave, San Francisco, CA 94112	Hrenyo & Evans	Nobody was at home.
12:58	230 Judson Ave, San Francisco, CA 94112	Garcia & Schec	Nobody was at home.
12:59	234 Judson Ave, San Francisco, CA 94112	Jonathan Stern	Nobody was at home.
13:01	238 Judson Ave, San Francisco, CA 94112	Abdul & Hussein	Nobody was at home.
13:04	240 Judson Ave, San Francisco, CA 94112	Carmen Murphy - Lopez	They have no objection to the 277 Judson addition project and signed the petition. They said: "You can build as large as you wish. We really do not care. "
13:08	246 Judson Ave, San Francisco, CA 94112	Occupant	Nobody was at home.
13:09	250 Judson Ave, San Francisco, CA 94112	Josefina Pacumio	Nobody was at home.
13:10	254 Judson Ave, San Francisco, CA 94112	Marantal Trs	He had concerns about parking congestion and whether we would rent out the property, and asked us to trim the tree next to our property. He said he had no objection to the 277 Judson addition project, but he wanted to discuss with his wife before signing the petition.
13:40	258 Judson Ave, San Francisco, CA 94112	Elizabeth Martinez	She has no objection to the 277 Judson addition project and signed the petition
13:42	262 Judson Ave, San Francisco, CA 94112	Mccosh & Enders	They have no objection to the the 277 addition project and signed the petition
13:47	266 Judson Ave, San Francisco, CA 94112	Heffernan Trs	They have no objection to the the 277 addition project and signed the petition
	270 Judson Ave, San Francisco, CA 94112	Wesley Patton	Same as above. This property is also owned by the 266 Judson Ave owner.
13:50	274 Judson Ave, San Francisco, CA 94112	Christina Foo	Nobody was at home.
13:52	280 Judson Ave, San Francisco, CA 94112	Shigeko Mayehara Trs	Nobody was at home.
13:55	235 Judson Ave, San Francisco, CA 94112	Ivy Hu	She has no objection to the 277 Judson addition project and signed the petition
13:58	241 Judson Ave, San Francisco, CA 94112	Laura Hapka	Nobody was at home.
14:00	247 Judson Ave, San Francisco, CA 94112	S & R Dawson	They have no objection to the 277 Judson addition project and signed the petition. They are going to start an addition project as well, so they fully support us
14:03	253 Judson Ave, San Francisco, CA 94112	Occupant	The house is under construction. Nobody was at home.
14:05	259 Judson Ave, San Francisco, CA 94112	William Marquardt	Nobody was at home.

RENOVATION & ADDITION FOR 277 JUDSON AVENUE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94112

ARCHITECT
LZI International
Architecture Interior Design Construction

P. O. BOX 11230
OAKLAND, CA 94611

TEL: (510) 759-4149
FAX: (510) 985-1668

EMAIL: lziarchitect@gmail.com

BUILDING OWNER

WEIPING JIA

277 Judson Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94112

E-mail: peacewang8618@gmail.com

CONSULTANTS

Structural Engineer

GTC GeoTrinity Consultants, Inc.
7770 Pardee Lane, Suite 101
Oakland, CA 94621
Tel: (510) 383-9950
E-mail: info@geotrinity.com

REVISIONS

09/27/18 FOR PLANNING APPLICATION

APPROVALS

PROJECT

ADDITION & RENOVATION
FOR
277 JUDSON AVENUE,
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94112

SHEET TITLE

COVER SHEET
(N) SITE PLAN

SHEET NO.

DRAWN BY
YFL

CHECKED BY
JTZ


DATE
OCT 19, 2017

SCALE
AS NOTED


LZ JOB NO.

A1.1





2 (N) SHADOW STUDY
2017.12.21 12:00 PM.



1 (E) SITE PLAN

1/8" = 1'-0"

ARCHITECT
LZI International
Architecture Interior Design Construction
P. O. BOX 11230
OAKLAND, CA 94611
TEL: (510) 759-4149
FAX: (510) 985-1668
EMAIL: lziarchitect@gmail.com
BUILDING OWNER



WEIPING JIA

277 Judson Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94112

E-mail: peacewang8618@gmail.com

CONSULTANTS

Structural Engineer

GTC GeoTrinity Consultants, Inc.
7770 Pardee Lane, Suite 101
Oakland, CA 94621

Tel: (510) 383-9950
E-mail: info@geotrinity.com

REVISIONS

09/27/18 FOR PLANNING APPLICATION

APPROVALS

PROJECT
ADDITION & RENOVATION
FOR
277 JUDSON AVENUE,
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94112

SHEET TITLE

(E) SITE PLAN

DRAWN BY
YFL
CHECKED BY
JTZ
DATE
OCT 19, 2017
SCALE
AS NOTED
LZ JOB NO.

SHEET NO.

A1.2

WEIPING JIA

277 Judson Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94112

E-mail: peacewang8618@gmail.com

CONSULTANTS

Structural Engineer

GTC GeoTrinity Consultants, Inc.
7770 Pardee Lane, Suite 101
Oakland, CA 94621

Tel: (510) 383-9950
E-mail: info@geotrinity.com

REVISIONS

102217 FOR OWNER'S REVIEW
09/27/18 FOR PLANNING APPLICATION

APPROVALS

PROJECT

ADDITION & RENOVATION
FOR
277 JUDSON AVENUE,
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94112

SHEET TITLE

(E) MAIN LEVEL PLAN

DRAWN BY

YFL

CHECKED BY

JTZ

DATE

AUGUST 08, 2016

SCALE


AS NOTED

LZ JOB NO.

021616

SHEET NO.

A2.1



1 (E) MAIN LEVEL PLAN
1/4" = 1'-0"



WEIPING JIA

277 Judson Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94112

E-mail: peacewang8618@gmail.com

CONSULTANTS

Structural Engineer

GTC GeoTrinity Consultants, Inc.
7770 Pardee Lane, Suite 101
Oakland, CA 94621

Tel: (510) 383-9950
E-mail: info@geotrinity.com

REVISIONS

102217 FOR OWNER'S REVIEW
09/27/18 FOR PLANNING APPLICATION

APPROVALS

PROJECT

ADDITION & RENOVATION
FOR
277 JUDSON AVENUE,
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94112

SHEET TITLE

(E) LOWER FLOOR PLAN

DRAWN BY
YFL

CHECKED BY
JTZ


DATE
AUGUST 08, 2016


SCALE
AS NOTED

LZ JOB NO.
021616

SHEET NO.

A2.2





1 (N) MAIN LEVEL PLAN
TOTAL TENANTS: 5
1/4" = 1'-0"

ARCHITECT
LZI International
Architecture Interior Design Construction
P. O. BOX 11230
OAKLAND, CA 94611
TEL: (510) 759-4149
FAX: (510) 985-1668
EMAIL: lziarchitect@gmail.com
BUILDING OWNER

WEIPING JIA
277 Judson Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94112
E-mail: peacewang8618@gmail.com
CONSULTANTS

Structural Engineer
GTC GeoTrinity Consultants, Inc.
7770 Pardee Lane, Suite 101
Oakland, CA 94621
Tel: (510) 383-9950
E-mail: info@geotrinity.com

REVISIONS
102217 FOR OWNER'S REVIEW
09/27/18 FOR PLANNING APPLICATION

APPROVALS


PROJECT

ADDITION & RENOVATION
FOR
277 JUDSON AVENUE,
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94112

SHEET TITLE

(N) MAIN FLOOR PLAN

DRAWN BY
YFL
CHECKED BY
JTZ
DATE
AUGUST 08, 2016
SCALE
AS NOTED
LZ JOB NO.
021616
SHEET NO.
A2.3



1 (N) LOWER LEVEL PLAN
TOTAL TENANTS: 2
1/4" = 1'-0"

ARCHITECT
LZI International
Architecture Interior Design Construction
P. O. BOX 11230
OAKLAND, CA 94611
TEL: (510) 759-4149
FAX: (510) 985-1668
EMAIL: lziarchitect@gmail.com
BUILDING OWNER

WEIPING JIA
277 Judson Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94112
E-mail: peacewang8618@gmail.com
CONSULTANTS

Structural Engineer
GTC GeoTrinity Consultants, Inc.
7770 Pardee Lane, Suite 101
Oakland, CA 94621
Tel: (510) 383-9950
E-mail: info@geotrinity.com

REVISIONS
102217 FOR OWNER'S REVIEW
09/27/18 FOR PLANNING APPLICATION

APPROVALS

PROJECT
ADDITION & RENOVATION
FOR
277 JUDSON AVENUE,
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94112

SHEET TITLE

(N) LOWER FLOOR PLAN

DRAWN BY
YFL
CHECKED BY
JTZ
DATE
AUGUST 08, 2016
SCALE
AS NOTED
LZ JOB NO.
021616
SHEET NO.
A2.4

WEIPING JIA

277 Judson Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94112

E-mail: peacewang8618@gmail.com

CONSULTANTS

Structural Engineer

GTC GeoTrinity Consultants, Inc.
7770 Pardee Lane, Suite 101
Oakland, CA 94621

Tel: (510) 383-9950
E-mail: info@geotrinity.com

REVISIONS

09/27/18 FOR PLANNING APPLICATION

APPROVALS

PROJECT

ADDITION & RENOVATION
FOR
277 JUDSON AVENUE,
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94112

SHEET TITLE

(N) BASEMENT PLAN

DRAWN BY
YFL

CHECKED BY
JTZ


DATE
AUGUST 08, 2016

SCALE
AS NOTED

LZ JOB NO.
021616

SHEET NO.



A2.5



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

NEIGHBOR (271 JUDSON)
DECK & STAIR AWNING SHWN DASHED,
VERIFY AT SITE
IT HAS NO WINDOWS FACING SUBJECT

NOTE: NEIGHBOR'S IMAGES ARE
APPROXIMATE AND ARE MEANT FOR
REFERENCE ONLY. IMAGE ARE BASED
ON CITY MAPS, AERIAL PHOTOS AND
ACCESSIBLE FIELD MEASUREMENTS.
FOR EXACT DIMENSIONS, VERIFY AT
SITE AND WITH NEIGHBOR'S
PERMISSION AS NEEDED.



ARCHITECT
LZI International
Architecture Interior Design Construction
P. O. BOX 11230
OAKLAND, CA 94611
TEL: (510) 759-4149
FAX: (510) 985-1668
EMAIL: lziarchitect@gmail.com
BUILDING OWNER

WEIPING JIA

277 Judson Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94112

E-mail: peacewang8618@gmail.com

CONSULTANTS

Structural Engineer

GTC GeoTrinity Consultants, Inc.
7770 Pardee Lane, Suite 101
Oakland, CA 94621

Tel: (510) 383-9950
E-mail: info@geotrinity.com

REVISIONS

102217 FOR OWNER'S REVIEW
09/27/18 FOR PLANNING APPLICATION

APPROVALS

PROJECT

ADDITION & RENOVATION
FOR
277 JUDSON AVENUE,
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94112

SHEET TITLE

(E) EAST ELEVATION
(N) EAST ELEVATION

DRAWN BY
YFL
CHECKED BY
JTZ
DATE
AUGUST 08, 2016
SCALE
AS NOTED
LZ JOB NO.
021616
SHEET NO.
A3.1

WEIPING JIA

277 Judson Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94112

E-mail: peacewang8618@gmail.com

CONSULTANTS

Structural Engineer

GTC GeoTrinity Consultants, Inc.
7770 Pardee Lane, Suite 101
Oakland, CA 94621

Tel: (510) 383-9950
E-mail: info@geotrinity.com

REVISIONS

102217 FOR OWNER'S REVIEW
09/27/18 FOR PLANNING APPLICATION

APPROVALS

PROJECT

ADDITION & RENOVATION
FOR
277 JUDSON AVENUE,
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94112

SHEET TITLE

(E) WEST ELEVATION
(N) WEST ELEVATION

SHEET NO.

DRAWN BY
YFL



CHECKED BY
JTZ



DATE
AUGUST 08, 2016

SCALE
AS NOTED

LZ JOB NO.
021616

A3.2





ARCHITECT
LZI International
Architecture Interior Design Construction
P. O. BOX 11230
OAKLAND, CA 94611
TEL: (510) 759-4149
FAX: (510) 985-1668
EMAIL: lziarchitect@gmail.com
BUILDING OWNER

WEIPING JIA

277 Judson Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94112

E-mail: peacewang8618@gmail.com

Structural Engineer

GTC GeoTrinity Consultants, Inc.
7770 Pardee Lane, Suite 101
Oakland, CA 94621



Tel: (510) 383-9950
E-mail: info@geotrinity.com

102217 FOR OWNER'S REVIEW
09/27/18 FOR PLANNING APPLICATION

PROJECT
ADDITION & RENOVATION
FOR
277 JUDSON AVENUE,
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94112

(E) NORTH ELEVATION
(N) NORTH ELEVATION

DRAWN BY
YFL
CHECKED BY
JTZ
DATE
AUGUST 08, 2016
SCALE
AS NOTED
LZ JOB NO.
021616
SHEET NO.
A3.3



ARCHITECT
LZI International
Architecture Interior Design Construction
P. O. BOX 11230
OAKLAND, CA 94611
TEL: (510) 759-4149
FAX: (510) 985-1668
EMAIL: lziarchitect@gmail.com
BUILDING OWNER

WEIPING JIA

277 Judson Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94112

E-mail: peacewang8618@gmail.com

CONSULTANTS

Structural Engineer

GTC GeoTrinity Consultants, Inc.
7770 Pardee Lane, Suite 101
Oakland, CA 94621

Tel: (510) 383-9950
E-mail: info@geotrinity.com

REVISIONS

102217 FOR OWNER'S REVIEW
09/27/18 FOR PLANNING APPLICATION

APPROVALS

PROJECT





ADDITION & RENOVATION
FOR
277 JUDSON AVENUE,
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94112

SHEET TITLE

(E) SOUTH ELEVATION
(N) SOUTH ELEVATION

DRAWN BY
YFL
CHECKED BY
JTZ
DATE
AUGUST 08, 2016
SCALE
AS NOTED
LZ JOB NO.
021616
SHEET NO.
A3.4

(N) Window Schedule						
Type Mark	Rough Opening		Recess	Type	Material	Number
	Width	Height				
01	5'-0"	4'-0"	3-5/16"	Double Casement	ALUM. CLAD	6
02	5'-0"	3'-0"	3-5/16"	Double Casement	ALUM. CLAD	1
03	4'-0"	4'-0"	3-5/16"	Double Casement	ALUM. CLAD	2
04	8'-0"	5'-8"	3-5/16"	Triple Casement w/ fix	ALUM. CLAD	1
05	3'-0"	4'-0"	3-5/16"	Casement	ALUM. CLAD	1
06	4'-0"	2'-0"	3-5/16"	Awning	ALUM. CLAD	1
07	3'-6"	5'-8"	3-5/16"	Single Hung	ALUM. CLAD	1



ARCHITECT
LZI International
Architecture Interior Design Construction
P. O. BOX 11230
OAKLAND, CA 94611
TEL: (510) 759-4149
FAX: (510) 985-1668
EMAIL: lziarchitect@gmail.com
BUILDING OWNER

WEIPING JIA

277 Judson Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94112

E-mail: peacewang8618@gmail.com

CONSULTANTS

Structural Engineer

GTC GeoTrinity Consultants, Inc.
7770 Pardee Lane, Suite 101
Oakland, CA 94621

Tel: (510) 383-9950
E-mail: info@geotrinity.com

REVISIONS

102217 FOR OWNER'S REVIEW
09/27/18 FOR PLANNING APPLICATION

APPROVALS

PROJECT

ADDITION & RENOVATION
FOR
277 JUDSON AVENUE,
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94112

SHEET TITLE

(N) SECTIONS & DETAILS

DRAWN BY SHEET NO.

YFL

CHECKED BY

JTZ

DATE

AUGUST 08, 2016

SCALE

AS NOTED

LZ JOB NO.

021616

A4.1