

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Memo to the Planning Commission

HEARING DATE: FEBRUARY 12, 2015

Previous Planning Commission Hearing: December 4, 2014

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

Reception: 415.558.6378

Fax: 415.558.6409

Planning Information: 415.558.6377

Date:	February 5, 2015
Case No.:	2013.1522DV
Project Address:	24 Ord Court
Permit Application:	2013.1021.9830
Zoning:	RH-2 (Residential House, Two-Family)
	40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot:	2619/066
Project Sponsor:	Aidin Massoudi
	Sia Consulting Corp.
	1256 Howard Street
	San Francisco, CA 94103
Staff Contact:	Tina Chang – (415) 575-9197
	tina.chang@sfgov.org
Recommendation:	Do Not Take DR and Approve Project with Modifications as Proposed

BACKGROUND

The Project Sponsor proposes the new construction of a three-story single-family dwelling unit at the rear of an existing single-family dwelling unit filed under building permit application 2013.1021.9830. New construction at the property's rear requires a variance, which is filed under Case Number 2013.1522V. New construction at the rear of the adjacent property at 24 Ord Court was also proposed, and heard at the same hearing. The Variance Hearing for the project was initially scheduled for August 27, 2014, but continued to December 4, 2014, then to February 5, 2015, and finally to February 12, 2015 in conjunction with the Planning Commission Hearing. The Property is located in an RH-2 (Residential House, Two-Family) Zoning District, and a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

The proposed Project was heard before the Planning Commission and Zoning Administrator on December 4, 2014. After public testimony in opposition to the Project and concerns raised regarding two mature Monterey Cypress trees at the rear of the subject property, the Planning Commission continued the subject item to February 5, 2015 requesting the following primary changes, but also to await conclusions from Department of Public Works (DPW) Staff regarding the mature Monterey Cypress trees. The project was subsequently continued to February 12th, to allow for additional time to conduct environmental review of the project changes. The primary changes requested include the:

- Removal of top level of the proposed structure at the rear
- Differentiation of architectural design between the proposed structures at the rear of 22 and 24 Ord Court

• Reduction of parking provided to increase habitable space the proposed new structure

CURRENT PROPOSAL

The following changes have been made in response to the Commission's concerns:

- The number of floors above grade was reduced from three to two.
- Reduction of off-street parking spaces from two to one, increasing habitable living space.
- Alteration of front façade to emphasize a vertical design.

In addition to the changes made in response to the Commission's concerns the project also includes the following changes:

- Excavation of 430 square feet beneath the basement level to create two levels below grade, resulting in a four-level structure; two levels above grade and two below.
- Addition of a roof deck above the second story, setback 13'-10" from the front façade.

After consideration of letters and testimonies presented at public hearing held by the Director of Public Works on November 24th, 2014, DPW staff decided to approve the removal of the significant trees on the condition that appropriate permits to construct the new structure at 24 Ord Court were attained. DPW Staff found that the trees had poor structure as the result of repeated pruning by PG&E contractors and no routine maintenance, and would thus be impacted by proposed construction. These findings and decision are memorialized in DPW Order No: 183228.

The Department has received the Discretionary Review Requestor's response to revised plans, which has been included as an attachment to the subject memo.


REQUIRED COMMISSION ACTION


In order for the Project to proceed, the Commission must decide whether or not to take Discretionary Review and approve the new construction of a two-story, four-level, two-unit building at the rear of the subject property, within RH-2, and 40-X Height and Bulk District.


BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION


- The Project Sponsor has responded to each of the Commission's primary concerns
- The Project Sponsor has relayed these changes to the neighbors.
- The scale and mass of the existing and proposed dwelling-units are contextual and compatible with the surrounding neighborhood character.
- The Department of Public Works has approved the removal of the two significant trees at the property's rear.
- The Project is consistent with adopted City policies and General Plan.
- The Project is Code-complying and meets all other applicable requirements of the Planning Department.


SCOPE OF WORK	ASSESSOR MAP	DRAWING	INDEX	PROJECT NAME
OPOSED NEW CONSTRUCTION OF SINGLE FAMILY HOME AT THE AR LOT OF 24 ORD COURT		A-2.2 THIRD & ROOF PLAN	SECOND FLOOR PLANS	- 24 Ord Ct-Rear Buildin SAN FRANCISCO,
	SUBJECT PARCEL	A-3.1FRONT & REAR ELEVA-3.2SIDE ELEVATIONA-3.3SIDE ELEVATIONA-4.1BUILDING SECTIONA-4.2BUILDING SECTIONGP-0.1GREEN POINT CHECC-1.0SURVEY		SIA ^{Sopo} rallan
GENERAL NOTES	ABBREVIATION	MASS STU	IDY	
1. ALL WORK SHALL BE PERFORMED IN COMPLETE COMPLANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE CODES, LAWS, ORDINANCES AND REGULATIONS OF ALL AUTHORITIES HAVING JURISDICTION OVER THE WORK. ALL CONTRACTORS SHALL HOLD HARMLESS THE ARCHITECTENSINEER AND THE OWNER FROM ALL DAMAGES AND/OR PENALTY ARISING OUT OF VIOLATION THEREOF. 2. ALL ATTACHMENTS, CONNECTIONS OR FASTENING OF ANY NATURE ARE TO BE PROPERLY AND PERMANENTLY SECURED IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE BEST PRACTICE OF THE BUILDING INDUSTRY. DRAWINGS SHOWS ONLY SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS TO ASSIST THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR VERIFYING ALL CONDITIONS DIMENSIONS, AND MEASUREMENTS IN THE FIELD BEFORE BEGINNING WORK, ANY AND ALL DISCREPANCIES, UNUSUAL CIRCUMSTANCES, ERRORS OMISSIONS AND/OR CONFLICTS FUNDS SHALL BE REPORTED TO THE ARCHITECTIENGINEER'S AND THE OWNER ATTENTION IMMEDIATELY BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH THE WORK. 4. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR COORDINATION BETWEEN ARCHITECTURAL, STRUCTURAL, FIRE PROTECTION, MECHANICAL, PLUMBING, AND ELECTRICAL THIS INCLUDES REVIEWING REQUIREMENTS OF INDIVIDUAL SYSTEMS BEFORE PROCEEDING NO INSTALLATION OF ANY WORK, VERIFY ALL ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS AND ALL FINISH CONDITIONS (WHETHER DEPICTED IN DRAWINGS OR NOT) WITH THE SAME DISCIPLINES. 5. UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED, ALL ANGLES SHALL BE RIGHT ANGLES SHALL BE REPORE HEAT	# POUND OR NUMBER H.C. HANDICAPPED & AND HI HIGH @ AT HM HOLLOW METAL ABV ABOVE HP HIGH POINT ACT ACOUSTIC CEILING TILE HR HOUR AD AREA DRAIN HVAC HEATING, VENTLATING, AND AREA DRAIN ALUM ALUMINUM IRGWB IMPACT RESISTANT ALUM ALUMINUM IRGWB IMPACT RESISTANT APPROX APPROX APPROX GYPSUM VALLBOARD ANDD ANDDIZED ILO IN LIEU OF ANDD ANDDIZED INSUL INSULATED BD BOARD INT INTERIOR BLGG BUILDING LO LOWW BLKG BLOCKING MAX MAXIMUM BOT BOTTOM MECH MERANEA BST BASEMENT MEMBR MEMBRANE BST BOTTOM OF STAIRS MIN MINIMUM BYND BEYOND MO MASORY OPENING CIP CAST IN PLACE MC MASORY OPENING	PROJECT		Cover Sheet
AND ALL ITEMS WHICH APPEAR CENTERED SHALL BE CENTERED. CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR MAINTAINING ALL LINES TRUE LEVEL, PLUMB AND SQUARE. 6. CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL SHORING AND PROTECTION DURING CONSTRUCTION. ALL EXISTING IMPROVEMENTS TO REMAIN SHALL BE PROTECTED. ALL MATERIALS DELIVERED TO THE SITE SHALL BE PROPERLY STORED AND	CHNL CHANNEL (N) NEW CJ CONTROL JOINT NIC NOT IN CONTRACT CLG CEILING NO NUMBER CLO CLOSET NOM NOMINAL CLR CLEAR N.T.S. NOT TO SCALE	LOT AREA:	2,945 ± S.F.	
PROTECTED UNTIL INSTALLATION. ALL LUMBER SHALL BE PROTECTED FROM MOISTURE AND STORED ABOVE GROUND. 7. DETAILED AND/OR LARGER SCALE DRAWINGS SHALL TAKE PRECEDENCE OVER GENERAL AND SMALLER SCALE DRAWINGS. FIGURED DIMENSIONS SHALL TAKE PRECEDENCE OVER SCALED DIMENSIONS, ALL SCALED DIMENSIONS SHALL BE VERIFIED.	CNTR COUNTER O.C. ON CENTER CMU CONCRETE MASONRY UNIT OFF OFFICE COL COLUMN OH OPPOSITE HAND COMPRE SIBLE OZ OUNCE	# OF UNIT: # OF COVER PARKING SPACE:	1 1	
8. ALL WORK SHALL BE DONE UNDER PERMIT. PLANS AND CALCULATIONS, IF REQUIRED, SHALL BE SUBMITTED TO AND APPROVED BY THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT. CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL REQUIRED PERMITS.	CONC CONCRETE PCC PRE-CAST CONCRETE CONT CONTINUOUS P.L. PROPERTY LINE CORR CORRIDOR PLUMB PLUMBING CPT CARPET PLV PLVWOOD	# OF STORIES: ALLOWABLE BUILDING HEIGHT:	3-OVER BASEMENT 40-X	
9. NOTE THAT MECHANICAL, ELECTRICAL, FIRE PROTECTION, PLUMBING AND COMMUNICATIONS ARE DESIGN BUILD ITEMS. ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS SHOW DESIGN INTENT, CONTRACTOR TO CONFIRM ALL SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS WITH BUILDING OWNER AND ARCHITECT PRIOR TO INSTALLATION. CONTRACTOR/SUBCONTRACTOR SHALL SUBMIT PLANS FOR THEIR RESPECTIVE WORK TO THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT AS REQUIRED FOR PLAN CHECK AND PERMIT ISSUANCE, INCLUDING PAYING FOR ALL PLAN CHECK AND PERMIT FEES.	CP1 CARPEI PETID PETID PETWODU CT CERAMIC TILE PT PRESSURE TREATED CTR CENTER PNT PAINT/PAINTED CTVD COURTYARD PVC POLYVINYL CHLORIDE DBL DOUBLE RBR RUBBER DEMO DEMOLISH RCP REFLECTED CEILING PLAN DET DETAIL RD ROOF DRAIN	BUILDING HEIGHT: CONSTRUCTION TYPE:	20'-6" @ CENTER OF FRONT P.L. TYPE "V-B"	These documents are property of SIA CONSUL and are not to be produced changed or copied
10. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR APPLYING AND OBTAINING ALL REQUIRED INSPECTIONS TO CONFORM WITH LOCAL BUILDING AND FIRE CODES.	D.F. DRINKING FOUNTAIN RDWD REDWOOD DIA DIAMETER REQD REQUIRED DIMS DIMENSIONS RM ROOM DN DOWN S.F. SQUARE FOOT	OCCUPANCY GROUP: BLOCK & LOT :	R-3 2619 / 066	without the expressed written consent of SIA CONSULTING ENGINEERS. ISSUES / REVISIONS
11. DO NOT SCALE DRAWINGS. WRITTEN DIMENSIONS GOVERN. 12. DETAILS SHOWN ARE TYPICAL, SIMILAR DETAILS APPLY IN SIMILAR CONDITIONS.	DN DUNN S.F. SQUARE FOOT DR DOOR SIM SIMILIAR DWG DRAWING SPEC SPECIFIED OR SPECIFICATION (E) EXISTING SPK SPRINKLER	ZONING:	RH-2	NO. DATE DESCRIPTION
13. VERIFY CLEARANCES FOR VENTS, CHASES, SOFFITS, FIXTURES BEFORE ANY CONSTRUCTION, ORDERING OF , OR INSTALLATION OF ANY ITEM OF WORK.	EA EACH SSTL STAINLESS STEEL EL ELEVATION STC SOUND TRANSMISSION ELEC ELECTRICAL COEFFICIENT	APPLICABLE CODES:	2010 CALIFORNIA CODES EDITIONS W/ SAN FRANCISCO AMENDMENTS	
14. UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE SOLID BLOCKING AND BACKING AS REQ'D FOR ALL NAILING OF INTERIOR TRIM AND FINISHES, AND SHALL COORDINATE AND PROVIDE ALL FRAMING, BACKING AND BRACING AS NECESSARY FOR INSTALLATION OF EQUIPMENT INDICATED ON THE DRAWINGS, PROVIDE BACKING PLATES AT ALL BATH ACCESSORIES, HANDRAILS,	ELEV ELEVATOR/ELEVATION STD STANDARD EQ EQUAL STL STEL EXT EXTERIOR STRUCT STRUCTURAL EXP JT EXPANSION JOINT SQ. SQUARE	GROSS FLOOR AREA:		
CABINETS, TOWEL BARS, WALL MOUNTED FIXTURES AND ANY OTHER ITEMS ATTACHED TO WALLS. 15. INSTALL ALL FIXTURES, EQUIPMENT, AND MATERIALS PER MANUFACTURER'S RECOMMENDATIONS AND CODE REQUIREMENTS.	F.D. FLOOR DRAIN T&G TONGUE AND GROOVE FEC FIRE EXTINGUISHER CABINET TC TOP OF CURB FIXT FIXTURE TELE TELEPHONE	BASEMENT GROSS AREA: FIRST FLOOR GROSS AREA:	430 ± S.F. 871 ± S.F.	
ALL APPLIANCES, FIXTURES, AND EQUIPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH PLUMBING, ELECTRICAL, MECHANICAL SYSTEMS SHALL BE LISTED BY A NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED AND APPROVED AGENCY.	FIXINE TELE TELEPHONE FLR FLOOR TLT TOILET FLUOR FLUORESCENT TO TOP OF FM FILLED METAL TOC TOP OF CONCRETE	SECOND FLOOR GROSS AREA.	974 ± S.F.	DRAWN R.L.
16. THERMAL AND SOUND INSULATING INSULATION SHALL COMPLY WITH CBC SEC. 719. 17. ALL WALL AND CEILING FINISHES SHALL COMPLY WITH CBC CHAPTER 8.	FND FOUNDATION TOS TOP OF STEEL FO FACE OF TP TOILET PAPER DISPENSER	THIRD FLOOR GROSS AREA:	944 ± S.F.	DESIGN R.K.
17. ALL WALL AND CEILING FINISHES SHALL COMPLET WITH GEO GHAFTER 0. 18. ALL NEW SMOKE DETECTORS TO E HARD WIRED.	F.O.F. FACE OF FININSH T/D TELEPHONE/DATA FURR FURRING TST TOP OF STAIRS GA GAUGE TYP TYPICAL	TOTAL GROSS FLOOR AREA:	3,221 ± S.F.	
NOTE: WATERPROOFING OF BUILDING ENVELOPE IS NOT UNDER THE SCOPE OF THIS PERMIT. OWNER IS TO HIRE A WATERPROOFING EXPERT TO PROVIDE	GALV GALVANIZED U.N.O. UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE G.B. GRAB BAR U/S UNDERSIDE GND GROUND V.I.F. VERIFY IN FIELD GRP GROUP VP VISION PANEL	HABITABLE FLOOR AREA:		DATE 08/19/2013
WATERPROOFING DETAILS	GWB GYPSUM WALL BOARD W/ WITH GYP GYPSUM WD WOOD	BASEMENT AREA:	348 ± S.F.	REVISED DATE 01/28/2015
	W.H. WATER HEATER		733 ± S.F.	JOB NO. 13-1590
		SECOND FLOOR AREA (Ex. GARAGE): THIRD FLOOR AREA:	556 ± S.F.	SHEET NO.
		TOTAL HABITABLE FLOOR AREA:	800 ± S.F. 2,437 ± S.F.	A-0.1
















NOR


8		9		10
	I		PROJECT NAME	
			24 Ord Ct	-Rear Building San francisco, ca
				_
CUPIED DOF				
LASS			SI.	
ILING Roof EL. + 326.26'				JLTING CORPORATION 1256 HOWARD STREET
ROOF DEC	<u>S</u>			I FRANCISCO CA 94103 TEL: (415) 922.0200 FAX: (415) 922.0203 WW. SIACONSULT.COM
			Floo	r Plans
CUPIED DOF	PATIO			
-	BELOW			
'-0"	10'-9"			_
			These documents are and are not to be prod without the expressed CONSULTING ENGIN ISSUES / REVISIO NO. DATE	
Plan		I		
			DRAWN	R.L.
			DESIGN	R.K.
			DATE	08/19/2013
N MONOXIDE DETEC	CTOR/ALARM IN AL	L BEDROOMS	REVISED DATE	01/28/2015
		VITH BATTERY BACKUP	JOB NO.	13-1590
PROPERTY			SHEET NO.	
(N) WALL	TO BE CONSTRUC	ED	SHEET NU.	
	TO BE 1-HR. FIRE	RATED		A-2.2




9	10
	PROJECT NAME 24 Ord Ct-Rear Building SAN FRANCISCO, CA
Bevaton + 319.53	SIA CONSULTING CORPORATION 1256 HOWARD STREET SAN FRANCISCO CA 94103 TEL: (415) 922.0200 FAX: (415) 922.0203 WEBSITE:WWW. SIACONSULT.COM
	Front Elevation –
231 STATES ST.	These documents are property of SIA CONSULTING
	and are not to be produced changed or copied without the sepressed written consent of SIA CONSULTING ENGINEERS. ISSUES / REVISIONS NO. DATE DESCRIPTION
	DRAWN R.L. DESIGN R.K.
	DATE 08/19/2013 REVISED DATE 01/28/2015 JOB NO. 13-1590
9	знеет NO. А-3.1










8	9		10
8500		PROJECT NAME 24 Ord Ct-F S/	Rear Building an francisco, ca
Dining	Roof Elev. + 326.25 - 2nd FF Elev. + 315.25 + 315.25 	12 SAN F	TING CORPORATION 256 HOWARD STREET RANCISCO CA 94103 TEL: (415) 922.0200 FAX: (415) 922.0203 W. SIACONSULT.COM
		Building	g Section -
		These documents are pl and are not to be produc without the expressed wCONSULTING ENGINE ISSUES / REVISION NO. DATE	rritten consent of SIA ERS.
		DRAWN DESIGN DATE	R.L. R.K. 08/19/2013
		REVISED DATE JOB NO. SHEET NO.	01/28/2015 13-1590 A-4.1
8	9		10

	1	2	3		4	5	6	7	8
_									
						24 ORD CT	. REAR	ļ	
					• Roof F. EL. + 326 26'	Roof Deck		22 ORD CT. REAR	
_				PROFILE OF 241 STATES ST.	• 31d F.F. + 315.26	Living Room	Bath		
						Master	Master		
		STATES ST.			● 2nd F.F. + 305.76'	Bedroom	CLO.		
						Bedroom	Bedroom		
_					• 1st F.F. + 294.76'				
		_			·	and the second s			
					Basement F.F. + 284.76'	Family F	Room		
_									
		Propos	sed Section B-B						

3/16" = 1'-0"



1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

Green Building: Site Permit Checklist

BASIC INFORMATION:

These facts, plus the primary occupancy, determine which requirements apply. For details, see AB 093 Attachment A Table 1.

Project Name	Block/Lot	Address
24 ORD CT-REAR	2619 / 066	24 ORD CT-REAR
Gross Building Area	Primary Occupancy	Design Professional/Applicant: Sign & Date
3,221 s.f. +/-	R-3	Sia Tahbazof
# of Dwelling Units	Height to highest occupied floor	Number of occupied floors
1	20'-6"	4

Instructions:

As part of application for site permit, this form acknowledges the specific green building under San Francisco Building Code Chapter 13C, California Title 24 Part 11, and related will be due with the applicable addendum. To use the form:

(a) Provide basic information about the project in the box at left. This info determines wh

AND

5

(b) Indicate in one of the columns below which type of project is proposed. If applicable, number of points the project must meet or exceed. A LEED or GreenPoint checklist is no permit application, but such tools are strongly recommended to be used .

Solid circles in the column indicate mandatory measures required by state and local cod GreenPoint Rated, prerequisites of those systems are mandatory. This form is a summary Chapter 13C for details.

BLE NON-

ALL PROJECTS, AS APPLICABLE		LE	OTHER APPLICABLE NON-RI						
Construction activity stormwater pollution prevention and site runoff controls - Provide a construction site Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan			New Large Commercia	Residential	New Residential High-Rise ¹	Commerical Interior	Commercial Alteration	Residential Alteration	Requirements below only apply when the measure is applicable to references below are applicable to New Non-Residential buildings. quirements for additions and alterations can be found in Title 24 Pa Requirements for additions or alterations apply to applications rece after. ³
and implement SFPUC Best Management Practices.	_ [Type of Project Proposed (Indicate at right)		X					Type of Project Proposed (Check box if applicable
Stormwater Control Plan: Projects disturbing ≥5,000 square feet must implement a Stormwater Control Plan		Overall Requirements:			1		1		Energy Efficiency: Demonstrate a 15% energy use reduction or
meeting SFPUC Stormwater Design Guidelines	╧	LEED certification level (includes prerequisites):	GOLD	SILVER	SILVER	GOLD	GOLD	GOLD	California Energy Code, Title 24, Part 6. (13C.5.201.1.1)
Water Efficient Irrigation - Projects that include ≥ 1.000 square feet of new or modified landscape must		Base number of required points: Adjustment for retention / demolition of historic	60	2	50	60	60	60	Bicycle parking: Provide short-term and long-term bicycle parkin motorized parking capacity each, or meet San Francisco Planning Co
comply with the SFPUC Water Efficient Irrigation		features / building:		ļ		n/a	ļ		whichever is greater (or LEED credit SSc4.2). (13C.5.106.4) Fuel efficient vehicle and carpool parking: Provide stall
Construction Waste Management – Comply with		Final number of required points (base number +/- adjustment)				50			low-entiting, fuel efficient, and carpool/van pool vehicles; approximat spaces. (13C.5.106.5)
the San Francisco Construction & Demolition Debris Ordinance		Specific Requirements: (n/r indicates a measure is no	ot required)						Water Meters: Provide submeters for spaces projected to consum or >100 gal/day if in buildings over 50,000 sq. ft.
Recycling by Occupants: Provide adequate space and equal access for storage, collection and loading of		Construction Waste Management – 75% Diversion AND comply with San Francisco Construction & Demolition Debris					Meet C&D		Indoor Water Efficiency: Reduce overall use of potable water within for showerheads, lavatories, kitchen faucets, wash fountains, water closets, and
compostable, recyclable and landfill materials. See Administrative Bulletin 088 for details.		Ordinance LEED MR 2, 2 points 15% Energy Reduction		•		•	ordinance only		Commissioning: For new buildings greater than 10,000 square shall be included in the design and construction of the project to verify systems and components meet the owner's project requirements. (13)
		Compared to Title-24 2008 (or ASHRAE 90.1-2007) LEED EA 1, 3 points	•	•	•	•		ED isite only	OR for buildings less than 10,000 square feet, testing and adjusting o Protect duct openings and mechanical equipment duri
GREENPOINT RATED PROJECTS		Renewable Energy or Enhanced Energy Efficiency Effective 1/1/2012:							(13C.5.504.3) Adhesives, sealants, and caulks: Comply with VOC limits in
Proposing a GreenPoint Rated Project (Indicate at right by checking the box.)		Generate renewable energy on-site ≥1% of total annual energy cost (LEED EAc2), OR Demonstrate an additional 10% energy use reduction (total of 25% compared to Title 24 Part 6 2008), OR	•	n/r	n/r	n/r	n/r	n/r	VOC limits and California Code of Regulations Title 17 for aerosol adhes Paints and coatings: Comply with VOC limits in the Air Resour Architectural Coatings Suggested Control Measure and California Co Title 17 for aerosol paints. (13C.5.504.4.3)
Base number of required Greenpoints: 75		Purchase Green-E certified renewable energy credits for 35% of total electricity use (LEED EAc6). Enhanced Commissioning of Building Energy Systems							Carpet: All carpet must meet one of the following: 1. Carpet and Rug Institute Green Label Plus Program
Adjustment for retention / demolition of	LEED EA 3		•		Mee	t LEED prerequ	uisites		 California Department of Public Health Standard Practice for the (Specification 01350) NSF/ANSI 140 at the Gold level
historic features / building:		Water Use - 30% Reduction LEED WE 3, 2 points	•	n/r	•	Mee	et LEED prerequ	isites	4. Scientific Certifications Systems Sustainable Choice AND Carpet cushion must meet CRI Green Label,
Final number of required points (base number +/-	1	Enhanced Refrigerant Management LEED EA 4	•	n/r	n/r	n/r	n/r	n/r	AND Carpet adhesive must not exceed 50 g/L VOC content. (130
adjustment)		Indoor Air Quality Management Plan LEED IEQ 3.1	•	n/r	n/r	n/r	n/r	n/r	Composite wood: Meet CARB Air Toxics Control Measure for Composi Resilient flooring systems: For 50% of floor area receiving re
GreenPoint Rated (i.e. meets all prerequisites)		Low-Emitting Materials LEED IEQ 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4	•	n/r	•	•	•	•	resilient flooring complying with the VOC-emission limits defined in the for High Performance Schools (CHPS) criteria or certified under the Re
Energy Efficiency: Demonstrate a 15% energy use reduction compared to 2008 California Energy Code,		Bicycle parking: Provide short-term and long-term bicycle parking for 5% of total motorized parking capacity each, or meet San Francisco Planning Code Sec 155, whichever is greater, or meet LEED credit SSc4.2. (13C.5.106.4)	•		n/r Icisco Planning	•	n/r	n/r	Covering Institute (RFCI) FloorScore program. (13C.5.504.4.6) Environmental Tobacco Smoke: Prohibit smoking within 25 entries, outdoor air intakes, and operable windows. (13C.5.504.7)
Title 24, Part 6. Meet all California Green Building Standards Code requirements		Designated parking: Mark 8% of total parking stalls for low-emitting, fuel efficient, and carpool/van pool vehicles. (13C.5.106.5)	•	Cod	e 155	•	n/r	n/r	Air Filtration: Provide at least MERV-8 filters in regularly occupie mechanically ventilated buildings. (13C.5.504.5.3)
(CalGreen measures for residential projects have been integrated into the GreenPoint Rated system.)		Water Meters: Provide submeters for spaces projected to consume more than 1,000 gal/day, or more than 100 gal/day if in	•	n/r	n/r	n/r	n/r	n/r	Acoustical Control: Wall and roof-ceilings STC 50, exterior win walls and floor-ceilings STC 40. (13C.5.507.4)
Notes	ŀ	building over 50,000 sq. ft. (13C.5.303.1)							CFCs and Halons: Do not install equipment that contains CFCs or
 New residential projects of 75' or greater must use the "New Residential High-Rise" column. New residential projects with >3 		Air Filtration: Provide at least MERV-8 filters in regularly occupied spaces of mechanically ventilated buildings (or LEED credit IEQ 5). (13C.5.504.5.3)	•	n/r	n/r	•	n/r	n/r	Additional Requirements for New A, B, I, OR M Occup
occupied floors and less than 75 feet to the highest occupied floor may choose to apply the LEED for Homes Mid-Rise rating system; if so, you must use the "New Residential Mid-Rise" column.		Air Filtration: Provide MERV-13 filters in residential buildings in air-quality hot-spots (or LEED credit IEQ 5). (SF Health Code Article 38	n/r	•	•	n/r	n/r	n/r	Construction Waste Management – Divert 75% of constru- debris AND comply with San Francisco Construction & Demolition De Renewable Energy or Enhanced Energy Efficiency
2) LEED for Homes Mid-Rise projects must meet the "Silver" standard including all prerequisites. The number of points required to achieve Silver depends on unit size. See LEED for Homes Mid-Rise Rating Surface to confirm the home number of achieve controls of the searcher.	e	and SF Building Code 1203.5) Acoustical Control: Wall and roof-ceilings STC 50, exterior windows STC 30, party walls and floor-ceilings STC 40. (13C.5.507.4)	•	See CI	3C 1207	•	n/r	n/r	Effective January 1, 2012: Generate renewable energy on-site equation annual energy cost (LEED EAc2), OR demonstrate an additional 10% energy use reduction (total of 25% cc Part 6 2008), OR
System to confirm the base number of points required. 3) Requirements for additions or alterations apply to applications									purchase Green-E certified renewable energy credits for 35% of total electric


3) Requirements for additions or alterations apply to applications received on or after July 1, 2012.


2


a a PROJECT NAME PROJECT NAME 24 Ord CL-Rear Building SAM FRANCISCO, CA determines which green building requirements apply. 24 Ord CL-Rear Building SAM FRANCISCO, CA 1.1 f applicable, fill in the blank lines below to identify the t checklist is not required to be submitted with the site 34 Ord CL-Rear Building SAM FRANCISCO, CA BELE NON-RESIDENTIAL PROJECTS Addition Non- issa summary; see San Francisco Building Code 35 October Alteration SSM CONSULTING CORPORATION (SSM CONSULTING CONSULTING (SSM CONS					
Provide states which green building requirements that apply to a project 11, and related local codes. Attachment C3, C4, or C5 22 Ord C4-Rear Building SAN FRANCISCO, CA SAN FRAN	8	9	9		10
SAN FRANCISCO, CA SAN FRANCIS				PROJECT NAME	
I. If applicable, fill in the blank lines below to identify the checklist is not required to be submitted with the site search checklist is not required to be submitted with the site search checklist is not required to be submitted with the site search checklist is not required to be submitted with the site search checklist is not required to be submitted with the site search checklist is not required to be submitted with the site search checklist is not required to be submitted with the site search checklist is not required to be submitted with the site search checklist is not required to be submitted with the site search checklist is not required to be submitted with the site search checklist is not required to the project. Coord is not required to applicable is not required to the project. Coord is not required to applicable is not required to applicable is not required to applicable is not required to applicable. Expering: Expering: Evaluation of the project. Coord is not required to applicable is not required to applicable is not required to applicable. Sec Not if applicable is not required to 2008 set to applicable. Sec Not if applicable is not required to 2008 set to applicable. Evaluation of the project covering the form the building profile of the applicable is not required to applicable is not required to applicable. Sec Not applicable is not required to 2008 set to applicable. Sec Not applicable is not required to 2008 set to applicable is not required to applicable. Sec Not applicable is not applicable is not not applicable. Sec Not applicable is not applicable is not not applicable. Sec Not applicable is not applicable. Sec Not applicable is not applicable. Sec Not applicable. Sec Not applicabl					
t checklist is not required to be submitted with the site e and local codes. For projects applying LEED or orm is a summary; see San Francisco Building Code ELEL NON-RESIDENTIAL PROJECTS masure is application required to the row replace to the form remained product code Residential building Corresponding Code Sec 15, 2011.11 Imparting: Provide stating for DSV of total emergy use reduction compared to 2008 South True History Davids stating regioned to 2008 South True History Davids Stating Corresponding Code Sec 15, 2011.11 Imparting: Provide stating for DSV of total and product equipment during Construction and the project of the testing of VOCs and the Chroise Bandradi Plactice for the testing of VOCs Anter Time Standard Plactice for the testing of VOCs Anter Time Standard Plactice for the testing of VOCs Anter Time Corresponding research and the Sec 122-29 April 15 Sec 123-29 April Standard Plactice for the testing of VOCs Anter Time Standard Flactice for the testing of VOCs Anter Time Standard Flactice for the testing of VOCs Anter Time Standard Flactice for the testing of VOCs Anter Time Standard Flactice for the testing of VOCs Anter Time Standard Flactice for the testing of VOCs Anter Time Standard Flactice for the testing of VOCs Anter Time Standard Flactice for the testing of VOCs Anter Time Standard Flactice for the testing of VOCs Anter Time Standard Flactice for the testing of VOCs Anter Time Standard Flactice for the testing of VOCs Anter Time Standard Flactice for the testing of VOCs Anter Time Standard Flactice for the testing of VOCs Anter Time Standard Flactice for the testing of VOCs Anter Time Standard Flactice for the testing of VOCs Anter Time Standard Flactice for the testing of VOCs Anter Time Standard Flactice for the testing of VOCs Anter Time Standard Flactice for the testing of V	determines which green buildin	ig requireme	ents apply.		-
Image: Sea Summary; see San Francisco Building Code BLE NON-RESIDENTIAL PROJECTS Image: Supplications received July 1, 2012 or Residential Addition St. 20, 0000- Residential Building: Comesponding Comparison St. 20, 0000- (ck box if applicable) (ch comparison on Trice 42 Part 11, Division 5.7, 20, 0000- (ck box if applicable) (ch comparison on Trice 42 Part 11, Division 5.7, 20, 0000- (ck box if applicable) (ch comparison on Trice 42 Part 11, Division 5.7, 20, 0000- (ck box if applicable) (ch comparison on Trice 42 Part 11, Division 5.7, 20, 0000- (ck comparison building Code Sec 156, 0.000- (c) (135.5.101.41) (c) (135.5.5.01.41) (c) (135.5.5.01.41)					
measure is applicable to the project. Code on-Residential buildings. Corresponding te- phy to applications received July 1, 2012 or Residential Other New Non- Residential Addition >2,000 sq t Messidential ck box if applicable) Image: Construction (14) sp2 sp2 constructi				SI.	
International support of applications received usity 1, 2012 of Mon- Non- Residential Link (Section 2) Other New Non- Residential Link (Section 2) >2,000 sq ft OR Alteration >\$500,000 ⁺ ck box if applicable immediate the model of the section 2,000 sq ft OR Alteration >\$500,000 ⁺ SM CONSULTING CORPORATION 1288 HOWARD STREET SAN FRANCISC CA 4103 FEEL (11) 922 2008 WEBSTEWWW, SACONSULT.COM FEEL (11) 922 2008 WEBSTEWW, SACONSULT.COM FEEL (11) 922 2008 WEBSTEWWW, SACONSULT.COM FEEL (11) 922 2008 WEBSTEWWW, SACONSULT.COM FEEL (11) 922 2008 WEBSTEWW, SACONSULT.COM FEEL (11) 92 2008 WEBSTEW, SACONSULT.COM FEEL (11) 92 2008 WEBSTEW, SACON	BLE NON-RESIDENTIA	L PROJE	CTS	Cosporatio	•/
Ck box if applicable) Ck box if applicable) Ck box if applicable) Ck box if applicable Ck box if app	neasure is applicable to the project. Code on-Residential buildings. Corresponding re- n be found in Title 24 Part 11, Division 5.7.	Other New Non-	Addition >2,000 sq ft OR Alteration	1	256 HOWARD STREET FRANCISCO CA 94103
25.201.1) Image: Im	ck box if applicable)		>\$300,000		FAX: (415) 922.0203
Inter-term bicycle parking for 5% of total in Prancisco Planning Code Sec 155, () (13C.5.16.4.) ● parking: Provide stall marking for sool vehicles; approximately 8% of total ● aces projected to consume >1.000 gal/day, th. ● at use of proteile water within the building by 20% fourthains, water closes, and urinals. (13C.5.303.2) ● at the than 10,000 square feet, commissioning for of the project to verify that the building project requirements. (13C.5.10.2) ● pet testing and adjusting of systems is required. ● Comply with VOC limits in SCAOMD Rule 1168 The 17 for aroos adhesives. (13C.5.504.4.1) ● Climits in the Air Resources Board easure and California Code of Regulations ● Bindle Choice een Labol, 50 gL VOC content. (13C.5.504.4.4) ● ortofild are receiving resilient flooring, install sion limits defined in the 2009 Collaborative as or certified under the Resilient Floori (1.(13C.5.504.4.7)) ● mits defined in the 2009 Collaborative 4.5.3) ● ● mits defined in the 2009 Collaborative 4.5.3) ● ● mits defined in the 2009 Collaborative 4.5.714.7 ● ● mits defined in the 2009 Collaborative 4.5.714.7 ● ● mits defined in the 2009 Collaborative 4.5.714.7 ● ● mark and benotifien Dehris Codinance. </td <td></td> <td>•</td> <td>n/r</td> <td></td> <td></td>		•	n/r		
parking: Provide stall marking for sool vehicles; approximately 8% of total Intervention Intervention	l long-term bicycle parking for 5% of total an Francisco Planning Code Sec 155,	•	•	Gree	n Point
a. ft. Image: Second Secon		•	•		
fountains, water closets, and urinals. (13C.5.303.2) ter than 10,000 square feet, commissioning in of the project to verify that the building project requirements. (13C.5.410.2) tet, testing and adjusting of systems is required. Balancing) ical equipment during construction Comply with VOC limits in SCAQMD Rule 1168 Title 17 for aerosol adhesives. (13C.5.504.4.1) Climits in the Air Resources Board assure and California Code of Regulations Musing: Pus Program Standard Practice for the testing of VOCs Pus Program Standard Practice for the testing of VOCs Pus Program Standard Practice for the testing of VOCs Pus Program Standard Practice for the testing of VOCs Pus Program Standard Practice for the testing of VOCs Pus Program Standard Practice for the testing of VOCs Pus Program Standard Practice for the testing of VOCs Pus Program Standard Practice for the testing of VOCs Pus Program Standard Practice for the testing of VOCs Pus Program Standard Practice for the testing of VOCs Pus Program Standard Practice for the testing of VOCs Pus Program Standard Practice for the testing of VOCs Pus Program Standard Practice for the testing of VOCs Pus Program Standard Practice for the testing of VOCs Pus Program Standard Practice for Composite Wood (13C.5.504.4.4) Pus Program Standard Practice for Duilding Pus Program Standard Practice for the testing of VOCs Pus Program Standard Practice for the testing of VOCs Pus Program Standard Practice for Composite Wood (13C.5.504.5) Pus Program These documents are property of SIA CONSULTING Pus Program Pus Program Pus Program Pus Program Pus Program Pus Program Pus Pus Program Pus		•	•		
ion of the project to verify that the building or opticet requirements. (13C.5.504.4.1) Comply with VOC limits in SCAQMD Rule 1168 Title 17 tor aerosol adhesives. (13C.5.504.4.1) C limits in the Air Resources Board assure and California Code of Regulations illowing: Plus Program Standard Practice for the testing of VOCs sen Label. 30 gL VOC content. (13C.5.504.4.4) Det Composed with 02.504.4.5) 0 gL VOC content. (13C.5.504.4.4) Det Composed with 02.504.4.5) 0 gL VOC content. (13C.5.504.4.4) Det Composed with 02.504.4.5) 0 of floor area receiving resilient flooring, install solution within 25 feet of building dows. (13C.5.504.7) Limited are required in the 2009 Collaborative 4.5.3) regist STC 50, exterior windows STC 30, party 4.5.3) regist STC 50, exterior windows STC 30, party 4.5.3) regist STC 50, exterior windows STC 30, party 4.5.3, See CA T24 Part 11 Section 5.714.6 DATE 08/19/2013 PARWN R.L. DATE 08/19/2013		•	•		
Comply with VOC limits in SCAQMD Rule 1168 Comply with VOC limits in SCAQMD Rule 1168 Title 17 for aerosol adhesives. (13C.5.504.4.1) C limits in the Air Resources Board easure and California Code of Regulations Ilowing: Pus Program Standard Practice for the testing of VOCs Inable Choice een Label, S0 g/L VOC content. (13C.5.504.4.4) Apply with vocupied spaces of a or certified under the Resilient flooring, install sistion limits defined in the 2009 Collaborative are certified under the Resilient floor notibit smoking within 25 feet of building ndows. (13C.5.504.4.6) modes STC 50, exterior windows STC 30, party 4) Part 11 Section 5.714.6 Part 11 Section 5.714.7 ent that contains CFCs or Halons. (13C.5.500.1) A, B, I, OR M Occupancy Projects 5,000 - 25,000 Square Feet — Divert 75% of construction and demolition struction & Demolition Debris Ordinance. Prory 2Fficiency arele energy on-site equal to ≥1% of total educities of	ion of the project to verify that the building project requirements. (13C.5.410.2)	•			
Title 17 for aerosol adhesives. (13C.5.504.4.1) Climits in the Air Resources Board easure and California Code of Regulations Illowing: Plus Program Standard Practice for the testing of VOCs Standard Practice for the testing of VOCs Inable Choice Standard Practice for the testing of VOCs Inable Choice Standard Practice for the testing of VOCs Inable Choice Standard Practice for the testing of VOCs Issues of the testing testing testing testing testing testing testing test	ical equipment during construction	•	•		
easure and California Code of Regulations		•	•		-
Plus Program Standard Practice for the testing of VOCs These documents are property of SIA CONSULTING and are not to be produced changed or copied without the expressed within consent of SIA CONSULTING ENGINEERS. ISSUES / REVISIONS NO. DATE DESCRIPTION NO. DATE DESCRIPTION DESIGN R.K. DATE 08/19/2013 REVISED DATE 01/28/2015 JOB NO. 13-1590 SHEET NO. C. 1 0		•	•		
50 g/L VOC content. (13C.5.504.4.4) NO. DATE DESCRIPTION 50 g/L VOC content. (13C.5.504.4.5) • • 50 of floor area receiving resilient flooring, install ssion limits defined in the 2009 Collaborative a or certified under the Resilient Floor • • 50 of floor area receiving resilient flooring, install ssion limits defined in the 2009 Collaborative a or certified under the Resilient Floor • • 1. (13C.5.504.4.6) • • • • trohibit smoking within 25 feet of building ndows. (13C.5.504.7) • • • ilters in regularly occupied spaces of 4.5.3) • See CA T24 Part 11 Section 5.714.6 • • mgs STC 50, exterior windows STC 30, party 4) • See CA T24 Part 11 Section 5.714.7 • • • • ent that contains CFCs or Halons. (13C.5.508.1) •	Plus Program Standard Practice for the testing of VOCs inable Choice	•	•	and are not to be produ without the expressed CONSULTING ENGIN	uced changed or copied written consent of SIA EERS.
o of floor area receiving resilient flooring, install ssion limits defined in the 2009 Collaborative a or certified under the Resilient Floor • a. (13C.5.504.4.6) • • rrohibit smoking within 25 feet of building dows. (13C.5.504.7) • • ilters in regularly occupied spaces of 4.5.3) • • • ngs STC 50, exterior windows STC 30, party 4) • • • • ngs STC 50, exterior windows STC 30, party 4) • • • • • A, B, I, OR M Occupancy Projects 5,000 - 25,000 Square Feet • • • • • − Divert 75% of construction and demolition struction & Demolition Debris Ordinance. • Meet C&D ordinance only •				NO. DATE	DESCRIPTION
Industry Image: Strict String Strict Strict Strict Strict String Strict Strict St	o of floor area receiving resilient flooring, install ssion limits defined in the 2009 Collaborative a or certified under the Resilient Floor	•	•		
Limited exceptions. See CA T24 Part 11 Section 5.714.6 DRAWN R.L. ngs STC 50, exterior windows STC 30, party 4) ● See CA T24 Part 11 Section 5.714.6 DRAWN R.L. mgs STC 50, exterior windows STC 30, party 4) ● See CA T24 Part 11 Section 5.714.7 DRAWN R.L. ent that contains CFCs or Halons. (13C.5.508.1) ● ● DATE 08/19/2013 A, B, I, OR M Occupancy Projects 5,000 - 25,000 Square Feet ● OATE 08/19/2013 - Divert 75% of construction and demolition struction & Demolition Debris Ordinance. ● Meet C&D ordinance only REVISED DATE 01/28/2015 Ible energy on-site equal to ≥1% of total eduction (total of 25% compared to Title 24 ● n/r SHEET NO.	rohibit smoking within 25 feet of building		•		
Image STC 50, exterior windows STC 30, party 4) Image STC 50, exterior windows STC 30, party 9 Image Structure S	ilters in regularly occupied spaces of	•	See CA T24 Part 11		
A, B, I, OR M Occupancy Projects 5,000 - 25,000 Square Feet DATE 08/19/2013 — Divert 75% of construction and demolition struction & Demolition Debris Ordinance. Meet C&D ordinance only REVISED DATE 01/28/2015 Energy Efficiency able energy on-site equal to ≥1% of total eduction (total of 25% compared to Title 24 n/r SHEET NO. SHEET NO.	ngs STC 50, exterior windows STC 30, party	•	• See CA T24 Part 11 Section		
A, B, I, OR M Occupancy Projects 5,000 - 25,000 Square Feet - Divert 75% of construction and demolition struction & Demolition Debris Ordinance. Meet C&D ordinance only Energy Efficiency rable energy on-site equal to ≥1% of total eduction (total of 25% compared to Title 24 • n/r SHEET NO.	ent that contains CFCs or Halons. (13C.5.508.1)	•	ə./14./	DESIGN	R.K.
Intergy Efficiency able energy on-site equal to ≥1% of total eduction (total of 25% compared to Title 24 ordinance only JOB NO. 13-1590 Intergy Efficiency able energy on-site equal to ≥1% of total eduction (total of 25% compared to Title 24 n/r SHEET NO.	A, B, I, OR M Occupancy Projects 5	,000 - 25,000	Square Feet	DATE	08/19/2013
able energy on-site equal to ≥1% of total eduction (total of 25% compared to Title 24 n/r SHEET NO.		•		REVISED DATE	01/28/2015
eduction (total of 25% compared to Title 24				JOB NO.	13-1590
		•	n/r	SHEET NO.	G-1.0
	8	9	9		10











January 23, 2015

To: San Francisco Planning Department

Honorable Planning Commissioners and Zoning Administrator

Re: 22/24 Ord Court Continued Discretionary Review Hearing, February 5, 2015

Commissioners,

Although I do not believe a variance is merited based on the analysis described below, in the event you and the Zoning Administrator nonetheless support a variance, please consider altering the proposed project and conditioning it as listed below. Please also note that although the project sponsor met with some neighbors to show us the plans and said they would provide us with pdf versions – We have not received emailed copies or final plans.

Among other things, I request:

1. Acknowledge removal of the third floor by taking DR;

2. Push back the second floor

3. Condition the approval of the States St. building at the back of 24 Ord to be redesigned to accommodate retention of the trees (more info. to follow at the hearing)

4. Condition the approval of both States buildings to prevent further enlargement of 22 and 24 Ord without a new variance approval

Please be aware the tree ruling is this -- the trees cannot be taken down if a building permit is not issued. In other words, the Hearing Officer did not find these trees to be a hazard or in poor condition. But he is allowing their removal anyway if you authorize a building on States. We have appealed the decision because, although we agree the trees are healthy enough to be maintained and are not a hazard (but do require care that the owner has thus far not provided), we believe he did not think thru the condition associated with removal if a building permit is issued. We believe the retention should be extended to include other circumstances, such as redesign of a building that accommodates the trees.

Please accept the following, including attachments, for inclusion in electronic and printed packets for the upcoming Discretionary Review continuance for 22/24 Ord Ct..

Sincerely,

Chris Parkes 231 States St., #4 San Francisco, CA 904114

Neighbors and I met with the project sponsor and received revised draft plans on Wednesday morning, January 21.

As before, this is a single response for all three 22/24 Ord Ct. projects. It includes specific project response information, as appropriate.

The project sponsor has not yet emailed us the plans or provided final plans. Several folks have not yet seen the plans. If allowed, I may ask to supplement my response after we have had an opportunity to review final plans in depth.

I <u>do not</u> support the exceptional variance necessary for the projects as proposed and presented to neighbors on January 21, 2015.

I <u>do</u> support the Commission to approve a modified variance that allows a reasonable encroachment into the rear yards of the projects, based upon several conditions.

I support a modified variance, with the following mitigations and conditions:

1. <u>Preservation of Significant Trees</u>

A. Condition 1A: Set back the 24 Ord Ct. home sufficiently from States Street to preserve the existing Monterey Cypress trees, designated significant trees by the Department of Public Works (DPW).

DPW Order # 183228, dated December 31, 2014, states that if the applicant does not submit all required necessary permit approvals to construct the new building, then removal of these significant trees is denied.

At the above Planning Commission December 4, 22/24 Ord Ct. Planning Commission meeting, the zoning administrator expressed:

"...which gives me a little bit of pause, honestly, in having any decision right now. I would really be hesitant in having a decision approving a project be used as justification for removal of the tree."

B. Condition 1B: Provide reports and evidence of certified arborist approval for both the building setback from the tree, and a plan for ongoing preservation of these trees during construction.

SIA Consulting January 21 draft plans continue to misrepresent the trees as 8" and 9" trunk diameter trees. The project sponsor's arborist reported the trees are 29.8" and 24.6" DBH (Diameter at Breast Height).

These trees are significant to the character of States Street and provide parrot habitat. Furthermore, a variance allowing removal would be precedent setting and be detrimental to the character of States Street.

Please see Attachments:

1a: DPW Tree Order # 183228

2. Limited encroachment into the required rear yard.

The last time a variance was requested for the scale for this project in the neighborhood was in 1985. The Planning Department denied this request, consistent with the Planning Code.

The Planning Department conducted an analysis of Ord Ct. lots encompassing the project lots and those southwest of the proposed project lots. Of 16 lots selected, the Planning Department identified 6 properties that either had dwelling units fronting both Ord Court and States Street or encroached upon the required rear yard. All but one of the 6 properties are 3-8 dwelling properties, including apartment buildings. The 6th lot appears to have an encroachment into the rear yard. The planning department explained that these non-conforming mulit-unit buildings were grandfathered when the current RH Zoning districts were created in 1978.

The 22/24 Ord Ct. projects are required to conform to current zoning standards. Effectiveness of Planning Code standards requires the Planning Department to maintain vigilance to prevent zoning standard subversion via exceptional or cumulative variance requests.

The city allows variances under the specific requirements of Planning Code Section 135. While this project sponsor variance request does not meet the 5 conditions necessary for a variance request, I could support a variance for 22/24 Ord Ct if the project sponsor enacted the other requested mitigation conditions.

The closest recent case of a variance found for new construction on States Street was at 2 Ord Ct in 2003. In this case, the zoning administrator allowed a 7.5' encroachment into the rear yard for new construction. If other proposed conditions of approval were adopted, a similar level of encroachment could be allowed for 22/24 Ord Ct.

A. Condition 2A: Limit encroachment into the required rear yard to no more than 7.5' Project sponsor contentions that the value of the existing sloped back yards may only be realized by constructing at the top of the lots contradict conforming neighbors with similar sloped back yards who have landscaped or terraced the back yards to provide significant enjoyment. See photos below:


Across the Street: Conforming back yards with steep slopes on States St.:



Down the Street: Conforming back yards with steep slopes on States St.:



Project sponsor contentions that the nearby homes lack an established pattern of mid-block open-space misapplies the concept of mid-block open-space. Residential guidelines refer to "Mid-Block Open Space" as the spaced formed by abutting rear yards from separate individual lots, fronting on opposite streets.



http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=5356

The valuable character of upper States Street and Museum Way exists because of the pattern of alternating required back yards on through lots.



Enforcement of zoning standards on the RH-2 through-lots that exist on States Street provides many mature trees that overhang States Street as they reside in these zoning protected back yards and overhang States Street. Allowing the exceptional proposed precedent setting variance will lead to the loss of the alternating open space character of States Street and the loss of enjoyment of this open space by neighbors, pedestrians, travelers, and tourists. This contradicts city code and policy.

3. <u>Record conditions of approval for any approved variance</u> and require future significant changes require a new variance.

Condition 3A: Require that Conditions of approval for granting the variance will be recorded with the Recorder's office and on the Planning Department's Website. Require that future significant expansion should require a variance, even if otherwise code complaint. 22 Ord Court received a variance to expand the third level in 1984, and the applicant has failed to request a new variance for the current 22 Ord Ct. expansion project.

Require the applicant to request a variance before approval of the 22 Ord Court Expansion. 4.

Condition 4A: Place the 22 Ord Court Project on hold, pending the Variance Hearing.

5. Request specific project changes in order be consistent neighborhood character and mass.

Condition 5A: Remove any proposed roof decks

Roof decks are atypical to the neighborhood and inconsistent with architecture in the neighborhood



Frankly, this came across to me as "Office Complex" style, which is inappropriate for States St. It also coincidentally highlights how the project sponsor's proposed diminutive trees, restricted by overhead

6. Façade and distinction between rear units.

The planning commission requested specific improvement from the project sponsor, including

high voltage power lines, would appear, should the project sponsor not be required to implement the setback condition above necessary to preserve the existing significant trees.

The project sponsor explained that the distinction between the units was that one was "horizontal", and the other "vertical". I do not believe either is in character with the street, and I do not anticipate it meets Commissioner's expectations. I ask that the project sponsor look at the façade of homes across the street, or up the street.

A. Condition 6A: The façade needs to be more in line with the neighborhood.

7. <u>City Affordability Iniatives</u>

A. Condition 7A: Require that the project sponsor to configure the floor plans and square footage so that at least one of the meets city standards for more affordable housing.

These projects conflict with city priority policy to promote affordable housing. While these projects add housing stock, they do so by removing more affordable smaller square footage housing (Existing 22 Ord Ct.), and replace it with less affordable larger square footage housing. Based upon recent neighborhood sales, the new larger square footage homes at 22 and 24 Ord Ct. are likely to sell for well over \$2 million each. It is the intent of city residents that the city preserve housing that is more affordable for its workers and residents. Approval of these projects as proposed would create precisely the opposite outcome.

8. Environmental and geotechnical review

Condition 8A: Require the project sponsor to update its geotechnical report and resubmit for environmental review.

The existing report assumes excavation does not exceed 8 feet, and the revised plans employ significantly greater excavation and retaining walls.

9. Cumulative/Piecemeal Impact

Condition 9A: Require a cumulative/piecemeal evaluation of what is happening to States Street and nearby neighborhoods.

Recent news articles have highlighted the cumulative impacts of development to residents in our neighborhood. On States Street alone, in addition to this project, we are being impacted by projects from:

53 States St. LLC

176/178 States St. and 190/192 Museum Way are listed as owned by 190/192 Museum Way LLC 214 States St. LLC

City and County of San Francisco

San Francisco Department of Public Works



GENERAL - DIRECTOR'S OFFICE City Hall, Room 348 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, S.F., CA 94102 (415) 554-6920 www.sfdpw.org



Edwin M. Lee, Mayor Mohammed Nuru, Director

DPW Order No: 183228

The Director of Public Works held a Public Hearing on Monday, November 24th, 2014 commencing at 5:30 PM at City Hall, Room 416, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102. The hearing was to consider Order No. 183116 to consider the removal of two (2) significant trees on private property at 24 Ord Crt.

Findings:

The subject trees are two mature Monterey cypress trees (*Cupressus macrocarpa*) located on private property at 24 Ord Crt., within ten (10') feet of the States St. public right-of-way (RoW). The trees qualify as significant trees because they are within 10' of the public RoW and meet at least one of the three size criteria. The Public Works code requires that the removal process for significant trees follow the rules and procedures governing permits for removal of street trees. In addition to these procedures, the Director shall also consider a number of factors related to the trees as outlined in Section 810A(c) of the Public Works Code.

Urban Forestry staff received an application from the property owner to remove the two significant trees and the applicant referenced the following reasons for removal:

- Seeking permission from the Planning Department to construct a new home on the States St. frontage of the property.
- Sidewalk damage
- The trees are located within the buildable area at the rear of the lot
- The new building will be adjacent to the States St. public RoW

Urban Forestry staff evaluated the condition of the trees and approved the proposed removals on the basis that the trees had poor structure and would be impacted by the construction of the proposed building. During the 30-day public notification period a protest was received and the matter was scheduled for a public hearing.

At the hearing Urban Forestry staff testified that both trees are located to the side of high voltage power lines. The trees have been repeatedly pruned by PG&E tree contractors and no routine maintenance appears to have been performed on the trees over the years by the property owner(s). Very poor tree structure has resulted. Staff testified that the trees have received heading or topping cuts and that the new growth has the potential to fail. The trees are composed of multiple co-dominant stems with included bark. The vigor of the trees is fine but the structure



of the two trees is very poor. The two trees are located along a narrow, level portion of the property on the top of a steep slope above nearby homes.

Testimony at the hearing supporting the applicant included an arborist, land use attorney and a neighbor who all testified in favor of approving the trees for removal. There were eight members of the public who testified against the removal of the trees, which also included an arborist who testified that pruning could help mitigate some of the structural issues of the trees.

An arborist for the applicant presented similar testimony to that of Urban Forestry staff regarding the poor structure of the trees and also expressed concerns about the lean of the trees, the steepness of the slope and the location of the trees at the top of the slope above several homes.

Eight members of the public spoke in favor of keeping the trees and how much the community valued the trees. Testimony included the many benefits that trees provide, including biological habitat, shade, and many other benefits that mature trees provide in a dense urban environment, and that the trees contribute to the character of the neighborhood.

Although the applicant wishes to replant two street trees within the States St. sidewalk at the conclusion of the project, Urban Forestry staff believes there is insufficient space to require two trees to be planted. There appears to be room to plant one street tree on the States St. frontage. The sidewalk on the Ord Crt. frontage is too narrow to accommodate any street trees.

The significant tree criteria for consideration as outlined in Article 16, Section 810A of the Public Works Code has been examined in making this recommendation.

Recommendation:

After consideration of letters and testimonies presented at the hearing the decision is to approve the removal of the two significant trees on the condition that all necessary permit approvals have first been obtained from other departments to construct a new building. If the required approvals to construct the new building are not obtained, then the request to remove the two significant trees is denied. A permit to remove the two trees will not be issued to the property owner until copies of the required approvals have been provided to Urban Forestry staff. If the removal of the two trees is granted the trees shall be replaced with a total of one (1) 36" box size street tree within the States St. sidewalk.

The tree species and location are to be approved by Urban Forestry staff.

Appeal:

This Order may be appealed to the Board of Appeals within 15 days of December 31, 2014.

Board of Appeals 1650 Mission, Room 304 San Francisco, CA 94103 (between Van Ness and Duboce Avenues) Phone: 415.575.6880 Fax: 415.575.6885



Regular office hours of the Board of Appeals are Monday through Friday from 8am to 5pm. Appointments may be made for filing an appeal by calling 415-575-6880. All appeals must be filed in person. For additional information on the San Francisco Board of Appeals and to view the Appeal Process Overview, please visit their website at http://sfgov.org/bdappeal/

12/24/2014

X Mohammed Nuru

Nuru, Mohammed Approver 1

