

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Discretionary Review Full Analysis

HEARING DATE JANUARY 14, 2016

Date:	December 18, 2015
Case No.:	2014-001639DRP
Project Address:	160 Bernard Street
Permit Application:	2014.08.13.3730
Zoning:	RH-3 (Residential House, Three-Family)
	65-A Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot:	0156/036
Project Sponsor:	J. Hulett Jones
	Jones Haydu
	1 Arkansas Street, Unit D2
	San Francisco, CA 94107
Staff Contact:	Nicholas Foster - (415) 557-9167
	nicholas.foster@sfgov.org
Recommendation:	Do not take DR and approve the project as proposed.

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

Reception: 415.558.6378

Fax: 415.558.6409

Planning Information: **415.558.6377**

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

PLEASE NOTE: The proposed Project at 160 Bernard Street (Block/Lot: 0156/036) is connected to the proposed project at 162-164 Bernard Street, the adjacent lot (Block/Lot: 0156/037). Two (2) Applications for Discretionary Review (DR) were filed by a single DR Requestor, one (1) for each lot; the Public-Initiated Discretionary Review case (2014-001639DRP) covers the proposed Project at 160 Bernard Street (Block/Lot: 0156/036), whereas the Public-Initiated Discretionary Review case (2014-001639DRP) covers the proposed (2014-001646DRP) covers the proposed project at 162-164 Bernard Street (Block/Lot: 0156/037)

The proposal ("Project") is to demolish an existing one-story-over-basement, one-car garage structure and construct a new four-story-over-basement, two-unit residential building. The proposed 40-foot tall building would contain a two-car garage (stacked parking), and the existing curb cut would be relocated to provide access to the new garage. Upon demolition of the existing garage (with basement storage below), the (new) lower unit (Unit #1) would contain 1,357 square feet (sf), while the (new) upper unit (Unit #2) would contain 2,801 sf, for a total of 4,158 sf. One (1) new street tree would be planted in front of the subject property.

The Applicant proposes to construct the Project in two phases. Phase 1 would include the demolition of the small garage/storage structure on the subject lot (160 Bernard Street; Block/Lot 0156/036) and construction of a two-unit residential structure, with one unit serving as the new home for the Applicants. Phase 2 of the Project would include the renovation and addition on the immediately adjacent lot (162-164 Bernard Street; Block/Lot 0156/037). No tenants will be evicted in order to construct either building.

SITE DESCRIPTION AND PRESENT USE

The Project Site ("Site") is approximately 23 feet wide and 60 feet deep and located on the north side of Bernard Street, between Leavenworth and Jones Streets. The Site is located in an RH-3 zoning district and a 65-X Height and Bulk District, which allows buildings up to 65' in height. The subject lot slopes downward, approximately 8 feet below grade, as measured at the sidewalk. The 160 Bernard Street property is improved with a 238 sf one-car garage measuring 10'-10" by 22' (with basement storage below), located at the southeast corner of the lot. Except for this small structure constructed in 1913, the remainder of the Site is undeveloped providing light and air to the property line windows of the existing, two-unit building located on the immediately adjacent lot (162-164 Bernard Street). The existing garage structure is uncharacteristically small compared to other buildings in the immediate area.

SURROUNDING PROPERTIES AND NEIGHBORHOOD

The Project Site ("Site") is located within the northern portion of the Nob Hill neighborhood, near the southern boundary of the Russian Hill neighborhood, within an established residential area primarily comprised of medium- to high-density housing. The buildings on the block face range from one to four stories and from single-family homes to multi-family unit buildings. The architecture of the buildings is diverse, providing a mixed visual character.

The Site is located along the northern side of Bernard Street, which is a relatively narrow street at 35' in width, as compared to the widths of both parallel and perpendicular streets (e.g. Broadway at 82'-6"; Pacific Avenue at 49'; Leavenworth Street at 68'-9"; and Jones Street at 68'-9"). Bernard Street is only two blocks long, stretching from Taylor Street to the east to Leavenworth Street to the west. Of the four blocks that front Bernard Street, three of them contain lots that front Bernard Street which are located within the 65-A Height and Bulk District (the forth block is entirely within a 40-X Height and Bulk District). The mid-block open space is minimal in the location of the subject property and immediately adjacent properties, as most lots are developed as full-lot coverage.

TYPE	REQUIRED PERIOD	NOTIFICATION DATES	DR FILE DATE	DR HEARING DATE	FILING TO HEARING TIME
311 Notice	30 days	May 7, 2015 – June 6, 2015	June 5, 2015	January 14, 2016	223 days

BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION NOTIFICATION

HEARING NOTIFICATION

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

	SUPPORT	OPPOSED	NO POSITION
Adjacent neighbor(s)	None	None	None
Other neighbors on the			
block or directly across	None	None	None
the street			
Neighborhood groups	None	None	None

No additional neighbor comments were received by the Department.

DR REQUESTOR

Patrick J. Connolly and Tiffany Hsueh, of 127A Bernard Street; located approximately 100 feet to the east (upslope) from the subject property.

DR REQUESTOR'S CONCERNS AND PROPOSED ALTERNATIVES

Issue #1: The alternations to the existing structure on the 162-164 Bernard lot and the new construction on the adjacent lot (160 Bernard) will cause the height of the proposed buildings to be incompatible with the height and scale of all mid-block buildings, increase shadowing and reduce light to Bernard Street and adjacent buildings, and negatively affect quality of pedestrian experiences on the block where bulk effects are particularly pronounced on narrow streets.

Issue #2: The proposed construction on the two adjacent parcels will destroy the historic feel of the existing cottage and garage structure, changing the historic character and feel of the block.

Issue #3: The height of the alternations to the existing structure on the 162-164 Bernard lot and the new construction on the adjacent lot (160 Bernard) should be limited to the prevailing roof heights along the immediate block. A reduction in height can be achieved by not approving the fourth floor over the basement and/or by reduction of proposed tall ceiling heights. A reduction in the height of the alternations to the cottage and the new construction will mitigate the potential adverse effects.

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

PROJECT SPONSOR'S RESPONSE

Discretionary review ("DR") is granted only if exceptional or extraordinary circumstances exist. The DR Requestors fail to establish the existence of any exceptional or extraordinary circumstance in this case. Therefore, the DR requests are without merit and the Planning Commission should not take Discretionary Review and approve the Project as proposed. The Project Sponsor has provided a matching light well of 6' on the 160 Bernard lot (which is twice as wide as the 3' required per Code), for the benefit of the adjacent property (150 Bernard), and maintains the existing 3' side setback on the 162-164 Bernard lot for its full length of 39'-6" as to provide side relief to the adjacent property (168-170 Bernard). Further, the

top floors of both development lots (160 and 162-164 Bernard) are set back 8' from the front property line, so they appear as three-story buildings from the subject street. These design measures are consistent with the Residential Design Guidelines in order to preserve light and air to adjacent buildings. Reference the *Response to Discretionary Review* for additional information. The *Response to Discretionary Review* is an attached document.

PROJECT ANALYSIS

Issue #1: The DR Requestors contend that the Project's mass will be inconsistent with the surrounding buildings. The buildings in the Project block range from single family homes to multi-unit buildings, from one to four stories in height. At a maximum proposed height of 40' (excluding permitted height exemptions allowed under Code Section 260), the overall height of the proposed buildings (at 160 Bernard and 162-164 Bernard) are below the maximum allowed building height of 65'.

To ensure that the mass and height of the Project are compatible with the massing, scale, and character of the neighborhood, the Project's top floors (both buildings) are set back 8' from the front facade of the floors below. The Project respects the topography of the Site in that it will step up the street and complete the block face. By setting back the upper floor, the Project will provide a pedestrian scale similar to the adjacent buildings. To further minimize the visual height of the buildings, the railing of the roof deck of the 160 Bernard building will be glass, thereby eliminating the need for a solid, 42" high roof parapet. The rooftop architectural features, such as the elevator overrun, are minimized by keeping them at the minimum height required.

Moreover, the Project will replace the existing one story and small garage/storage buildings and the existing two-unit building that lack architectural interest with two contemporary buildings adding diversity to the existing, mixed-character architecture found on the subject block.

Overall, the form and detailing of the buildings are contemporary yet compatible with the various architectural characteristics of the neighboring properties. The primary façade materials on the existing structures on the block are stucco or wood siding. The primary façades of the Project buildings will be horizontal wood siding that would extend to the visible portion of the side property line walls. The front façades include bay windows commonly found in the Project neighborhood.

Issue #2: The DR Requestor's assertion that the Project would have a negative effect on historic resources is devoid of merit. The environmental review application submitted by the Applicants included Part 1 of a Historic Resource Evaluation Report by William Kostura ("Kostura Report"). The Kostura Report found that the Site and Buildings were not associated with events or patterns of history, or person. Further, the few architectural features of note cannot be seen from the public right-of-way, and these features are not sufficient to raise the Building to a level of distinction. The Kostura Report determined that the buildings on the Site are not eligible to be listed on the California Register.

The Planning Department conducted an independent review of the Kostura Report and agreed with its findings and conclusions. A Class 1 and a Class 3 categorical exemption were issued as of April 28, 2015. See CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination attached to the case report.

Issue #3: The Project will not adversely affect light and air access to the adjacent buildings or the pedestrian experience along Bernard Street. The partial top floors of both proposed buildings will be set back 8' from the front property line and 25' from the rear property line. A Department Sanborn Map shows that all of the buildings on the block face and those fronting on Broadway to the north do not have Code-complying rear yards. In fact, several buildings on the block face including the 162-164 Bernard building have 100% lot coverage.

The two lots to the rear of the Site, with frontage on Broadway, are developed with a four story and a three story apartment building that are similar in height to the Project buildings. Both the 160 Bernard and 162-164 Bernard buildings will have 15' deep Code-complying rear yards and the partial fourth floor are set back 25' from the rear property line; therefore, the Project will have minimal impact on sunlight and air access on the light and air access to the adjacent properties.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

A Class 1 and a Class 3 categorical exemption were issued as of April 28, 2015. See CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination attached to the case report.

RESIDENTIAL DESIGN TEAM REVIEW

On June 24, 2015 the Residential Design Team (RDT) reviewed the proposal in light of the DR requestor's Application for Discretionary Review. The RDT did not find there to be an exceptional or extraordinary circumstance as both of the proposed buildings are Code-complaint, and meet the criteria of the Residential Design Guidelines (RDG). The RDT believes both of the proposed buildings are consistent with the neighborhood character in that they are of a compatible bulk and mass with other residential structures that are located on lots within the same Height and Bulk District (65-A), including residential structures found along the same block face.

Under the Commission's pending DR Reform Legislation, this project <u>would</u> be referred to the Commission, as this project involves new construction on a vacant lot.

BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- The Residential Design Team did not find that an exceptional or extraordinary circumstance exists that would lead to additional setbacks or modifications to the proposed building in order to address the DR requestor's concerns.
- The proposed building is consistent with the neighborhood character of the immediate area of the subject property.

RECOMMENDATION: Do not take DR and approve the project as proposed.

Attachments: Block Book Map Sanborn Map Zoning Map Height and Bulk Map Aerial Photographs Context Photos Section 311 Notice CEQA Determination with Preservation Team Review Form DR Application Response to DR Application dated January 4, 2016 (with Exhibits 1 and 2) Reduced Plans 3-D Rendering

Design Review Checklist

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER (PAGES 7-10)

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

Comments: The buildings on the subject block range from one to four stories and from single-family homes to multi-family unit buildings. The architecture of the buildings is diverse, providing a mixed visual character.

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: The Project respects the topography of the Site in that it will step up the street and complete the block face. By setting back the upper floor, the Project will provide a pedestrian scale similar to the adjacent buildings.

BUILDING SCALE AND FORM (PAGES 23 - 30)

QUESTION		NO	N/A
Building Scale (pages 23 - 27)			
Is the building's height and depth compatible with the existing building scale at	x		
the street?			
Is the building's height and depth compatible with the existing building scale at	x		
the mid-block open space?	Χ		
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?			
Are the building's proportions compatible with those found on surrounding buildings?			
Is the building's roofline compatible with those found on surrounding buildings?	X		

Comments: The proposed buildings are consistent with the neighborhood character in that they are of a compatible bulk and mass with other residential structures that are located on lots within the same Height and Bulk District (65-A), including residential structures found along the same block face.

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	x		
the street and sidewalk and the private realm of the building?	^		
Does the location of the building entrance respect the existing pattern of building	x		
entrances?	^		
Is the building's front porch compatible with existing porches of surrounding			x
buildings?			^
Are utility panels located so they are not visible on the front building wall or on			x
the sidewalk?			^
Bay Windows (page 34)			
Are the length, height and type of bay windows compatible with those found on	x		
surrounding buildings?	^		
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	x		
the building and the surrounding area?	Λ		
Is the width of the garage entrance minimized?			
Is the placement of the curb cut coordinated to maximize on-street parking?			
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		Y
building elements?		л
Are the dormers compatible with the architectural character of surrounding		v
buildings?		Λ
Are the windscreens designed to minimize impacts on the building's design and	v	
on light to adjacent buildings?	X	

Comments: The primary façades of the Project buildings will be horizontal wood siding that would extend to the visible portion of the side property line walls. The front façades include bay windows commonly found in the Project neighborhood. The rooftop architectural features, such as the elevator overrun, are minimized by keeping them at the minimum height required and the roof deck railings are made of glass.

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?			
Are the building's materials properly detailed and appropriately applied?	X		

Comments: The form and detailing of the buildings are contemporary yet compatible with the various architectural characteristics of the neighboring properties. The primary façade materials on the existing structures on the block are stucco or wood siding.

This page intentionally left blank.

Parcel Map





Sanborn Map*



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

 $\mathbf{\Theta}$

Aerial Photos



Discretionary Review Hearing Case Number 2014-001639DRP 160 Bernard Street

Aerial Photo



Discretionary Review Hearing Case Number 2014-001639DRP 160 Bernard Street

Zoning Map



Height and Bulk Map



SUBJECT PROPERTY



Street View of 160 Bernard Street (view from Bernard Street)



Street View of 160 Bernard Street (view from Bernard Street)

Discretionary Review Hearing Case Number 2014-001639DRP 160 Bernard Street

SUBJECT PROPERTY



Street View of 160 Bernard Street (view from Bernard Street)



Street View along Bernard Street (looking West)



Street View along Bernard Street (looking East)

This page intentionally left blank.



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1650 Mission Street Suite 400 San Francisco. CA 94103

NOTICE OF BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION (SECTION 311)

On **August 11, 2014**, the Applicant named below filed Building Permit Application No. **2014.08.11.3471** with the City and County of San Francisco.

PROPERTY INFORMATION		APPL	ICANT INFORMATION
Project Address:	162-164 Bernard Street	Applicant:	J. Hulett Jones
Cross Street(s):	Leavenworth Street	Address:	One Arkansas Street, #D2
Block/Lot No.:	0156/037	City, State:	San Francisco, CA 94107
Zoning District(s):	RH-3 / 65-A	Telephone:	(415) 558-0400

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

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

PROJECT SCOPE				
Demolition	New Construction	☑ Alteration		
Change of Use	Façade Alteration(s)	Front Addition		
Rear Addition	□ Side Addition	Vertical Addition		
PROJECT FEATURES	EXISTING	PROPOSED		
Building Use	Residential	No Change		
Front Setback	5 feet, 3 inches	7 inches		
Side Setbacks	2 feet, 10 inches	3 feet		
Building Depth	53 feet, 11 inches	58 feet, 7 inches		
Rear Yard	None	None		
Building Height	16 feet, 6 inches	40 feet		
Number of Stories	2 (lower level is below grade)	4		
Number of Dwelling Units	2	No Change		
Number of Parking Spaces	None	2		

The project proposes to remodel an existing two-story (two-unit) building, adding two additional floors, creating a four-story (twounit) residential building. The proposed 40-foot tall building would contain a two-car garage (stacked parking), and would add a new curb cut to provide access to the garage. This building permit application is related to the building permit application (2014.08.13.3730) for the adjacent lot (160 Bernard Street); the applicant information is the same for both permits.

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:	Nicholas Foster
Telephone:	(415) 575-9167
E	

E-mail: nicholas.foster@sfgov.org

Notice Date: 5/07/2015 Expiration Date: 6/06/2015

中文詢問請電: (415) 575-9010

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

This page intentionally left blank.



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Address		Block/Lot(s)	
16	0-164 Bernard St.	0156	6/036 & 037
Case No.	Permit No.	Plans Dated	
2014.1564E	201408113471, 201408133731,		9/25/2014
Addition/ Alteration	Demolition (requires HRER if over 45 years old)	New Construction	Project Modification (GO TO STEP 7)
Project description for	or Planning Department approval.		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	o-story addition to existing one-story, two-ur nolition of existing garage and construction of		

STEP 1: EXEMPTION CLASS TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

STEP 2: CEQA IMPACTS TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

If any box is checked below, an Environmental Evaluation Application is required. Transportation: Does the project create six (6) or more net new parking spaces or residential units? Does the project have the potential to adversely affect transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle safety (hazards) or the adequacy of nearby transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities? Air Quality: Would the project add new sensitive receptors (specifically, schools, day care facilities, hospitals, residential dwellings, and senior-care facilities within an Air Pollution 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) Hazardous Materials: If the project site is located on the Maher map or is suspected of containing hazardous materials (based on a previous use such as gas station, auto repair, dry cleaners, or heavy manufacturing, or a site with underground storage tanks): Would the project involve 50 cubic yards or more of soil disturbance - or a change of use from industrial to residential? If yes, this box must be checked and the project applicant must submit an Environmental Application with a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. Exceptions: do not check box if the applicant presents documentation of enrollment in the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) Maher program, a DPH waiver from the

	Maher program, or other documentation from Environmental Planning staff that hazardous material effects would be less than significant (refer to EP_ArcMap > Maher layer).
	Soil Disturbance/Modification: Would the project result in soil disturbance/modification greater
	than two (2) feet below grade in an archeological sensitive area or eight (8) feet in a non-archeological
	sensitive area? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Archeological Sensitive Area)
	Noise: Does the project include new noise-sensitive receptors (schools, day care facilities, hospitals,
	residential dwellings, and senior-care facilities) fronting roadways located in the noise mitigation
	area? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Noise Mitigation Area)
	Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment: Does the project site involve a subdivision or lot line adjustment
	on a lot with a slope average of 20% or more? (<i>refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers ></i>
	Topography)
	Slope = or > 20%: Does the project involve excavation of 50 cubic yards of soil or more, square factors are appreciately used to be a statistic production of the state of th
	footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft., shoring, underpinning, retaining wall work, or grading on a lot with a slope average of 20% or more? <i>Exceptions: do not check box for work performed on a</i>
	previously developed portion of site, stairs, patio, deck, or fence work. (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex
	Determination Layers > Topography) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required and a Certificate or
	higher level CEQA document required
	Seismic: Landslide Zone: Does the project involve excavation of 50 cubic yards of soil or more,
	square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft., shoring, underpinning, retaining wall work,
	grading –including excavation and fill on a landslide zone – as identified in the San Francisco
	General Plan? Exceptions: do not check box for work performed on a previously developed portion of the site,
	stairs, patio, deck, or fence work. (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones)
	If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required and a Certificate or higher level CEQA document required
	Seismic: Liquefaction Zone: Does the project involve excavation of 50 cubic yards of soil or more,
	square footage expansion greater than 1000 sq ft, shoring, underpinning, retaining wall work, or
	grading on a lot in a liquefaction zone? <i>Exceptions: do not check box for work performed on a previously</i>
	developed portion of the site, stairs, patio, deck, or fence work. (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination
	<i>Layers</i> > <i>Seismic Hazard Zones</i>) If box is checked, a geotechnical report will likely be required Serpentine Rock: Does the project involve any excavation on a property containing serpentine rock?
	Exceptions: do not check box for stairs, patio, deck, retaining walls, or fence work. (refer to EP_ArcMap >
	CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Serpentine)
*If no boxes	are checked above, GO TO STEP 3. If one or more boxes are checked above, an <i>Environmental</i>
	Application is required, unless reviewed by an Environmental Planner.
	Project can proceed with categorical exemption review. The project does not trigger any of the
	CEQA impacts listed above.
Comments	and Planner Signature (optional): Jean Poling

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

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

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT 8/18/2014

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

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

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

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

	8. Other work consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (specify or add comments):
X	 9. Reclassification of property status to Category C. (Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator)
	a. Per HRER dated: <u>April 21, 2015</u> (attach HRER)
	b. Other (specify):
Not	e: If ANY box in STEP 5 above is checked, a Preservation Planner MUST check one box below.
	Further environmental review required. Based on the information provided, the project requires an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i> to be submitted. GO TO STEP 6.
	Project can proceed with categorical exemption review . The project has been reviewed by the Preservation Planner and can proceed with categorical exemption review. GO TO STEP 6.
Com	ments (<i>optional</i>):
Prese	ervation Planner Signature: hily Thegazon 04.28.15
STEF	P 6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION
STEF	P 6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER Further environmental review required. Proposed project does not meet scopes of work in either (<i>check</i>
STEF	P 6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER
STEF	P 6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER Further environmental review required. Proposed project does not meet scopes of work in either (check all that apply):
STEF	P 6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER Further environmental review required. Proposed project does not meet scopes of work in either (check all that apply): Step 2 – CEQA Impacts
STEF	P 6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER Further environmental review required. Proposed project does not meet scopes of work in either (check all that apply): Step 2 – CEQA Impacts Step 5 – Advanced Historical Review
	P 6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER Further environmental review required. Proposed project does not meet scopes of work in either (check all that apply): Step 2 – CEQA Impacts Step 5 – Advanced Historical Review STOP! Must file an Environmental Evaluation Application.
	P 6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER Further environmental review required. Proposed project does not meet scopes of work in either (check all that apply): Step 2 - CEQA Impacts Step 5 - Advanced Historical Review STOP! Must file an Environmental Evaluation Application. No further environmental review is required. The project is categorically exempt under CEQA. Planner Name: Cuequage Signature:
	P 6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER Further environmental review required. Proposed project does not meet scopes of work in either (check all that apply): Step 2 – CEQA Impacts Step 5 – Advanced Historical Review STOP! Must file an Environmental Evaluation Application. No further environmental review is required. The project is categorically exempt under CEQA. Planner Name:
	P6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER Further environmental review required. Proposed project does not meet scopes of work in either (check all that apply): Step 2 - CEQA Impacts Step 5 - Advanced Historical Review STOP! Must file an Environmental review is required. The project is categorically exempt under CEQA. Planner Name: Yeqa 224 Project Approval Action: Signature: *If Discretionary Review before the Planning Mage Caga 200
	P6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER Further environmental review required. Proposed project does not meet scopes of work in either (check all that apply): Step 2 - CEQA Impacts Step 5 - Advanced Historical Review STOP! Must file an Environmental Evaluation Application. No further environmental review is required. The project is categorically exempt under CEQA. Planner Name: Yeqa224 Project Approval Action: Signature: "If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project. Signature scalegorical exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines
STEP TO B	P6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION EF COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER Further environmental review required. Proposed project does not meet scopes of work in either (check all that apply): Step 2 - CEQA Impacts Step 5 - Advanced Historical Review STOP! Must file an Environmental Evaluation Application. No further environmental review is required. The project is categorically exempt under CEQA. Planner Name: Yeqa224 Project Approval Action: Signature: "If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project. Signature:

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

DETERMINATION IF PROJECT CONSTITUTES SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

Compared to the approved project, would the modified project:

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

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

DETERMINATION OF NO SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

		The proposed modification would not result in any of the above changes.
		is checked, the proposed modifications are categorically exempt under CEQA, in accordance with prior project and no additional environmental review is required. This determination shall be posted on the Planning
Dep	artmen	nt website and office and mailed to the applicant, City approving entities, and anyone requesting written notice.
Pla	nner l	Name: Signature or Stamp:
Pla	nner l	Name: Signature or Stamp:
Pla	nner l	Name: Signature or Stamp:



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW FORM

Preservation Team Meeting Date:		Date of Form Compl	etion 4/21/20)15
PROJECT INFORMATION:				
Planner:	Address:			
Lily Yegazu	160-164 Bernard S	Street	y conquises.	hagoid 17t
Block/Lot:	Cross Streets:			
0156/036 + 037	Jones and Leaven	worth Streets		
CEQA Category:	Art. 10/11:	BPA/Case	No.:	
3 - Potential Historic Resource	N/A	2014.1564	Egalbay 308	t pdr si bei
PURPOSE OF REVIEW:		PROJECT DESCRIPTIO	ON:	
CEQA CArticle 10/11	O Preliminary/PIC	C Alteration (Demo/New	Construction
ATE OF PLANS UNDER REVIEW:	August 8, 2014	a da sente par da contra	n istaalii kaaliin Maala	med wind insi artina t
	[//ugust 0/2011			
PROJECT ISSUES:				
Is the subject Property an eli	gible historic resourc	ce?	i) militaliji is	nuite divise
If so, are the proposed change	ges a significant impa	act?		
Additional Notes:				
	يعتاب لغريانه ومنقبها	which have state.	وبالقائدية فلاء	han de state
Submitted: EEA, plans by Pr	oject Sponsor.	, and have active. Howard back little of	alaasdadaa Maalaasi	na an a
Submitted: EEA, plans by Pr	inanelsco's, Califo	truct a two-story add	dition to the	existing
	emodel and cons			-
Submitted: EEA, plans by Pr The proposed project is to r one-story-over-basement si the existing one-story-over	emodel and cons ngle-family reside basement garage	ence at 162-164 Berr e at 160 Bernard Stree	hard Street. In et will be der	n addition, molished
Submitted: EEA, plans by Pr The proposed project is to r one-story-over-basement si	emodel and cons ngle-family reside basement garage	ence at 162-164 Berr e at 160 Bernard Stree	hard Street. In et will be der	n addition, molished
Submitted: EEA, plans by Pr The proposed project is to r one-story-over-basement si the existing one-story-over and a new four-story, two-u	emodel and cons ngle-family reside basement garage	ence at 162-164 Berr e at 160 Bernard Stree	hard Street. In et will be der	n addition, molished
Submitted: EEA, plans by Pr The proposed project is to r one-story-over-basement si the existing one-story-over and a new four-story, two-u	emodel and cons ngle-family reside basement garage	ence at 162-164 Berr e at 160 Bernard Stree	hard Street. In et will be der	n addition, molished
Submitted: EEA, plans by Pro The proposed project is to r one-story-over-basement si the existing one-story-over and a new four-story, two-u	emodel and cons ngle-family reside basement garage	ence at 162-164 Berr e at 160 Bernard Stree basement level park CYes	hard Street. In et will be den ing will be co	n addition, molished onstructed
Submitted: EEA, plans by Preservation Team Review:	emodel and cons ngle-family reside basement garage init building with	ence at 162-164 Berr e at 160 Bernard Stree basement level park OYes Historic D	et will be der ing will be co No * istrict/Context	n addition, molished onstructed
Submitted: EEA, plans by Pro- The proposed project is to rone-story-over-basement sithe existing one-story-over and a new four-story, two-ue PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW: Historic Resource Present Individual Property is individually eligible for California Register under one or	emodel and cons ngle-family reside basement garage init building with for inclusion in a	ence at 162-164 Bern a at 160 Bernard Stree basement level park OYes Historic D Property is in an eligib Historic District/Conte	et will be der ing will be co No * istrict/Context le California Re	n addition, molished onstructed
Submitted: EEA, plans by Pro The proposed project is to rone-story-over-basement si the existing one-story-over and a new four-story, two-u PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW: Historic Resource Present Individual Property is individually eligible for	emodel and cons ngle-family reside basement garage init building with for inclusion in a	ence at 162-164 Berr e at 160 Bernard Stree basement level park CYes Historic D Property is in an eligib	et will be der ing will be co No * istrict/Context le California Re	n addition, molished onstructed
Submitted: EEA, plans by Pro The proposed project is to r one-story-over-basement si the existing one-story-over and a new four-story, two-u PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW: Historic Resource Present Individual Property is individually eligible f California Register under one or	emodel and cons ngle-family reside basement garage init building with for inclusion in a	ence at 162-164 Bern a at 160 Bernard Stree basement level park OYes Historic D Property is in an eligib Historic District/Conte	et will be der ing will be co ing will be co istrict/Context le California Re xt under one on	n addition, molished onstructed
Submitted: EEA, plans by Pro The proposed project is to r one-story-over-basement si the existing one-story-over and a new four-story, two-u PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW: Historic Resource Present Individual Property is individually eligible for California Register under one or following Criteria:	emodel and cons ngle-family reside basement garage init building with for inclusion in a more of the	ence at 162-164 Berr e at 160 Bernard Stree basement level park CYes Historic D Property is in an eligib Historic District/Contec the following Criteria:	et will be der ing will be co ing wi	n addition, molished onstructed CN/A gister r more of
Submitted: EEA, plans by Pro The proposed project is to r one-story-over-basement si the existing one-story-over and a new four-story, two-u PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW: Historic Resource Present Individual Property is individually eligible for California Register under one or following Criteria: Criterion 1 - Event:	emodel and cons ngle-family reside basement garage init building with for inclusion in a more of the O Yes No	ence at 162-164 Berr a at 160 Bernard Stree basement level park OYes Historic D Property is in an eligib Historic District/Contect the following Criteria: Criterion 1 - Event:	et will be der ing will be co ing will be co istrict/Context le California Re xt under one o Y C Y	n addition, molished onstructed ON/A gister r more of es O No res O No
Submitted: EEA, plans by Proposed project is to rone-story-over-basement sittle existing one-story-over and a new four-story, two-urand a new four-story, two-urand a new four-story, two-urand a new four-story, two-urand a new four-story is not read a new four-story is used to be a new four-story is individual Property is individually eligible for a california Register under one or following Criteria: Criterion 1 - Event: Criterion 2 - Persons:	emodel and cons ngle-family reside basement garage init building with for inclusion in a more of the O Yes O No O Yes O No	ence at 162-164 Berr e at 160 Bernard Stree basement level park CYes Historic D Property is in an eligib Historic District/Conte the following Criteria: Criterion 1 - Event: Criterion 2 -Persons:	ing Will be der ing will be der ing will be co istrict/Context le California Re xt under one of Y y ure: O Y	n addition, molished onstructed ON/A gister r more of es No
Submitted: EEA, plans by Preservation The proposed project is to rone-story-over-basement sittle existing one-story-over and a new four-story, two-uter and a new four-story, two-uter and a new four-story, two-uter and a new four-story and	emodel and cons ngle-family reside basement garage unit building with for inclusion in a more of the Yes No Yes No Yes No	ence at 162-164 Berr at 160 Bernard Stree basement level park CYes Historic D Property is in an eligib Historic District/Contect the following Criteria: Criterion 1 - Event: Criterion 2 -Persons: Criterion 3 - Architectu	ard Street. In et will be der ing will be co ing will be co istrict/Context le California Re xt under one of C Y ure: C Y ntial: C Y	n addition, molished onstructed CN/A gister r more of res • No res • No res • No

Complies with the Secretary's Standards/Art 10/Art 11:	C Yes	ONo	€ N/A
CEQA Material Impairment:	O Yes	No	1 h
Needs More Information:	() Yes	No	
Requires Design Revisions:	O Yes	• No	
Defer to Residential Design Team:	O Yes	● No	

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

PRESERVATION TEAM COMMENTS:

The subject property comprises of two adjacent lots (Lot 36 and 37), each developed with one-story-over-basement structures. Both lots are 23-foot wide by 60-foot deep, located on the north side of Bernard Street, between Jones and Leavenworth streets.

The primary structure on lot 36 was built in 1906 replacing the previous building on the lot that burned in the 1906 earthquake and fire. The structure on lot 37, currently used as a garage, was built in 1913 as a plumbing shop for the same property owner. The two buildings have never been moved, retaining integrity of location but they have since lost integrity of setting as most early houses on the subject block appear to have been heavily altered or have been replaced by modern construction. No potential historic district is identified in the vicinity of the subject property.

As fully detailed in the Historic Resources Evaluation (HRE) document prepared by William Kostura, architectural historian (dated September 2013), both properties do not appear to be individually eligible for the California Register under criterion 1, 2 or 3. Specifically, although both structures were rebuilt immediately following the 1906 earthquake and fire, a small to moderate number of similar sized houses with higher integrity than the subject buildings remain standing on Nob Hill and Russian Hill. In addition, none of the persons associated with the property were significant in San Francisco's, California or national history. Lastly, both structures do not display any significant architectural features other than the bracketed cornice on the primary structure and the ornamental iron fence in front of it, as well as the historic large casement and steel windows that face the sunken yard and not visible from the public right-of-way. As such, given the otherwise plain architecture of the subject buildings, the property does not appear to be individually eligible for the California Register under criterion 3.

The Department concurs with the analysis included in the HRE prepared by William Kostura that the subject sites are not resources and the one-story residence as well as garage structure on the subject lots do not retain sufficient integrity to be considered historic resources. As such, the Department defers to the recommendation from the Department's Residential Design Team (RDT) on the proposed project.

4/27/2015

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

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT



Case Number 2014.1564E 160 & 162-164 Bernard Street

SUBJECT PROPERTY – Garage (Plumbing shop)



Case Number 2014.1564E 160 & 162-164 Bernard Street

This page intentionally left blank.

CASE NUMBER:

RECEIVED

APPLICATION FOR APPLICATION I C.I. Discretionary Review JUN 11 0 2013 CITY & COUNTY OF S.F. PLANNING DEPARTMENT PTC

Patrick J. Connolly and Tiffany Hsueh			
DR APPLICANT'S ADDRESS:	ZIP CODE:	TELEPHONE: (415)357-0600	
127A Bernard Street, San Francisco, California	94109		
PROPERTY OWNER WHO IS DOING THE PROJECT ON WHICH YOU ARE REQUESTING DISC	RETIONARY REVIEW NAME:		
Philip Campbell, Julia Campbell, Philip Campbell & Julia Camp	bell Revocable Trus	t	
ADDRESS:	ZIP CODE:	TELEPHONE:	
162 Bernard Street, San Francisco, California	94109	(415) 279-0056	
CONTACT FOR DR APPLICATION:			
Same as Above 🔄 Niall Vignoles			
ADDRESS:	ZIP CODE:	TELEPHONE:	
649 Mission Street, Fifth Floor, San Francisco, California	94105	(415) 823-3683	
E-MAIL ADDRESS: vignoleslaw@gmail.com			

2. Location and Classification

STREET ADDR	ESS OF PROJECT				• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	ZIP CODE:	
162-164 Be	ernard Street	t				94109	
,	CROSS STREETS: Leavenworth Street and Jones Street						
ASSESSORS B	ASSESSORS BLOCK/LOT: LOT DIMENSIONS: LOT AREA (SQ FT): ZONING DISTRICT: HEIGHT/BULK DISTRICT:						
0156	/037	23x60	1380	RH-3	65-A		

3. Project Description

Please check all that apply Change of Use D Cha	inge of Hours 🗌	New Construction	Alterations \mathbf{X}	Demolition 🗌	Other 🗌
Additions to Building: Present or Previous Use:	Rear 🗌 Front Two Family Dwel	0	Side Yard 🗌		
Proposed Use: Two Fam	nily Dwelling			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Building Permit Applicat	2014.08.11. ion No.	3471	Date	Filed: August 11	, 2014

4 Actions Phorito a Discretionary Review Request

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

6 Changes Made to the Project as a Result of Mediation

If you have discussed the project with the applicant, planning staff or gone through mediation, please summarize the result, including any changes there were made to the proposed project. The DR applicants discussed their concerns with both the Planner and the Sponsor. The Sponsor made clear that she was not going to compromise based on the concerns raised by the DR applicants. The DR applicants were not provided notification in August 2014 when other neighbors received notice and only recently learned of the project when the Notice of Building Permit Application was mailed.
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.

Please see Attachment.

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:

Please see Attachment.		
an ann an saon an ann an an ann an ann an ann an ann an a		
	n mana and an	

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?

Please see Attachment.

Applicant's Affidavit

Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:

- a: The undersigned is the owner or authorized agent of the owner of this property.
- b: The information presented is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.
- c: The other information or applications may be required.

Signature:

Date: 6/5/15

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

Patrick J. Connolly Owner Authorized Agent (circle one)

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: O(1/201) Date: O(1/201)

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

Owner / Authorized Agent (circle one)

Constant in the

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	
Address labels (original), if applicable	0
Address labels (copy of the above), if applicable	0
Photocopy of this completed application	
Photographs that illustrate your concerns	
Convenant or Deed Restrictions	8
Check payable to Planning Dept.	
Letter of authorization for agent	
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)	

NOTES:

Required Material.

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

RECEIVED

JUN 0 8 2015

CITY & COUNTY OF S.F.

For Department Use Only Application received by Planning Department:

By: Kurt Sotn

_____ Date: <u>618/15</u>

ATTACHEMENT TO APPLICATION FOR DISCRETIONARY REVIEW

DR APPLICANT: Patrick J. Connolly and Tiffany Hsueh

PROPERTY OWNER WHO IS DOING PROJECT: Philip Campbell, Julia Campbell & Philip Campbell & Julia Campbell Revocable Trust

STREET ADDRESS OF PROJECT: 162-164 Bernard Street

Discretionary Review Request

1. The existing historic 1906 cottage and garage are each located on small 23 x 60 lots mid-block on a narrow mid-block alley and are surrounded on all sides by buildings which are only one or two stories (some of which are over garages). [See Exhibits A-F.] All of the midblock buildings on this block of the alley (Exhibits A-D), the midblock buildings fronting on Broadway and abutting the rear of the proposed Project (Exh. E) and most other midblock buildings in the neighborhood (Exh. F) are only one or two stories (some being over garages).

The alternations to cottage and the new construction on adjacent parcel will: 1) cause the height of the proposed buildings to be incompatible with the height and scale of all mid-block buildings; 2) create two new four story buildings over basements with roof decks where all other mid-block buildings (including adjacent rear buildings on Broadway) are one or two story; 3) create the only four story buildings in the middle of the block and the tallest buildings in the middle of the block instead of at the end of the block near the wide street; 4) mass into mid-block open space on the alley, which is particularly harsh on this narrow block (it will also mass onto mid-block open space on Broadway); 5) negatively affect quality of pedestrian experiences on the block where bulk effects are particularly pronounced on a narrow alley-type mid-block street; 6) increase shadowing and reduce light to the alley and adjacent buildings; 7) destroy the historic feel of the cottage/garage now at the two-parcel joint project; and 8) change the historic character and feel of the block, including by the proposed frontage design of the building.

2. The proposed construction on the two adjacent parcels will create two new adjacent structures towering over the adjacent buildings and the block because they are much taller and are more stories than all adjacent buildings and all midblock buildings. [See Exhibit G.]

Specifically, the alternations to cottage and the new construction on adjacent parcel will: 1) cause the height of the proposed buildings to be incompatible with the height and scale of all mid-block buildings; 2) create two new four story buildings over basements with roof decks where all other mid-block buildings (including adjacent rear buildings on Broadway) are one or two story; 3) create the only four story buildings in the middle of the block and the tallest buildings in the middle of the block instead of at the end of the block near the wide street; 4) mass into mid-block open space, which is particularly harsh on this narrow block(it will also mass onto mid-block open space on Broadway); 5) negatively affect quality of pedestrian experiences on the block where bulk effects are particularly pronounced on a narrow alley-type mid-block street; 6) increase shadowing and reduce light to the alley and adjacent buildings; 7) destroy the historic feel of the cottage/garage now at the two-parcel joint project; and 8)

change the historic character and feel of the block, including by the proposed frontage design of the building.

Neighboring owners and tenants of the proposed Project have had discussions with the DR Applicants in which they have expressed these concerns and the potential adverse effects on them (as discussed above).

3. The height of the alternations to cottage and the new construction on adjacent parcel should be limited to the prevailing roof height, which is approximately thirty (30) feet. A reduction in height can be achieved by not approving the fourth floor over the basement and/or by reduction of proposed tall ceiling heights. A reduction in the height of the alternations to cottage and the new construction will mitigate the potential adverse effects listed in #1-#8 above. A reduction in height will also mitigate the adverse effects of the elevator overrun which extends higher than forty (40) feet based on the proposed plans.

The front of the proposed altered cottage and the new construction on adjacent parcel should be set back to match the set back of the existing cottage. A front set back will mitigate the potential adverse effects listed in #1, #4-#8.

The front façade of the proposed altered cottage and the new construction should provide features that acknowledge the historic designs of neighboring buildings along the block, many of which were built within the decade after the 1906 earthquake.

June 5, 2015

San Francisco Planning Department Planning Information Center 1660 Mission Street, First Floor San Francisco, CA 94103

To Whom It May Concern:

I, Tiffany Hsueh, authorize Patrick J. Connolly , the co-owner of the building located at 127-131 Bernard Street with me, to file enclosed Application for Discretionary Review on my behalf for the projects located at 160 Bernard Street and 162-164 Bernard Street.

Sincerely,

2-Tiffany Hsueh



Exhibit B

Google

Image capture: Feb

Subject garage with cottage to the left partially obstructed by tree











Exhibit G

This page intentionally left blank.

NEW YORK LONDON SINGAPORE PHILADELPHIA CHICAGO WASHINGTON, DC SAN FRANCISCO SILICON VALLEY SAN DIEGO SHANGHAI BOSTON HOUSTON LOS ANGELES HANOI HO CHI MINH CITY DuaneMorris[®]

FIRM and AFFILIATE OFFICES

ALICE SUET YEE BARKLEY DIRECT DIAL: +1 415 957 3116 PERSONAL FAX: +1 415 358 5593 *E-MAIL:* asbarkley@duanemorris.com

www.duanemorris.com

ATLANTA BALTIMORE WILMINGTON MIAMI BOCA RATON PITTSBURGH NEWARK LAS VEGAS CHERRY HILL LAKE TAHOE MYANMAR OMAN A GCC REPRESENTATIVE OFFICE OF DUANE MORRIS

MEXICO CITY ALLIANCE WITH MIRANDA & ESTAVILLO <u>SRI LANKA</u> ALLIANCE WITH GOWERS INTERNATIONAL

January 4, 2016

Commissioner Rodney Fong President, Planning Commission 1650 Mission Street, fourth floor San Francisco, CA 94103

Subject:Opposition to Discretionary Review RequestProposed buildings at 160 Bernard and 162-164 Bernard Street

Dear Commissioner Fong:

Our office represents Julia and Philip Campbell (collectively, "Applicants"), who propose to demolish a single car garage with a storage room underneath and construct a two-unit, fourstory building with a basement at 160 Bernard Street, and to remodel and add two floors to the existing one-story plus basement two-unit building at 162-164 Bernard Street (collectively, the "Project"). The 160 and 162-164 Bernard properties are two separate legal lots (collectively, the "Site"). The Applicants currently reside in the 162-164 Bernard Street building and plan to reside in the upper unit of the 160 Bernard Street building once it is completed. Upon completion, the Project will have two four-bedroom units, one two-bedroom unit and a one-bedroom unit.

Patrick Connolly and Tiffany Hsueh (collectively, "DR Requestors") reside at 127A Bernard Street, which is uphill and southeast from the Site. The DR Requestors filed discretionary review ("DR") requests of the Project. Inasmuch as both DR requests are identical, the Applicants' responses have been consolidated into one.

Discretionary review is granted only if exceptional or extraordinary circumstances exist. The DR Requestors fail to establish the existence of any exceptional or extraordinary circumstance in this case. Therefore, the DR requests are without merit and should be denied.

DUANE MORRIS LLP



PROJECT APPLICANTS

The Applicants, who have three children, bought the properties in 1997 from Patricia Brindle and her husband who occupied both of units at 162-164 Bernard Street. The Applicants have resided at the Property since that time and occupy both units. In 2001 the Applicants obtained permits to renovate the existing kitchen on the lower floor of 162 Bernard Street and to expand an existing bathroom on the upper floor. In 2003 the Applicants submitted a permit request to renovate the 162-164 Bernard building into a single family home. The Planning Commission approved the plans with the condition that a replacement second unit be constructed by expanding the garage on the adjacent legal lot which is under common ownership. The Applicants decided not to proceed with the approved application due to financial considerations. The Project is to construct two buildings, each with two units. The Project would add two fourbedroom dwelling units to be added to the City's housing stock.

PROJECT SITE

The Site is located where the western slopes of Nob Hill and Russian Hill meet in an established residential area with medium to high density housing that is close to Downtown. The buildings on this block range from one to four stories and from single family homes to 16 unit apartment buildings. The architecture of the buildings is diverse providing a mixed visual character. (See photographs of the Site vicinity attached hereto as **Exhibit 1.**)

The Site, two adjoining lots each measuring 23' x 60', is located in an RH-3 zoning district and a 65-X Height and Bulk District, which allows buildings up to 65' high. The 160 Bernard Street property is improved with a 10'10" x 22', 238 gross square feet (gsf) garage with basement storage located at the southeast corner of the lot. Except for this small structure constructed in 1913, the remainder of the site is undeveloped providing light and air to the property line windows of the two unit building located at 162-164 Bernard Street.

The one-story over basement two-unit building at 162-164 Bernard Street was constructed in 1906. The basement unit contains a kitchen, a family room, a bedroom with a connecting home office, bathroom and utility room. The ground floor unit contains a living room, two bedrooms, kitchen and bathroom. The façade of the building is set back 4'7" from the front property line to provide access to the basement unit. The Planning Department has determined that this building is not a historic resource. (See Categorical Exemption, the Historic Resource Evaluation Report by William Kostura and the Department's Historic Resource Evaluation attached to the Case Report.)

The existing building lacks adequate light and air access in that:

• The family in the basement has one small west facing window facing a 2'10" open air wide exit corridor and a window on the side property line, and a window facing a light well that is not sufficiently deep to provide adequate light and air;

- The basement bedroom and family room windows face the 2'-10" open air exit corridor;
- The hallway and the room at the rear at the ground floor are along the side property line; and
- The two front bedrooms receive their light and air facing the 2'-10" open air exit corridor.

This building does not meet numerous Building Code provisions, most notably with respect to the operable windows and doors along the property line and the light well. Compliance with the Building Code would deprive several rooms of air access to the rooms along the property line.

PROJECT

The Applicants propose to construct the Project in two phases. Phase 1 will be the demolition of the small garage/storage building at 160 Bernard Street and construction of a two unit townhouse, one being a new home for the Applicants. Phase 2 of the Project would be the renovation and addition to 162-164 Bernard Street. No tenants will be evicted in order to construct either building.

Phase 1 - Proposed Two-unit Building-160 Bernard Street

The Applicants propose to demolish the existing garage/storage structure and construct a five story handicap accessible two-unit building with two townhouse units and off-street parking provided by a car stacker. The elevator will not access the roof limiting the elevator overrun to be approximately 4' high above the roof. (See the existing and proposed floor plans, elevations and sections attached to the Case Report.)

The 1,357 sq. ft. lower unit will be a townhouse consisting of the basement and the rear portion of the ground floor. The common area at the ground floor will include the entrance lobby for both units, the elevator, a garage with a car stacker for the two off-street parking spaces and two Class 1 bicycle parking spaces. This lower townhouse unit will have two bedrooms and a bathroom on the ground floor with the living/dining/kitchen area in the basement level. The private usable open space for this lower unit will be the 345 sq. ft. at-grade 15' deep Code complying rear yard. (See Sheets A2.1 of plans attached to the Case Report.)

The 2,801 sq. ft. upper four bedroom townhouse unit consisting of the second, third and fourth floors will be occupied by the Applicants and their family. The second floor will have an ensuite master bedroom, two bedrooms, laundry area and a bathroom. The third floor will contain the living room/office and an ensuite bedroom. The fourth floor penthouse containing the dining/kitchen area will be set back 8' from the front façade and 10' from the rear façade.

A 6' light well matching the adjacent light well of the uphill neighbor will ensure light and air access to the neighbor's rear bedrooms and hallway.



The 400 sq. ft. roof deck, the fourth floor 170 sq. ft rear terrace and the 184 sq. ft. front terrace will be the private usable open space for the upper unit. Access to the roof deck will be via a spiral staircase located at the fourth floor rear terrace. To minimize the visual height the railings of the roof deck will be glass. (See Sheet A2.3 of plans attached to the Case Report.) After the 160 Bernard building is completed, the Applicants' family will relocate to the upper unit of 160 Bernard Street and the lower unit will be rented.

Proposed addition and renovation of 162-164 Bernard Street Building

The two-unit, one-story with basement 162-164 Bernard Street building will include renovation of the basement unit and a vertical addition above the ground floor that complies with the rear yard requirement. The building will continue to have two units each with 2 new off-street parking spaces provided by a car stacker, as shown by the existing and proposed floor plans, elevations and sections attached to the Case Report.

The existing basement unit will be renovated to include a kitchen/living/dining area, one bedroom with a connecting home office, a bathroom, storage room, garage, circulation, and building services. This lower unit will not have any usable open space because it is a renovation of a lawful non-complying unit. (See Sheets A02.01 and A02.05 of plans attached to the Case Report.)

The upper four-bedroom townhouse unit will consist of the existing ground floor and the new second and third floors. The ground floor will contain an ensuite master bedroom, two bedrooms, and common area for the garage and building entry. The second floor will be an open living/dining/kitchen area. The partial third floor will be an ensuite master bedroom that is set back 8' from the street and 25' from the rear property line. The private usable open space will be the 184 sq. ft. second floor terrace, the 160 sq. ft. front terrace and the 230 sq. ft. rear terrace on the third floor. (See Sheets A02.03 and A02.04 of the plans attached to the Case Report.)

ISSUES RAISED BY DR REQUESTORS

The DR Requestors raise the following issues:

1. The existing buildings are historic resources and the Projects will adversely affect these historic resources.

2. The Projects are out of scale, too tall and incompatible with the character of the neighborhood.

3. The Projects will adversely affect the light and air access to the adjacent Broadway Street and Bernard Street neighbors.

4. The DR Requestors were not provided Pre-Application Notice of the Project.



APPLICANTS' RESPONSES TO ISSUES RAISED BY DR REQUESTORS

1. The Project will have no adverse impact on Historic Resources.

DR Requestors' assertion that the Project would have a negative effect on historic resources is devoid of merit. The environmental review application submitted by the Applicants included Part 1 of a Historic Resource Evaluation Report by William Kostura (herein, "Kostura Report"). The Kostura Report found that the Site and Buildings were not associated with events or patterns of history, or person. Further, the few architectural features of note cannot be seen from the public right of way and these features are not sufficient to raise the Building to a level of distinction. (See pp. 8 and 9 of the Kostura Report, attached to the case report.) Kostura determined that the buildings on the Site are not eligible to be listed on the California Register.

The Planning Department conducted an independent review of the Kostura Report and agreed with his findings and conclusions. The Planning Department found that while "the two buildings have never been moved, retaining integrity of location, they have lost integrity of setting as most of the buildings on this block have been heavily altered or replaced; thus 'no potential historic district is identified in the vicinity of the subject property." A Class 1 and a Class 3 categorical exemption were issued as of April 28, 2015. See CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination attached to the case report. Notwithstanding the DR Requestors' contention, the buildings are not historic resources and cannot support a discretionary review request.

2. <u>The massing and height of the Project are compatible with the massing, scale and character of the neighborhood.</u>

The DR Requestors contend that the Project's mass will be inconsistent with the surrounding buildings. The buildings in the Project block range from single family homes to apartments with up to 16 units, from one to four stories high. The DR Requestors chose to completely ignore both the uphill and downhill corner lots that feature the largest buildings on the block face and chose to focus only on the shorter mid-block buildings. The height of the Project design reflects the slope of the street. The Site is located in a 65' height district and the proposed buildings are 40' high.

The partial top floors of both buildings are set back 8' from the front facade of the floors below so they appear as three story buildings from the street. To further minimize the visual height of the buildings, the railing of the roof deck of the 160 Bernard building will be glass eliminating the need for a solid 42" high roof parapet.

The Project will replace the existing one story and small garage/storage buildings and the existing two-unit building that lack architectural interest with two contemporary buildings adding diversity to the existing architectural of the block. The Projects are consistent with the Residential Design Guidelines ("Guidelines") in that:



- The Project respects the topography of the Site in that it will step up the street and complete the block face. By setting back the upper floor, the Project will provide a pedestrian scale similar to the adjacent buildings. (See Guidelines page 11.)
- The existing buildings in the Site vicinity have minimal or no rear yards. (See enlarged Sanborn Map of the Project block attached hereto as **Exhibit 2**.) The addition to the 162-164 Bernard Street building above the ground floor and the new building at 160 Bernard Street will have rear yards that comply with the Planning Code and will not alter the existing rear yard corridor of the block.
- The partial top floors of the proposed buildings have been set back 8' from the front facade to maintain a pedestrian scale. The 23' wide façade is similar to the existing Bernard Street buildings except for the corner lots fronting on Leavenworth and Jones Streets. (See Guidelines 23 and 24.)
- The garage door will be slightly recessed, similar to the existing garage doors in the area. The 10' curb cut and the 8' garage door comply with the planning requirements. (See Guidelines page 37.)
- The rooftop architectural features, such as the elevator overrun, are minimized by keeping them at the minimum height required and the roof deck railings are glass. (See Guidelines page 38.)
- The form and detailing of the buildings are contemporary yet compatible with the various architectural characteristics of the neighboring properties. The primary façade materials on the existing structures on the block are stucco or wood siding. The primary façades of the Project buildings will be horizontal wood siding that would extend to the visible portion of the side property line walls. The front façades include bay windows commonly found in the Project neighborhood. (See Guidelines pages 34, 44, 47.)

3. <u>The Project will not adversely affect the light and air access to the adjacent buildings</u> and Bernard Street.

The Site is on the north side of Bernard Street. The partial top floors of both proposed buildings will be set back 8' from the front property line and 25' from the rear property line. The Sanborn Map attached here to as **Exhibit 2** shows that all of the buildings on the block face and those fronting on Broadway to the north do not have Planning Code complying rear yards. Several buildings on the block face including the 162-164 Bernard building have 100% lot coverage.

The two lots to the rear of the Site with frontage on Broadway are developed with a four story and a three story apartment building that are similar in height to the Project buildings. Both the 160 Bernard building and the expanded 162-164 Bernard building will have 15' deep code complying rear yards and the partial fourth floor are set back 25' from the rear property line;



therefore, the Project will have minimal impact on sunlight and air access on the light and air access to the adjacent properties.

4. DR Requestors received the Section 311 notice from the Planning Department.

Prior to submitting the building permit application in 2014, the Applicants sent out a preapplication meeting notice to their adjacent neighbors, as required by the Planning Department. The DR Requestors reside approximately 120' uphill on the opposite block face and did not receive the pre-application meeting notice because they reside outside of the pre-application notification area.

When the DR Requestors received the Section 311 notice from the Planning Department they met with the Applicants and expressed their opinion that the proposed buildings are too high and out of scale with the neighborhood. The Applicants pointed out that the proposed buildings were 20' below the height limit and the design of the proposed buildings were reviewed extensively by the Planning Department prior to sending out the Section 311 notice. The proposed buildings do not have any stair or elevator penthouses on the roof (except for a minimum height for the elevator overrun) and the roof deck railings are glass to further minimize the visual height of the buildings. While the DR Requestors did not mention view blockage during the meeting, it became obvious that their concern was about blockage of their northwestern view.

SUMMARY

The DR Requestors fail to state facts supporting the existence of exceptional and extraordinary circumstances that warrant the granting of discretionary review by the Commission. The Project will add two new four bedroom units to the City's housing stock and retain a 1-bedroom unit and a 2-bedroom unit. The Project is consistent with the City's General Plan objectives and policies, the priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1(b) and the Residential Design Guidelines. Notwithstanding the DR Requestors' contention, their real concern is blockage of their view towards to northwest by the Project. Private view corridors are not protected by the Planning Code or the Guidelines. (See Guidelines, page 18.)

It is respectfully submitted that the DR requests should be denied and the Project approved.

Very truly yours,

Alice Suet Yee Barkley

Duane Morris

Commissioner Rodney Fong January 4, 2016 Page 8

Attachments: Exhibits 1 and 2.

cc: Commissioner Cindy Wu Michael J. Antonini Rich Hillis Christine D. Johnson Kathrin Moore Dennis Richards Scott Sanchez Mark Luellen Nicholas Foster Patrick Connolly and Tiffany Hsueh (DR Requestors) Julia and Philip Campbell Hulett Jones



TABLE OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1 Photographs of project site and vicinity

Exhibit 2 Sanborn Map showing the existing rear yard corridor

EXHIBIT 1



A:

SPONTANEOUS BERNARD STREET MOMENT CAPTURED ON GOOGLE'S STREET VIEW.

NEIGHBORS HAVING A CHAT: HE, WALKING HIS DOG AT THE SIDEWALK. SHE, PEERING OUT HER WINDOW ON THE FIFTH FLOOR.

THIS EXACT SPOT IS ACROSS THE STREET AND ONE PROPERTY UP FROM THE DISCRETIONARY REVIEW APPLICANT. jones | haydu

EXHIBIT 1



B: LOOKING NORTH ON LEAVENWORTH ST AT BERNARD ST



C: LOOKING SOUTH ON LEAVENWORTH ST AT BERNARD ST

one arkansas street, suite d1 san francisco, ca 94107 www.joneshaydu.com ph:415.558.0400

jones | haydu

EXHIBIT 1



D: LOOKING NORTH ON JONES ST AT BERNARD ST



E: LOOKING SOUTH ON JONES ST AT BERNARD ST

jones haydu



F: LOOKING WEST ON BERNARD ST AT EAST END OF BLOCK. Discretionary Review Applicant's Residence is the light blue building at left (127 Bernard). Note four story building directly across the street.



G: LOOKING WEST ON BERNARD ST, PROJECT SITE AT DIRECT RIGHT AT RED SCOOTER

one arkansas street, suite d1 san francisco, ca 94107 www.joneshaydu.com ph:415.558.0400

jones haydu



H: LOOKING EAST ON BERNARD ST AT LEAVENWORTH ST



Google I: LOOKING EAST ON BERNARD ST, PROJECT SITE AT DIRECT LEFT one arkansas street, suite d1 san francisco, ca 94107 www.joneshaydu.com ph:415.558.0400 jones | haydu

EXHIBIT 1



J: LOOKING EAST ON BERNARD ST, MID-BLOCK

jones haydu

EXHIBIT 3



SANBORN MAP

HIGHLIGHTING REAR YARD OPEN SPACE ON BERNARD STREET BETWEEN JONES AND LEAVENWORTH STREETS

GREEN AREAS DENOTE BACKYARD OPEN SPACE GRAY AREAS DENOTE VACANT OR PAVED AREAS YELLOW HIGHLIGHTS THE PROPOSED PROJECT SITE (2 LOTS)

This page intentionally left blank.

GENERAL NOTES & CONDITIONS

CONTRACT

GENERAL CONDITIONS: AIA Document A201, General Conditions for the Performance of the Contract, is hereby incorporated into these drawings and shall be considered as part of the requirements for the work.

EXISTING CONDITIONS: Conditions shown on the drawings are as shown on the original drawings or as observed on the site, but their accuracy is not guaranteed. Contractor shall verify all dimensions and conditions at the site. All discrepancies shall be reported to architect prior to proceeding with the work.

<u>PERMITS</u>: The contractor shall obtain and pay for all fees and permits relating to the project except for the General building Permit Plan Check Fee, which is the responsibility of the owners.

THE CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS are provided to illustrate the design and general type of construction desired and imply the finest quality of construction, material and workmanship throughout.

EXAMINATION OF THE SITE and portions thereof which will affect this work shall be made immediately by the Contractor, who shall compare it with the drawings and satisfy himself to conditions under which work is to be performed. He shall at such time ascertain and check locations of the existing structures and equipment which may affect his work. No allowance shall be made for any extra expense to which he may be due because of failure or neglect on his part to make such examinations. Any conflicts or omissions, etc., shall be reported to the Architect before proceeding with the work.

WORK PERFORMED: All work listed, shown or implied on any construction document shall be supplied and installed by the Contractor except where noted. The Contractor shall closely coordinate his work with that of other contractors or vendors to assure that all schedules are met and that all work is done in conformance to manufacturers requirements. Work required under this Contract shall include all labor, materials, equipment, etc., necessary to complete this project. All materials shall be new and unused, unless specifically noted, and be of a quality acceptable by industry standards.

ANY ERRORS, OMISSIONS, OR CONFLICTS found in the various parts of the construction documents shall be brought to the attention of the Architect and the Owner before proceeding with the work.

ARCHITECT: Where referenced in notes, Architect shall be **jones I haydu**. Building Owner shall be referred to as "owner."

QUESTIONS: All **questions** regarding project either during bidding phase or during construction shall be directed to the Architect, jones | haydu, at (415) 558-0400

CONST RUCTION

SCHEDULE OF CONSTRUCTION: Contractor shall provide Architect and Owner with a complete cost breakdown and **schedule of construction** for this project prior to commencement of work.

BUILDING CODES: All construction work, architectural, mechanical, plumbing, electrical, etc., shall conform to the latest Edition of the California Building Code and the latest edition of all governing codes and regulations as adopted by the local agencies. All work shall be done in a thorough, workmanlike manner and equal to the best standards of the practice.

CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS: The Contractor shall maintain a current and complete Set of Construction Documents on the job site during all phases of construction for use of all trades and shall provide all subcontractors with current construction documents as required. The Contractor, in assuming responsibility for the work indicated, shall comply with the spirit as well as with the letter in which they were drawn. Details shown are typical. Similar details apply in similar conditions.

DIMENSIONS: All dimensions on construction drawings are to face of structure e.g., face of stud (F.O.S.), or face of concrete (F.O.C.), unless otherwise noted to be **Center Line** of a mullion, a partition, or a column line, etc., or to **Face** of Finish for clear dimensions. Vertical dimensions are to top of plate or top of subfloor in section or elevation unless otherwise noted.

All **dimensions take precedence** over scale. Any discrepancies shall be brought immediately to the attention of the Architect. Contractor shall not scale drawings. Questions regarding dimensions shall be brought to the attention of the Architect or Owner prior to any start of work.

Where **locations of windows and doors** are not dimensioned they shall be centered on the wall or placed two stud widths from adjacent wall as indicated on the drawings.

Window sizes and door head heights are nominal dimensions. Refer to manufacturer for actual rough opening sizes.

PROVIDED: The use of the word '**provided**' in connection with any item specified is intended to mean that such item shall be furnished, installed, and connected where so required, except as noted.

MATERIALS: All materials for use on a project shall be stored within the project site.

PROTECTION OF NEW MATERIALS: Contractor shall **protect new** materials and finishes from damage which may occur from construction, demolition, dust, water. etc., and shall provide and maintain temporary barricades, closure walls. etc., as required to protect the public as required during the period of construction. Damage to new materials, finishes, structures, and equipment shall be repaired or replaced. Contractor shall coordinate temporary barricades with Architect and / or Owner prior to commencement of work.

<u>SUBSTITUTIONS</u>: Substitutions, revisions or changes must have approval by the Architect prior to proceeding with the work.

MATERIAL TRANSITIONS: All changes in floor materials occur at centerline of door or framed opening unless otherwise indicated on the drawings.

DAMAGE: The Contractor shall repair or replace any surface or items damaged by construction to the satisfaction of the Architect and Owner.

PATCHING: Properly prepare all surfaces for receiving the specified finishes including patching of surfaces altered by construction. On patched areas or areas where a finish is not specified, the finish shall match adjacent material in construction, color, and texture.

WATERPROOFING: Sealant, caulking, and flashing, etc., locations shown on drawings are not intended to be inclusive. Follow manufacturer's installation

recommendations and standard industry and building practices.

<u>VENTILATION</u>: All attics, rafter spaces, soffits, crawl spaces, etc., shall be fully ventilated.

BACKING: Provide **backing** for all towel bars, etc. using material acceptable for the building type listed for the project.

INSULATION: Install batt **insulation** between studs and joists at all exterior walls, ceilings, and floors where exposed, except where shown on the drawings. Verify with Title 24 Report for compliance when appropriate.

ELECTRICAL, MECHANICAL, AND PLUMBING: All electrical, mechanical, and plumbing work and materials shall be in full accordance with the latest rules and regulations of the National Board of Fire Underwriters, the State Fire Marshall, The Safety Orders of the Division of Industrial Safety, and any applicable state or local laws and ordinance. Nothing on these drawings is to be construed to permit work not conforming to these codes. Any questions regarding installations shall be brought to the Architect for clarification.

CONSTRUCTION DEBRIS: The Contractor shall remove all rubbish and waste materials of all subcontractors and trades on a regular basis, and shall exercise strict control over **job cleaning** to prevent any dirt, debris or dust from affecting in any way, finished areas in or outside the job site.

CONTRACTOR'S PRESENCE: Contractor shall personally **supervise** and direct the work or shall keep a competent employee, authorized to receive instructions and act on the Contractor's behalf, continuously on site during working hours.

<u>CLOSEOUT</u>

<u>REVIEW PROJECT</u>: Contractor shall **review project** with Architect and/or Owner to ensure that all requirements of the contract documents have been followed.

<u>CERTIFICATES AND NOTICES:</u> Contractor shall obtain all required certificates and notices

CLEAN AND READY FOR USE: All work performed shall be clean and ready for USe

PUNCH LIST: Upon SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETION, the CONTRACTOR shall compile a **project punch list** noting any corrections or omissions for review by the architect and owner or owner's representative. Architect's acceptance will be cause for final payment, unless specifically determined otherwise by Owner.

GUARANTEES: The Contractor shall guarantee that the project will be free of defects of workmanship and materials for a period of one year from the date of acceptance from the owner. No work defective in construction or quantity or deficient in any requirement of the drawings or notes will be acceptable in consequence of the Owner's or Architect's failure to discover or point out defects or deficiencies during construction. Defect of workmanship or materials revealed within a period of one year from the date of acceptance shall be replaced by work conforming with the intent of the contract at no cost to the Owner. No payment, partial or final, shall be construed as acceptance of defective work or improper materials.

SITE PHOTOS



FRONT FACADE



FRONT VIEW ADJACENT BUILDINGS

ABBREVIATIONS

A.S.F. ADJ. A.F.F.	ABOVE SUB FLOOR ADJUSTABLE ABOVE FINISH FLOOR	NOM. NTS O.C.
ALUM.	ALUMINUM	0.D.
ATTN.	ATTENTION	О.Н.
BATHRM.	BATHROOM	OPN'G
BLDG.	BUILDING	OPP.
BLKG.	BLOCKING	P.L.
BD.	BOARD	P.LAM
CAB.	CABINETRY	PLAS.
CL	CENTER LINE	PLYWD.
CLG.	CEILING	PREFAB
CMU COL.	CONCRETE MASONRY UNIT	
CONC.	COLUMN CONCRETE	PTD. QTY.
CONC.	CONTINUOUS	R
CP	CENTER POINT	RAD.
С.Т.	CERAMIC TILE	R.D.
DIA.	DIAMETER	REF.
DBL.	DOUBLE	REG.
DN	DOWN	REINF.
DWGS.	DRAWINGS	REQ'D
EA.	EACH	RET.
E.J.	EXPANSION JOINT	RM
ELEV.	ELEVATION	R.O.W.
EQ.	EQUAL	R.W.L.
EXIST'G	EXISTING	SCHED.
EXT.	EXTERIOR FURNISHED BY OWNER	SIM.
F.B.O. F.O.F.	FACE OF FINISH	SQ. S.M.D.
F.O.S.	FACE OF STRUCTURE	S.S.D.
FIN.	FINISH	S.S.
FLR.	FLOOR	STD.
GA.	GAUGE	ST'L
GALV.	GALVANIZED	SUSP.
GL.	GLASS	т
GLU-LAM.	GLUE LAMINATED	T.B.D.
GWB	GYPSUM WALL BOARD	T.O.
HDWR	HARDWARE	T.O.P.
H.M.	HOLLOW METAL	T.O.C.
H.P.		T.O.W.
Horiz. ht.	HORIZONTAL HEIGHT	THK. VAR.
п. I.D.	INSIDE DIMENSION	VAR. VCT
J.B.	JUNCTION BOX	V.I.F.
JT.	JOINT	W.C.
LAM.	LAMINATED	WD
LAV.	LAVATORY	
L.P.	LOW POINT	
MECH.	MECHANICAL	
MIN.	MINIMUM	
MR	MOISTURE RESISTANT	
MT'L	METAL	
N.I.C.	NOT IN CONTRACT	

NOMINAL
NOT TO SCALE
ON CENTER
OUTSIDE DIMENSION
OVERHEAD
OPENING
OPPOSITE
PROPERTY LINE
PLASTIC LAMINATE
PLASTER
PLYWOOD
PREFABRICATED
POINT
PAINTED
QUANTITY
RISER
RADIUS
ROOF DRAIN
REFERENCE
-
REGISTER
REINFORCING
REQUIRED
RETURN
ROOM
RIGHT OF WAY
RAIN WATER LEADER
SCHEDULE
SIMILAR
SQUARE
SEE MECHANICAL DRAWINGS
SEE STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS
STAINLESS STEEL
STANDARD
STEEL
SUSPENDED
TREAD
TO BE DETERMINED
TOP OF
TOP OF PARAPET
TOP OF CONCRETE
TOP OF WALL
THICK
VARIES
VINYL COMPOSITE TILE
VERIFY IN FIELD
WATER CLOSET
WOOD

SYMBOL KEY

	NEW WALL IN PLAN
	1-HOUR FIRE RATED WALL IN PLANI
OWASTE	WASTE PIPE FROM ABOVE
E	EMERGENCY ESCAPE OPENING
\bigoplus	PLAN NORTH
Ę	CENTER LINE
•	FLOOR ELEVATION
1 A101	CROSS SECTION
Ref	ELEVATION
0	GRIDLINE
1 A101	DETAIL CALL-OUT
	REVISION
(1t)	WINDOW TAG
	DOOR TAG

VICINITY MAP



AREA CALCULATIONS

EXISTING GARAGE FOR DEMO.	200 SF
PROPOSED BUILDING AREA:	
GARAGE AREA	400 SF
TERRACES & PATIO	752 SF
UNIT #1 (LOWER UNIT)	1,357 SF GROSS INT. AREA
<u>UNIT #2 (UPPER UNIT)</u>	<u>2,801 SF GROSS INT. AREA</u>
TOTAL	4,158 SF GROSS INT. AREA



FRONT VIEW BUILDINGS ON FACING SIDE OF STREET

PROJECT DIRECTORY

OWNER JULIA CAMPBELL 160 BERNARD ST SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109 ARCHITECT jones | haydu 1 ARKANSAS STREET, STE D2 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107 415.558.0400 415.861.5095 FAX ATTN: HULETT JONES e-mail: hulett@joneshaydu.com

CONTRACTOR TBD

SURVEYOR BAY AREA LAND SURVEYING, INVC. MICHAEL J. FOSTER 961 EL SOBRANTE, CA, 94803 510.223.5167

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

THIS APPLICATION IS BEING SUBMITTED TO THE CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR SITE BUILDING PERMIT.

- (N) 4-STORY RESIDENTIAL BLDG (BASEMENT, GROUND, 2ND, 3RD, 4TH FLR).

- (N) ROOF ACCESS STRUCTURE
- DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DETACHED GARAGE
- NEW 2-CAR GARAGE WITH LIFT.
- RELOCATE EXISTING DRIVEWAY.
- 2 LIVING UNITS.

ALL PROPOSED WORK SHALL CONFORM TO THE SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING CODE HEIGHT AND SETBACK LIMITS.

PROJECT DATA

ADDRESS: LOT #: PARCEL: LOT AREA: ZONING: HEIGHT DISTRICT: OCCUPANCY: CONSTR. TYPE: SPRINKLERED:	R-3
(E) BLDG: (E) BLDG AREA: YEAR BUILT: HISTORIC STATUS:	1939
PROPOSED UNITS:	4 STORIES ABOVE GRADE 2 UNITS. 40'-0" ABOVE GRADE + ROOF ACCESS STRCT.
APPL. PLNG. CODES:	2003 S.F. RESIDENTIAL DESIGN GUIDELINES 2014 S.F. PLANNING CODE S.F. GENERAL PLAN DESIGN GUIDELINES 2013 SAN FRANCISCO HOUSING CODE
APPL. BLDG. CODES:	2013 CALIF. BUILDING CODE & S.F. AMDNTS. 2013 CALIF. ELECTRICAL CODE & S.F. AMDNTS. 2013 CALIF. MECHANICAL CODE & S.F. AMDNTS. 2013 CALIF. PLUMBING CODE & S.F. AMDNTS. 2013 GREEN BUILDING CODE & S.F. AMDNTS. 2013 CALIF. ENERGY CODE - EFF. JULY 1, 2014

DRAWING INDEX

ARCHITECTURAL

	A0.0 A0.1 A0.2 A0.3 A0.4 A1.1 A1.2 A1.3	Title Sheet Green Building Shadow Study - June 21 Shadow Study - Mar./Sep. 21 Shadow Study - Dec. 21 Plot Plan Renderings Renderings
3	A1.4 A2.0 A2.1	Renderings Floor Plans - Existing Floor Plans
	A2.2	Floor Plans
	A2.3	Floor Plans
	A3.1	South Elevation
	A3.2	North Elevation
	A3.3	East Elevation
	A3.4	West Elevation
	A4.1	Cross Section
	A4.2	Details

jones | haydu

one arkansas street, d2, san francisco, ca 94107 architecture design interiors v 415.558.0400 f 415.861.5095

() σ erna 036 Ś m 60 0

DATE	ISSUE	DRWN	CHK'D
12.23.2015	Revision 3	AL	HJ



Title Sheet

SHEET NUMBER



© 2015 jones | haydu



EXISTING - 8 AM

EXISTING - 10 AM



PROPOSED - 8 AM

SUMMER SOLSTICE

PROPOSED - 10 AM



PROPOSED - 12 PM

EXISTING - 12 PM



SUBJECT LOTS

EXISTING - 2PM

PROPOSED - 2PM







jones | haydu

one arkansas street, d2, san francisco, ca 94107 architecture design interiors v 415.558.0400 f 415.861.5095



EXISTING - 4 PM





PROPOSED - 4 PM



	n		
DATE	ISSUE	DRWN	CHK'D
12.23.2015	Revision 3	AL	HJ
	1	1	1



Shadow Study - June 21



EQUINOX

PROPOSED - 8 AM

PROPOSED - 10 AM

SUBJECT LOTS -



SUBJECT LOTS -

EXISTING - 12 PM

EXISTING - 8 AM

SUBJECT LOTS -

SUBJECT LOTS -----



SUBJECT LOTS —



SUBJECT LOTS —



PROPOSED - 12 PM

PROPOSED - 2PM

EXISTING - 2PM





EXISTING - 4 PM

PROPOSED - 4 PM







jones | haydu

one arkansas street, d2, san francisco, ca 94107 architecture design interiors v 415.558.0400 f 415.861.5095





EXISTING - 6 PM





PROPOSED - 6 PM

ISSUE	DRWN	CHK'D
Revision 3	AL	HJ





EXISTING - 8 AM

EXISTING - 10 AM

PROPOSED - 10 AM



PROPOSED - 8 AM

WINTER SOLSTICE

2

PROPOSED - 12 PM

PROPOSED - 2PM

EXISTING - 2PM

SUBJECT LOTS -



EXISTING - 12 PM



SUBJECT LOTS -



jones | haydu

one arkansas street, d2, san francisco, ca 94107 architecture design interiors v 415.558.0400 f 415.861.5095





EXISTING - 4 PM





PROPOSED - 4 PM



	1		
DATE	ISSUE	DRWN	CHK'D
12.23.2015	Revision 3	AL	HJ
L	I	I	I



Shadow Study - Dec. 21






one arkansas street, d2, san francisco, ca 94107 architecture design interiors v 415.558.0400 f 415.861.5095



160 Bernard Street Lot 0156-036 San Francisco, CA, 94109

DATE	ISSUE	DRWN	CHK'D
12.23.2015		AL	HJ
12.20.2010			
L			



Plot Plan









VIEW A

jones | haydu

one arkansas street, d2, san francisco, ca 94107 architecture design interiors v 415.558.0400 f 415.861.5095

160 Bernard Street Lot 0156-036 San Francisco, CA, 94109

[
DATE	ISSUE		CHK'D
12.23.2015	Revision 3	AL	HJ



Renderings





VIEW B

jones | haydu

one arkansas street, d2, san francisco, ca 94107 architecture design interiors v 415.558.0400 f 415.861.5095

160 Bernard Street Lot 0156-036 San Francisco, CA, 94109

DATE	ISSUE	DRWN	CHK'D
12.23.2015	Revision 3	AL	HJ



Renderings





VIEW C

jones | haydu

one arkansas street, d2, san francisco, ca 94107 architecture design interiors v 415.558.0400 f 415.861.5095

Lot 0156-036 San Francisco, CA, 94109

160 Bernard Street

	r		
DATE	ISSUE	DRWN	CHK'D
12.23.2015	Revision 3	AL	HJ
L			



Renderings















one arkansas street, d2, san francisco, ca 94107 architecture design interiors v 415.558.0400 f 415.861.5095

109 160 Bernard Street San Francisco Lot 0156-036

DATE	ISSUE	DRWN	CHK'D
12.23.2015	Revision 3	AL	HJ



Floor Plans - Existing







one arkansas street, d2, san francisco, ca 94107 architecture design interiors v 415.558.0400 f 415.861.5095

160 Bernard Street Lot 0156-036 San Francisco, CA, 94109

DATE	ISSUE	DRWN	CHK'D
12.23.2015	Revision 3	AL	HJ



Floor Plans











one arkansas street, d2, san francisco, ca 94107 architecture design interiors v 415.558.0400 f 415.861.5095

160 Bernard Stree Lot 0156-036 San Francisco, CA, 941

60

DATE	ISSUE	DRWN	CHK'D
12.23.2015	Revision 3	AL	HJ



Floor Plans



FLOOR PLAN LEGEND

New Wall

1-hr New Fire Rated Wall

O WASTE Waste Pipe from above

E

R

 \bigcirc

Emergency Escape and Rescue

Floor or Ground Spot Elevation

Fire Rated Window or Door







4 4th Floor Plan (Unit #2) Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0"

jones | haydu

one arkansas street, d2, san francisco, ca 94107 architecture design interiors v 415.558.0400 f 415.861.5095

FLOOR PLAN LEGEND New Wall 1-hr New Fire Rated Wall **O**WASTE Waste Pipe from above E Emergency Escape and Rescue Fire Rated Window or Door

Floor or Ground Spot Elevation

NORTH

R

 \bigcirc

DATE	ISSUE	DRWN	CHK'D
12.23.2015	Revision 3	AL	HJ

109

()

San Francisco

Lot 0156-036

160 Bernard Street



Floor Plans





 Street Frontage (South Elevation)

 Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0"

jones | haydu

one arkansas street, d2, san francisco, ca 94107 architecture design interiors v 415.558.0400 f 415.861.5095

DATE	ISSUE	DRWN	CHK'D
12.23.2015	Revision 3	AL	HJ



South Elevation





 Rear Elevation (North)

 Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0"

jones | haydu

one arkansas street, d2, san francisco, ca 94107 architecture design interiors v 415.558.0400 f 415.861.5095







one arkansas street, d2, san francisco, ca 94107 architecture design interiors v 415.558.0400 f 415.861.5095

_ __ _ _

- PROPERTY LINE

EXISTING BUILDING LOT 49 1157 BROADWAY ST.

160 Bernard Street Lot 0156-036 109

San Francisco

	r		
DATE	ISSUE	DRWN	CHK'D
12.23.2015	Revision 3	AL	HJ
1	1		



East Elevation

SHEET NUMBER







West Elevation Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0"

jones | haydu

one arkansas street, d2, san francisco, ca 94107 architecture design interiors v 415.558.0400 f 415.861.5095

60

San Francis

DRWN CHK'D

AL

HJ

EXISTING BUILDING LOT 17 165 BERNARD ST.

Π

160 Bernard Street

Lot 0156-036

DATE ISSUE 12.23.2015 Revision 3

ISSUE



West Elevation

SHEET NUMBER











one arkansas street, d2, san francisco, ca 94107 architecture design interiors v 415.558.0400 f 415.861.5095

			<u></u>
DATE	ISSUE	DRWN	CHK'D
12.23.2015	Revision 3	AL	HJ



Details



