**DISCRETIONARY REVIEW**

**ABBREVIATED ANALYSIS**

**HEARING DATE:** November 19, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record No.</th>
<th>2014-0243DRP-02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Address</td>
<td>3927 -3929 19th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Applications</td>
<td>2008.0813.9076 &amp; 2008.0813.9077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>RH-2 [Residential House, Two-Family]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-X Height and Bulk District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block/Lot</td>
<td>3601 / 073 &amp; 072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Sponsor</td>
<td>Jeff Burris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1501 Mariposa Street, Suite 319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Francisco, CA 94107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Contact</td>
<td>David Winslow – (628) 652-7335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:david.winslow@sfgov.org">david.winslow@sfgov.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation:** Take DR and Approve as Modified

---

**Project Description**

The project proposes to construct two new five-story, one-family dwellings approximately 36 feet in height with two off-street parking spaces.

**Site Description and Present Use**

The site is a 25’ wide x 114’ deep extremely steep upsloping lots which have existing 2-story, single-family houses that are located in the rear portion of the lots.

**Surrounding Properties and Neighborhood**

The buildings on this block of 19th Street are typically 3- to 4-story residential buildings- some fronting the street and some articulated by step backs at the second floors and above. The mid-block open space consists of a row of four historic 2-story houses in the rear of their lots which are accessed from the street by exterior stairs.
Building Permit Notification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Required Period</th>
<th>Notification Dates</th>
<th>DR File Date</th>
<th>DR Hearing Date</th>
<th>Filing to Hearing Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Hearing Notification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Required Period</th>
<th>Required Notice Date</th>
<th>Actual Notice Date</th>
<th>Actual Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Posted Notice</td>
<td>20 days</td>
<td>October 30, 2020</td>
<td>October 30, 2020</td>
<td>20 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailed Notice</td>
<td>20 days</td>
<td>October 30, 2020</td>
<td>October 30, 2020</td>
<td>20 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Notice</td>
<td>20 days</td>
<td>October 30, 2020</td>
<td>October 30, 2020</td>
<td>20 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public Comment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
<th>No Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent neighbor(s)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other neighbors on the block or directly across the street</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Review

The Department has determined that the proposed project is exempt/excluded from environmental review, pursuant to CEQA Guideline Section 15303 (Class 3 – New Construction. Up to three new single-family residences or six dwelling units in one building.

DR Requestors

**DR requestor 1:**
Bruce Bowen of the Dolores Height Improvement Club and resident of 4016 20th Street.

**DR requestor 2:**
Carolyn Kenady, of the Dolores Height Improvement Club and resident of 3632 21st Street
DR Requestors’ Concerns and Proposed Alternatives

DR requestors are concerned that the proposed project:

1. Was improperly noticed and resulted in inadequate time to or understanding to respond to the project
2. Excavation and construction risks due to the 20% slope steep hillside;
3. Will impede access to neighbors' home at rear during construction;
4. Has an inadequate plan to restore and preserve rear cottages as affordable housing;
5. Is incompatible with the scale and form of existing surrounding buildings and;
6. Will impact light air and privacy of adjacent properties.
7. Does not provide the minimum rear yard space with respect to the rear yard requirement and will further encroach into what is left of the small mid-block open space.

**Proposed alternatives:**

Ensure the residents safe and unimpeded access;
Remove the roof decks;
Revise the building design to improve the access to light and air;
Renovate or demolish the existing cottages;
Provide a geotechnical and soils report and structural design;
Revise the building design to improve scale and form


**Project Sponsor’s Response to DR Application**

The proposal has been revised to respond to the issue brought forth by the DR requestors.

See attached Response to Discretionary Review, dated January 17, 2020
Department Review

The DR requestors and project Sponsor have reached an agreement that they would like memorialized through the Planning Commission’s action. This is reflected in the attached drawings dated 8.25.2020 and stipulated in the resolution settlement agreement dated August 25, 2020.

The agreement includes assurances that the project sponsor will:

1. provide unimpeded access to rear buildings during construction;
2. share the final shoring and structural design and excavation monitoring plan;
3. renovate the rear cottages under a separate permit;
4. not seek variances for additional rear yard encroachment;
5. step back the façade for 3927 19th as per 8.25.2020 plans and;
6. not build roof decks, now or in the future

**Recommendation:** Take DR and Approve and Approve as Modified

**Attachments:**

- Block Book Map
- Sanborn Map
- Zoning Map
- Aerial Photographs
- Context Photographs
- Section 311 Notice
- CEQA Determination
- DR Application
- Response to DR Application, dated January 17, 2020
- 311 plans
- Revised plans dated 8.25.2020
The Sanborn Maps in San Francisco have not been updated since 1998, and this map may not accurately reflect existing conditions.
Zoning Map

Discretionary Review Hearing
Case Number 2014.0243DRP-02
3927-3931 19th Street
Aerial Photo

Discretionary Review Hearing
Case Number 2014.0243DRP-02
3927-3931 19th Street
Aerial Photo
NOTICE OF BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION (SECTION 311)

On August 13, 2008, Building Permit Application No. 2008.0813.9076 was filed for work at the Project Address below.

Notice Date: August 26th, 2019  Expiration Date: September 25th, 2019

You are receiving this notice as an owner or occupant of property 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 that the Planning Commission review this application at a public hearing for Discretionary Review. Requests for a Discretionary Review hearing must be filed during the 30-day review period, prior to the close of business on the Expiration Date shown above, 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
- Change of Use
- Rear Addition
- New Construction
- Façade Alteration(s)
- Side Addition
- Alteration
- Front Addition
- Vertical Addition

PROJECT FEATURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXISTING (REAR BLDG ONLY)</th>
<th>PROPOSED (REAR BLDG; FRONT BLDG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Use: Residential</td>
<td>Rear Bldg: No change; Front Bldg: Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback: 62 feet 3 inches</td>
<td>Rear Bldg: No change; Front Bldg: Zero (Abuts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Setbacks: 9 inches</td>
<td>Rear Bldg: No change; Front Bldg: Zero (Abuts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Depth: 36 feet 6 inches</td>
<td>Rear Bldg: No change; Front Bldg: 61 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard: 15 feet</td>
<td>Rear Bldg: No change; Front Bldg: 53 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height: 22 feet 6 inches</td>
<td>Rear Bldg: No change; Front Bldg: 36 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Stories: 2</td>
<td>Rear Bldg: No change; Front Bldg: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Dwelling Units: 1</td>
<td>Rear Bldg: No change; Front Bldg: 1 (2 units total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Parking Spaces: 0</td>
<td>Rear Bldg: No change; Front Bldg: 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposal is for the construction of a new 5-story, 36-foot tall, 4,486 square foot, single dwelling unit with two off-street parking spaces at the front of an existing 2,850 square foot rectangular lot containing an existing 2-story, 22 feet 6 inches tall, 1,334 square foot, single family residence with no off-street parking that is not in the scope of work and will remain unchanged. See attached plans for further detail. 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.

To view plans or related documents, visit sf-planning.org/notices and search the Project Address listed above. Once the property is located, click on the dot(s) to view details of the record number above, its related documents and/or plans.

For more information, please contact Planning Department staff:
Chris Townes, (415) 575-9195, chris.townes@sfgov.org
GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT PROCEDURES

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

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

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

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

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

BOARD OF APPEALS

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

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

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

Under CEQA, in a later court challenge, a litigant may be limited to raising only those issues previously raised at a hearing on the project or in written correspondence delivered to the Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, Planning Department or other City board, commission or department at, or prior to, such hearing, or as part of the appeal hearing process on the CEQA decision.
NOTICE OF BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION (SECTION 311)

On August 13, 2008, Building Permit Application No. 2008.0813.9077 was filed for work at the Project Address below.

Notice Date: August 26th, 2019
Expiration Date: September 25th, 2019

PROJECT INFORMATION

| Project Address: | 3929 19th Street |
| Cross Street(s): | Sanchez St & Noe St |
| Block/Lot No.: | 3601 / 072 |
| Zoning District(s): | RH-2 / 40-X |
| Record Number: | 2014.0243 |

APPLICANT INFORMATION

| Applicant: | Jeff Burris (Studio 12) |
| Address: | 1501 Mariposa Street, Suite 319 |
| City, State: | San Francisco, CA 94107 |
| Telephone: | (415) 503-0212 |
| Email: | jeff@studio12arch.com |

You are receiving this notice as an owner or occupant of property 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 that the Planning Commission review this application at a public hearing for Discretionary Review. Requests for a Discretionary Review hearing must be filed during the 30-day review period, prior to the close of business on the Expiration Date shown above, or the next business day if that date is on a weekend 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXISTING (REAR BLDG ONLY)</th>
<th>PROPOSED (REAR BLDG; FRONT BLDG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Use</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Bldg: No change; Front Bldg: Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback</td>
<td>62 feet 9 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Bldg: No change; Front Bldg: Zero (Abuts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Setbacks</td>
<td>Zero (Abuts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Bldg: No change; Front Bldg: Zero (Abuts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Depth</td>
<td>36 feet 6 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Bldg: No change; Front Bldg: 61 feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard</td>
<td>14 feet 9 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Bldg: No change; Front Bldg: 53 feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>22 feet 6 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Bldg: No change; Front Bldg: 37 feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Stories</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Bldg: No change; Front Bldg: 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Dwelling Units</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Bldg: No change; Front Bldg: 1 (2 units total)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Parking Spaces</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Bldg: No change; Front Bldg: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposal is for the construction of a new 5-story, 37-foot tall, 5,023 square foot, single dwelling unit with two off-street parking spaces at the front of an existing 2,850 square foot rectangular lot containing an existing 2-story, 1,000 square foot, 22 feet 6 inches tall, single family residence with no off-street parking that is not in the scope of work and will remain unchanged. See attached plans for further detail. 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.

To view plans or related documents, visit sf-planning.org/notices and search the Project Address listed above. Once the property is located, click on the dot(s) to view details of the record number above, its related documents and/or plans.

For more information, please contact Planning Department staff:
Chris Townes, (415) 575-9195, chris.townes@sfgov.org
GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT PROCEDURES

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

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

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

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

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

**BOARD OF APPEALS**

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

**ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

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

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

Certificate of Determination
EXEMPTION FROM ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Case No.: 2014.0243E
Project Title: 3927, 3929, and 3931 19th Street
Zoning: RH-2 (Residential, House, Two-Family) District
        40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lots: 3601/071, 072, and 073
Total Size of Lots: 8,544 square feet
Project Sponsor: Jeff Burris, Studio 12 Architecture
                 (415) 503-0212 x201
Staff Contact: Timothy Johnston - (415) 575-9035
timothy.johnston@sfgov.org

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project site is located on the block bounded by 19th, Sanchez, Cumberland, and Noe Streets in the Castro/Upper Market neighborhood. The project site consists of three parcels totaling approximately 8,544 square feet (sf) in area. Lot 071 contains an existing, 43-foot-tall, four-story, approximately 1,700-sf residence built in 1908. Lot 072 contains an existing, 29-foot-tall, three-story, approximately 1,400-sf single-family residence built in 1909. Lot 073 contains an existing, 26-foot-tall, two-story, approximately 1,300-sf single-family residence built in 1909.

(Continued on Second Page.)

EXEMPT STATUS:
Categorical Exemption, Class 3 [State CEQA Guidelines Section 15303(b)]

REMARKS:
See next page.

DETERMINATION:
I do hereby certify that the above determination has been made pursuant to State and local requirements.

LISA M. GIBSON
Acting Environmental Review Officer

Date: 8/19/14

cc: Jeff Burris, Project Sponsor
    Erika Jackson, Current Planner
    Stephanie Cisneros, Preservation Planner
    Supervisor Scott Wiener, District 8 (via Clerk of the Board)

 Bulletin Board
 Virna Byrd, M.D.F
 Preservation Distribution List
PROJECT DESCRIPTION (continued):

The proposed project involves the demolition of the three existing onsite residential buildings (described above), a merger of the three lots, and the construction of a four-unit, 40-foot tall, 6-story, approximately 19,313 gross square-foot four unit residence. Unit 1 would total 8,973 sq. ft., unit 2 would total 893 sq. ft., unit 3 would total 800 sq. ft., and unit 4 would total 839 sq. ft. Shared building areas, including 3,010 sq. ft. for parking and 2,000 sq. ft. for mechanical areas would total 7,808 sq. ft. Four off-street automobile parking spaces and five bicycle parking spaces would be provided within the new building.

A mat foundation system would be used the proposed building. Project implementation would entail soil-disturbing activities associated with building construction, including excavation of approximately 9,000 cubic yards of soil to a depth of approximately zero to 50 feet below grade surface (bgs).

Project Approval:

Approval Action: The proposed project is subject to notification under Section 311 of the Planning Code. If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project. If no Discretionary Review is requested, the issuance of a building permit by the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) is the Approval Action. The Approval Action date establishes the start of the 30-day appeal period for this CEQA exemption determination pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

REMARKS:

Historic Architectural Resources

In evaluating whether the proposed project would be exempt from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the Planning Department must first determine whether the existing building on the project site is a historical resource as defined by CEQA, and if so, whether the proposed project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the historical resource.

A building may be considered a historical resource if it meets any of the criteria that make it eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources. According to the Planning Department’s records, the existing building on Lot 071 (3931 19th St.) was built in 1908 and both of the existing buildings on Lots 072 (3929 19th Street) and 073 (3927 19th Street) were built in 1909. However, no known historic events occurred at any of the three properties (Criterion 1). None of the owners or occupants of the three properties have been identified as important to history (Criterion 2). The existing structures appear to have been originally constructed as simple, vernacular cottages and have undergone significant alterations since their construction. Thus, none of the three properties are architecturally distinct such that they would qualify individually for listing in the California Register (Criterion 3).

1 Stephanie Cisneros, San Francisco Planning Department. Preservation Team Review Form for 3927, 3929, and 3931 19th Street, June 21, 2016. This document is available for review as part of Case File No. 2014.0243E at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA.
The subject properties are not located within the boundaries of any identified historic district. They are located in the Castro/Upper Market neighborhood on a block that exhibits a variety of architectural styles with subsequent alterations and original construction dates ranging from 1900-2008 with a majority being constructed within the period 1906-1915. Although this majority, including the three subject properties appears to be associated with the immediate reconstruction era after the 1906 Earthquake and Fire, further research is needed to determine the boundaries of an identified-eligible historic district. However, should such a district be identified, the subject properties would not be contributing properties to this district because of a lack of integrity due to the extensive alterations they have undergone.

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

Geology

According to the Planning Department’s records, the project site includes slopes greater than 20 percent. A geotechnical investigation report and supplemental memo were prepared for the proposed project. Three test borings were drilled to depths ranging from 14 to 15.5 feet within the project site on October 25, 2011. The borings encountered fill and colluvium (slopewash) overlying bedrock. The fill encountered generally consists of loose silty gravel and medium stiff gravelly clay. The colluvium encountered consists of soft gravelly silt, stiff to very stiff sandy clay and medium dense to dense clayey gravel. The fill and native soils encountered are relatively weak and compressible. Bedrock encountered in the borings generally consists of highly weathered, firm to hard greenstone.

The report found that the proposed project is feasible from a geotechnical standpoint, provided that the recommendations presented in the report are incorporated into the project. These recommendations are related to: 1) specifications for seismic design (in accordance with the California and International Building Codes); 2) excavation, underpinning, and temporary shoring (for slope stabilization during construction); 3) foundations (e.g., spread footings, drilled piers, and/or mat slabs on grade); 4) retaining walls (for permanent slope stabilization); and 5) geotechnical drainage (to ensure that water flows around and away from foundations). The project sponsor has agreed to implement all applicable recommendations outlined in the geotechnical investigation reports.

The final building plans would be reviewed by the Department of Building Inspection (DBI). In reviewing building plans, DBI refers to a variety of information sources to determine existing hazards.
Sources reviewed include maps of Special Geologic Study Areas and known landslide areas in San Francisco as well as the building inspectors' working knowledge of areas of special geologic concern. DBI will review the geotechnical report and building plans for the proposed project to determine the adequacy of the proposed engineering and design features and to ensure compliance with all applicable San Francisco Building Code provisions regarding structural safety. The above-referenced geotechnical investigation report would be available for use by DBI during its review of building permits for the site. In addition, DBI could require that additional site specific soils report(s) be prepared in conjunction with permit applications, as needed. The DBI requirement for a geotechnical report and review of the building permit application pursuant to DBI's implementation of the Building Code would ensure that the proposed project would have no significant impacts related to soils or geology.

Exempt Status

The CEQA Guidelines Section 15303, or Class 3, provides an exemption from environmental review for the "construction and location of limited numbers of new, small facilities or structures." Specifically, Section 15303(b) states that in "urbanized areas, this exemption applies to apartments, duplexes, and similar structures designed for not more than six dwelling units" on a legal parcel. The proposed project includes the demolition of the three existing single-family residences, each on a separate legal parcel, the merger of those three parcels into one, and the construction of a new four-unit multifamily residence in an urbanized area. Therefore, the proposed project would be exempt under Class 3.

Conclusion

CEQA State Guidelines Section 15300.2 states that a categorical exemption shall not be used for an activity where there is a reasonable possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances. The proposed project would not have a significant effect on a historic resource, surrounding historic district, or other historic buildings in the vicinity. In addition, the project would not have significant effects related to soils or geology. There are no unusual circumstances surrounding the current proposal that would suggest a reasonable possibility of a significant environmental effect. The project would be exempt under the above-cited classification. For the above reasons, the proposed project is appropriately exempt from environmental review.
### Preservation Team Review Form

**Preservation Team Meeting Date:** 6/1/2016  
**Date of Form Completion:** 6/1/2016

### Project Information:

- **Planner:** Stephanie Cisneros  
- **Address:** 3927-3931 19th Street  
- **Block/LOT:** 3601/073, 072, 071  
- **Cross Streets:** Sanchez Street & Noe Street  
- **CEQA Category:** B  
- **Art.: 10/11:** N/A  
- **BPA/Case No.:** 2014.0243E

### Project Description:

- **Purpose of Review:** CEQA  
- **Project Information:** Article 10/11, Preliminary/PIC, Alteration, Demo/New Construction

### Purpose of Review:

- **Is the subject Property an eligible historic resource?** ☑  
- **If so, are the proposed changes a significant impact?** ☑

### Project Issues:

- **Submitted:** Historic Resource Evaluation prepared by Left Coast Architectural History (dated December 8, 2015).

### Proposed Project:

Add a second residential unit at the front of each of three lots that contain one residence at the rear of each lot. Increase number residences from three to six and increase total residential area from 5,132 sf to 22,678 sf.

### Preservation Team Review:

#### Historic Resource Present:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Historic District/Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑ Yes</td>
<td>☑ Yes, ☑ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Historic Resource Present:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property is individually eligible for inclusion in a California Register under one or more of the following Criteria:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 1 - Event:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 2 - Persons:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 3 - Architecture:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 4 - Info. Potential:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Historic District/Context:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period of Significance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑ Yes, ☑ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Historic District/Context:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property is in an eligible California Register Historic District/Context under one or more of the following Criteria:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 1 - Event:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 2 - Persons:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 3 - Architecture:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 4 - Info. Potential:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period of Significance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑ Yes, ☑ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ☑ Contributor, ☑ Non-Contributor |
If No is selected for Historic Resource per CEQA, a signature from Senior Preservation Planner or Preservation Coordinator is required.

The three subject properties located at 3927, 3929, and 3931 19th Street are each located at the top of steeply sloping lots that slope upwards from 19th Street. Each is residential in use, are vernacular in architectural style, and have undergone their own lists of significant alterations since their original construction dates in the early 20th Century.

3927 19th Street contains a one-and-one-half-story-over-basement, wood-frame, single-family residence constructed in 1909 (source: water tap record). No original building permit was uncovered to name an architect or builder of the property, but according to the Water Tap record, the original owner was Elizabeth S. Henderson, who inherited the vacant property from her husband Roy in 1901 and pursued the construction of a residence in 1909. Elizabeth Henderson and her family owned and occupied the property until 1924, when she passed ownership to her son and daughter-in-law. The property has undergone a number of significant alterations since its construction, which include: reconfiguring the existing stairs (2004); addition of a flat-roofed rear addition (pre-1938); addition of a gable dormer on the front of the roof (post-1938); removing the shed-roofed front porch that spanned the first story of the primary facade (post-1950); and removal of large sections of siding, window sashes and doors at the basement level of the primary facade (recent, but date unknown).

3929 19th Street contains a one-and-one-half-story-over-basement, wood-frame, single-family residence constructed in 1909 (source: building permit). The original building permit lists Ernest L. Morberg as the architect and John H. Gegax as the contractor, both of whom were based in San Mateo County. The original owner of the property Tillie Bjorkman, wife of Karl Bjorkman, a cabinet maker. Tillie owned and occupied the property with her husband until she sold it to her daughter and son-in-law in 1955. The property has undergone a number of significant alterations since its construction, which include: building a concrete retaining wall across the front of the property and 9 new concrete steps (1934); repairing fire damage, removing and replacing all burned structural members (1949); change old wood windows to aluminum (1977); replace 4 windows at rear 91996); install 7 replacement windows (1997); siding replacement (date unknown); addition of second story pop-up at rear (pre-1938); and addition of glass panels to partially enclose front porch (date unknown).

(continued)
3931 19th Street contains a four-story-over-basement, wood-frame, multi-family residence constructed in 1908 (source: building permit). The original permit does not list an architect but lists George A. Rigg as the original owner and the builder. Rigg, a civil engineer, and his wife Eleanor, owned the property and occupied one unit until 1923, when it was sold to Karl and Delilah Binder. The property has undergone a number of significant alterations since its construction, which include: removing existing ground floor kitchen and bedroom, adding new kitchen and bedroom on new foundation, adding first story addition with mezzanine and roof deck, and adding one story and one dwelling unit (1977); installing stairs with handrails and guardrails and three exterior doors (1982); replacing 17 windows in-kind and removing damaged dormer (2004); enclosing the first story porch (date unknown); removal of a rear addition, chimney, and alteration/extension of rear and upper story additions (ca. 1977); and replacement of basement-level siding and door added (ca. 1994 or 2004).

No known historic events occurred at any of the three properties (Criterion 1). None of the owners or occupants of the three properties have been identified as important to history (Criterion 2). The existing structures appear to have been originally constructed as simple, vernacular cottages and have undergone significant alterations since their construction. None of the three properties are architecturally distinct such that they would qualify individually for listing in the California Register under Criterion 3.

The subject properties are not located within the boundaries of any identified historic district. They are located in the Castro/Upper Market neighborhood on a block that exhibits a variety of architectural styles with subsequent alterations and original construction dates ranging from 1900-2008 with a majority being constructed within the period 1906-1915. Although this majority, including the three subject properties appears to be associated with the immediate reconstruction era after the 1906 Earthquake and Fire, further research is needed to determine the boundaries of an identified-eligible historic district. However, should such a district be identified, the subject properties would not be contributing properties to this district because of a lack of integrity due to the extensive alterations they have undergone.

Therefore, the subject properties are not eligible for listing in the California Register under any criteria individually or as part of a historic district.
DISCRETIONARY REVIEW PUBLIC (DRP) APPLICATION

Discretionary Review Requestor's Information

Name: Carolyn Kenady - Dolores Heights Improvement Club
Address: 3632 21th Street San Francisco CA 94114
Email Address: carolynkenady@gmail.com
Telephone: 408-218-3115

Information on the Owner of the Property Being Developed

Name: Jeff Burris
Company/Organization: Studio 12
Address: 1501 Mariposa Street San Francisco CA 94107
Email Address: jeff@Studio12arch.com
Telephone: 415-503-0212

Property Information and Related Applications

Project Address: 3927 19th Street, San Francisco CA 94114
Block/Lot(s): 3601/073
Building Permit Application No(s): 2008.0813.9076

ACTIONS PRIOR TO A DISCRETIONARY REVIEW REQUEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIOR ACTION</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you discussed this project with the permit applicant?</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you discuss the project with the Planning Department permit review planner?</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you participate in outside mediation on this case? (Including Community Boards)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 that were made to the proposed project.
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 standards of the Planning Code and the Residential Design Guidelines. What are the exceptional and extraordinary circumstances that justify Discretionary Review of the project? How does the project conflict with the City's General Plan or the Planning Code's Priority Policies or Residential Design Guidelines? Please be specific and site specific sections of the Residential Design Guidelines.

See attached.

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 unreasonably affected, please state who would be affected, and how.

See attached.

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

See attached.
DISCRETIONARY REVIEW REQUESTOR’S AFFIDAVIT

Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:

a) The undersigned is the DR requestor or their authorized representation.

Carolyn Kenady

Name (Printed)

408-218-3115

Phone

carolynkenady@gmail.com

Email

For Department Use Only

Application received by Planning Department:

By: 

Date: 

PAGE 4 | PLANNING APPLICATION - DISCRETIONARY REVIEW PUBLIC.
1. What are the reasons for requesting DR?

A. The following exceptional and extraordinary circumstances justify Discretionary Review of the project proposed for 3927 19th Street:

- Failure to meaningfully follow Planning’s process for public notice and discussion.

According to Planning’s instructions, “The Pre-Application Meeting is a mandatory form of community outreach conducted by the project sponsor to receive initial feedback regarding certain project types prior to submittal to the Planning Department or the Department of Building Inspection. Adjacent neighbors and relevant neighborhood organizations are invited to attend this meeting…” This project is subject to that requirement (“The Pre-Application process is required for certain projects subject to Planning Code Section 311 Notification …”). However, no Pre-Application Meeting was held concerning this specific version of this project. So neighbors and Dolores Heights Improvement Club (“DHIC”) did not have the opportunity to review and discuss the plans with the Project Sponsor prior to their distribution with the 311 Notice. The receipt of the 311 Notice via mail in early September was the first notice that DHIC and other interested parties had of this new version of the proposed project. In May 2017 DHIC Chair, Carolyn Kenady, found a Planning Dept Memo posted on Accela regarding discussions of an earlier version of the project (see Exhibit 1 - Proj Coord. 4_11.pdf). She emailed the project’s agent (see Exhibit 2) and requested a Pre-Application Meeting. The agent assured her that a meeting would be held and would include DHIC. Then, after several follow-ups, she received a reply noting that the project was “on hold indefinitely.” Since then, neither DHIC nor any neighbors with whom DHIC has spoken received any official Pre-Application Meeting notification. If a pre-application meeting was held in years past, it would have involved a project with significantly different scope, perhaps even different sponsors and owners and different scope, including different numbers of units, different numbers of lots, different numbers of buildings, demolitions, different degrees of excavation. Note the project as discussed in Exhibit 1 involves demolition, lot mergers and construction of a single 6-unit, 20,000 sq ft building. The current building involves no demolition, no lot mergers and two new single family homes. At no time, to the best of our knowledge, was a pre-application meeting held with this number of units or buildings, and specific amount of excavation.
• Excavation and construction risks on steep hillside.

The slope on which the subject property and the other two lots owned by the developer sit exceeds 20%. The elevation change from sidewalk to top of the lot is greater than 70 feet (see Exhibit 3 - “The 19th Street Site Survey PDF”, May 2013.) Neither DHIC nor adjacent neighbors have seen either a soils report, an updated CEQA report, or any structural engineering report that identifies the hillside conditions and the approach to excavate and build safely. This is a big concern. In Dolores Heights, we’ve seen a project currently underway stopped and cited for inadequate structural work and damage to neighboring properties. Several years back the property at 125 Crown Terrace slid down the hill because of shoddy work.

In fact, the 311 plans indicate that this project is subject to the provisions of the Slope Protection Act (amended in 2018 and now the Slope and Seismic Hazard Zone Protection Act (the “Act”). The Act provides for certain requirements and guidelines for building permit application submittal and review. Because this building permit application was filed so long ago, and has been changed so dramatically over time, and because none of the pertinent documents or studies are available online, we cannot be confident that these requirements and guidelines have been met and are in place.

• Access for neighbors to their homes.

Related to the excavation, adjacent property owners and tenants are concerned about their access to their homes during and after the construction. Properties at 3919, 3921, 3923, and 3925 19th Street use a single narrow stairway from the sidewalk up the hill for access to their homes. The stairs are located at the property line between these properties and 3927 19th Street. Although the project sponsor has discussed ameliorating this impact with the owner of 3919 19th, the project sponsor hasn’t yet provided a plan that shows the intended access to 3919 19th after construction, or assured these residents that they will be able to safely enter and exit their homes via the stairway during construction. Until these access issues have been solved and shown in plans, approval of the project is premature.
• Sham plan for the cottages in the rear of the lots.
  Per San Francisco’s General Plan - Housing Element: “Sixty-two percent of San Francisco’s residents are renters. In the interest of the long term health and diversity of the housing stock the City should work to preserve this approximate ratio of rental units.” Each lot has a cottage in the rear that is uninhabited (or uninhabitable) and dilapidated. It appears that the developer wants to avoid demolition of all three of the existing cottages and take credit for adding two new units. But in reality their plan will “landlock” the existing dilapidated cottages. Once the proposed homes are built in the front of the lots, there’s no viable way that the cottages can be renovated to be habitable. Nor could they reasonably be demolished. The Project Sponsor’s summary implies that there will be as many as six units of housing across three lots. In reality, there will only be two or four livable units - the large single-family luxury homes proposed for 3927 and 3929 19th Street, plus perhaps the two vacant units at 3931. Because the Project Sponsor did not hold a Pre-Application Meeting, we have had about two weeks to understand their project. If our understanding is true, then the sponsors are gaming the system.

• Probable permanent loss of affordable units.
  Per San Francisco’s General Plan - Housing Element: “Conserving and improving the existing housing stock is critical to San Francisco’s long term housing strategy. Retaining existing housing reduces the needs for resources to build new housing.” The cottage at 3927 (along with the two other cottages located on the 3929 and 3931 properties, respectively) have been vacant for undetermined number of years and have unknown histories with respect to evictions. So their status as potentially subject to San Francisco’s rent ordinance is uncertain. The cottage at 3927 is in dilapidated condition; it has only part of its floor assemblies. By “landlocking” the 3927 cottage and the other two structures, the project sponsor is sealing the fate of these structures. Currently, the rear of all three lots can only be accessed via narrow stairways (see Exhibit 3 - The 19th Street Site Survey and Exhibit 4 - 19th Site Photo.) Access to the cottage at 3927 is via an easement on the neighboring lot to the east. The cottage at present has an entrance on the east side. The project plans do not indicate how this cottage will be accessed. As proposed, the landlocked cottages will be firetraps that provide neither open space or habitable unit benefits to the neighborhood or City.
• Minimum rear yard space.
The proposed house at 3927 19th Street will have a depth of 61 feet. With the pre-existing cottage in the rear of the lot, the minimum depth of a yard between the two properties is less than required by the Zoning Administrator's interpretation of Section 134(c)(4)(C) of the Planning Code - 15 feet or 25% of the depth of the lot, whichever is greater.

• Configuration of lots and existing structures create greater issues relating to light, air, privacy, and access.
3927 19th Street (and the two adjoining properties 3929 & 3931) do not follow the standard residential lot model. The 19th Street Site Survey PDF (Exhibit 3), conducted by the Project Sponsor in May 2013 illustrates the unique nature of the site and surrounding properties. While the lots are the standard 25 feet wide and 114 feet deep, they are very steep - rising over 70 feet from the street level to the rear of the lot. And they are hilly -- within each lot, elevations vary across the hillside. The adjacent properties sit at the lot line. One property, Lot 74A (3919 19th Street), is located behind Lot 74 (3921 - 3925 19th Street). These “close quarters” magnify the impact of the proposed house at 3927 19th Street (and the proposed structures at 3929 and 3931 19th Street.) The plans do not protect the basic rights to privacy, light, and air of adjacent neighbors.

• Building scale and form.
The Residential Design Guidelines recommend “GUIDELINE: Design the height and depth of the building to be compatible with the existing building scale at the street.” The verticality of the proposed building at floors 3, 4 and 5 does not complement other buildings on the block. No other building on this block has a 5th floor as close to the street as this building.

B. How does the project conflict with the City's General Plan or the Planning Code's Priority Policies or Residential Design Guidelines? (see table on next page)
1B. How does the project conflict with the City's General Plan or the Planning Code's Priority Policies or Residential Design Guidelines?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Element</th>
<th>How The Project Conflicts with these Components of SF Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF General Plan - 2014 Housing Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Code Priority Policies (Sect 101.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential Design Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to follow SF Planning Pre-Application process for public notice and discussion</td>
<td>Part II - Objective 10 - Ensure a streamlined, yet thorough, and transparent decision-making process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation and construction risks</td>
<td>POLICY 11.2 Ensure implementation of accepted design standards in project approvals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sham plan for the cottages in the rear of the lots</td>
<td>Policy 2 - Retain existing housing units, and promote safety and maintenance standards, without jeopardizing affordability Policy 7.5 Encourage the production of affordable housing through process and zoning accommodations, and prioritize affordable housing in the review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1B. How does the project conflict with the City's General Plan or the Planning Code's Priority Policies or Residential Design Guidelines?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Element</th>
<th>How The Project Conflicts with these Components of SF Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF General Plan - 2014 Housing Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and approval processes. POLICY 7.7 Support housing for middle income households, especially through programs that do not require a direct public subsidy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent loss of affordable, rent-controlled units</td>
<td>Policy 3.1 - Preserve rental units, especially rent controlled units, to meet the City's affordable housing needs. Policy 3.4 - Preserve &quot;naturally affordable&quot; housing types, such as smaller and older ownership units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum rear yard space</td>
<td>That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1B. How does the project conflict with the City's General Plan or the Planning Code's Priority Policies or Residential Design Guidelines?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Element</th>
<th>How The Project Conflicts with these Components of SF Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF General Plan - 2014 Housing Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Code Priority Policies (Sect 101.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential Design Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light, air, and privacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building scale and form - compatibility with neighborhood</td>
<td>Maintain light to adjacent properties by providing adequate setbacks. (page 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building scale and form (pages 23 - 30) - Is the building's form compatible with that of surrounding buildings? Is the building facade width compatible?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. The Residential Design Guidelines assume some impacts to be reasonable. Explain how this project would cause unreasonable impacts. Who would be affected and how:

The proposed project with the increased depth, mass and height imparted by the design choices, creates many unreasonable impacts on properties in the neighborhood. These impacts demonstrate substantively that the proposed project design and the sponsor’s request for variance for rear yard open space should be denied. Below are the most significant impacts:

a) Impact: Access - the homeowner and tenants who live at 3919 - 3925 19th Street rely on a single narrow stairway for access to their homes (see Exhibits 3 and 4). The project sponsor has not guaranteed their continued safe access to their homes via that stairway during construction of the project. The project sponsor at one time proposed that the resident and his children 3919 move out of their home for a period of time during construction. This impact is unreasonable.

b) Impact: Privacy - the proposed roof deck will unreasonably invade the privacy of the residents in adjacent buildings. Specifically, the roof deck will have direct visibility into the master bedroom of 3919 19th Street. It will also have unobstructed line of sight to 606 Sanchez Street. The roof deck will be within 30 feet of five existing homes. It will increase the noise level of the broader neighborhood. The roof deck is unnecessary, excessive and an undue burden on the neighborhood.

c) Impact: Light and air - The proposed house at 3927 19th Street will be 36 feet high (following the slope of the hill as measured consistent with Section 260) and 61 feet deep. Its east-facing wall located at the property line creates light and air issues. The stairway that serves the homes at 3919, 3921, 3923, & 3925 will have a wall rising over 36 feet high on the west side of the stairway that is only three feet wide. No reasonable accommodation has been made to offset the impact on residents whose only access to their homes will be through the canyon created by the proposed project. The resulting canyon will eliminate all but the noonday sun from the stairway and the apartments. The apartments at 3921, 3923, and 3925 all have west-facing windows which will be in shadow most of the afternoon hours. Air
circulation will also be affected. It will also cast a shadow on the building at 3913 19th Street.

d) Impact: Sham plan for the cottages in the rear of the lots. The cottage in the rear yard of 3927 19th Street (along with two other cottages on the other lots in the project) is vacant and dilapidated. The appearance and safety impact all adjacent neighbors. Yet the project sponsors did not include either renovation or demolition of the cottage in their project plan. The proposed plan to build a house that fills the width of the lot effectively blocks access to the rear yard. Hence, the project sponsors deliberately choose to allow a dilapidated structure to remain on the property in perpetuity. The project plan does not provide access to the rear yard (other than through the proposed house) for future construction work.

e) Impact: Permanent loss of affordable units - The project sponsors vacated the cottages and did not maintain them. The loss of units with unknown rental history and potential protection under San Francisco's rent control ordinance affects San Francisco's affordable housing crisis. Building a luxury home in the front of 3927 19th St (and another in the adjacent lot) does not mitigate the loss of affordable units. This impacts the many senior and other lower income residents in our neighborhood and the Castro District who cannot afford market-rate housing.

f) Impact: rear yard space - The project does not provide a rear yard that meets the minimum mandated by the planning code Section 134. The smaller scale rear yard creates a "boxed-in" effect on the surrounding residents and cuts them off from the mid-block open space.

g) Impact: risk to the stability of neighboring properties: The proposed project is on a slope that exceeds 20%. Construction requires significant excavation which causes risk of flooding, soil disturbance, erosion, and seismic damage to uphill properties to the south and to the adjacent properties to the east and west. The property is on the site of a former quarry. The prior excavation of this hillside poses even greater risks and challenges for soil removal and structural engineering.

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?
a) **Failure to hold timely Pre-Application meeting**: Notice and hold a public Pre-Application meeting. Follow the process described in the Pre-Application Packet (Exhibit 5) in order to hold a transparent and public discussion about the project with all interested neighbors and community associations. No approval of this project can occur before this mandatory step is completed.

b) **Access**: Ensure the residents safe and uninterrupted access to their homes at 3919, 3921, 3923, and 3925 19th Street throughout the construction project and after the project is completed. Also, if the project retains the cottage at the rear of the lot, ensure that separate access (other than through the proposed house) is provided to this as well.

c) **Preserve privacy of neighbors**: Revise the building plans to eliminate the roof deck to preserve the privacy of the neighbors. The remaining decks and backyard provide outdoor space for the house.

d) **Preserve light and air for neighboring properties**: Revise the building design to allow adequate light and air to adjacent properties. The plan design could include a side setback to allow light and air to the eastern neighbors' stairway, units, and the rear cottage. It could step back the front exterior of the structure by level to allow greater sunlight during the afternoon hours.

e) **Sham plan for the cottages**: Do not leave the dilapidated cottage(s) in their current state. Either renovate them and provide habitable units or demolish them and provide mid-block open space.

f) **Permanent loss of affordable units**: Building two luxury houses - one at 3927 19th Street and the other at 3929 19th does not replace the loss of affordable housing units. If the cottages are to be retained, renovate the units and obtain a certificate of occupancy for them. If the cottages are to be demolished, file the required Conditional Use Authorization application.

g) **Rear yard space**: Deny the variance. Revise the project design to increase
the rear yard space to at least the minimum of 25% of the lot's depth.

h) Stability of the neighboring properties: Provide the required soils report, geotechnical report, and structural engineering design to Planning, DHIC and interested neighbors and meet the requirements of the Slope Protection and Seismic Hazard Zone Protection Act. Conduct any other studies needed to ensure that the proposed project will not place the stability of the hillside, existing foundations or other elements of the existing buildings at risk.

i) Revise the building scale and form: The proposed front facade includes one flat vertical surface with the minimum required front setback at floors 4 and 5. The Residential Design Guidelines recommend a more articulated facade - such as stepping back the fifth floor by 15 feet. That eliminates the "canyon" effect of the flat vertical facade at the streetfront and is more in character with the current streetscape of the neighboring residences than the original proposed design. Creating side setbacks on the east side in order to preserve light and air to those neighboring structures. We are seeking changes that mitigate the impact of the height of the proposed house on the neighbors' open space, stairways, and windows.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time: 15 Minutes</th>
<th>Background/Issues/Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Rahaim/Joslin/Washington/Jonckheer | 1. **Background:** The project proposes a remodel of the front elevation, a horizontal addition and the reconfiguration of the existing two-unit residence by relocating Unit 1 from the second floor to the ground floor behind the garage, and combining habitable space on second and third floors into one residential unit – Unit 2. The project would also fill in alley space/side yard at the south front of the building on all floors. The relocated unit will be 95% of the area of the original unit, and has rear yard open space, street exposure and direct access to the street. Two reviews at Project Lite, recommending support and abbreviated DR. Scheduled for Planning Commission, April 27th. DR filed by Sue Hestor. Bill Pashelinsky & David Silverman project sponsor team.  

**Case Issues:** The original units were equivalent one flat per floor units with adjacent door entries. The Commission has not been supportive of unit relocations on the ground floor behind a garage.  

**Recommendations:** Review Commission policy with the Director.  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time: 15 Minutes</th>
<th>Background/Issues/Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Rahaim/Joslin/Washington/Jackson/Small | 2. **Background:** Demolition of three existing buildings (2 single-family, 1 two-family), a merger of three lots, and the construction of a six unit, 40’ tall, 6-story, approximately 20,000 gsf multi-family residence.  

**Case Issues:** Demolition of rent controlled housing.  

**Size of units. Condition of structures to be demolished.**  

**Recommendations:** To be determined.  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time: 15 Minutes</th>
<th>Background/Issues/Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rahaim/Joslin/Watty/Exline/Wietglee/Tam/Dwyer/Landis/Bintliff/Espliritu</td>
<td>3. <strong>Background:</strong> The SFMTA proposes to implement its Facility Assessment and Workspace Planning Framework which would include two scenarios that expand MUNI's motor coach storage and maintenance facilities. The MUNI sites involved with each scenario include the following: Presidio Division, Potrero Division, Kirkland Division, and an undeveloped four-acre portion of Muni Metro East. Scenario 1 involves the construction of a new facility provided by a private property owner, as well as improvements within the existing sites. Scenario 2 involves improvements focused on maximizing the capacity of MTA's existing reach estate facilities, with no new facilities constructed. Pending negotiations with the private property owner (Scenario 1), SFMTA would likely make a decision on the preferred scenario by the end of 2017. Under Scenario 1, the new facility would be submitted to the Department for review and would be undertaken by the property owner. Scenario 2 would involve maximum development on a site by site basis, because without the new facility, each of the existing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Request for Pre-application Meeting - Project 3927-3931 19th Street

14 messages

Carolyn Kenady <carolynkenady@gmail.com>  
To: Chris Wade <chris@ssllawfirm.com>, Eric Jacobs <eric@gbasf.com>  
Cc: "Jackson, Erika" <erika.jackson@sfgov.org>, "<plu@doloresheights.org>" <plu@doloresheights.org>  

Hello Ms. Wade and Mr. Jacobs -

I chair the Planning & Land Use Committee of Dolores Heights Improvement Club (DHIC). We are the neighborhood association for Dolores Heights. We recently became aware of the project (per attached PDF) that you are proposing for the above addresses in our neighborhood. We request that you hold a Pre-Application Meeting with neighbors and DHIC representatives so that we can learn more about the project and provide feedback to the project sponsor. We think it's vitally important for our community to have the opportunity to review this large project with its significant impact at this stage in the planning and permitting process. You're welcome to call my mobile # below to discuss live. Thank you.

Carolyn

Carolyn Kenady  
carolynkenady@gmail.com  
408-218-3115

Eric Jacobs <eric@gbasf.com>  
To: Carolyn Kenady <carolynkenady@gmail.com>  
Cc: Chris Wade <chris@ssllawfirm.com>, "Jackson, Erika" <erika.jackson@sfgov.org>, "<plu@doloresheights.org>" <plu@doloresheights.org>, Taylor Robinson <taylor@dydxllc.com>  

Good Morning Ms. Kenady,

Thank you for your email and for reaching out to Chris and I. I completely agree that it is of the utmost importance to include DHIC in our plans for development of 3927-3931 19th street. We are currently in the process of a redesign of our project proposal and shift in development strategy. It is our intention to hold a pre-application meeting when we have new plans to share and you will be included in our outreach. It is our team's intention and core values to design a project that will greatly benefit the Dolores Heights community and look forward to hearing your thoughts and reflections.

Have a great day.

best,

Eric

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Eric B. Jacobs  
Permit Expediter, Gary Bell & Associates  
General Contractor  
Lic. # 971143  
(415)377-0425  
eric@gbasf.com  
201 Noe Street  
SF CA 94114
Thanks so much, Eric. We look forward to meeting you and hearing about the project.
Carolyn

Caroly Kenady / 408-218-3115

Hi Eric -

It's been about three weeks since the email exchange re: Pre-App meeting on the 19th Street properties. What's your ETA for holding the meeting? Thanks.

Carolyn

Carolyn Kenady
carolynkenady@gmail.com
408-218-3115
http://www.linkedin.com/in/ckenady

Hi Eric -

Just a ping to get a status from you on meeting with DHIC & neighbors. It's been nearly two months since my first request. Thanks!

Carolyn

Carolyn Kenady
carolynkenady@gmail.com
408-218-3115
http://www.linkedin.com/in/ckenady
Hi Erika -

I haven't heard anything from the sponsors of the 3929 - 3731 19th Street project since my original email of May 2 asking them for a Pre-App meeting on this project. After following up with Eric twice, I'm contacting you directly. What's the status of the project? All I see on Accela is the following:

**Project Description:**

3927-3931 19TH ST

Add a second residential unit at the front of each of three lots that

Conditional Use Authorization request to add a second residential unit at the front

of each of three lots that contain one residence at the rear of each lot. Increase

number residences from three to six and increase total residential area from 4,917

sf to 16,917 sf.

Thanks so much!

Carolyn

Carolyn Kenady
carolynkenady@gmail.com
408-218-3115
http://www.linkedin.com/in/ckenady

-------- Forwarded message --------

From: Carolyn Kenady <carolynkenady@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Jun 21, 2017 at 3:15 PM
Subject: Re: Request for Pre-application Meeting - Project 3927-3931 19th Street
To: Eric Jacobs <eric@gbasf.com>
Cc: "<plu@doloresheights.org>" <plu@doloresheights.org>, Chris Wade <chris@sslawfirm.com>, "Jackson, Erika" <erika.jackson@sfgov.org>, Taylor Robinson <taylor@dydxllc.com>

[Quoted text hidden]

Jackson, Erika <erika.jackson@sfgov.org>
To: Carolyn Kenady <carolynkenady@gmail.com>

Hi Carolyn,

I haven't heard anything from the Project Sponsor in months. The last I heard is that they were changing the scope of work. I'm still waiting on revised plans.

Thanks,

Erika

[Quoted text hidden]

Carolyn Kenady <carolynkenady@gmail.com>
To: "Jackson, Erika" <erika.jackson@sfgov.org>

Thanks. Please forward any updates to me. I'll also write Eric again.

Carolyn Kenady / 408-218-3115 m
Hi Eric -

Are you are moving ahead with your plans ... or are you in "hold" or revising? We like to review & discuss the plans with you once they are ready. Thanks.

Carolyn

Carolyn

Carolyn Kenady
carolynkenady@gmail.com
408-218-3115
http://www.linkedin.com/in/ckenady

---

Eric Jacobs <eric@gbasf.com>
To: Carolyn Kenady <carolynkenady@gmail.com>
Cc: "plu@doloresheights.org" <plu@doloresheights.org>, Chris Wade <chris@ssllawfirm.com>, "Jackson, Erika" <erika.jackson@sfgov.org>, Taylor Robinson <taylor@dydxllc.com>

Carolyn,

The project is on hold indefinitely.

Best,

Eric

Eric B. Jacobs
Permit Expediter,
Gary Bell & Associates
General Contractor,
Lic. # 971143
(415)377-0425
Eric@gbasf.com

---

Carolyn Kenady <carolynkenady@gmail.com>
To: Eric Jacobs <eric@gbasf.com>

Thanks for the update Eric. Let us know if that changes.

Carolyn

Carolyn Kenady
carolynkenady@gmail.com
408-218-3115
http://www.linkedin.com/in/ckenady
This packet consists of instructions for conducting the Pre-Application Meeting. Planning Department staff are available to advise you in the preparation of this application. Call 415.558.6377 for further information.

**Español:** Si desea ayuda sobre cómo llenar esta solicitud en español, por favor llame al 415.575.9010. Tenga en cuenta que el Departamento de Planificación requerirá al menos un día hábil para responder.

**中文:** 如果您希望獲得使用中文填寫這份申請表的幫助，請致電415.575.9010請注意，規劃部門需要至少一個工作日來回應。

**Tagalog:** Kung gusto mo ng tulong sa pagkumpleto ng application na ito sa Filipino, paki tawagan ang 415.575.9010. Paki tandaan na mangangailangan ang Planning Department ng hindi kukulangin sa Tsang craw na pantrabaho para makasagot.

### WHAT IS A PRE-APPLICATION MEETING?

The Pre-Application Meeting is a mandatory form of community outreach conducted by the project sponsor to receive initial feedback regarding certain project types prior to submittal to the Planning Department or the Department of Building Inspection. Adjacent neighbors and relevant neighborhood organizations are invited to attend this meeting, which must take place during certain hours of the day and within a certain distance from the project site. The meeting's intention is to initiate neighbor communication and identify issues and concerns early on; provide the project sponsor the opportunity to address neighbor concerns about the potential impacts of the project prior to submitting an application; and, reduce the number of Discretionary Reviews (DRs) that are filed.

### WHY IS A PRE-APPLICATION MEETING REQUIRED?

The Pre-Application process is required for certain projects subject to Planning Code Section 311 Notification, or as required by other activities listed below. It serves as the first step in the process prior to building permit application or entitlement (Conditional Use Authorization, Variance, etc.) submittal. Those contacted as a result of the Pre-Application process will also receive a formal notice after the project is reviewed by Planning Department staff.
WHEN IS A PRE-APPLICATION MEETING REQUIRED?

- Projects subject to 311 Notification that include:
  - New Construction;
  - Any vertical addition of 7 feet or more;
  - Any horizontal addition of 10 feet or more;
  - Decks over 10 feet above grade or within the required rear yard;
- All Formula Retail uses subject to a Conditional Use Authorization;
- Community Business Priority Processing (CB3P);
- Projects in PDR-1-B Districts subject to Section 313; and
- Department staff may request a Pre-Application meeting be conducted for any project.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PRE-APPLICATION MEETINGS

Prior to filing any Project Application, the applicant must conduct a minimum of one Pre-Application meeting if required, as stated above.

Additionally, if the project will be required to submit a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan pursuant to Planning Code Section 169, the Project Sponsor must discuss potential TDM Measures that may be incorporated into the project.

These materials must be submitted to the Planning Department:

All of the following materials must be submitted along with the Project Application for the project in order to verify compliance with the Pre-Application Meeting requirements. If a Pre-Application Meeting is required, Planning Department review will not begin until all the following are received:

- A copy of the letter mailed to neighbors and neighborhood organizations (use attached invitation)
- A list of the neighborhood organizations and individuals invited to the meeting, including the mailing address for each (see instructions below)
- A copy of the sign-in sheet (use attached template)
- A summary of the meeting and a list of any changes made to the project as a result of the neighborhood comments (use attached template)
- The affidavit, signed and dated (use attached template)
- One reduced copy of the plans presented to the neighbors at pre-application meeting, labeled as “Pre-Application Plans”
This meeting must be held in accordance with the following rules.

These groups and individuals must be invited to the meeting:

- Invite all Neighborhood Organizations for the neighborhood(s) in which the project site is located, as defined on the Planning Department Neighborhood Groups Map. Enter “Neighborhood Groups Map” into the search bar on www.sfplanning.org. Then, click on the relevant neighborhood on the map, and click on the “Neighborhood Contact List” link to download the list of neighborhood organizations in a spreadsheet format. Be sure to view the list for the appropriate neighborhood(s) by using the tabs at the bottom of the spreadsheet. If the property is located on the border of two or more neighborhoods, you must invite all bordering neighborhood organizations.

- Invite all owners and residents of properties that are abutting (next to), and directly across the street from, the project site. If the project site is on a corner, you must also invite owners and occupants of the properties across both streets, and the corner property diagonally across the intersection. To find the address of abutting properties, go to the online San Francisco Property Information Map (propertymap.sfplanning.org), search for the address of the project site, and click on each of the abutting properties to find the address and block/lot number of the property. The list of property owners should be based on the latest citywide property tax roll, which is available at the Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector, City Hall, Room 140, Carlton B Goodlett Pl. You must also invite all residents of the abutting properties by mailing an invitation to each property addressed to “Residents”. Be sure to mail to each unit separately, if there are more than one unit on the property.

- Note that projects in PDR-1-B districts subject to Sec. 313 require mailing to owners and residents of properties within a 300 foot radius. Refer to the Neighborhood Notification handout, available at www.sfplanning.org, for clarification.

- Invitations must be sent at least 14 calendar days before the meeting. One copy of the invitation letter must be mailed to the project sponsor as proof of mailing. Invitations with the postal date stamp will serve as record of timely mailing.

- You may have a private drafting or mailing service generate the correct mailing list for you, for a fee that varies by firm. The following businesses have indicated that they provide professional notification services. This listing does not constitute an endorsement. Other professionals can also perform this work and can be added to this list upon request:

**Build CADD**
3515 Santiago Street  
San Francisco, CA 94116  
(415) 759-8710

**Jerry Brown Designs**
619 - 27th Street, Apt. A  
Oakland, CA 94612  
(415) 810-3703, jbdsgn328@gmail.com

**Radius Services**
1221 Harrison Street #18  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
(415) 391-4775, radiusservices@sfradius.com

**Javier Solorzano**
3288 - 21st Street #49  
San Francisco, CA 94110  
(415) 724-5240, javier131064@yahoo.com

**Notificationmaps.com**
Barry Dunzer  
(866) 752-6266  
www.notificationmaps.com

**Ted Madison Drafting**
P.O. Box 8102  
Santa Rosa, CA 95407  
(707) 228-8850, tmadison@pacbell.net

**Notice This** - (650) 814-6750
Discretionary Review Requestor's Information

**Name:** Bruce R. Bowen - Dolores Heights Improvement Club  
**Address:** 4016 20th Street San Francisco CA 94114  
**Email Address:** bruce.r.bowen@gmail.com  
**Telephone:** 415-533-0586

Information on the Owner of the Property Being Developed

**Name:** Jeff Burris  
**Company/Organization:** Studio 12  
**Address:** 1501 Mariposa Street San Francisco CA 94107  
**Email Address:** jeff@Studio12arch.com  
**Telephone:** 415-503-0212

Property Information and Related Applications

**Project Address:** 3929 19th Street, San Francisco CA 94114  
**Block/Lot(s):** 3601/072  
**Building Permit Application No(s):** 2008.0813.9077

**ACTIONS PRIOR TO A DISCRETIONARY REVIEW REQUEST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIOR ACTION</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you discussed this project with the permit applicant?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you discuss the project with the Planning Department permit review planner?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you participate in outside mediation on this case? (including Community Boards)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 that were made to the proposed project.
1. What are the reasons for requesting DR?

A. The following exceptional and extraordinary circumstances justify Discretionary Review of the project proposed for 3929 19th Street:
   - Failure to meaningfully follow Planning's process for public notice and discussion.

According to Planning's instructions, "The Pre-Application Meeting is a mandatory form of community outreach conducted by the project sponsor to receive initial feedback regarding certain project types prior to submittal to the Planning Department or the Department of Building Inspection. Adjacent neighbors and relevant neighborhood organizations are invited to attend this meeting..." This project is subject to that requirement. ("The Pre-Application process is required for certain projects subject to Planning Code Section 311 Notification ..."). However, no Pre-Application Meeting was held concerning this specific version of this project. So neighbors and the Dolores Heights Improvement Club ("DHIC") did not have the opportunity to review and discuss the plans with the Project Sponsor prior to their distribution with the 311 Notice. The receipt of the 311 Notice via mail in early September was the first notice that DHIC and other interested parties had of this new version of the proposed project. In May 2017 DHIC Chair, Carolyn Kenady, had found a Planning Dept Memo posted on Accela dated April 11, 2017 regarding discussions of an earlier version of the project (see Exhibit 1 - Proj Coord. 4_11.pdf). She emailed the project's agent (see Exhibit 2) and requested a Pre-Application Meeting. The agent assured her that a meeting would be held and would include DHIC. Then, after several follow-ups, she received a reply noting that the project was "on hold indefinitely." Since then, neither DHIC nor any neighbors with whom DHIC has spoken received any official Pre-Application Meeting notification. If a pre-application meeting was held in years past, it would have involved a project with significantly different scope, perhaps even different sponsors and owners, different numbers of units, different numbers of lots, different numbers of buildings, demolitions, and different degrees of excavation. Note that the 2017 project as discussed in Exhibit 1 involved demolition, lot mergers and construction of a single 6-unit, 20,000 sq ft building. The current plan (as described in the 311 Notice dated August 26, 2019) involves no demolition, no lot mergers and two new single family homes. At no time, to the best of our knowledge, was a pre-application meeting held with this number of units or
buildings, and specific amount of excavation.

- Excavation and construction risks on steep hillside.

The slope on which the subject property and the other two lots owned by the developer sit exceeds 20%. The elevation change from sidewalk to top of the lot is greater than 70 feet (see Exhibit 3 - "The 19th Street Site Survey PDF", May 2013.) Neither DHIC nor adjacent neighbors have seen either a soils report, an updated CEQA report, or any structural engineering report that identifies the hillside conditions and the approach to excavate and build safely. This is a big concern. In Dolores Heights, we've seen a project currently underway stopped and cited for inadequate structural work and damage to neighboring properties. Several years back the property at 125 Crown Terrace slid down the hill because of shoddy work.

In fact, the 311 plans indicate that this project is subject to the provisions of the Slope Protection Act (amended in 2018 and now the Slope and Seismic Hazard Zone Protection Act (the "Act"). The Act provides for certain requirements and guidelines for building permit application submittal and review. Because this building permit application was filed so long ago, and has been changed so dramatically over time, and because none of the pertinent documents or studies are available online, we cannot be confident that these requirements and guidelines have been met and are in place.

- Sham plan for the cottages in the rear of the lots.

Per San Francisco's General Plan - Housing Element: "Sixty-two percent of San Francisco's residents are renters. In the interest of the long term health and diversity of the housing stock the City should work to preserve this approximate ratio of rental units." Each lot (at 3927, 3929 and 3931 19th St.) has a cottage in the rear that is to different degrees uninhabited (or uninhabitable) and dilapidated. It appears that the developer wants to avoid demolition of the existing cottages and take credit for adding two new units. But in reality their plan will "landlock" the existing dilapidated cottages. Once the proposed homes are built in the front of the lots, there's no viable way that the cottages can be renovated to be habitable. Nor could they reasonably be demolished. The access to the rear cottage at 3929 will only be via a stairway shared with the separate lot at 3931 19th St. The Project Sponsor's summary implies that there will be as many as six units of housing across three lots. In reality, there will only be two or four livable units - the two large single-family luxury homes proposed for 3927
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 standards of the Planning Code and the Residential Design Guidelines. What are the exceptional and extraordinary circumstances that justify Discretionary Review of the project? How does the project conflict with the City's General Plan or the Planning Code's Priority Policies or Residential Design Guidelines? Please be specific and site specific sections of the Residential Design Guidelines.

See attached.

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 unreasonably affected, please state who would be affected, and how.

See attached.

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

See attached.
DISCRETIONARY REVIEW REQUESTOR'S AFFIDAVIT

Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:

a) The undersigned is the DR requestor or their authorized representation.

Signature

[Signature]

Chair - Planning & Land Use Cttee, Dolores Heights Improvement Club

Phone

415-533-0586

Relationship to Requestor
(i.e. Attorney, Architect, etc.)

Phone

Email

For Department Use Only

Application received by Planning Department:

By: ________________________________

Date: ________________________________

Bruce Bowen

Name (Printed)

bruce.r.bowen@gmail.com

Email
and 3929 19th Street, plus perhaps the two vacant units at 3931. Because the Project Sponsor did not hold a Pre-Application Meeting, we have had about two weeks to understand their project. If our understanding is true, then the sponsors are gaming the system.

- Probable permanent loss of affordable units.

Per San Francisco’s General Plan - Housing Element: “Conserving and improving the existing housing stock is critical to San Francisco’s long term housing strategy. Retaining existing housing reduces the needs for resources to build new housing.” The cottage at 3929 (along with the two other cottages located on the 3927 and 3931 properties, respectively) has been vacant for an undetermined number of years and all have unknown histories with respect to evictions. So their status as potentially subject to San Francisco’s rent ordinance is uncertain. The condition of the cottage at 3929 is not known. Since it has been vacant for some years, it is likely it will need significant work to be habitable. At present, the rear of all three lots can only be accessed via narrow stairways (see Exhibit 3 - The 19th Street Site Survey and Exhibit 4 - 19th Site Photo.) By constructing a new house in the front of the lot that spans the width of the lot, the sponsor is “landlocking” the 3929 cottage. The 311 Notice project plans do not indicate clearly how the cottage at 3929 will be accessed. The plans show the proposed house extending almost lot-line to lot-line with limited or no access to the cottage via the stairway at the west lot line. Will the cottage at 3929 continue to be accessible only via a stairway from the adjacent lot at 3931? Will these lots be a de facto compound? As proposed, the landlocked cottages will be firetraps that provide neither open space or habitable unit benefits to the neighborhood or City.

- Minimum rear yard space.

The proposed house at 3929 19th Street will have a depth of 61 feet. With the pre-existing cottage in the rear of the lot, the minimum depth of a yard between the two properties is less than required by the Zoning Administrator’s interpretation of Section 134(c)(4)(C) of the Planning Code - 15 feet or 25% of the depth of the lot, whichever is greater.
• Configuration of lots and existing structures create greater issues relating to light, air, privacy, and access.

3929 19th Street (and the two adjoining properties 3927 & 3931) do not follow the standard residential lot model. The 19th Street Site Survey PDF (Exhibit 3) conducted by the Project Sponsor in May 2013 illustrates the unique nature of the site and surrounding properties. While the lots are the standard 25 feet wide and 114 feet deep, they are very steep - rising over 70 feet from the street level to the rear of the lot. And they are hilly -- within each lot, elevations vary across the hillside. The adjacent properties contain multiple units per lot, at different locations on the lot. One property, Lot 74A (3919 19th Street), is located behind Lot 74 (3921 - 3925 19th Street). These "close quarters" magnify the impact of the proposed house at 3929 19th Street (and the proposed structures at 3927 and 3931 19th Street.) The plans do not protect the basic rights to privacy, light, and air of adjacent neighbors.

• Building scale and form.

The Residential Design Guidelines recommend "GUIDELINE: Design the height and depth of the building to be compatible with the existing building scale at the street." The verticality of the proposed building at floors 4 and 5, as far forward as they can be built, does not complement other buildings on the block. No other building on this block has a 5th floor as close to the street as this building.

B. How does the project conflict with the City's General Plan or the Planning Code's Priority Policies or Residential Design Guidelines? (see table on next page)
### Table: How does the project conflict with the City's General Plan or the Planning Code's Priority Policies or Residential Design Guidelines?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Element</th>
<th>How The Project Conflicts with these Components of SF Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF General Plan - 2014 Housing Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to follow SF Planning Pre-Application process for public notice and discussion</td>
<td>Part II - Objective 10 - Ensure a streamlined, yet thorough, and transparent decision-making process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation and construction risks</td>
<td>POLICY 11.2 Ensure implementation of accepted design standards in project approvals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sham plan for the cottages in the rear of the lots</td>
<td>Policy 2 - Retain existing housing units, and promote safety and maintenance standards, without jeopardizing affordability Policy 7.5 Encourage the production of affordable housing through process and zoning accommodations, and prioritize affordable housing in the review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1B. How does the project conflict with the City's General Plan or the Planning Code's Priority Policies or Residential Design Guidelines?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Element</th>
<th>How The Project Conflicts with these Components of SF Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF General Plan - 2014 Housing Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Code Priority Policies (Sect 101.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential Design Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent loss of affordable, rent-controlled units</td>
<td>Policy 3.1 - Preserve rental units, especially rent controlled units, to meet the City's affordable housing needs. Policy 3.4 - Preserve &quot;naturally affordable&quot; housing types, such as smaller and older ownership units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum rear yard space</td>
<td>That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**DR_Application_3929 19th Street - PRJ 2014.0243**  
Section 311 Notice - Building Permit Application No. 2008.0813.9077

**1B. How does the project conflict with the City's General Plan or the Planning Code's Priority Policies or Residential Design Guidelines?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Element</th>
<th>How The Project Conflicts with these Components of SF Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF General Plan - 2014 Housing Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light, air, and privacy</td>
<td>Maintain light to adjacent properties by providing adequate setbacks. (page 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building scale and form - compatibility with neighborhood</td>
<td>That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. The Residential Design Guidelines assume some impacts to be reasonable. Explain how this project would cause unreasonable impacts. Who would be affected and how:

The proposed project with the increased depth, mass and height imparted by the design choices, creates many unreasonable impacts on properties in the neighborhood. These impacts demonstrate substantively that the proposed project design and the sponsor’s request for variance for rear yard open space should be denied. Below are the most significant impacts:

a) Impact: **Access** - the access to the cottage at 3929 19th is not clearly shown on the 311 plans for 3929 19th. It appears that the only access to the cottage at 3929 will be through 3931, which is a separate lot and so could be under separate ownership.

b) Impact: **Privacy** - the proposed roof deck will unreasonably invade the privacy of the residents in the adjacent building to the east. Specifically, the roof deck will have direct visibility into the cottage at 3927 19th Street. It will increase the noise level of the broader neighborhood. The roof deck is unnecessary, excessive and an undue burden on the neighborhood.

c) Impact: **Light and air** - The proposed house at 3929 19th Street will be 36 feet high (following the slope of the hill as measured consistent with Section 260) and 61 feet deep. Its east-facing wall located at the property line along with its south-facing exterior roofline creates light and air issues. The rear cottage at 3929 will have reduced light and air. The apartments at 3921, 3923, and 3925 all have west-facing windows which will be in shadow most of the afternoon hours. Air circulation will also be affected. It will also cast a shadow on the buildings to the east.

c) Impact: **Sham plan for the cottages in the rear of the lots.** The cottage in the rear yard of 3929 19th Street (along with two other cottages on the other lots in the project) is vacant and possibly dilapidated. Its appearance and safety impact all adjacent neighbors. Yet the project sponsors did not include either renovation or
demolition of the cottage in their project plan. The proposed plan to build a house that fills almost the width of the lot effectively blocks access to the rear yard. Hence, the project sponsors deliberately choose to allow a possibly dilapidated structure to remain on the property in perpetuity. The project plan does not provide reasonable access to the rear yard for future construction work.

d) Impact: **Permanent loss of affordable units** - The project sponsors vacated the cottages and did not maintain them. The loss of units with unknown rental history and potential protection under San Francisco's rent control ordinance affects San Francisco's affordable housing crisis. Building a luxury home in the front of 3929 19th St (and another in the adjacent 3927 lot) does not mitigate the loss of affordable units. This impacts the many senior and other lower income residents in our neighborhood and the Castro District who cannot afford market-rate housing.

e) Impact: **rear yard space** - The project does not provide a rear yard that meets the minimum mandated by the planning code Section 134. The smaller scale rear yard creates a "boxed-in" effect on the surrounding residents and cuts them off from the mid-block open space.

f) Impact: **risk to the stability of neighboring properties**: The proposed project is on a slope that exceeds 20%. Construction requires significant excavation which causes risk of flooding, soil disturbance, erosion, and seismic damage to uphill properties to the south and to the adjacent properties to the east and west. The property is on the site of a former quarry. That prior excavation of this hillside poses even greater risks and challenges for soil removal and structural engineering.

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?

a) **Failure to hold timely Pre-Application meeting**: Notice and hold a public Pre-Application meeting. Follow the process described in the Pre-Application Packet (Exhibit 5) in order to hold a transparent and public discussion about the project with all interested neighbors and community associations. No approval of this project can occur before this mandatory step is completed.
b) **Access:** If the project retains the cottage at the rear of the lot, ensure that separate access is provided to the rear cottage.

c) **Preserve privacy of neighbors:** Revise the building plans to eliminate the roof deck to preserve the privacy of the neighbors. The remaining decks and backyard provide outdoor space for the house.

d) **Preserve light and air for neighboring properties:** Revise the building design to step back the front exterior of the structure at the top level to allow greater sunlight during the afternoon hours.

e) **Sham plan for the cottages:** Do not leave the dilapidated cottage in its current state. Either renovate it and provide a habitable unit or demolish it and provide mid-block open space.

f) **Permanent loss of affordable units:** Building two luxury houses - one at 3929 19th Street and the other at 3927 19th - does not replace the loss of affordable housing units. If the cottages are to be retained, renovate the units and obtain a certificate of occupancy for them. If the cottages are to be demolished, file the required Conditional Use Authorization application.

g) **Rear yard space:** Deny the Variance. Revise the project design to increase the rear yard space to at least the minimum of 25% of the lot's depth.

h) **Stability of the neighboring properties:** Provide the required soils report, geotechnical report, and structural engineering design to Planning, DHIC and interested neighbors and meet the requirements of the Slope Protection and Seismic Hazard Zone Protection Act. Conduct any other studies needed to ensure that the proposed project will not place the stability of the hillside, existing foundations or other elements of the existing buildings at risk.

i) **Revise the building scale and form:** The proposed front facade includes one flat vertical surface with the minimum required front setback at floors 4 and 5. The Residential Design Guidelines recommend a more articulated facade - such
as stepping back the fifth floor by 15 feet. That may eliminate the "canyon" effect of the flat vertical facade at the streetfront and is more in character with the current streetscape of the neighboring residences than the original proposed design. We are seeking changes to building scale and form that mitigate the impact of the height of the proposed house on the neighbors' open space, stairways, and windows.
### Project Coordination Meeting Agenda
TUESDAY, APRIL 11, 2017, 10:30 A.M. to 12:00 NOON IN ROOM 505 (Director's Conf. Room)

#### Planners/Addresses/Zoning/Height District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time: 15 Minutes</th>
<th>Background/Issues/Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Rahaim/Joslin/Washington/Jonckheer | **1. Background:** The project proposes a remodel of the front elevation, a horizontal addition and the reconfiguration of the existing two-unit residence by relocating Unit 1 from the second floor to the ground floor behind the garage, and combining habitable space on second and third floors into one residential unit — Unit 2. The project would also fill in alley space/side yard at the south front of the building on all floors. The relocated unit will be 85% of the area of the original unit, and has rear yard open space, street exposure and direct access to the street. Two reviews at Project Lite, recommending support and abbreviated DR. Scheduled for Planning Commission, April 27th. DR filed by Sue Hester. Bill Pasheinsky & David Silverman project sponsor team.  
**Case Issues:** The original units were equivalent one flat per floor units with adjacent door entries. The Commission has not been supportive of unit relocations on the ground floor behind a garage.  
**Recommendations:** Review Commission policy with the Director. |
| Address: 1369 Sanchez Street | **2. Background:** Demolition of three existing buildings (2 single-family, 1 two-family), a merger of three lots, and the construction of a six unit, 40' tall, 6-story, approximately 20,000 gsf multi-family residence.  
**Case Issues:** Demolition of rent controlled housing.  
Size of units. Condition of structures to be demolished.  
**Recommendations:** To be determined. |
| Cross St(s): Cesar Chavez and 27th Streets |  
| Block/Lot: 6578/027 |  
| Zoning/Height Dist: RH-2/40-X |  
| (Jonckheer) |  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time: 15 Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rahaim/Joslin/Washington/Jackson/Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 3927-31 19th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross St(s): Sanchez and Noe Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block/Lot: 3601/073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning/Height Dist: RH-2/40-X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Jackson)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time: 15 Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rahaim/Joslin/Watty/Exline/Wietgrove/Tam/Dwyer/Landis/Bintliff/Espiritu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Address: SFMTA – Facility Assessment And Workspace Planning Framework:  
949 Presidio Avenue (Presidio Division); 2500 Mariposa Street (Potrero Division); 2301 Stockton Street (Kirkland Division), 601 25th Street (Muni Metro East) |  
| Cross St(s): Varies |  
| Block/Lot: 1072/001; 3971/001; 0019/001; 4257/001 |  
| Zoning/Height Dist: P - Public |  
| (Jonckheer) |  

#### Additional Information:
- **Background:** The SFMTA proposes to implement its Facility Assessment and Workspace Planning Framework which would include two scenarios that expand MUNI's motor coach storage and maintenance facilities. The MUNI sites involved with each scenario include the following: Presidio Division, Potrero Division, Kirkland Division, and an undeveloped four-acre portion of Muni Metro East. Scenario 1 involves the construction of a new facility provided by a private property owner, as well as improvements within the existing sites. Scenario 2 involves improvements focused on maximizing the capacity of MTA's existing reach estate facilities, with no new facilities constructed. Pending negotiations with the private property owner (Scenario 1), SFMTA would likely make a decision on the preferred scenario by the end of 2017. Under Scenario 1, the new facility would be submitted to the Department for review and would be undertaken by the property owner. Scenario 2 would involve maximum development on a site by site basis, because without the new facility, each of the existing...
Request for Pre-application Meeting - Project 3927-3931 19th Street

14 messages

Carolyn Kenady <carolynkenady@gmail.com>  
To: Chris Wade <chris@sslawfirm.com>, Eric Jacobs <eric@gbasf.com>
Cc: "Jackson, Erika" <erika.jackson@sfgov.org>, "<plu@doloresheights.org>" <plu@doloresheights.org>

Hello Ms. Wade and Mr. Jacobs -

I chair the Planning & Land Use Committee of Dolores Heights Improvement Club (DHIC). We are the neighborhood association for Dolores Heights. We recently became aware of the project (per attached PDF) that you are proposing for the above addresses in our neighborhood. We request that you hold a Pre-Application Meeting with neighbors and DHIC representatives so that we can learn more about the project and provide feedback to the project sponsor. We think it's vitally important for our community to have the opportunity to review this large project with its significant impact at this stage in the planning and permitting process. You're welcome to call my mobile # below to discuss live. Thank you.

Carolyn

Carolyn Kenady
carolynkenady@gmail.com
408-218-3115

Eric Jacobs <eric@gbasf.com>  
To: Carolyn Kenady <carolynkenady@gmail.com>
Cc: Chris Wade <chris@sslawfirm.com>, "Jackson, Erika" <erika.jackson@sfgov.org>, "<plu@doloresheights.org>" <plu@doloresheights.org>, Taylor Robinson <taylor@dydxllc.com>

Good Morning Ms. Kenady,

Thank you for your email and for reaching out to Chris and I. I completely agree that it is of the utmost importance to include DHIC in our plans for development of 3927-3931 19th street. We are currently in the process of a redesign of our project proposal and shift in development strategy. It is our intention to hold a pre-application meeting when we have new plans to share and you will be included in our outreach. It is our team's intention and core values to design a project that will greatly benefit the Dolores Heights community and look forward to hearing your thoughts and reflections.

Have a great day.

best,

Eric

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Eric B. Jacobs  
Permit Expediter, Gary Bell & Associates  
General Contractor  
Lic. # 971143  
(415)377-0425  
eric@gbasf.com  
201 Noe Street  
SF CA 94114

Carolyn Kenady <carolynkenady@gmail.com>  
To: Eric Jacobs <eric@gbasf.com>

Eric
[Quoted text hidden]
Thanks so much, Eric. We look forward to meeting you and hearing about the project.
Carolyn

Carolyn Kenady / 408-218-3115

---

**Carolyn Kenady** <carolynkenady@gmail.com>  
To: Eric Jacobs <eric@gbasf.com>  
Cc: "<plu@doloresheights.org>" <plu@doloresheights.org>, Chris Wade <chris@ssllawfirm.com>, "Jackson, Erika" <erika.jackson@sfgov.org>, Taylor Robinson <taylor@dydxllc.com>

Hi Eric -

It's been about three weeks since the email exchange re: Pre-App meeting on the 19th Street properties. What's your ETA for holding the meeting? Thanks.

Carolyn

Carolyn

Carolyn Kenady  
carolynkenady@gmail.com  
408-218-3115  
http://www.linkedin.com/in/ckenady

---

**Carolyn Kenady** <carolynkenady@gmail.com>  
To: Eric Jacobs <eric@gbasf.com>  
Cc: "<plu@doloresheights.org>" <plu@doloresheights.org>, Chris Wade <chris@ssllawfirm.com>, "Jackson, Erika" <erika.jackson@sfgov.org>, Taylor Robinson <taylor@dydxllc.com>

Hi Eric -

Just a ping to get a status from you on meeting with DHIC & neighbors. It's been nearly two months since my first request. Thanks!

Carolyn

Carolyn Kenady  
carolynkenady@gmail.com  
408-218-3115  
http://www.linkedin.com/in/ckenady
Hi Erika -

I haven't heard anything from the sponsors of the 3929 - 3731 19th Street project since my original email of May 2 asking them for a Pre-App meeting on this project. After following up with Eric twice, I'm contacting you directly. What's the status of the project? All I see on Accela is the following:

**Project Description:**

3927-3931 19TH ST

Add a second residential unit at the front of each of three lots that

Conditional Use Authorization request to add a second residential unit at the front of each of three lots that contain one residence at the rear of each lot. Increase number residences from three to six and increase total residential area from 4,917 sf to 16,917 sf.

Thanks so much!

Carolyn

Carolyn Kenady

carolynkenady@gmail.com

408-218-3115

http://www.linkedin.com/in/ckenady

--------- Forwarded message  ---------

From: Carolyn Kenady <carolynkenady@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Jun 21, 2017 at 3:15 PM
Subject: Re: Request for Pre-application Meeting - Project 3927-3931 19th Street
To: Eric Jacobs <eric@gbasf.com>
Cc: "<plu@doloresheights.org>" <plu@doloresheights.org>, Chris Wade <chris@sslawfirm.com>, "Jackson, Erika" <erika.jackson@sfgov.org>, Taylor Robinson <taylor@dydxllc.com>

[Quoted text hidden]

Jackson, Erika <erika.jackson@sfgov.org>

To: Carolyn Kenady <carolynkenady@gmail.com>

Fri, Jul 21, 2017 at 2:23 PM

Hi Carolyn,

I haven’t heard anything from the Project Sponsor in months. The last I heard is that they were changing the scope of work. I’m still waiting on revised plans.

Thanks,

Erika

[Quoted text hidden]

Carolyn Kenady <carolynkenady@gmail.com>

To: "Jackson, Erika" <erika.jackson@sfgov.org>

Fri, Jul 21, 2017 at 2:30 PM

Thanks. Please forward any updates to me. I’ll also write Eric again.

Carolyn Kenady / 408-218-3115 m
Hi Eric -

Are you moving ahead with your plans ... or are you in "hold" or revising? We like to review & discuss the plans with you once they are ready. Thanks.

Carolyn

Carolyn

Carolyn Kenady
carolynkenady@gmail.com
408-218-3115
http://www.linkedin.com/in/ckenady

---

Eric Jacobs <eric@gbasf.com>
To: Carolyn Kenady <carolynkenady@gmail.com>
Cc: "<plu@doloresheights.org>" <plu@doloresheights.org>, Chris Wade <chris@ssllawfirm.com>, "Jackson, Erika" <erika.jackson@sfgov.org>, Taylor Robinson <taylor@dydxlic.com>

Carolyn,

The project is on hold indefinitely.

Best,

Eric

Eric B. Jacobs
Permit Expediter,
Gary Bell & Associates
General Contractor,
Lic. # 971143
(415)377-0425
Eric@gbasf.com

---

Carolyn Kenady <carolynkenady@gmail.com>
To: Eric Jacobs <eric@gbasf.com>

Thanks for the update Eric. Let us know if that changes.

Carolyn

Carolyn Kenady
carolynkenady@gmail.com
408-218-3115
http://www.linkedin.com/in/ckenady
PRE-APPLICATION MEETING PACKET

This packet consists of instructions for conducting the Pre-Application Meeting. Planning Department staff are available to advise you in the preparation of this application. Call 415.558.6377 for further information.

Español: Si desea ayuda sobre cómo llenar esta solicitud en español, por favor llame al 415.575.9010. Tenga en cuenta que el Departamento de Planificación requerirá al menos un día hábil para responder.

中文：如果您希望獲得使用中文填寫這份申請表的幫助，請致電415.575.9010請注意，規劃部門需要至少一個工作日來回應。

Tagalog: Kung gusto mo ng tulong sa pagkumpleto ng application na ito sa Filipino, paki tawagan ang 415.575.9010. Paki tandaan na mangangailangan ang Planning Department ng hindi kukulangin sa isang araw na pantrabaho para makasagot.

WHAT IS A PRE-APPLICATION MEETING?

The Pre-Application Meeting is a mandatory form of community outreach conducted by the project sponsor to receive initial feedback regarding certain project types prior to submittal to the Planning Department or the Department of Building Inspection. Adjacent neighbors and relevant neighborhood organizations are invited to attend this meeting, which must take place during certain hours of the day and within a certain distance from the project site. The meeting's intention is to initiate neighbor communication and identify issues and concerns early on; provide the project sponsor the opportunity to address neighbor concerns about the potential impacts of the project prior to submitting an application; and, reduce the number of Discretionary Reviews (DRs) that are filed.

WHY IS A PRE-APPLICATION MEETING REQUIRED?

The Pre-Application process is required for certain projects subject to Planning Code Section 311 Notification, or as required by other activities listed below. It serves as the first step in the process prior to building permit application or entitlement (Conditional Use Authorization, Variance, etc.) submittal. Those contacted as a result of the Pre-Application process will also receive a formal notice after the project is reviewed by Planning Department staff.
WHEN IS A PRE-APPLICATION MEETING REQUIRED?

- Projects subject to 311 Notification that include:
  - New Construction;
  - Any vertical addition of 7 feet or more;
  - Any horizontal addition of 10 feet or more;
  - Decks over 10 feet above grade or within the required rear yard;
- All Formula Retail uses subject to a Conditional Use Authorization;
- Community Business Priority Processing (CB3P);
- Projects in PDR-1-B Districts subject to Section 313; and
- Department staff may request a Pre-Application meeting be conducted for any project.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PRE-APPLICATION MEETINGS

Prior to filing any Project Application, the applicant must conduct a minimum of one Pre-Application meeting if required, as stated above.

Additionally, if the project will be required to submit a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan pursuant to Planning Code Section 169, the Project Sponsor must discuss potential TDM Measures that may be incorporated into the project.

These materials must be submitted to the Planning Department:

All of the following materials must be submitted along with the Project Application for the project in order to verify compliance with the Pre-Application Meeting requirements. If a Pre-Application Meeting is required, Planning Department review will not begin until all the following are received:

- A copy of the letter mailed to neighbors and neighborhood organizations (use attached invitation)
- A list of the neighborhood organizations and individuals invited to the meeting, including the mailing address for each (see instructions below)
- A copy of the sign-in sheet (use attached template)
- A summary of the meeting and a list of any changes made to the project as a result of the neighborhood comments (use attached template)
- The affidavit, signed and dated (use attached template)
- One reduced copy of the plans presented to the neighbors at pre-application meeting, labeled as “Pre-Application Plans”
This meeting must be held in accordance with the following rules.

These groups and individuals must be invited to the meeting:

- Invite all Neighborhood Organizations for the neighborhood(s) in which the project site is located, as defined on the Planning Department Neighborhood Groups Map. Enter “Neighborhood Groups Map” into the search bar on www.sfplanning.org. Then, click on the relevant neighborhood on the map, and click on the “Neighborhood Contact List” link to download the list of neighborhood organizations in a spreadsheet format. Be sure to view the list for the appropriate neighborhood(s) by using the tabs at the bottom of the spreadsheet. If the property is located on the border of two or more neighborhoods, you must invite all bordering neighborhood organizations.

- Invite all owners and residents of properties that are abutting (next to), and directly across the street from, the project site. If the project site is on a corner, you must also invite owners and occupants of the properties across both streets, and the corner property diagonally across the intersection. To find the address of abutting properties, go to the online San Francisco Property Information Map (propertymap.sfplanning.org), search for the address of the project site, and click on each of the abutting properties to find the address and block/lot number of the property. The list of property owners should be based on the latest citywide property tax roll, which is available at the Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector, City Hall, Room 140, Carlton B Goodlett Pl. You must also invite all residents of the abutting properties by mailing an invitation to each property addressed to “Residents”. Be sure to mail to each unit separately, if there are more than one unit on the property.

- Note that projects in PDR-1-B districts subject to Sec. 313 require mailing to owners and residents of properties within a 300 foot radius. Refer to the Neighborhood Notification handout, available at www.sfplanning.org, for clarification.

- Invitations must be sent at least 14 calendar days before the meeting. One copy of the invitation letter must be mailed to the project sponsor as proof of mailing. Invitations The postal date stamp will serve as record of timely mailing.

- You may have a private drafting or mailing service generate the correct mailing list for you, for a fee that varies by firm. The following businesses have indicated that they provide professional notification services. This listing does not constitute an endorsement. Other professionals can also perform this work and can be added to this list upon request:

  Build CADD
  3515 Santiago Stree
  San Francisco, CA 94116
  (415) 759-8710

  Javier Solorzano
  3288 - 21st Street #49
  San Francisco, CA 94110
  (415) 724-131064@yahoo.com

  Jerry Brown Designs
  619 - 27th Street, Apt. A
  Oakland, CA 94612
  (415) 810-3703, jbdsgn328@gmail.com

  Notificationmaps.com
  Barry Dunzer
  (866) 752-6266
  www/notificationmaps.com

  Radius Services
  1221 Harrison Street #18
  San Francisco, CA 94103
  (415) 391-4775, radiusservices@sfradius.com

  Ted Madison Drafting
  P.O. Box 8102
  Santa Rosa, CA 95407
  (707) 228-8850, tmadison@pacbell.net

Notice This - (650) 814-6750
RE: Discretionary Review Response 2008.0813.9077
[3927 19th Street, Block 3601 Lot 073] & [3929 19th Street, Block 3601/Lot 072]
Filed by Carolyn Kenady & Bruce Bowen, dated 10.7.2019

January 15, 2019

Dear Commissioners:

The following are responses to the discretionary reviews for 3927 19th Street, Block 3601 Lot 073 & 3929 19th Street, Block 3601/Lot 072, each located in the City and County of San Francisco. It should be noted that the DRs filed for each of these properties are largely identical in comment and scope despite that there are separate applications for different buildings on each lot. We will address each comment either together or separately as it applies to each project site. Excerpts of the DR have been copied here and are represented in Italics with associated responses.

SECTION 1: REASONS FOR REQUESTING DR

Item 1: Failure to meaningfully follow Planning’s process for public notice and discussion.

RESPONSE:

The original filing of this project with the planning department was in August of 2008. Following that filing a neighborhood meeting was held that included a physical model of the project, with a corresponding project website on www.19thstreet.org. Attached in Exhibit A is an email from that documents the project meeting. In addition to this, the project was in the San Francisco Chronicle and heavily marketed for sale using the project drawings and renderings. From that original meeting to the 311 notification the Architect estimates over ten formal and informal neighborhood meetings took place prior to the original 311 notification that went out in March of 2009. Over the course of this project the Architect has worked with 5 different planners and three different owner groups, and yet the project did not change in its formally submitted form until August of 2017 – when it was reduced in scale and size at the bequest of planning staff. See permitting history attached in Exhibit B.

As the Requestors discuss, the Applicant did explore changing the project to demolish the existing cottages, merge the lot and build a single multi-unit apartment building. This alternate
was contemplated between early 2015 and May 2017. This densified plan - which was abandoned - is the project discussed in the emails between Eric Jacobs and Carolyn Kenady. It was ultimately set aside after the project team was facing seemingly insurmountable and changing requirements and mounting costs.

The Applicant then, in the spring of 2017, decided to return to the original entitled plan resubmitting in August of 2017. The revised project was reduced in scale and size, and also modified to meet current building and planning codes which had changed in the time that had passed. In May of 2018 - after transfer to a third planner in 4 years - planning formally decided to accept the project revisions and push it forward to RDAT. RDAT approved the project in August of 2018.

It should be noted that from resubmittal in summer of 2017 until the summer of 2019 – the Applicant was led to believe that a 311 notice was not going to be required because the project had previously been noticed as shown in the permit history, and because the size of the project has been reduced in height, scale and required excavation. The final determination that the project needed a new 311 notification occurred in the summer of 2019 – leaving the applicant little time to reach all the neighbors before the notifications were posted.

The DR was filed in September 2019. Despite the long road - the project before the commission is simply a reduction in scope of the original 2008 and noticed and approved via formal 311 in 2009 – thus should not require a new requirement of a pre-application meeting.

After the DR was filed by the Requestors, a formal neighbor meeting was also held with the Requestors and other neighbors to review the DR issues and concerns with the revised project on November 19, 2019. Attendees present are outlined as discussed Exhibit C. Ongoing email correspondence since that meeting is attached as Exhibit D.

**Item 2: Excavation and construction risks on steep hillside**

**RESPONSE:**

The Applicant has provided the geotechnical report via email [Exhibit E] to all neighbors, including DR Requestors, who attended the November 2019 meeting. The project site has been thoroughly surveyed along with the preparation of an extensive geotechnical report and the involvement of three highly regarded engineering firms. Engineering feasibility studies and plan reviews by engineering have been performed that verify the buildability of the past more extensive excavation and the reduced simplified terraced excavation plan.

It should be noted that the site slope is nearly 1:1, so continued erosion and displacement will occur if this hillside is not stabilized. Surveys were performed in 2007 and again in 2013 that have already shown 10” in displacement of a tree at the project site and the existing – nonconforming wooded staircase needs regular maintenance to be safe for passage.
The project proposal will make the hill stronger and more stable, not weaker. The Applicant will be excavating loose soil and very weak shale and replacing it with terraced foundations that support the new houses.

Updated CEQA analysis not required due to the reduction in the scope of excavation as verified and confirmed by planning. The new project clearly has less excavation volume, to be exact a total reduction of an estimated XX cubic yards.

To date the following engineers have been retained to work on and design the final project plans for DBI approval pending Planning Department approval.

ZFA – Structural Engineering
Lea & Braze - Civil Engineering
Rollo & Ridley – Geotechnical Engineering

The Applicant has made their engineers available to answer additional questions from Requestors and neighbors as needed.

**Item 3: Access to neighbors to their homes [This comment only applies to 3927 19th Street]**

RESPONSE:

The Applicant does not plan on remodeling the existing staircase between 3919-25 19th Street and does not have the unilateral right to do so in any event.

Thus, there should be no time during construction that neighbors would not have access to their homes. The Applicant will make this a condition of any RFP for General Contractors to build the project.

This information was shared with the neighbors and Requestors at the meeting in November 2019, including Dylan Etkin the owner of 3919 19th Street.
**Item 4: Sham plan for the cottages in the rear of the lots**

RESPONSE:

It is unclear what the DR requestor is asserting with regard to the cottages. They seem to be demanding that the Applicant demolish the cottages as part of this project which goes against all current City policies and would absolutely be opposed by other neighbors.

The eastern cottages are not easily accessed as currently sited at the top of the slope and at the rear of these lots. The two cottages at 3929 and 3931 are currently approached by a single wooden stairway that is not code compliant. The cottage at 3927 is accessed via an existing easement stair that also serves the houses to the east of the easement. With the new project proposal, all three existing buildings will have safe, code compliant stair access on a very difficult landscape.

The cottage renovations are not a part of this permit application. The units at 3929 and 3931 are livable and will continue “as is”, with some minor renovation in the future. The cottage at 3927 is uninhabitable, but we cannot bring it back to livability until the permits for the new house are completed, according to planning department staff. The cottages are an integral part of each site proposal and there is no “sham” to this project. This project will not impact the cottages in any way for purposes of renovations and interior upgrades.

**3927 19th**

The current cottage has an outstanding building permit # 200606234889 that needs to be renewed and remedied [See Exhibit F], thus cannot be considered as part of this permit. It is an existing building that was partially demolished by previous ownership. The Applicant will renew the permit and perform an interior remodel to make the cottage habitable again. As it has historic access from the existing shared stair, there is no feasible way this cottage could become “landlocked” as purported. The project is not a “SHAM” and instead preserves much needed affordable housing.

There is no history of eviction at this property. See Exhibit G.

This information was shared with the Requestors & neighbors.

**3929 19th**

The neighbor meeting was held at the cottage located at 3929 19th Street. The home is still functional as existing affordable housing stock. The Applicant, will address improvements to this property with interior remodel permits for kitchen, bath and flooring improvements.
This property will not be “landlocked” - as shown in the development plans there is a staircase between 3931 and 3929 19th Street that allows for direct access to this cottage from the street. The project is not a “SHAM” and instead keeps much needed affordable housing.

There is no history of eviction at this property. See Exhibit G.

This information was shared with the DR requestors and neighbors.

**Item 5. Probable permanent loss of affordable units**

Each of the existing small houses will remain “as is” and will be available as separate residential units not connected to the new buildings proposed. Each cottage will have better egress and access and will have a stronger hillside construction holding them in place.

As discussed above, the existing affordable housing will remain on each of the project sites. They have no eviction history and are not landlocked. Thus project will return affordable units to the market and add additional housing units desperately needed in San Francisco and California.

They are not “fire-traps”. 3927 19th’s cottage has the exact same stair access as the neighbor’s property at 3919 19th and the proposed project would improve and enhance access to the cottages.

Any further permits pulled or renewed at DBI for the cottages existing permits will be in compliance with all City and State building and fire codes.

This information was shared with the neighbors.

**Item 6: Minimum rear yard space**

RESPONSE:

Per the Planning Code Sec 134(c)(3), Rear yards in RH-2 zones shall be “at grade and at each succeeding story” above. For existing non-compliant units in the rear yard, a 25% lot depth separation is required between the new building and the existing non-compliant unit. This is the “rear yard” for the existing cottage. Existing grade on this site is very steep, and the newly proposed house is primarily below existing grade at this location on site. We are proposing a sodded roof and no building obstructions in the 25% separation zone.

The attached plan removes the above grade obstructions that would have previously required a variance.
The project as designed meets all rear yard project requirements as outlined in Exhibit H for sloped sites. This diagram and the recently updated plans dated 1/16/2020 was shared with the neighbors and Requestors.

**Item 7: Configuration of lots and existing structures create greater issues related to light, air, privacy and access.**

**RESPONSE:**

**Light & Air** – There is an existing staircase between the buildings at 3919-3925 19th Street that provides 6 feet on average of space between structures and existing buildings. Additionally, the new buildings are on the north side of the hill and therefore cast no adverse shadows on the block. The existing cottages are all taller than the new buildings (relative to the sidewalk). The overall height of the new structures is less than the height of the adjacent building at 3933-35 19th Street. The face of the structure is also set back ten feet from the sidewalk above the garage level, in comparison with both 3921-25 19th and 3933-39 19th. This design iteration also eliminates a floor from the original 2008 submission. [See Attached Exhibit I]

**Privacy** – There are little to minimal windows on the east side of the building to protect the privacy of the existing residents. Great care was taken for window locations. Privacy concerns have been addressed by avoiding windows that look directly at existing residential windows and entries. This is a hillside site, like much of San Francisco, and privacy is relative.

The proposed roof decks are a response for more useful open space. The decks are pushed closer to the street so they do not encroach on existing houses to the rear, but on this site the houses on Cumberland look down on the houses at 19th Street, which look over the houses on 18th Street, and so forth.

A more solid screening element has been added on the staircase side per the request of the owner of 3919 19th. See attached rendering [Exhibit J] showing a continuous greenwall & planter that was shared with the neighbors and Requestors on 1/16/2020.

**Access** – All existing access to properties will remain.

It should be noted that the Requestors live on Cumberland Street, and will have no view whatsoever of the projects from their properties and are not at all effected by light and air, privacy, and access complaints.

See attached updated views to clarify dated 1/16/2020.
**Item 8: Building Scale and Form**

This project revision is a reduction in scope and massing of the original approved and entitled project. Both buildings have had bulk and mass removed in the last round of permitting. [See Exhibit I]. The newly proposed structures are lower than what planning code allows – as we have already removed an allowable floor. The buildings could also be farther forward, but we have pulled them back for more than the required setback from the street in floors to maintain the landscape at the street. And allow for more light and air into the building at 3921-25 19th Street.

This project design was developed in concert with the neighbors. The Architect has had at least ten structured meetings, including an organized block party with a model, and many more informal discussions for neighbors both on 19th and Cumberland. The project was also featured on the neighborhood website (when it was in an early stage of design).

The concept for the project is simple: Create a retaining wall to replace the existing crumbling wall; expose landscape at the street face of each lot; provide better access to the existing cottages, and “terrace” the new design to stabilize the hill. It should be noted that more than 60% of the new structure and project square footage is below existing grade.

The new houses are designed to reduce any sense of bulk by layering the massing and creating a palette of detail that gives depth to the façade and emphasizes thinner profiles than the neighboring buildings.

This is an appropriate project for the location and is articulated and speaks to the adjacent buildings and structures.

**How the Project Conflicts with these Components of SF Planning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Element</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failure to follow SF Planning Pre-Application process for public notice and discussion</td>
<td>Process followed correctly. Additional courtesy meeting held with neighbors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation and construction risks</td>
<td>This requirement is part of the standard permit process review by the Department of Building Inspection after planning has approved a project. All state and city requirements will be adhered to for final building permit plans and during construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sham plan for cottages in the rear of the lots</td>
<td>Cottages will be preserved as affordable housing. One additional unit is being added to each lot.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Permanent loss of affordable rent-controlled units | Cottages will be preserved as affordable housing. One additional unit is being added to each lot.
---|---
Minimum rear yard space | Design meets rear yard space requirements for sloped lots
Light air and privacy | Design meets light and air requirements and takes privacy into consideration
Building scale and form – compatibility with neighborhood | Building is compatible with neighboring structures and streetscape.

**SECTION 2 Unreasonable Impacts & Requests**

a. **Access**
   RESPONSE: Access will be provided. Current design does not require any access changes. There is no unreasonable impact here.

b. **Privacy**
   RESPONSE: See revised plans with new screening toward neighbor at 3919 19th Street at the project at 3927 19th. The roof decks are required by planning code as private exterior space and cannot be removed. There is no unreasonable impact here.

c. **Light and Air**
   RESPONSE: Existing stairwell more than meets light and air requirements. The building as revised is shorter than the previously approved building. There is no unreasonable impact here.

d. **Sham Plan for Cottages**
   RESPONSE: Cottages will be preserved as affordable housing. One additional units is being added to each lot. There is no unreasonable impact here

e. **Permanent loss of Affordable Units**
   RESPONSE: Cottages will be preserved as affordable housing. One additional units is being added to each lot. There is no unreasonable impact here.

f. **Rear Yard Space**
   RESPONSE: Design meets rear yard space requirements for sloped lots. There is no unreasonable impact here.
g. **Risk to the stability of neighboring properties**
RESPONSE
All state and city requirements will be adhered to for final building permit plans and during construction. There is no unreasonable impact here.

**SECTION 3 Requests**

a. **Failure to hold timely Pre-Application Meeting – request for additional pre-application meeting**
RESPONSE
As it is not required by the planning department to hold multiple pre-application meetings for a singular site permit, the ownership instead held a meeting with the Requestors and interested neighbors on November 19, 2019. The Applicant feels this request has been met and no further meetings should be required. This item is resolved.

b. **Access – Request uninterrupted access and cottage access.**
RESPONSE:
Access will provided. Current design does not require any access changes. Current design preserves and provides access to cottages. This item is resolved.

c. **Privacy – Request to eliminate roof decks**
RESPONSE:
See revised plans with new screening toward neighbor at 3919 19th Street at the project at 3927 19th. The roof decks are required by planning code as private exterior space and cannot be removed. This item is resolved.

d. **Light and Air – Request for side setback and step back front of the the exterior**
RESPONSE:

**3927**
Existing design more than meets light and air requirements as side of the building is already three feet away from the property line, and on average six feet away from adjacent neighbors as part of the stairwell easement. The proposed structure is already only twenty-two feet wide. The building as revised in this submission is also shorter than the previously approved building and has articulation and setbacks.

**3929**
Comments about light and air do not apply to 3929 19th Street. The building as revised in this submission is also shorter than the previously approved building and has articulation and setbacks.

There is not a need to modify these buildings further and they should be approved as designed.

e. **Sham Plan for Cottages – Request - do not leave cottages in their current state**
   RESPONSE:
   Cottages will be preserved as affordable housing. One additional units is being added to each lot. Renovations for cottages will be under separate permit. This item is resolved.

f. **Permanent loss of Affordable Units – Request - renovate cottages**
   RESPONSE:
   Cottages will be preserved as affordable housing. One additional units is being added to each lot. Renovations for cottages will be under separate permit. This item is resolved.

g. **Rear Yard Space – Request Deny Variance**
   RESPONSE:
   Design has been modified such that a variance is no longer required. This item is resolved.

h. **Risk to the stability of neighboring properties – Request provide soils report conduct more design**
   RESPONSE
   The soils report was provided to the Requestors in paper and electronic form. All other requests here are standard as part of the building permit process and will be met in those filings and as part of a normal standard of care for building on a sloped site. The Applicant should not be required to continue to design a project in its entirety until it is approved by the Planning Department, so this request is unreasonable at this time.

   The Applicant agrees to conduct proper engineering and design for a sloped site and is willing to have this be a condition of approval. This item is resolved.

i. **Revise the building scale & Form – request changes to and side front facade**
   RESPONSE:
   Both DR’s discuss requesting a set back at the east façade, but this request really only applies to 3927 19th street and not 3929 19th Street. Asking for an additional setback when the building is on average six feet away from the adjacent windows and structure at 3921-25 19th Street is unreasonable and obstructionist. The code allows for buildings
to be built on the property line, blocking windows so this canyon effect argument is null and void.

Regarding the façade – the building was revised to eliminate a full floor and has articulation on both facades. The requirement for the open space between the buildings pushes the building onto the street, but well within the required setbacks and in line with other buildings on the street. Additional setback and articulation is not required and would be detrimental to the design.

In conclusion, the Applicant believes this DR has been filed as a delay tactic and an attempt by the neighbors to maintain a largely open space next door while at the same time delaying or avoiding construction disturbance. The impacts purported have been addressed, explained and mitigated since the filing of the DR. The requests for changes to the façade and setbacks are vague and not specific in nature, and are out of step given the long history of this project in the neighborhood and within in the planning department.

The Applicant stands behind the years of design and teamwork with the planning department to bring this project to the commission. This project was reviewed, noticed and approved by planning and the neighborhood – and this revision is a smaller version of that project so should not have required a 311 notification. The project is officially on its fifth planner as of this week. The lack of continuity and continually moving goal posts has not benefitted the project or the Applicant or the neighborhood. Despite this, the Applicant and the Architect has continued to work with the Requestors and neighbors on their complaints – have made modification to ameliorate some of their concerns – and strongly believes the project should be approved in its current form.

San Francisco needs housing – all kinds. This project when it is complete will put 6 units (4 existing and 2 new) back into San Francisco’s housing stock.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Kennedy</td>
<td>3632 26th St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:carolynkennedy@gmail.com">carolynkennedy@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>408-218-3115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Bowen</td>
<td>4016 25th St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brcu.r.bowen@gmail.com">brcu.r.bowen@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>415-533-0586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dylan Etkin</td>
<td>3919 19th St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dylan.etkin@gmail.com">dylan.etkin@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>415-602-3160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Harbut</td>
<td>3911 19th St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:SCOTTHARBUT@COMCAST.NET">SCOTTHARBUT@COMCAST.NET</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Leichum</td>
<td>3917-19th St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:leichum@earthlink.net">leichum@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>415 344 4504</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Taylor Robinson <taylor@dydxllc.com>

3927/3929 19th Street Meeting // Week of November 18th?

Bruce Bowen <bruce.r.bowen@gmail.com>  To: Taylor Robinson <taylor@dydxllc.com>
Cc: Carolyn Kenady <carolynkenady@gmail.com>, Joan Zhao <joan@dydxllc.com>, "jeff@studio12arch.com" <jeff@studio12arch.com>

Mon, Nov 18, 2019 at 4:37 PM

Taylor

Thanks for the confirmation and the update. Yes, we will be there. Also coming with us are 19th St neighbors Karl Leichum, Scott Herbst and Dylan Etkin (though Dylan has to leave early - around 2:40 I believe).

Bruce

On Mon, Nov 18, 2019 at 2:34 PM Taylor Robinson <taylor@dydxllc.com> wrote:

Bruce & Carolyn,

Just confirming we are still on for tomorrow at 2pm.

Our soils engineer, Frank Rollo of Rollo & Ridley, is an expert witness at a trial and just found out of the final hearing schedule today - so won't be able to make it tomorrow.

I will bring the soils report to review and we can do a follow up call with him as needed. If for some reason his hearing schedule changes he will let us know. He sends his apologies to everyone.

Best,
Taylor

On Tue, Oct 29, 2019 at 3:48 PM Taylor Robinson <taylor@dydxllc.com> wrote:

Bruce & Carolyn:

We are confirmed on our end for 2 pm 11/19 at 3929 19th Street.

I would recommend tennis shoes for walking up the stairs, there are a lot of them and they can be a little slippery when wet. Hopefully the weather cooperates for us.

Joan cc'd will also be there from my office. Let me know if others will be joining us so we make sure to meet everyone at the gate. We will make sure to be there a little earlier either way.

See everyone soon!

Best,
Taylor

On Tue, Oct 29, 2019 at 2:35 PM Taylor Robinson <taylor@dydxllc.com> wrote:

Hi Bruce,

I am confirming with Jeff - 2pm on 11/19 looks great for me, and our soils engineer can come then as well. Stay tuned.

-Taylor

On Tue, Oct 29, 2019 at 12:12 PM Bruce Bowen <bruce.r.bowen@gmail.com> wrote:

Taylor

Sorry it has taken me a few days to get back to you. We would like to meet if still possible. The best dates for us on 11/18 (from 10 - 3 are best), 11/19 (in the afternoon) and 11/20 (in the afternoon).

Thanks.
Bruce

On Mon, Oct 21, 2019 at 2:05 PM Taylor Robinson <taylor@dydxllc.com> wrote:
Bruce,

So nice to speak with you this afternoon - thanks for offering to reach out to Carolyn and see what her availability is to meet with us.

As I mentioned, the week of November 18th is most ideal for me working around my health care constraints. I also can be available on Thursday November 14th or 15th as well, the 18th-20th are wide open, the 21st and 22nd are a little harder for me.

I appreciate your candor and look forward to discussing the project further in person and we are happy to have you meet us on site at 3929.

Feel free to reach out with questions as well to Jeff in the meantime, he is cc'd on this email. Carolyn - nice to meet you via email. I look forward to meeting with you both soon.

Very Best,
Taylor

--
Taylor Robinson
Principal
dy/dx LLC
516A Diamond St
San Francisco, CA 94114
415.225.7245

--
Taylor Robinson
Principal
dy/dx LLC
516A Diamond St
San Francisco, CA 94114
415.225.7245

--
Taylor Robinson
Principal
dy/dx LLC
516A Diamond St
San Francisco, CA 94114
415.225.7245

--
Taylor Robinson
Principal
dy/dx LLC
516A Diamond St
San Francisco, CA 94114
415.225.7245
EXHIBIT A - NEIGHBOR MEETING AND PUBLICITY
Even in its development stage, this planned three-home modern complex atop Liberty Hill on 19th Street commands attention. "Elevation" aptly sums up this new level of residential advancement San Francisco collaborators Dawson & Clinton contractors and Studio 12 architects are calling Block 3900.

"Our inspiration derived from the steep-site topography," said Jeff Burris, principal at Studio 12 on Third Street. "The deep, open court at the center was a direct response to the hillside, and design ideas sprung from that condition."
Early on, they decided to dig into the Liberty Hill parcel, lifting the upper floors higher into the sky as opposed to stair-stepping them up the steep incline. Eventually, the center court became a unifying element for the complex as a whole, and lifting the upper stories resulted in the project nickname: the tree houses,” Burris said.

Now pre-selling for $5.5 million and $6 million, the six-level, freestanding homes will stand side-by-side as glass, steel and timber symbols of a modern school of thought, accessible for any lifestyle. Homebuyers will work closely with the architect in contouring the Block 3900 homes to suit their design tastes and everyday needs.

Also included in the purchase price is ownership of existing century-old on-site guest houses abutting Cumberland Street and accessible all the way to the top by a commercial-grade elevator. Block 3900 listing agent Frank Nolan of Vanguard
Properties said the cottage sites, if desired, could be subdivided as separate residences or retained to complement the modern abodes.

"It is probably the most desirable part of San Francisco; a hip, trendy location two blocks from Delores Park overlooking the city skyline," said Nolan. "It's so modern, so iconic, the architecture completely stands out."

From groundbreaking to move-in, the collaboration between buyer and architect will span 18 months to two years, he said.

The planned residence at 3931 19th Street will be the largest of Block 3900, spanning 4,784 square feet to include four bedrooms, three full baths and a powder room. The guest house is 1,800 square feet with two bedrooms and two baths.

The second-largest unit will be at 3929 19th Street at 4,612 square feet with three bedrooms, two full baths and two powder rooms. The existing guest house included is 1,650 square feet with two bedrooms and one bath.

The third unit at 3927 19th Street will be 4,109 square feet with three bedrooms, three bathrooms and two powder rooms. The existing cottage is 1,581 square feet with two bedrooms and baths.

All of the units at Block 3900 will come loaded with luxurious amenities like radiant heating, two-car parking, fireplaces, master suites, multiple outdoor decks and expansive light wells.

The homes will have floor-to-ceiling windows, basements and rooftop terraces with a glass observatory. In addition to luxury baths with walnut cabinets and quartz surfaces, the tile will be selected by the buyer. Gourmet kitchens are also part of the blueprint, with cabinets and tile to the buyer's liking.

Block 3900 is certainly modern, said architect Burris, with views second to none. Best of all, the finished product will reflect the hopes and dreams of the homebuyer, he said, whether a single professional or large family.
"The houses can be adapted to the user's needs," said Burris, who did his graduate work at UC Berkeley. Like the concept, the Block 3900 residences are not small, he said. "They are tall houses, but they are pulled apart in a way that plays down the height and fosters a healthy mix of outside and inside spaces."

**Details**

Block 3900 on 19th Street, San Francisco  
Planned three-home custom development on Liberty Hill  
**Beds:** Three to four per home  
**Baths:** Three per home  
**Size:** 4,109 to 4,784 square feet  
**Price:** $5.5 million or $6 million, depending on size  
**Listing agent:** Frank Nolan, Vanguard Properties, (415) 321-7011, Block3900.com

© 2020 Hearst Communications, Inc.
The Homes at Block 3900

Views, Location, Architecture, Presence, Scale, Light and Space. NOW PRE-SELLING - Perched on Liberty Hill, these three unique homes with guest houses will be modern showcases of glass, steel and timber, while blending into the area's surrounding natural beauty.

www.Block3900.com
EXHIBIT B - PERMIT HISTORY
Permit Details Report

Report Date: 1/16/2020 12:37:47 PM

Application Number: 200808139076
Form Number: 2
Address(es): 3601 / 073 / 0 3927 19TH ST
Description: ERECT 5 STORY SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING. (3 STORY OCCUPANCY & 2 BASEMENTS)
Cost: $598,650.00
Occupancy Code: R-3
Building Use: 27 - 1 FAMILY DWELLING

Disposition / Stage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Date</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/13/2008</td>
<td>TRIAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13/2008</td>
<td>FILING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13/2008</td>
<td>FILED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact Details:

Contractor Details:
License Number: 791724
Name: TIM CLINTON
Company Name: DAWSON - CLINTON GEN CONTR CORP
Address: P.O.BOX 410475 ST * SAN FRANCISCO CA 94141-0000
Phone: 4154413473

Addenda Details:

Description:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Arrive</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>In Hold</th>
<th>Out Hold</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Checked By</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Hold Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CP-ZOC</td>
<td>8/27/08</td>
<td>12/23/08</td>
<td>3/31/09</td>
<td></td>
<td>JAROSLAWSKY CECILIA</td>
<td>415-558-6377</td>
<td></td>
<td>SENT LTR. 311 REQUESTED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SFFD</td>
<td>8/26/08</td>
<td>8/26/08</td>
<td>8/26/08</td>
<td></td>
<td>MITCHELL BILL</td>
<td>415-558-6177</td>
<td></td>
<td>for sfd access only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BLDG</td>
<td>4/14/09</td>
<td>5/1/09</td>
<td>5/1/09</td>
<td></td>
<td>LUI RAYMOND</td>
<td>415-558-6133</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT APPROVED, grs 5/1/09 comments out and route to PPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>BLDG</td>
<td>6/14/13</td>
<td>6/20/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LIN EMILY</td>
<td>415-558-6133</td>
<td></td>
<td>No work done, route back to planning for approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CP-ZOC</td>
<td>6/20/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SMITH MICHAEL</td>
<td>415-558-6377</td>
<td></td>
<td>reassigned to Michael E. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>DPW-BSM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>415-558-6960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CP-DR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CORRETTE MOSES</td>
<td>415-558-6377</td>
<td></td>
<td>DR intake at pic from Dolores Heights Imp club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SFPUC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>415-575-5941</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/11/19: R4 to DCP; cp 6/20/13; to Planning, return to Emily Lin after Planning's approval; sent 8/27/2008: ROUTED TO DCP. RQZ 11/12/08: (Revision SR-1) plans only to C. Jaroslawsky of dep. gjs 04/10/09: At PPC waiting for response for S-1 addendum option from the Arch. office of Jeffrey Burris. RQZ 04/14/09: Router to RT DC: RQZ 5.26.09: Rev'd plans and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1/16/2020

Department of Building Inspection

Appointments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointment Date</th>
<th>Appointment AM/PM</th>
<th>Appointment Code</th>
<th>Appointment Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Time Slots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Inspections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Date</th>
<th>Inspector</th>
<th>Inspection Description</th>
<th>Inspection Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Special Inspections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addenda No.</th>
<th>Completed Date</th>
<th>Inspected By</th>
<th>Inspection Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

For information, or to schedule an inspection, call 558-6570 between 8:30 am and 3:00 pm.

Online Permit and Complaint Tracking home page.

Technical Support for Online Services
If you need help or have a question about this service, please visit our FAQ area.

Contact SFGov Accessibility Policies
City and County of San Francisco © 2020
**Permit Details Report**

**Report Date:** 1/16/2020 12:40:17 PM

**Application Number:** 200808139077

**Address(es):** 3601/072/0 3929 19TH ST

**Description:** ERECT 5 STORY SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING. (3 STORY OCCUPANCY & 2 BASEMENTS.)

**Cost:** $678,450.00

**Occupancy Code:** R-3

**Building Use:** 27 - 1 FAMILY DWELLING

### Disposition / Stage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Date</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/13/2008</td>
<td>TRIAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13/2008</td>
<td>FILING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13/2008</td>
<td>FILED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contact Details:

**License Number:** 791724

**Name:** TIM CLINTON

**Company Name:** DAWSON - CLINTON GEN CONTR CORP

**Address:** P.O.BOX 410475 ST * SAN FRANCISCO CA 94141-0000

**Phone:** 4154413473

### Contractor Details:

**License Number:** 791724

**Name:** TIM CLINTON

**Company Name:** DAWSON - CLINTON GEN CONTR CORP

**Address:** P.O.BOX 410475 ST * SAN FRANCISCO CA 94141-0000

**Phone:** 4154413473

### Addenda Details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

03/28/11: Rec'd Extension of Time Request.gjs 04/04/11: Mailed Extension of Time Approval Letter.gjs 04/08/11: Extension of Time Fee Paid in full. New cancel date is October 20 10/05/11: NOC issued 10/05/11. Reassigned from Chris Townes 1/16/2020
Appointments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointment Date</th>
<th>Appointment AM/PM</th>
<th>Appointment Code</th>
<th>Appointment Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Time Slots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Inspections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Date</th>
<th>Inspector</th>
<th>Inspection Description</th>
<th>Inspection Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Special Inspections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addenda No.</th>
<th>Completed Date</th>
<th>Inspected By</th>
<th>Inspection Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

For information, or to schedule an inspection, call 558-6570 between 8:30 am and 3:00 pm.

Online Permit and Complaint Tracking home page.

Technical Support for Online Services
If you need help or have a question about this service, please visit our FAQ area.
EXHIBIT D - EMAIL CORRESPONDENCE AND PLANS
Thank you Taylor and Jeff for following up. Looking forward to seeing the additional drawings. We will certainly let you know if any questions come up.

Bruce

Sent from my iPhone
thanks!
Jeff.

On Thu, Jan 2, 2020 at 3:58 PM Taylor Robinson <taylor@dydxllc.com> wrote:

All:

See attached soils report. This will be updated by our soils engineer Rollo & Ridley with the building department permit submissions. Rollo & Ridley would be on site during all excavation inspecting and approving the work by a general contractor, and their excavation subcontractor and provide sometimes daily inspection reports pending the work that is being completed, pending what is going on at the site. Frank is happy to talk with anyone who has questions about excavation and shoring from a geotech standpoint.

In addition to that regular civil engineering survey monitoring is also a standard of care that would be implemented for adjacent structures and neighbors. Preconstruction surveys would be completed, and then points on buildings shot at a regular interval to make sure nothing is moving during the excavation, foundation and building process. I am happy to put anyone in touch with our civil engineers if they have questions on how they perform survey monitoring. We work with Lea & Braze Engineering.

I will try and touch base with Jeff in the morning tomorrow and see where he is on everything else - with school break/surgery etc he might not be able to get back to us until Monday.

Thanks,
Taylor

On Thu, Jan 2, 2020 at 12:30 PM Taylor Robinson <taylor@dydxllc.com> wrote:

Yes - I can get that out later today. About to start a meeting.

Thanks!
Taylor

On Thu, Jan 2, 2020 at 12:29 PM Bruce Bowen <bruce.r.bowen@gmail.com> wrote:

Taylor
I am so sorry; yes you are right that you gave a document to me. Now I remember. This is my fault for immediately forgetting it.
I am out of town until Monday. If it isn’t too much trouble could you email an electronic copy?
I still think we are waiting for info from Jeff.
Bruce

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 2, 2020, at 10:04 AM, Taylor Robinson <taylor@dydxllc.com> wrote:

Dylan:

Sorry - after you left the meeting I provided Bruce with the soils report for the property. We haven't done any additional studies, as we are waiting to do the final building permit designs once we get through planning. Soils analysis and geotech studies are typically part of the building departments final review, not planning and are a typical requirement for sloped sites.

If we need to send it electronically to everyone we can.

Best,
Taylor

On Thu, Jan 2, 2020 at 11:56 AM Dylan Etkin <dylan.etkin@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Taylor and Jeff,

Could it be that there's a separate thread that I'm missing from? I haven't seen the additional information provided by Jeff other than the one rendered image included...
in this email chain from the start of December. I also haven’t seen the soils information you referenced.

Cheers,
Dylan

On Thu, Jan 2, 2020 at 9:51 AM Taylor Robinson <taylor@dydxllc.com> wrote:
Happy New Year all!

Bruce & Carolyn:

We wanted to know if the soils information we provided is sufficient to respond to your inquiries on that part of the DR or if you need additional information on that item?

Jeff can you provide an update on the other information?

Thanks,
Taylor

On Thu, Dec 12, 2019 at 1:40 AM Bruce Bowen <bruce.r.bowen@gmail.com> wrote:

Jeff

Thanks for the response and hope the surgery wasn't major and the recovery is swift.

The only additional data I can think of is the heights of Karl's and Scott's houses (3917 and 3911, I believe) - we assume you have those heights - in addition to the heights of the adjacent buildings to the west and east of 3927 and 3931.

Bruce

On Wed, Dec 11, 2019 at 12:24 PM Jeff Burris <jeff@studio12arch.com> wrote:

Hi, Bruce,

My apologies for the delay, but we had to pull this together as I was going into surgery, which meant I had no chance to review the work done by my office in response.

It appears we will have those items to show you today or tomorrow.

To re-cap, we are providing:
1. An elevation of the street frontage with information on height of buildings to the east and west adjacency of our three lots;
2. A view of the 25% separation between buildings (in 3D); and
3. A view of the existing easement stair with the new house next to it.

Let me know if I've left anything out.

Thanks for your patience. The drawings will be ready soon.

J.

On Mon, Dec 9, 2019 at 9:30 AM Bruce Bowen <bruce.r.bowen@gmail.com> wrote:

Jeff

Please let us know when we can expect the information and data we discussed at our meeting.

Thanks

Bruce
On Tue, Nov 26, 2019 at 9:32 AM Jeff Burris <jeff@studio12arch.com> wrote:

Thank you!
I am trying to get the cottages inserted into our model so I can begin sending the items we discussed.

I have determined the heights of the neighboring buildings and will send a graphic today.
The existing stair rendering is begun. You can see the outlines in the attached.
But adding the cottage models is important to show different viewing angles, and that is taking a bit more time.

'more soon!
J

<19th-existing-stair.JPG>

On Tue, Nov 26, 2019 at 9:27 AM Bruce Bowen <bruce.r.bowen@gmail.com> wrote:

Taylor, Jeff
This email is simply to make sure you have the correct email addresses of all of the attendees at our meeting last week.

Hope all have a wonderful Thanksgiving!

Bruce

--

Jeff Burris  |  Studio12 Architecture
principal  
p  415.503.0212
www.studio12arch.com
1501 Mariposa Street, #319
San Francisco, CA  94107

--

Taylor Robinson
Principal
dy/dx LLC
516A Diamond St
--
Taylor Robinson  
Principal  
dy/dx LLC  
516A Diamond St  
San Francisco, CA 94114  
415.225.7245

--
Taylor Robinson  
Principal  
dy/dx LLC  
516A Diamond St  
San Francisco, CA 94114  
415.225.7245

--
Jeff Burris  |  Studio12 Architecture  
principal  
p  415.503.0212  
www.studio12arch.com  
1501 Mariposa Street, #319  
San Francisco, CA  94107

--
Taylor Robinson  
Principal  
dy/dx LLC  
516A Diamond St  
San Francisco, Ca 94114  
415.225.7245 m
Hello,

I have two drawings to share with the group.
These are per our onsite meeting.

1. We are showing a 3D view looking both 'up' and 'down' the easement stair. This drawing shows the new house at 3927 added.
The easement encroaches on the 3927 property a total of 3', leaving a house 22' wide. We are able to do more windows facing the easement, but we are limited to 15% of the total wall. If more windows will make the project more acceptable, I am fine exploring our options there.
We were limiting windows for privacy, but could open the issue again if it helps the feel of the walking easement.

2. We have a new drawing that calls out elevations of each building adjacent to the property. I'm sorry we did not survey the rooftop elevation of buildings not adjacent, but I trust this drawing gives a clear sense of existing building heights. The differential is shown in red.

Have a look, and we can clarify or give another view if needed.
These two drawings answer those two questions. There was an additional request to see 3D images of the top floor near the cottages. We will have something produced this week for your review. It is a little more difficult because those views do not yet exist in the computer model and will need to be added.
If there is a specific view you are seeking, please let me know.

thanks!
Jeff.
EXHIBIT E - EMAIL AND SOILS REPORT
Hi Jeff,

So sorry for the delayed response. Yes, this question came back to me from the current planner not too long ago and we here at EP determined that the original Cat Ex was still valid. I hope this helps. But let me know if you have any further questions.

Thanks,

Tim Johnston

---

From: Jeff Burris [mailto:jeff@studio12arch.com]
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 2:57 PM
To: Johnston, Timothy (CPC)
Subject: Fwd: CatEx 2014.0243E - 3927, 29, 31 - 19th Street

Hi,

I wanted to follow up to be certain this email was not lost.

I am trying to double confirm our Cat Ex is still valid.

The explanation is below.

thanks,

Jeff.
Hello,

You were copied on this email in November, and I wanted to circle back and make certain you were fine with Stephanie's response.

I am getting ready to show the project to RDAT, and I just need to verify the CAT EX is still valid.

The new project is smaller than the one previously approved, so we were operating under the assumption this does not require a new review.

If you could please confirm this is still true, I can start working with Chris Townes on notifying the neighbors.

thank you!

Jeff.

--- Forwarded message ---
From: Cisneros, Stephanie (CPC) <stephanie.cisneros@sfgov.org>
Date: Thu, Nov 2, 2017 at 2:26 PM
Subject: RE: CatEx 2014.0243E - 3927, 29, 31 - 19th Street
To: Jeff Burris <jeff@studio12arch.com>
Cc: "Townes, Chris (CPC)" <chris.townes@sfgov.org>, "Johnston, Timothy (CPC)" <timothy.johnston@sfgov.org>

Hi Jeff,

Thanks for your email. We cannot amend the scope of work on the preservation review and determination documents.

The preservation review was competed in 2016 when the original project description applied. The purpose of that review was to determine if the existing property is a historic resource. Since the Planning Department determined that the existing building is not a historic resource and that there is no historic district present, the revised project and any other project that may or may not come along in the future will have no impact on a historic resource. Projects are often modified subsequent to a historic resource determination. Therefore, the project description does not need to be updated for this document.

The modified scope would only have required additional review if the existing property been found to be located within a historic district. If this had been the case, I would have referred it to the Preservation Team for a review of its district compatibility. As stated above, this situation did not apply.

In regard to other environmental topics, I believe a new EEA would only be required if you are exceeding the scope that was previously granted exemption. Timothy Johnston (cc’ed here) would be able to answer questions with regard to other environmental topics as he was the environmental planner assigned to this case.
Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Stephanie

**Stephanie Cisneros**  
Preservation Planner

---

*I will be out of the office the following days: November 3rd to November 12th, November 22nd to 26th*

Planning Department, City and County of San Francisco  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103  

Email: stephanie.cisneros@sfgov.org  
Web: www.sfplanning.org

---

From: Jeff Burris [mailto:jeff@studio12arch.com]  
Sent: Thursday, November 02, 2017 12:35 PM  
To: Cisneros, Stephanie (CPC)  
Subject: CatEx 2014.0243E - 3927, 29, 31 - 19th Street

Stephanie,

I am the architect managing three permits for the properties listed above. An environmental application was submitted years ago, but the owner altered the project scope, amended the application, and received a categorical exemption for the work.

Unfortunately, the lot merger they petitioned was rejected.

I am now trying to finish the project as originally designed.....and as originally submitted for environmental review.

The original planner was Erika Jackson, but the project was re-assigned to Chris Townes. Chris and I met on Tuesday, and his first question was about the EE forms.
Our CatEx scope was more extensive than the project now proposed.

We were given an exemption based on a six-unit project over three merged properties....along with a full demo of the existing cottages in the rear yard of each lot.

Our new project is intent on keeping these cottages.

We would also like to do two units on each of the three sites, but that's not controversial for environmental review.

Lastly, we are proposing less excavation than the original CatEx scope.

I need to amend the application for environmental, and I'm trying to avoid starting over with a new application.

Lisa Gibson signed the first review, but Chris thought I should reach out to you first.

Are you able to help me in amending the original report?

Is there some way I can alter the numbers? Obviously the new project is much less involved, and we originally submitted and amended.....so I hoped we could "amend back".

Please let me know your thoughts... The CatEx doc is attached for reference.

thanks!

Jeff.

--

Jeff Burris  |  Studio12 Architecture
principal
p  415.503.0212

www.studio12arch.com

1501 Mariposa Street, #319
San Francisco, CA  94107

:::?
Taylor Robinson <taylor@dydxllc.com>  
Thu, Jan 2, 2020 at 5:58 PM

To: Bruce Bowen <bruce.r.bowen@gmail.com>
Cc: Dylan Etkin <dylan.etkin@gmail.com>, Joan Zhao <joan@dydxllc.com>, Jeff Burris <jeff@studio12arch.com>, Carolyn Kenady <carolynkenady@gmail.com>, Karl Leichum <leichum@earthlink.net>, "Scott A. Herbst, Esq."
Bcc: Christine Wade <chris@sslawfirm.com>

All:

See attached soils report. This will be updated by our soils engineer Rollo & Ridley with the building department permit submissions. Rollo & Ridley would be on site during all excavation inspecting and approving the work by a general contractor, and their excavation subcontractor and provide sometimes daily inspection reports pending the work that is being completed, pending what is going on at the site. Frank is happy to talk with anyone who has questions about excavation and shoring from a geotech standpoint.

In addition to that regular civil engineering survey monitoring is also a standard of care that would be implemented for adjacent structures and neighbors. Preconstruction surveys would be completed, and then points on buildings shot at a regular interval to make sure nothing is moving during the excavation, foundation and building process. I am happy to put anyone in touch with our civil engineers if they have questions on how they perform survey monitoring. We work with Lea & Braze Engineering.

I will try and touch base with Jeff in the morning tomorrow and see where he is on everything else - with school break/surgery etc he might not be able to get back to us until Monday.

Thanks,
Taylor

[Quoted text hidden]
May 28, 2013
Project Number 2753-01-13

Studio 12 Architecture
Attention: Jeff Burris
665 Third Street, #335
San Francisco, California 94107

RE: Report
Geotechnical Investigation
3927, 3929 & 3931 19th Street
San Francisco, California

This presents the results of our geotechnical investigation for the proposed residences at 3927, 3929 & 3931 19th Street in San Francisco, California. Our scope of work consisted of performing a site reconnaissance, reviewing selected geologic references, drilling three test borings, conducting laboratory testing, performing engineering analyses, and submitting this report summarizing geologic hazards at the site and presenting geotechnical conclusions and recommendations for the design and construction of the project. Our work was performed in accordance with our proposal dated May 13, 2013.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project will consist of three adjoining, five-story, single-family residences over subterranean garages. Retained cuts for the project will range to approximately 50 feet high. The project is shown on the plans by Studio 12 Architecture transmitted May 12, 2013.

WORK PERFORMED

Prior to performing our investigation, we reviewed selected geologic references. We explored the subsurface conditions in the project area on October 25, 2011 to the extent of three test borings ranging between approximately 14 to 15-1/2 feet deep, and extending into bedrock. Due to limited access, the test borings were drilled with portable drilling equipment. The locations of the test borings are shown on the attached Site Plan, Plate 1.
Our personnel observed the drilling, logged the subsurface conditions encountered, and collected soil samples for visual examination and laboratory testing. Samples were retrieved using Sprague and Henwood and Standard Penetration Test samplers driven with a 70-pound hammer. Penetration resistance blow counts were obtained by dropping the hammer through a 30-inch free fall. The samplers were driven 18 inches, and the number of blows was recorded for each 6 inches of penetration. These blow counts were then correlated to equivalent standard penetration resistance blow counts. The blows per foot recorded on the boring logs represent the accumulated number of correlated standard penetration blows that were required to drive the sampler the last 12 inches or fraction thereof.

Logs of the test borings are presented on Plates 2 through 4. The soils encountered are described in accordance with the criteria presented on Plate 5. Bedrock is described in accordance with the *Engineering Geology Rock Terms* presented on Plate 6. The logs depict our interpretation of subsurface conditions on the date and at the depths indicated. The stratification lines on the logs represent the approximate boundaries between soil types; the actual transitions may be gradational.

Selected samples were laboratory tested to determine their moisture content and dry density. Laboratory test results are posted on the boring logs in the manner described on the *Key to Test Data*, Plate 5.

Based on mapped orientations of observed fractures sets and shear surfaces, we performed kinematic analyses utilizing stereographic projections to evaluate critical modes of failure at different locations along the cliff face. Critical failure modes were subsequently re-examined to develop design criteria for shoring and retaining walls.

**FINDINGS**

**Site Conditions**

The site is located on the southern side of 19th Street, between Noe Street and Sanchez Street in San Francisco, California. The site is bounded on the east and west sides by residential buildings. The southern portion of the site is an approximately 50-foot to 60-foot high cliff which slopes up towards the south at inclinations of between approximately 1/2:1 and 1:1 (horizontal:vertical). The base of the western portion of the cliff is supported by a 3-1/2 to 4 foot high timber bulkhead, and the base of the eastern portion of the cliff is retained by an approximately 13-1/2 foot high concrete wall. The upper portion of the cliff exposes perched fills and colluvium (slopewash). Beneath the soils, the cliff generally exposes sheared and highly weathered metavolcanic (greenstone) bedrock, and the lower portion of the cliff exposes harder and more resistant greenstone. Fracture and shear surface attitudes within the cliff face are
variable and discontinuous as a result of previous tectonic movement. Prominent fracture sets were noted to strike towards the northwest and to dip between 80 and 85 degrees towards the northeast (adversely out-of-slope). Adverse fracture sets were also noted striking east-west and dipping approximately 60 degrees towards the north. Topping failures were noted on prominent northeast striking fracture sets which dip 65 degrees towards the southeast. Prominent shear surfaces were noted within the lower portion of the cliff striking towards the northwest and dipping 67 degrees towards the southwest, and within the middle portion of the cliff striking north-south and dipping between 35 and 45 degrees towards the west. The cliff face has been subject to previous sloughing and shallow instability.

Three wood-framed residences are situated upslope of the cliff. The houses are supported on spread footing foundations. Fills for yard areas below the two western-most houses are supported by 3-foot high timber retaining walls. Fills downslope of the easternmost house are supported by an approximately 8 to 8-1/2 foot high brick retaining wall.

**Subsurface Conditions**

The site is within the Coast Range Geomorphic Province, which includes San Francisco Bay and the northwest-trending mountains that parallel the coast of California. These features were formed by tectonic forces resulting in extensive folding and faulting of the area. Previous geologic mapping by Schlocker (1958) indicates that the site is underlain by Jurassic to Cretaceous aged greenstone bedrock of the Franciscan Assemblage.

Our test borings encountered fill and colluvium (slopewash) overlying bedrock. The fill encountered generally consists of loose silty gravel and of medium stiff gravelly clay. The colluvium encountered consists of soft gravelly silt, stiff to very stiff sandy clay and medium dense to dense clayey gravel. The fill and native soils encountered are relatively weak and compressible. Bedrock encountered in the borings generally consist of highly weathered, firm to hard greenstone.

The approximate test boring locations are shown on the *Site Plan* (Plate 1). The test borings encountered the following profiles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boring</th>
<th>Fill (feet)</th>
<th>Colluvium (feet)</th>
<th>Bedrock (feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>0-5.0</td>
<td>5.0-13.0</td>
<td>13.0-15.5+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0-9.0</td>
<td>9.0-14.2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-3</td>
<td>0-2.0</td>
<td>2.0-12.3</td>
<td>12.3-15.0+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptions of the subsurface conditions encountered are presented on the boring logs.
Groundwater

Free groundwater did not develop in the borings prior to backfilling. Groundwater levels at the site are expected to fluctuate over time due to variations in rainfall and other factors. Rainwater percolates through the relatively porous surface soils. On hillsides, the water typically migrates downslope in the form of seepage within the porous soils, at the interface of the soil/bedrock contact, and within the upper portions of the weathered and fractured bedrock.

GEOLOGIC AND SEISMIC HAZARDS

Fault Rupture

The property is not within a current Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone (EFZ), and we did not observe geomorphic features that would suggest the presence of active faulting at the site. As such, we judge that the risk of ground rupture along a fault trace is low at this site.

Ground Shaking

The San Francisco Bay Region has experienced several historic earthquakes from the San Andreas and other associated active faults. Mapped active faults (those experiencing surface rupture within the past 11,000 years) nearest the site are summarized in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fault</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Moment Magnitude</th>
<th>Acceleration (g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Kilometers</td>
<td>M^3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Andreas (Northern)</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seal Cove/San Gregorio</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Peak ground acceleration averaged from New Generation Attenuation (NGA) relationships by Abrahamson and Silva (2008), Boore and Atkinson (2008), Campbell and Bozorgnia (2008), Chiou and Youngs (2008) and Idriess (2008). Estimated shear wave velocity (V_s330) = 760 m/s. NGA values have been increased 16% to determine maximum rotated ground motion component per ASCE-7-05 Revision #3 (2009).
(3) M = mean value; M+1 = mean+1 standard deviation value.

Deterministic information generated for the site considering the proximity of active faults and estimated ground accelerations are presented in the table above. The estimated ground accelerations were derived from the above-referenced mean attenuation relationships, and are based on the published estimated maximum earthquake moment magnitudes for each fault, the
shortest distance between the site and the respective fault, the type of faulting, and the estimated shear wave velocities of the on-site geologic materials. The deterministic evaluation of the potential for ground shaking assumes that the anticipated maximum magnitude earthquake produces fault rupture at the closest proximity to the site, and does not take recurrence intervals or other probabilistic effects into consideration. This evaluation also does not consider directivity effects, topographic amplification, or other phenomena which may act to amplify ground motions.

Data presented by the Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities (USGS, 2008) estimates the chance of one or more large earthquakes (Magnitude 6.7 or greater) in the San Francisco Bay region within the next 30 years to be 63 percent. Consequently, we judge that the site will likely be subject to strong earthquake shaking during the life of the improvements.

**Liquefaction**

During severe ground shaking from earthquakes, liquefaction can occur in saturated, loose, cohesionless sands. The occurrence of this phenomenon is dependent on many factors, including the intensity and duration of ground shaking, soil density, particle size distribution, and position of the ground water table (Idriss and Boulanger, 2008). Previous regional mapping by California Divisions of Mines and Geology (CDMG, 1997) does not indicate that the site lies within an identified liquefaction hazard zone. In addition, the soils encountered in our test borings contain a high percentage of fine grained materials (silt and clay). Thus, we judge that the likelihood of liquefaction during ground shaking is low.

**Densification**

Densification can occur in low density, uniformly-graded sandy soils above the groundwater table. We judge that significant densification is unlikely to occur in the areas explored because of the relative dense condition and/or high silt and clay content of the soils encountered in the test borings.

**Landsliding**

Regional mapping by Shlocker (1958) does not indicate the presence of previous landsliding at the site, and mapping by the California Divisions of Mines and Geology (CDMG, 2001) does not indicate that the area to be susceptible to seismically induced landsliding. As previously discussed, the cliff face has experienced previous sloughing and shallow instability. We judge that the risk of future sliding will be mitigated by retention of the cliff by the walls proposed for the project.
CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results of our investigation, we conclude that the project is feasible from a geotechnical standpoint provided the recommendations presented in this report are incorporated into the project. The primary geotechnical concerns are discussed below.

Excavation and Shoring

If non-yielding (tiedback or rigidly braced) support is not provided during excavation, underpinning should be installed where excavations or overexcavations will extend below the foundations of adjacent residences. Underpinning may consist of deepened footings or drilled piers extending into bedrock below a 1:1 line projected up from the base of the planned excavation. Excavations for underpinning must be properly shored, and the underpinning designed or braced to resist anticipated lateral forces including lateral earth pressures.

Our investigation indicates that planned cuts will expose relatively weak soils and highly weathered bedrock which are subject to instability. It will therefore be necessary to shore excavations in order to maintain lateral support for adjacent areas. Shoring should be designed to resist lateral earth pressures and surcharge loads from structures and retaining walls using the design criteria presented in this report. Shoring, underpinning, and the stability of excavations and existing structures should be contractually established as solely the responsibility of the Contractor. It would be prudent to perform a detailed crack survey of this and adjacent improvements prior to beginning construction so that the validity of claims can be verified.

Our investigation indicates that deeper excavations will expose hard bedrock which will necessitate the use of heavy-duty, hydraulically-driven excavation equipment. Resistant zones of hard rock may require hoe-ramping, jack hammering and rock fracturing. Hard drilling or coring will be required to achieve the required penetrations for drilled piers and tiebacks.

Grading and Retaining Walls

It will be necessary to fully retain the entire cliff and all cuts with engineered retaining walls. Retaining walls should be supported on foundations which extend into undisturbed bedrock. Walls should be provided with adequate backdrainage to prevent hydrostatic buildup.

Foundation Support

Our test borings indicate that the project area is generally underlain by relatively weak soils which are subject to settlement under foundation loading. These soils will not suitable for the support of foundations. We therefore conclude that improvements should be supported in bedrock on spread footings or on drilled, cast-in-place, reinforced concrete piers. Spread footings will only be feasible in areas where level cuts expose bedrock, while drilled piers could
be used everywhere. We estimate that post construction differential settlements of foundations designed in accordance with the recommendations contained in this report will be on the order of half an inch.

**Slab Support**

In areas where excavations do not expose bedrock, it will be necessary to design slabs to span between foundations supported on bedrock.

**Geotechnical Drainage**

It will be necessary to provide perimeter subdrains and slab underdrains. All roofs should be provided with gutters and downspouts. Drains for the project should extend to the sewer in accordance with City and County standards.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Seismic Design**

Based on the results of our investigation, the following seismic design criteria were developed in accordance with the *California Building Code (2010)* and *International Building Code (2009)*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Class</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Coefficient $F_a$</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Coefficient $F_v$</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2 sec Spectral Acceleration $S_S$</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 sec Spectral Acceleration $S_1$</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2 sec Max Spectral Response $S_{MS}$</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 sec Max Spectral Response $S_{M1}$</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2 sec Design Spectral Response $S_{DS}$</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 sec Design Spectral Response $S_{D1}$</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Excavation and Underpinning**

Prior to beginning excavation, neighbors should be notified and given the opportunity to perform underpinning and other work they deem necessary. Unless tiedback or rigidly-braced shoring is provided, underpinning should be installed where excavations or overexcavations will extend will extend below the foundations of adjacent residences. Underpinning should consist of deepened pit footings or drilled, cast-in-place, reinforced concrete piers which extend into
bedrock located below a 1:1 line projected up from the base of planned excavations. The underpinning should be designed in accordance with the recommendations presented in the Foundations section of this report, and should be designed to resist lateral earth pressures acting above a 1:1 line projected up from the base of unretained excavations. The Contractor should slope temporary excavations no steeper than 1-1/2:1 and permanent excavations no steeper than 2:1, or should install shoring as the excavation proceeds in order to maintain lateral support. All temporary slopes and shoring should be contractually established as solely the responsibility of the Contractor. Shoring should be designed to resist lateral earth pressures and surcharge loading from structures and retaining walls as outlined in the Temporary Shoring section of this report.

**Temporary Shoring**

Support for excavations may be provided using cantilevered, tiedback, or internally braced lagged soldier pier and lagging walls. Cantilevered soldier piers and lagging should be designed to resist an active lateral earth pressure equivalent to a fluid weighing 45 pcf where retaining soil, 35 pcf where retaining bedrock. If tiebacks or bracing are used with the soldier piers, the shoring should be designed to resist uniform lateral earth pressures of 30xH psf and 23xH psf (where H is the height of the shoring in feet) in soil and rock, respectively. Shoring should be designed for additional surcharge loading from structures and walls as outlined in the Retaining Walls section of this report.

Soldier piers should consist of drilled, cast-in-place, reinforced concrete piers or isolated pit footings which are designed in accordance with the Foundations section of this report. Lagging should be installed promptly as the excavation progresses. Voids behind the lagging should be tightly backfilled with free-draining crushed rock or gravel (drain rock) to prevent yielding behind the wall. Vertical spacers should be provided between the lagging to allow seepage through the face of the wall. If the wall is to act as a permanent structure, at least 1 foot of drain rock or Caltrans Class 2 Permeable Material should be placed between the lagging and the cut face. If crushed rock or gravel is used, a filter fabric such as Mirafi 140N or equivalent should be provided between the drain rock and the cut face. If Class 2 Permeable Material is used, the filter fabric may be omitted. The upper 1 foot of the wall backfill should be compacted clayey soil to exclude surface water.

Tiebacks may be used in conjunction with the soldier piers to generate additional lateral resistance. It will be necessary to obtain appropriate easements where tiebacks will extend off of the property. The downward thrust from the tiebacks should be included when calculating the vertical load on the soldier piers. Tiebacks should be inclined downward at an angle of at least 15 degrees from the horizontal. The holes should be drilled without the use of driller's mud. Tiebacks should have minimum unbonded lengths of 10 and 15 feet for bars and strands, respectively. Tiebacks should have minimum bonded lengths of 12 feet in bedrock. The allowable skin friction of tiebacks will depend upon drilling method, grout installation pressure,
and workmanship. For estimating purposes, the portion of tiebacks grouted into bedrock located at least 5 feet beyond an imaginary 60 degree line extended upwards from the bottom of the planned excavation may impose a skin friction value of 2000 pounds per square foot (psf). The contractor should be responsible for determining the actual length of tiebacks necessary to resist design loads based on their familiarity with the installation method utilized. Our field engineer should be present to observe conditions during drilling.

Tieback materials, installation, corrosion protection and testing should conform to Recommendations for Prestressed Rock and Soil Anchors (Post-Tensioning Institute, latest edition). The tieback bars or strands should be double corrosion protected. The bars or strands should be positioned in the center of the holes, and the bonded length grouted in place from the bottom. If a frictionless sleeve is used over the unbonded length, the bars or strands may be initially grouted over their entire length. When the grout has attained the required compressive strength, the anchors should be proof tested to 1.33 times the design load as outlined by the Post-Tensioning Institute. Proof test loads should be held for 10 minutes, and the deflection at test load between the 1 and 10 minute readings should not exceed 0.04 inches. After testing, the tension in the anchor should be reduced to the design load and locked off. Replacement tiebacks should be installed for tiebacks that fail the load testing. Each row of tiebacks should be installed and load tested before proceeding further with the excavation.

**Foundations**

**Spread Footings**

Spread footings should be at least 18 inches wide, should be bottomed at least 18 inches into bedrock, and should extend at least 24 inches below finished grade. Footings should be stepped as necessary to produce level tops and bottoms, and should be deepened as necessary to provide at least 7 feet of horizontal clearance between the portion of footings designed to impose passive pressures and the face of the nearest slope or wall. Spread footings extending into competent bedrock can be designed to impose dead plus code live load bearing pressures and total design load bearing pressures of 4000 and 5300 psf, respectively.

Resistance to lateral pressures can be obtained in rock from passive pressures against the face of footings poured neat against rock, and from friction along the base of footings. We recommend the following criteria for design:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Passive Pressures} & = 450 \text{ pcf equivalent fluid pressure} \\
\text{Friction Factor} & = 0.40 \times \text{net vertical dead load}
\end{align*}
\]

* Neglect passive pressure in the top 12 inches where the surface is not confined by slabs.
Drilled Piers

Drilled piers should be at least 18 inches in diameter and should extend at least 6 feet into bedrock. The depth to bedrock may be estimated based on the boring logs. Design pier depths and diameters should be calculated by the Project Structural Engineer using the criteria presented below. The materials encountered in the pier excavations should be evaluated by our representative in the field during drilling.

Piers should be interconnected with grade beams to support structural loads. The portion of piers extending into bedrock at least 5 horizontal feet from the face of the nearest slope or wall can impose a passive equivalent fluid pressure of 450 pounds per cubic foot (pcf) acting over 2 pier diameters, and vertical dead plus real live loads of 1000 pounds per square foot (psf) in skin friction. These values may be increased by 1/3 for seismic and wind loads, but should be decreased by 1/3 for determining uplift resistance. End bearing should be neglected due to the uncertainty of mobilizing end bearing and skin friction simultaneously.

Groundwater may be encountered, in which case it will be necessary to dewater the holes and/or to place concrete by the tremie method. Caving soils may be encountered, in which case it will be necessary to case the holes. Casing should be carefully maintained ahead of the drill to avoid causing settlement of adjacent improvements. Casing should be removed from the holes simultaneous with concrete placement. If desired, casing in zones not imposing skin friction may remain in-place. Hard drilling or coring may be required to achieve required bedrock penetrations.

Retaining Walls

Retaining walls should be supported on foundations which are designed in accordance with the recommendations presented in this report. A minimum factor of safety of 1.5 against overturning and sliding should be used in the design of retaining walls.

Free-standing retaining walls supporting soil should be designed to resist active lateral earth pressures equivalent to those exerted by a fluid weighing 45 pounds per cubic foot (pcf) where the backslope is level, and 60 pcf for backfill at a 2:1 slope. Free-standing walls supporting bedrock should be designed to resist active lateral earth pressures equivalent to those exerted by a fluid weighing 35 pounds per cubic foot (pcf) where the backslope is level, and 50 pcf for backfill at a 2:1 slope. For intermediate slopes, interpolate between these values.

Retaining walls supporting soil and which are restrained from movement should be designed to resist an “at-rest” equivalent fluid pressure of 60 pcf for level backfill and 75 pcf for backfill at a 2:1 slope. Restrained walls supporting rock should be designed to resist an “at-rest” equivalent fluid pressure of 50 pcf for level backfill and 65 pcf for backfill at a 2:1 slope. For intermediate slopes, interpolate between these values.
Seismic wall stability should be evaluated based on a uniform lateral earth pressure of 12xH psf (where H is the height of the wall in feet). This pressure is in addition to the active equivalent fluid pressures presented in the report. For restrained walls, seismic pressures may be assumed to act in combination with active rather than at-rest earth pressures. The factor of safety against instability under seismic loading should be at least 1.1.

In addition to lateral earth pressures, retaining walls must be designed to resist horizontal pressures that may be generated by uphill retaining walls and foundation loads. Where an imaginary 1-1/2:1 (horizontal:vertical) plane projected downward from the base of an upslope retaining wall intersects the downslope wall, that portion of the downslope wall below the intersection should be designed for an additional horizontal uniform pressure equivalent to the maximum calculated lateral earth pressure at the base of the upslope wall. Where an imaginary 1-1/2:1 plane projected downward from the outermost edge of a surcharge load or footing intersects a retaining wall, we should be contacted to provide appropriate lateral surcharge criteria.

Retaining walls should be fully backdrained. The backdrains should consist of 4-inch diameter, rigid perforated pipe surrounded by a drainage blanket. The top of the drain pipe should be at least 8 inches below lowest adjacent downslope grade. The pipe should be PVC Schedule 40 or ABS with an SDR of 35 or better, and the pipe should be sloped to drain at least 1 percent by gravity in accordance with City and County of San Francisco standards. Accessible subdrain cleanouts should be provided, and should be maintained on a routine basis. The drainage blanket should consist of clean, free-draining crushed rock or gravel wrapped in a filter fabric such as Mirafi 140N. Alternatively, the drainage blanket could consist of Caltrans Class 2 "Permeable Material", in which case the filter fabric may be omitted. A prefabricated drainage structure such as Mirafi Miradrain may also be used provided that the backdrain pipe is embedded in at least 1 cubic foot of Class 2 Permeable Material or fabric-wrapped crushed rock per lineal foot of wall. The drainage blanket should be continuous, at least 1 horizontal foot thick, and should extend to within 1 foot of the surface. The uppermost 1 foot should be backfilled with compacted soil to exclude surface water.

Where migration of moisture through retaining walls would be detrimental or undesirable, retaining walls should be waterproofed as specified by the Project Architect or Structural Engineer.

Wall backfill should be spread in level lifts not exceeding 8 inches in thickness, brought to near the optimum moisture content, and compacted to at least 90 percent relative compaction. Relative compaction refers to the in-place dry density of a soil expressed as a percentage of the maximum dry density of the same material, as determined by the ASTM D1557 test procedure. Retaining walls will yield slightly during backfilling. Therefore, walls should be backfilled prior to building onto or adjacent to the walls. Backfilling adjacent to walls should be performed only
with hand operated equipment to avoid over-stressing the walls, and the walls should be properly braced during the backfilling operations.

Even well-compacted backfill will settle about 1 percent of its thickness. Therefore, slabs and other improvements crossing the backfill should be designed to span or to accommodate this settlement.

**Slabs**

In areas where slab subgrade excavations do not expose bedrock, slabs should be structurally supported by foundations founded in bedrock.

Slab subgrade within interior and garage areas should be sloped to drain into a 12 inch deep trench excavated in the downslope direction beneath the middle of each slab. The trenches should be lined completely with a filter fabric such as Mirafi 140N, or equivalent. A 4-inch diameter rigid-perforated PVC or ABS (Schedule 40, SDR 35 or equivalent) pipe should be placed on a 1-inch layer of drain rock at the bottom of the trench with perforations down. The trench should be backfilled with drain rock up to slab subgrade elevation. The filter fabric should be wrapped over the top of the drain rock. The pipe should be sloped to drain by gravity to a non-perforated pipe which discharges at an approved outlet. The trench for the non-perforated pipe should be backfilled with properly compacted soil.

Interior and garage slabs should be underlaid by a capillary moisture break consisting of at least 4 inches of free-draining, crushed rock or gravel (slab base rock) at least 1/4 inch, and no larger than 3/4 inch, in size. Moisture vapor detrimental to floor coverings or stored items will condense on the underside of slabs. A moisture vapor barrier should therefore be installed over the capillary break. The barrier should be specified by the slab designer. It should be noted that conventional concrete slab-on-grade construction is not waterproof. The local standard under-slab construction of crushed rock and vapor barrier will not prevent moisture transmission through slab-on-grade. Where moisture sensitive floor coverings are to be installed, a waterproofing expert and/or the flooring manufacturer should be consulted for their recommended moisture and vapor protection measures, including moisture barriers, concrete admixtures and/or sealants.

Non-structural slabs-on-grade should be at least 5 inches thick, and should be reinforced at least with #4 reinforcing bars spaced at 12 inches on-center each way to control cracking. All slabs should be designed by the project structural engineer.

**Geotechnical Drainage**

Positive drainage should be provided away from foundations. Ponding of surface water should not be allowed. All roofs should be provided with gutters and downspouts. Site drainage should be
conducted to the sewer in accordance with City and County of San Francisco standards. Conduit should consist of rigid PVC or ABS pipe which is Schedule 40, SDR 35 or equivalent. Downspouts and surface drains must be maintained entirely separate from foundation drains, underdrains and wall backdrains. Downspouts, surface drains and subsurface drains should be checked for blockage, and cleared and maintained on a regular basis.

**Supplemental Services**

Our conclusions and recommendations are contingent upon Herzog Geotechnical being retained to review the project plans and specifications to evaluate if they are consistent with our recommendations, and being retained to provide intermittent observation during pier drilling, footing excavation, tieback drilling and load testing, underdrain installation, backdrain installation, wall backfilling, and foundation drain installation. We should also be notified to observe the completed project. Steel, concrete, slab moisture barriers and/or waterproofing should be inspected by the designer. Inspection of underpinning should be performed by the underpinning designer.

If during construction subsurface conditions different from those described in this report are observed, or appear to be present, we should be advised at once so that these conditions may be reviewed and our recommendations reconsidered. The recommendations made in this report are contingent upon our being notified to review changed conditions.

If more than 18 months have elapsed between the submission of this report and the start of work at the site, or if conditions have changed because of natural causes or construction operations at or adjacent to the site, the recommendations of this report may no longer be valid or appropriate. In such case, we recommend that we review this report to determine the applicability of the conclusions and recommendations considering the time elapsed or changed conditions. The recommendations made in this report are contingent upon such a review.

We should be notified at least 48 hours before the beginning of each phase of work requiring our observation, and upon resumption after interruptions. These services are performed on an as-requested basis and are in addition to this geotechnical reconnaissance. We cannot provide comment on conditions, situations or stages of construction that we are not notified to observe.

**LIMITATIONS**

This report has been prepared for the exclusive use of Studio 12 Architecture and their consultants for the proposed project described in this report. Our services consist of professional opinions and conclusions developed in accordance with generally-accepted geotechnical engineering principles and practices. We provide no other warranty, either expressed or implied. Our conclusions and recommendations are based on the information provided us regarding the
proposed construction, the results of our field exploration and laboratory testing programs, and professional judgment. Verification of our conclusions and recommendations is subject to our review of the project plans and specifications, and our observation of construction.

The test boring logs represent subsurface conditions at the locations and on the dates indicated. It is not warranted that they are representative of such conditions elsewhere or at other times. Site conditions and cultural features described in the text of this report are those existing at the time of our field exploration and may not necessarily be the same or comparable at other times. The locations of the test borings were established in the field by reference to existing features, and should be considered approximate only.

Our investigation did not include an environmental assessment or an investigation of the presence or absence of hazardous, toxic or corrosive materials in the soil, surface water, ground water or air, on or below, or around the site, nor did it include an evaluation or investigation of the presence or absence of wetlands. Our work also did not address the evaluation or mitigation of mold hazard at the site.

We appreciate the opportunity to be of service to you. If you have any questions, please call us at (415) 388-8355.

Sincerely,

HERZOG GEOTECHNICAL

Craig Herzog, G.E. #2383
Principal Engineer

Attachments: References
Plates 1 through 6
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ASCE-7-05, 2009, *Proposal 2-8, Revision #3, SCOPE: Revise Sec. 16.1.3.2.*


EQUIPMENT: 4" Flight Auger
LOGGED BY: C.H.
START DATE: 10-25-11
FINISH DATE: 10-25-11

DARK RED-BROWN GRAVELLY CLAY (CL), medium stiff, dry, with roots (Fill)

11.7 88

RED-BROWN SANDY CLAY WITH GRAVEL (CL), stiff, moist, with decomposed greenstone and chert fragments

20.9 102

YELLOW-GRAY-RED-BROWN CLAYEY GRAVEL (GC), medium dense, moist, with greenstone and chert gravels

36

ORANGE-BROWN GREENSTONE, firm, friable to weak, highly weathered, with shear surfaces dipping 60° to near-vertical

comes hard at 15 feet

BOTTOM OF BORING 1 @ 15.5 FEET
No Free Water Encountered

* Converted to equivalent standard penetration blow counts.
** Existing ground surface at time of investigation.
RED-BROWN GRAVELLY SILT (ML), soft, dry

MOTTLED YELLOW-RED-BROWN CLAYEY GRAVEL (GC), dense, dry, with decomposed greenstone fragments

YELLOW-GRAY GREENSTONE, moderately hard, weak, highly weathered

becomes very hard at 12.5’
drilling refusal at 13’

BOTTOM OF BORING 2 @ 14.2 FEET
No Free Water Encountered

* Converted to equivalent standard penetration blow counts.
** Existing ground surface at time of investigation.
BROWN SILTY GRAVEL (GM), loose to medium dense, dry, with roots (Fill)

RED-BROWN GRAVELLY CLAY (CL), very stiff, dry

YELLOW-GREENISH-GRAY GREENSTONE, firm, friable to weak, highly weathered, sub-horizontal shear fractures

becomes hard at 15'

BOTTOM OF BORING 3 @ 15 FEET
No Free Water Encountered

* Converted to equivalent standard penetration blow counts.
** Existing ground surface at time of investigation.
### Unified Soil Classification System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR DIVISIONS</th>
<th>TYPICAL NAMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAVELS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than half coarse fraction is larger than No. 4 sieve</td>
<td>Clean Gravels with little or no fines: GW, GP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gravels with over 12% fines: GM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clays: GC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clays: SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SANDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than half coarse fraction is smaller than No. 4 sieve</td>
<td>Clean Sands with little or no fines: SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sands with over 12% fines: SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clays: SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clays: SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SILTS AND CLAYS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid limit less than 50</td>
<td>ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SILTS AND CLAYS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid limit greater than 50</td>
<td>CH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGHLY ORGANIC SOILS</strong></td>
<td>Pt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key to Test Data

- **Consol**: Consolidation
- **LL**: Liquid Limit (in %)
- **PL**: Plastic Limit (in %)
- **PI**: Plasticity Index
- **Gs**: Specific Gravity
- **SA**: Sieve Analysis
- **Undisturbed Sample (2.5-inch ID)**
- **2-inch-ID Sample**
- **Standard Penetration Test**
- **Bulk Sample**

**Shear Strength, psf**
- **TX**: 2630 (240) Unconsolidated Undrained Triaxial
- **TX sat**: 2100 (575) Unconsolidated Undrained Triaxial, saturated prior to test
- **DS**: 3740 (960) Unconsolidated Undrained Direct Shear
- **TV**: 1320 Torvane Shear
- **UC**: 4200 Unconfined Compression
- **LVS**: 500 Laboratory Vane Shear
- **FS**: Free Swell
- **EI**: Expansion Index
- **Perm**: Permeability
- **SE**: Sand Equivalent

**SOIL CLASSIFICATION CHART AND KEY TO TEST DATA**

**Job No:** 2763-01-11
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ROCK SYMBOLS

- SHALE OR CLAYSTONE
- CHERT
- SERPENTINITE
- SILTSTONE
- PYROCLASTIC
- METAMORPHIC ROCKS
- SANDSTONE
- VOLCANIC
- DIATOMITE
- CONGLOMERATE
- PLUTONIC
- SHEARED ROCKS

LAYERING

- MASSIVE
- THICKLY BEDDED
- MEDIUM BEDDED
- THINNLY BEDDED
- VERY THINNLY BEDDED
- CLOSELY LAMINATED
- VERY CLOSELY LAMINATED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layering Style</th>
<th>Thickness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MASSIVE</td>
<td>Greater than 6 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THICKLY BEDDED</td>
<td>2 to 6 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM BEDDED</td>
<td>8 to 24 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THINNLY BEDDED</td>
<td>2-1/2 to 8 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY THINNLY BEDDED</td>
<td>3/4 to 2-1/2 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOSELY LAMINATED</td>
<td>1/4 to 3/4 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY CLOSELY LAMINATED</td>
<td>Less than 1/4 inch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JOINT, FRACTURE, OR SHEAR SPACING

- VERY WIDELY SPACED
- WIDELY SPACED
- MODERATELY SPACED
- CLOSELY SPACED
- VERY CLOSELY SPACED
- EXTREMELY CLOSELY SPACED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spacing Style</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY WIDELY SPACED</td>
<td>Greater than 6 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIDELY SPACED</td>
<td>2 to 6 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY SPACED</td>
<td>8 to 24 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOSELY SPACED</td>
<td>2-1/2 to 8 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY CLOSELY SPACED</td>
<td>3/4 to 2-1/2 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY CLOSELY SPACED</td>
<td>Less than 3/4 inch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HARDNESS

- SOFT - Pliable; can be dug by hand
- FIRM - Can be gouged deeply or carved with a pocket knife
- MODERATELY HARD - Can be readily scratched by a knife blade; scratch leaves heavy trace of dust and is readily visible after the powder has been blown away
- HARD - Can be scratched with difficulty; scratch produces little powder and is often faintly visible
- VERY HARD - Cannot be scratched with pocket knife; leaves a metallic streak

STRENGTH

- PLASTIC - Capable of being molded by hand
- FRIABLE - Crumbles by rubbing with fingers
- WEAK - An unfractured specimen of such material will crumble under light hammer blows
- MODERATELY STRONG - Specimen will withstand a few heavy hammer blows before breaking
- STRONG - Specimen will withstand a few heavy ringing hammer blows and usually yields large fragments
- VERY STRONG - Rock will resist heavy ringing hammer blows and will yield with difficulty only dust and small flying fragments

DEGREE OF WEATHERING

- HIGHLY WEATHERED - Abundant fractures coated with oxides, carbonates, sulphates, mud, etc., thorough discoloration, rock disintegration, mineral decomposition
- MODERATELY WEATHERED - Some fracture coating, moderate or localized discoloration, little to no effect on cementation, slight mineral decomposition
- SLIGHTLY WEATHERED - A few stained fractures, slight discoloration, little or no effect on cementation, no mineral decomposition
- FRESH - Unaffected by weathering agents, no appreciable change with depth
Building Permits

Applications for Building Permits submitted to the Department of Building Inspection.

Report for: 3927 19TH ST

Active Permits

Permit 200808139076

Status: TRIAGE

Status Date: 8/13/2008

Erect 5 story single family dwelling. (3 story occupancy & 2 basements)

MORE DETAILS

Completed Permits

Permit 200808199543

Status: ISSUED

Status Date: 8/19/2008

Renew 200606234889. To complete work 200505091932, 200503258390 and 200503107169.

MORE DETAILS

Permit 200808078667

Status: CANCELLED

Status Date: 1/24/2011

Remodel interior, new building entry, raise roof, new exterior finish, new windows and doors.

MORE DETAILS

Permit 200608290928

Status: WITHDRAWN

Status Date: 7/16/2008

Proposed horizontal addition to accommodate 1 additional unit. Refer to 200503107169, 200606234889.
Permit 200606234889

Status: ISSUED

Status Date:

Complete work under pa #'s 200505091932, 200503258390 & 200503107169-renew permits.

Permit 200505091932

Status: ISSUED

Status Date:
5/9/2005

Install plywood wals & frame details asper plan

Permit 200503258390

Status: ISSUED

Status Date:
3/25/2005

Replace extg foundation voluntary upgrade as per plan

Permit 200503107169

Status: ISSUED

Status Date:
3/10/2005

New reinforced concrete retaining wall to reinforce (e) retaining at rear property line per plan.

Permit 200401285025

Status: ISSUED

Status Date:
1/28/2004

Reconfigure existing concrete stairs on grade with new concrete stairs to provide landings at a max

Additional Permits

Additional Permits (electrical, plumbing, etc) lodged with the Department of Building Inspections.
Permit Details Report

Report Date: 1/16/2020 3:40:03 PM

Application Number: 200808199543
Form Number: 8
Address(es): 3601 / 073 / 03927 19TH ST
Description: RENEW 200606234889. TO COMPLETE WORK 200505091932, 200503258390 AND 200503107169.
Cost: $25,100.00
Occupancy Code: R-3
Building Use: 27 - 1 FAMILY DWELLING

Disposition / Stage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Date</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/19/2008</td>
<td>TRIAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/19/2008</td>
<td>FILING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/19/2008</td>
<td>FILED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/19/2008</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/19/2008</td>
<td>ISSUED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact Details:

Contractor Details:
License Number: 791724
Name: TIM CLINTON
Company Name: DAWSON - CLINTON GEN CONTR CORP
Address: P.O.BOX 410475 ST * SAN FRANCISCO CA 94141-0000
Phone: 4154413473

Addenda Details:

Description:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Arrive</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>In Hold</th>
<th>Out Hold</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Checked By</th>
<th>Hold Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BID - INS</td>
<td>8/19/08</td>
<td>8/19/08</td>
<td>8/19/08</td>
<td>LOWREY DANIEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CPB</td>
<td>8/19/08</td>
<td>8/19/08</td>
<td>8/19/08</td>
<td>YAN BRENDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This permit has been issued. For information pertaining to this permit, please call 415-558-6096.

Appointments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointment Date</th>
<th>Appointment AM/PM</th>
<th>Appointment Code</th>
<th>Appointment Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Time Slots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Inspections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Date</th>
<th>Inspector</th>
<th>Inspection Description</th>
<th>Inspection Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Special Inspections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addenda No.</th>
<th>Completed Date</th>
<th>Inspected By</th>
<th>Inspection Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

For information, or to schedule an inspection, call 558-6570 between 8:30 am and 3:00 pm.

Online Permit and Complaint Tracking home page.

Technical Support for Online Services
If you need help or have a question about this service, please visit our FAQ area.
Tenant History

3927 19th Street:

- Has been vacant, and not offered for rent, for many years, likely since at least 2004.
- No clear record of last occupant since purchased by Tony Vella that year.
- Sold in 2014 as a vacant property

3929 19th Street:

- Last know owner occupant 2005-2008: Robert J. Allen
- Vacant with no long-term tenants since 2008
- Previous owner used as an Airbnb from time to time prior to registration requirements.
- Sold in 2014 as a vacant property
28'-6" (25%) BUILDING SEPARATION. ALL OBSTRUCTIONS REMOVED.

PLANTING AT REAR OF DECKS FOR ADD'L PRIVACY FOR HOUSES UP HILL.

OPEN SPACE; NON-HABITABLE ROOF ASSEMBLY; TYPICAL.
1501 MARIPOSA ST, SUITE 319
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107
415.503.0212

STUDIO 12
ARCHITECTURE

PERMIT NUMBER: 2019/06/05

19TH ST.
3927 19th Street.
San Francisco, CA 94110
3601 / 073

SITE PERMIT
2019/06/05

THIS PROJECT FALLS WITHIN THE LANDSLIDE HAZARD
AREA, AND IS SUBJECT TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE SLOPE PROTECTION ACT.
SFBC SEC's. 106A.4.1.4, 106A.4.1.4.3 and SFBC SEC. 106A.4.1.4.4.
PROPOSED NEW CONSTRUCTION OF A SECOND DETACHED DWELLING UNIT. A SINGLE DWELLING UNIT EXISTS IN THE REAR YARD OF THE SITE. NO WORK IS PROPOSED FOR THE AS TYPE V-B CONSTRUCTION. BUILDING TO BE FULLY NOT TO SCALE

DATA STORED PERmits, SHERIFF, DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING & PLANNING, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS, GENERAL CONTRACTOR, CONTRACTOR, ARCHITECT, ENGINEER, SPECIAL INSPECTOR, BUILDING OFFICIAL, DANGER OF FALLS AND OTHER HAZARDS.

ARCHITECTURAL, STRUCTURAL, CIVIL, LANDSCAPE, MECHANICAL, PLUMBING, ELECTRICAL, AND FIRE (WHETHER DEPICTED IN DRAWINGS OR NOT) WITH SAME DISCIPLINES.

THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL REPORT, IN WRITING, ANY AND ALL ERRORS, OMISSIONS, INCOMPLETE INFORMATION, OR CONFLICTS FOUND IN THE CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS TO THE OWNER AND ARCHITECT BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH THE WORK.

THE CONTRACTOR SHALL REVIEW AND VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS OF THE BUILDING AND SITE, NOTIFYING THE ARCHITECT OF ANY DISCREPANCIES BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH CONSTRUCTION.

EXAMINATION.

THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL REPORT, INWRITING, ANY AND ALL ERRORS, OMISSIONS, INCOMPLETE INFORMATION, OR CONFLICTS FOUND IN THE CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS TO THE OWNER AND ARCHITECT BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH THE WORK.

All temporary glass shall be affixed with a permanent label PER CBC 2406.2

13. MECHANICAL, PLUMBING, ELECTRICAL, AND PENETRATIONS OF FLOOR, WALLS, CEILINGS SHALL BE ASSEMBLED (VERTICAL AND HORIZONTAL) as per 2013 CBC SEC 718.2 & 718.3.

GRADE PLANE ANALYSIS: 172.16'+172.62'+220.02'+221.60' = 786.40' /4 = 197.6'

(DIAGRAMS)

D. STRUCTURAL OBSERVATION SHALL BE REQUIRED BY STRUCTURAL COMPLIANCE of the APPROVED PLANS per CBC Sec. 1704.5.

REVISION REFERENCE

14. DISCREPANCIES: WHERE a CONFLICT in REQUIREMENTS OCCURS BETWEEN the SPECIFICATIONS and DRAWINGS, or in the DRAWINGS, is NOT OBTAINED from the ARCHITECT or the ARCHITECT or the LOCATION where the CONTRACTOR shall be subject to REMOVAL or EXPOSURE.

17. PROVIDE SAFETY GLAZING at ALL HAZARDOUS LOCATIONS, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, GLAZING WITHIN 18 INCHES OF A VAPING SURFACE. GLAZING IN DOORS AND WINDOWS ADJACENT TO HAZARDOUS LOCATIONS, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, GLAZING WITHIN 18 INCHES OF A VAPING SURFACE.

15. CONTRACTOR SHALL INSURE THAT GUIDELINES SET FORTH in the DOCUMENTS ARE MAINTAINED DURING CONSTRUCTION, INSTALLATION, AND FINISHING of ALL ASPECTS of THIS PROJECT.

6. PROVIDE I.O.B. EVALUATION SERVICES INC. REPORT ON TEST DATA FOR ALL SKYLIGHTS.

22. SPECIAL INSPECTION of STRUCTURAL OBSERVATION IS NOT A SUBSTITUTE for INSPECTIONS by the BUILDING Official, AND THE SPECIAL INSPECTION IS NOT A SUBSTITUTE for INSPECTIONS by the SPECIAL INSPECTOR, CHIEF INSPECTOR, BUILDING OFFICIAL, or THE ARCHITECT.

MECHANICAL, PLUMBING, ELECTRICAL, and PENETRATIONS of FLOOR, WALLS, CEILINGS SHALL BE Sealed MANTAIN in ACCORDANCE with the SPECIAL INSPECTION and FIRE PROTECTION.

20. ALL WORKSHOPS shall BE SUBMITTED to the BUILDING Official PRIOR to REQUESTING permission for WELDING and GROUTING INSPECTION.

18. ALL TEMPERED GLASS shall BE AFFIXED WITH A PERMANENT LABEL PER CBC 2406.2

19. ALL SMOKED DETECTORS shall BE HARDwired.

21. SPECIAL INSPECTION of STRUCTURAL OBSERVATION IS NOT a SUBSTITUTE for INSPECTIONS by the SPECIAL INSPECTION is NOT a SUBSTITUTE for INSPECTIONS by the BUILDING Official, and THE SPECIAL INSPECTION is NOT a SUBSTITUTE for INSPECTIONS by the SPECIAL INSPECTOR, CHIEF INSPECTOR, BUILDING OFFICIAL, or THE ARCHITECT.

23. CONTRACTOR Must note on JOB CARD, in INSPECTION NOTES section, THAT STRUCTURAL OBSERVATION has BEEN PERFORMED and STRUCTURE is IN COMPLIANCE with the APPROVED PLANS plus any SPECIAL INSPECTION or BUILDING INSPECTION.

24. PLACE and Secure ALL ANCHOR BOLTS and OTHER ITEMS that are CAST in CONCRETE for FOUNDATION INSPECTION. WET SETTING ANCHOR BOLTS or REINFORCING AFTER PLACEMENT OF CONCRETE IS NOT ALLOWED.

25. SPECIAL INSPECTION is REQUIRED for WELDING and GROUTING INSPECTIONS.

16. FIREPLACE IN LIVING ROOM SHALL be APPROVED by the BUILDING OFFICIAL PRIOR to REQUESTING permission for WELDING and GROUTING INSPECTION.

26. FIREPLACE INLAYS ROOM shall BE APPROVED by the BUILDING OFFICIAL PRIOR to REQUESTING permission for WELDING and GROUTING INSPECTION.

27. GAS LINE SCHEMATIC DRAWING calculations, and FIRE SIZE shall BE APPROVED by the BUILDING OFFICIAL PRIOR to REQUESTING permission for WELDING and GROUTING INSPECTION.

28. THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT’s NOISE MAPS indicate THAT EXISTING AMBIENT NOISE LEVELS AT THE PROJECT SITE WERE EXCEEDED UNDER CURRENT AMBIENT NOISE LEVELS. THE PROJECT IS SUBMITTED to the LAURELINA NOISE INSULATION STANDARDS in TITLE 24 of the CALIFORNIA Code of REGULATIONS as PART of the ENVIRONMENTAL BEHAVIOR. THE DEPARTMENT WILL REQUIRE an ACoustical ANALYSIS of EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL BEHAVIOR. THE DEPARTMENT WILL REQUIRE an ACoustical ANALYSIS of EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL BEHAVIOR. THE DEPARTMENT WILL REQUIRE an ACoustical ANALYSIS of EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL BEHAVIOR. THE DEPARTMENT WILL REQUIRE an ACoustical ANALYSIS of EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL BEHAVIOR. THE DEPARTMENT WILL REQUIRE an ACoustical ANALYSIS of EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL BEHAVIOR.
Green Building: Site Permit Submittal

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

ALL PROJECTS, AS APPLICABLE
- Construction activity that involves the removal of more than 10,000 cubic yards of earth or the removal of more than 500 tons of earth that is the primary structure.
- Construction activity that involves the removal of more than 10,000 cubic yards of earth or the removal of more than 500 tons of earth that is the primary structure.
- Construction activity that involves the removal of more than 10,000 cubic yards of earth or the removal of more than 500 tons of earth that is the primary structure.
- Construction activity that involves the removal of more than 10,000 cubic yards of earth or the removal of more than 500 tons of earth that is the primary structure.
- Construction activity that involves the removal of more than 10,000 cubic yards of earth or the removal of more than 500 tons of earth that is the primary structure.
- Construction activity that involves the removal of more than 10,000 cubic yards of earth or the removal of more than 500 tons of earth that is the primary structure.

LEED PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Project Proposed (Indicate at right)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Requirements:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEED certification level (includes prerequisite):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base number of required points:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted for reduction in demolition, remediation, or existing building footprint:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Requirements:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Check all that apply)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEED prerequisite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEED prerequisite only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEED prerequisite only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEED prerequisite only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEED prerequisite only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEED prerequisite only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEED prerequisite only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEED prerequisite only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEED prerequisite only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEED prerequisite only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER APPLICABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Site Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3927 - 19TH STREET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructions:
As part of application for site permit, this form acknowledges the specific green building requirements that apply to a project under San Francisco Green Building Code, California Title 24 Part 11, and related codes. Attachments G52, G53, G54, or G55 will be due with the applicable addendum. To use the form:
(a) Provide basic information about the project in the box at left. This info determines which green building requirements apply.
(b) Indicate in one of the columns below which type of project is proposed. If applicable, fill in the blank lines below to identify the number of points the project must meet or exceed. A LEED or GreenPoint checklist is not required to be submitted with the site permit application, but using such tools as early as possible is strongly recommended.

Sold circuits or code references indicate measures required by state and local codes. For projects applying LEED or GreenPoint Rated, prerequisites of those systems are mandatory. See relevant codes for details.

GREENPOINT RATED PROJECTS

Proposing a GreenPoint Rated Project (Indicate by checking the box.)

Base number of GreenPoints Required: 75

Adjustment for reduction in demolition of historic features/building:

Final number of required points (base number +/- adjustment):

GreenPoint Rated (i.e. meets all prerequisites):

Better Roofs: Buildings of 10 occupied floors or less must install solar photovoltaic or wind energy systems in the 10% of roof area designated as Solar Ready per Title 24 Part 5 (2014).

Wiring for Electric Vehicle Charging: Provide 100% of parking spaces for electric vehicles, EN 50597, Table 12.

Energy Efficiency: Meet one GreenPoint Rated environmental objective. In homes with solar electricity, only heating and water heating, installation of photovoltaic systems is in compliance with San Francisco Better Roofs (above) may be applied to all electric path.

Most all California Green Building Standards Code requirements:

CaGreen measures for residential projects have been integrated into the GreenPoint Rated system.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Door Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>WIDTH</th>
<th>HEIGHT</th>
<th>THICKNESS</th>
<th>OPERATION</th>
<th>HARDWARE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Door Elevations**
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SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"
**PER CBC §1029.2**

**MINIMUM**

24"  

**PER CBC §1029.3**

**MAXIMUM**

44"  

**PER CBC 1029.2, EMERGENCY ESCAPE AND RESCUE OPENINGS**

SHALL HAVE A MINIMUM NET CLEAR OPENING OF 5.7 SQUARE FEET  

**EGRESS WINDOWS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WINDOW SCHEDULE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>PRODUCT ID</th>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>U-VALUE</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3'-2 3/4&quot; 2'-2 3/4&quot; 7 SF ALUM. 1&quot; DOUBLE-INSULATED TBD WESTERN WINDOWS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11'-1 1/2&quot; 4'-6 1/2&quot; 50 SF FIXED + CASEMENT ALUM. 1&quot; DOUBLE-INSULATED TBD WESTERN WINDOWS TEMPERED GLAZING PER CBC SEC 2406.4 / EGRESS WINDOW PER CBC 1029.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8'-0&quot; 4'-4&quot; 35 SF ALUM. 1&quot; DOUBLE-INSULATED TBD WESTERN WINDOWS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8'-0&quot; 5'-3 3/4&quot; 42 SF ALUM. 1&quot; DOUBLE-INSULATED TBD WESTERN WINDOWS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8'-7 1/2&quot; 14'-4 3/4&quot; 124 SF ALUM. 1&quot; DOUBLE-INSULATED TBD WESTERN WINDOWS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8'-2 1/4&quot; 5'-3 3/4&quot; 43 SF ALUM. 1&quot; DOUBLE-INSULATED TBD WESTERN WINDOWS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9'-2 1/2&quot; 11'-8 1/2&quot; 108 SF ALUM. 1&quot; DOUBLE-INSULATED TBD WESTERN WINDOWS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5'-8&quot; 6'-3&quot; 35 SF ALUM. 1&quot; DOUBLE-INSULATED TBD WESTERN WINDOWS TEMPERED GLAZING PER CBC SEC 2406.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8'-3 3/4&quot; 6'-10 3/4&quot; 57 SF ALUM. 1&quot; DOUBLE-INSULATED TBD WESTERN WINDOWS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8'-5 3/4&quot; 5'-3 3/4&quot; 45 SF ALUM. 1&quot; DOUBLE-INSULATED TBD WESTERN WINDOWS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9'-1&quot; 14'-2 1/2&quot; 129 SF FIXED + CASEMENT ALUM. 1&quot; DOUBLE-INSULATED TBD WESTERN WINDOWS TEMPERED GLAZING PER CBC SEC 2406.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9'-2 1/2&quot; 4'-9 1/2&quot; 44 SF ALUM. 1&quot; DOUBLE-INSULATED TBD WESTERN WINDOWS TEMPERED GLAZING PER CBC SEC 2406.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5'-9 3/4&quot; 14'-9&quot; 86 SF ALUM. 1&quot; DOUBLE-INSULATED TBD WESTERN WINDOWS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8'-7&quot; 5'-3 3/4&quot; 46 SF ALUM. 1&quot; DOUBLE-INSULATED TBD WESTERN WINDOWS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9'-4 3/4&quot; 24'-4&quot; 229 SF ALUM. 1&quot; DOUBLE-INSULATED TBD WESTERN WINDOWS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10'-8&quot; 5&quot; 0&quot; 53 SF ALUM. 1&quot; DOUBLE-INSULATED TBD WESTERN WINDOWS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10'-1&quot; 2'-9 1/2&quot; 28 SF ALUM. 1&quot; DOUBLE-INSULATED TBD WESTERN WINDOWS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10'-11 1/2&quot; 8'-4 1/4&quot; 92 SF ALUM. 1&quot; DOUBLE-INSULATED TBD WESTERN WINDOWS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8'-6 3/4&quot; 5'-3 3/4&quot; 45 SF ALUM. 1&quot; DOUBLE-INSULATED TBD WESTERN WINDOWS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10'-11&quot; 14'-8 1/4&quot; 160 SF ALUM. 1&quot; DOUBLE-INSULATED TBD WESTERN WINDOWS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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THIS PROJECT FALLS WITHIN THE LANDSLIDE HAZARD AREA, AND IS SUBJECT TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE SLOPE PROTECTION ACT.
SFBC SEC. 106A.1.4.1, 106A.4.1.4.3 and SFBC SEC. 106A.1.4.4.
GREEN BUILDING: Site Permit Submittal

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

Project Name: 3929 - 19TH STREET
Address: 3929 19TH STREET, San Francisco, CA 94110

Development Size:

- 5,099 SQ. FT.
- SINGLE FAMILY

Design Professional(s)/Firms & Date:
AB 12 TRADE ROOM ARCHITECTURE

ALL PROJECTS, AS APPLICABLE:

- Smoke Detector Requirements: Buildings over 40,000 sq. ft must include a fire alarm.
- Site Plan: Provide a site plan that includes the following features: walkways, streets, parking, landscaping, and utility easements.
- Construction Waste Management - Comply with the San Francisco Construction and Demolition Debris Ordinance.
- Recycling by Occupants: Provide adequate space and visual areas for storage, collection, and reclamation of disposable, recyclable and recyclable materials. Note: Administrative Bulletin 8(B) for details.

GREENPOINT RATED PROJECTS:

- Proposing a GreenPoint Rated Project (Indicate if by checking the box.)
- Base number of Greenpoint Ratings: 1D
- Adjustment for retention/denial of historic features/buildings
- Final number of required points (base number +/- adjustment)

GreenPoint Rated (i.e., meets all requirements):

- Better Roof:
- Better Walls:
- Low Emissivity Materials
- Low-Emissive Lighting
- Energy Efficiency: Meet one GreenPoint Rated energy/operations path. In homes with electrically only heating and water heating, installation of pre-engineered compliance with San Francisco Better Roofs (above) may apply all Electric path.
- Most all California Green Building Standards Code requirements
- CalGreen measures for residential projects have been integrated into the Greenpoint Rated system.

LEED PROJECTS:

Type of Project Proposed (Indicate at right):

- Overall Requirements:
  - LEED certification level (include prerequisites): GOLD
  - Base number of required points: 60
  - Adjustment for reduction/elimination of features/credits:

Specific Requirements: (An indicates a measure is required)

Energy Design
- Consist with California Title 24 for Part 2015 and meet LEED energy performance requirements (See EXHIBIT A).

Better Roofs:
- Buildings of 10 occupied floors or less must:
  - Meet steep roof requirements. 
  - Demonstrate a demonstrating the roof system's ability to drain excessive water:
  - Insure each building has a drainage plan approved

Greenpoint Enhanced Rainwater Harvesting

-stalks of 10% or more annual energy use reduction compared to the 2015 Title 24 (PAR). 

Additional Enriched Commissioning
- LEED prerequire

Water Use - 30% Reduction
- LEED prerequisite

NEED PROJECTS:

- Purchase Greenpoint certified renewable energy credits for 10% of electricity use (TED Ordinance)

Other Applicable Non-Residential Projects

- Other New Non-Residential
  - Requirement 2 adds one sq ft of office/retail to the floor area of M<0.200

Other Applicable Non-Residential Projects

- Energy: Comply with California Energy Code (Title 24 Part 2015)
- Better Roofs: Buildings over 10 occupied floors or less must:
  - Insure each building has a drainage plan approved
  - Meeting the roof system's ability to drain excessive water:
  - Demonstrate a demonstrating the roof system's ability to drain excessive water:
- Additional Cost: Any Greenpoint Rated project shall include additional costs.

- Fuel efficient vehicle and carpark parking:
  - Designate and mark parking for fuel efficient vehicles only:
  - Mark designated parking spaces for fuel efficient vehicles only.

Wiring for Electric Vehicle Charging:
- Prepare electrical systems for future installation of EV charging at 0% of parking spaces.

Water Meter:
- Provide automated for use projected to consume 1,000 gallons or more per month.

- Additon very

- Painting and Coatings:
  - Comply with VOC limits in the Air Resources Board and Architectural Coatings Guidelines while maintaining the California Code of Regulations (Title 17) for general purposes.

- Carpets:
  - Carpets: Any carpet used in the building shall be selected from the list provided by the LEED Certification Program.

- Acoustical Control:
  - Low and roll ceilings (CT 02, exterior ceilings, CT 12, party walls, and floor ceilings CT 40).
  - See CRC 107C

-eggies and Hotels:
- Do not receive equipment that contains CFOS or Chlorines.

Notes:
- Residents and non-residential projects of 1,000 sq. meters or more occupied floors must use the "Non-Residential High-Rise" column.
- Note: Residents with 0 or 3 or more occupied floors must use the "Non-Residential Low-Rise" column.

For additional information, please refer to the LEED GreenBuilding / SITE PERMIT CHECKLIST program.
### Door Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Swing</th>
<th>Hardware</th>
<th>Wall Type</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Thickness</th>
<th>Lockset</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001-1</td>
<td>Garage</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>001 - 1</td>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td>Sectional</td>
<td>Aluminum &amp; Wood</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>8' - 4&quot;</td>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td>Sectional</td>
<td>Aluminum &amp; Wood</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>8' - 4&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003-1</td>
<td>Stairwell</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>003 - 1</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>3' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>1 3/4&quot;</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>3' - 0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003-2</td>
<td>Stairwell</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Slide</td>
<td>Slide</td>
<td>003 - 2</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-1</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>101 - 1</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Passage</td>
<td>8' - 10 1/4&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 11 1/4&quot;</td>
<td>3/4&quot;</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Passage</td>
<td>8' - 10 1/4&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 11 1/4&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-3</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>DD</td>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>101 - 3</td>
<td>Slide</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>8' - 10 1/4&quot;</td>
<td>4' - 1 3/4&quot;</td>
<td>1/2&quot;</td>
<td>Slide</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>8' - 10 1/4&quot;</td>
<td>4' - 1 3/4&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103-1</td>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>103 - 1</td>
<td>1 3/4&quot;</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 8&quot;</td>
<td>1 3/4&quot;</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 8&quot;</td>
<td>1 3/4&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103-2</td>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>103 - 2</td>
<td>1 1/2&quot;</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 8&quot;</td>
<td>1 1/2&quot;</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 8&quot;</td>
<td>1 1/2&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104-1</td>
<td>Mech</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>104 - 1</td>
<td>1 3/4&quot;</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 8&quot;</td>
<td>1 3/4&quot;</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 8&quot;</td>
<td>1 3/4&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105-1</td>
<td>Stairwell</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>105 - 1</td>
<td>1 3/4&quot;</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 10&quot;</td>
<td>1 3/4&quot;</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 10&quot;</td>
<td>1 3/4&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-1</td>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>201 - 1</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>10' - 7 1/4&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 11 1/4&quot;</td>
<td>3/4&quot;</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>10' - 7 1/4&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 11 1/4&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-2</td>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>201 - 2</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>10' - 7 1/4&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 5 1/4&quot;</td>
<td>3/4&quot;</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>10' - 7 1/4&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 5 1/4&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-3</td>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Slide</td>
<td>Slide</td>
<td>201 - 3</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203-1</td>
<td>Powder</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>203 - 1</td>
<td>1 1/2&quot;</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 8&quot;</td>
<td>1 1/2&quot;</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 8&quot;</td>
<td>1 1/2&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204-1</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>204 - 1</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>9' - 1&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 10 3/4&quot;</td>
<td>3/4&quot;</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>9' - 1&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 10 3/4&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-1</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>301 - 1</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>3' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>3' - 0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302-1</td>
<td>Bedroom</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>302 - 1</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 10&quot;</td>
<td>1 3/4&quot;</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 10&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303-1</td>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>303 - 1</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 8&quot;</td>
<td>1 3/4&quot;</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 8&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304-1</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>304 - 1</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>9' - 6 1/4&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 10 1/2&quot;</td>
<td>3/4&quot;</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>9' - 6 1/4&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 10 1/2&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401-1</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>401 - 1</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>3' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>3' - 0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401-2</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>401 - 2</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>8' - 2 1/4&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 8 1/4&quot;</td>
<td>3/4&quot;</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>8' - 2 1/4&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 8 1/4&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402-1</td>
<td>Bedroom</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>402 - 1</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 10&quot;</td>
<td>1 3/4&quot;</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 10&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404-1</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>404 - 1</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 10&quot;</td>
<td>1 3/4&quot;</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 10&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404-2</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>404 - 2</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>9' - 6 1/4&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 10 1/2&quot;</td>
<td>3/4&quot;</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>9' - 6 1/4&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 10 1/2&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404-23</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>404-23</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>0' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>0' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>0&quot;</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>0' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>0' - 0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406-1</td>
<td>Master Bath</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>406 - 1</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 10&quot;</td>
<td>1 3/4&quot;</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 10&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406-2</td>
<td>Master Bath</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>406 - 2</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 8&quot;</td>
<td>1 1/2&quot;</td>
<td>Swing</td>
<td>Lever</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 8&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Door Elevation Drawings

---

**Drawn By:** [Name]

**Date:** [Date]

**Project Number:** [Number]

**Checked By:** [Name]

---

**Site Permit:** [Permit Number]

**Architect:** STUDIO 12 ARCHITECTURE

**Design:** [Design Firm]

**Contact:** [Contact Information]

---

**Scale:** 1/4" = 1'-0"
PER CBC §1029.2
MINIMUM 24”

PER CBC §1029.3
MAXIMUM 44”

PER CBC 1029.2
EMERGENCY ESCAPE AND RESCUE OPENINGS
SHALL HAVE A MINIMUM
NET CLEAR OPENING OF 5.7 SQUARE FEET

WINDOW SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARK</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>ORIENTATION</th>
<th>HEIGHT</th>
<th>WIDTH</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>OPERATION</th>
<th>FRAME</th>
<th>GLAZING</th>
<th>U-VALUE</th>
<th>MANUFACTURER</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101 - LIBRARY</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>8’ - 7”</td>
<td>8’ - 11”</td>
<td>77 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-Hung</td>
<td>Vinyl</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>101 - LIBRARY</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>8’ - 7”</td>
<td>5’ - 4”</td>
<td>46 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-Hung</td>
<td>Vinyl</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>205 - DINING</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>10’ - 1 1/2”</td>
<td>4’ - 7 1/4”</td>
<td>47 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-Hung</td>
<td>Vinyl</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>204 - LIVING</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>13’ - 4”</td>
<td>14’ - 6”</td>
<td>193 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>Double-Hung</td>
<td>Vinyl</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>202 - KITCHEN</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>9’ - 1 1/2”</td>
<td>3’ - 5 3/4”</td>
<td>32 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-Hung</td>
<td>Vinyl</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>201 - ENTRY</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>10’ - 9”</td>
<td>14’ - 0”</td>
<td>151 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>Double-Hung</td>
<td>Vinyl</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>204 - LIVING</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>10’ - 9”</td>
<td>3’ - 1”</td>
<td>33 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-Hung</td>
<td>Vinyl</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>304 - FAMILY</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>6’ - 10 1/4”</td>
<td>14’ - 2”</td>
<td>97 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-Hung</td>
<td>Vinyl</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>302 - BEDROOM</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>7’ - 10”</td>
<td>3’ - 5 3/4”</td>
<td>27 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-Hung</td>
<td>Vinyl</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>301 - READING</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>8’ - 11 3/4”</td>
<td>14’ - 4 3/4”</td>
<td>129 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-Hung</td>
<td>Vinyl</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>304 - FAMILY</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>7’ - 9 1/4”</td>
<td>3’ - 8”</td>
<td>28 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-Hung</td>
<td>Vinyl</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>106 - MASTER BATH</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>9’ - 2 1/4”</td>
<td>4’ - 7 1/4”</td>
<td>42 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-Hung</td>
<td>Vinyl</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>404 - MASTER BED</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>8’ - 9 3/4”</td>
<td>9’ - 8 1/4”</td>
<td>85 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-Hung</td>
<td>Vinyl</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>402 - BEDROOM</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>8’ - 6”</td>
<td>2’ - 3 3/4”</td>
<td>20 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-Hung</td>
<td>Vinyl</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>401 - OFFICE</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>9’ - 6 3/4”</td>
<td>14’ - 4 3/4”</td>
<td>138 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>Double-Hung</td>
<td>Vinyl</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>405 - DRESSING</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>9’ - 10”</td>
<td>3’ - 1”</td>
<td>30 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single-Hung</td>
<td>Vinyl</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUBJECT PROPERTY
3601 / 072
3929 19TH STREET
EXISTING SINGLE FAMILY HOUSE,
NO WORK PROPOSED.

EXISTING COTTAGE
3601 / 073
3927 19TH STREET
EXISTING SINGLE FAMILY HOUSE,
NO WORK PROPOSED.

EXISTING COTTAGE
3601 / 071
3931 19TH STREET
EXISTING SINGLE FAMILY HOUSE,
NO WORK PROPOSED.

NEIGHBORING PROPERTY
3601 / 074
3921, 3923, 3925 19TH STREET
4 STORY RESIDENTIAL

NEIGHBORING PROPERTY
3601 / 096 & 097
3939 & 3941 19TH STREET
5 STORY RESIDENTIAL

NEIGHBORING PROPERTY
3601 / 045
324 CUMBERLAND STREET
2 STORY RESIDENTIAL

NEIGHBORING PROPERTY
3601 / 047
328 CUMBERLAND STREET
3 STORY RESIDENTIAL

NEIGHBORING PROPERTY
3601 / 048
332 CUMBERLAND STREET
3 STORY RESIDENTIAL

NEIGHBORING PROPERTY
3601 / 092 & 093
336 & 338 CUMBERLAND STREET
1 STORY RESIDENTIAL

45% REAR YARD
51'-3 1/2" 62'-8 1/2"

45% SIDEWALK
15'-0"
LEVEL 0
171' - 2 1/4"

LEVEL 1
180' - 11 3/4"

LEVEL 2
191' - 4 1/2"

LEVEL 3
203' - 5 3/4"

LEVEL 4
214' - 0 3/4"

LEVEL 5
225' - 5 1/4"

EXISTING COTTAGE
3601 / 072
3929 19TH STREET
EXISTING SINGLE FAMILY HOUSE, NO WORK PROPOSED.

IN-SITU CONCRETE WALL.

GLAZING IN ALUM. GLAZING SYSTEM.

ENTRY DOOR.

42" GUARD RAIL.

EXTERIOR MATERIAL #1; HORIZONTAL WOOD SIDING, PAINTED.
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GLAZING IN ALUM. GLAZING SYSTEM.

ENTRY DOOR.
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REVISIONS:
STUDIO 12
ARCHITECTURE
1501 MARIPOSA ST, SUITE 319
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This project falls within the landslide hazard area and is subject to the provisions of the slope protection act. SFBC Sec. 106A.1.4.4 and SFBC Sec. 106A.1.4.3.
1. All construction, regardless of details or plans, shall comply with the following:

2016 San Francisco Building Code (SFBC)
2016 CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE (CBC)
2016 CALIFORNIA MECHANICAL CODE (CMC)
2016 CALIFORNIA ELECTRIC CODE (CEC)
2016 CALIFORNIA FIRE CODE
2016 CALIFORNIA PLUMBING CODE (CPMC)
2016 CALIFORNIA ENERGY CODE
2016 CALIFORNIA RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS CODE
2016 CALIFORNIA EXISTING BUILDING CODE
2016 CALIFORNIA FIRE CODE
2016 CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD

2. As well as any and all other governing codes and ordinances.

3. The contractor shall review and verify all dimensions of the building and site, notifying the architect of any discrepancies before proceeding with construction.

4. The general contractor shall verify and assume responsibility for all dimensions and site conditions. The general contractor shall inspect the existing site/building conditions and prepare a detailed report outlining any discrepancies encountered which could have reasonably been inferred from such an examination.

5. The general contractor shall be responsible for the coordination between architectural, structural, civil, electrical, mechanical, plumbing, etc. protection. This includes reviewing requirements of individual systems before orders are placed and/or work is installed, verifying all architectural details, and all finish conditions (whether depicted in drawings or not) with same discipline.

6. The general contractor shall report, in writing, any and all errors, omissions, incomplete information or conflicts found in the construction documents to the owner and architect before proceeding with the work.

7. Drawing information is not to be scaled. Written dimensions shall govern.

8. Details shown are typical. Similar details apply in similar conditions.

9. The general contractor shall be responsible for all records, and obtaining all required inspections to conform with local building and fire codes.

10. The general contractor shall provide and install sufficient backfill/balconies for all wall mounted fixtures and any other items attached to the walls.

11. Install all fixtures, equipment, and materials per manufacturers recommendations and the requirements of the codes. All appliances, fixtures, and equipment associated with plumbing, electrical, and mechanical systems shall be listed by a nationally recognized and approved agency.

12. Provide fire blocking and obstructions in all concealed draft openings (vertical and horizontal) as per 2016 CBC Sec 703.3.6.1.4 and 106A.4.1.4.4.

13. Mechanical, plumbing, electrical, and relocations of floors, walls, ceilings shall be sealed, painted, or in accordance with structural and fire protection codes.

14. Discrepancies where a conflict with requirements occurs between the specifications and drawings, or in the drawings, is not obtained from the architect before the building date, for any structural changes, it will be the contractor's responsibility to correct such.

15. The contractor shall ensure that guidelines set forth in the documents are maintained during construction, installation, and finishing of all aspects of the project.


17. Provide safety glazing at all hazardous locations, including but not limited to slabs within 18 inches of a walking surface. Glazing in doors and windows adjacent to stairs and balconies shall be safety glass.

18. All tempered glass shall be affixed with a permanent label for CBC 240.2

19. All smoke detectors to be hard wired.

20. All assemblies shall be approved construction.

21. Special inspection or structural observation is not a substitute for inspections by the building official. Items not approved shall be removed and discarded.

22. Structural observation shall be required for structural compliance of the approved plans per CBC Sec 1576.5.

23. Engineer must note on job card, in inspection notes section, that structural observation and been performed and structure is in compliance with approved plans prior to building inspection by San Francisco building inspector.

24. Place and secure all anchor bolts and other items to be cast in concrete at foundation inspection. Wet setting anchor bolts or reinforcements after placement of concrete is not allowed.

25. Special inspection is required for welding and epoxy set anchor bolts.

26. Fireplace bylaw room shall be approved by the building official prior to requesting any close-out or final payment.

27. Gas line schematic diagram, calculations, and fire size must be approved by the building official prior to requesting plumbing inspection.

28. The plumbing department's noise maps indicate that existing ambient noise levels at the project site meet exceed levels per applicable laws. The project is subject to the California noise insulation standards in Title 24 of the California code of regulations as a part of environment. The department will issue an acoustic analysis of the project to meet the standards. Noise insulation features identified and recommended by the analysis must be included in the design.
Green Building: Site Permit Submittal

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

Project Name: 3927 - 19th St.
Building: 3927 - 19TH
Address: 3927 19TH St., San Francisco, CA 94110
Occupants: 4,046 SQ. FT.
Type of occupied use: SINGLE FAMILY

ALL PROJECTS, AS APPLICABLE


Stormwater Control Plan: Projects disturbing 5,000 sq ft in combined or separate sewer areas, or requiring a 2,500 square foot in a separate sewer area, must implement a Stormwater Control Plan meeting SFRPCV Stormwater Management Requirements.

Revegetation: New buildings, 4,000 SQ FT gross floor area, must equalize a water budget. New buildings 10,000 sq ft or less may use available alternate water sources for toilet and urinal flushing and irrigation (SF Health Code 102).

Water efficient irrigation: Projects with 5,000 square feet or less modified landscape must comply with the SFRPCV Water Efficient Irrigation Ordinance.

Construction Waste Management: Comply with the San Francisco Construction & Demolition Debris Ordinance.

Recycling by Occupancy: Provide adequate space and equal access for storage, collection and handling of compostable, recyclable and landfill materials.

See Administrative Bulletin 868 for details.

GREENPOINT RATED PROJECTS

Proposing a GreenPoint Rated Project (Indicate all that apply by checking the box.)

- [ ] X

- [ ] Base number of GreenPoint credits required: 10
- [ ] Adjustment for retention/denial of historic features/building
- [ ] Final number of required points (base number +/- adjustment)

GreenPoint Rated (i.e. meets all prerequisites)

- [ ] Better Roofs: Buildings of 10 occupied floors or less must install green roofs or cool roofs in the 10% of roof area designated as Solar Ready per Title 24 Part 6 (2010)
- [ ] With Planning Department Approval, projects subject to Exceptional Stormwater Management Requirements may substitute living roof for all or a portion of solar energy systems. (See Planning Code Sec 140)
- [ ] Energy Efficiency: Meet one GreenPoint Rated Energy efficiency compliance path. In homes with electricity only, heating and cooling, installation of photovoltaics, or compliance with San Francisco Better Roofs (above) may be all that is required.
- [ ] Most all California Green Building Standards Code requirements: CalGreen measures for residential projects have been integrated into the GreenPoint Rated system.

LEED PROJECTS

Type of Project Proposed (Indicate all that apply)

Overall Requirements:

- [ ] LEED certification level (include prerequisites): GOLD SILVER SILVER GOLD GOLD GOLD
- [ ] Base number of required points: 50 50 50 60 60 60
- [ ] Adjustment for retention/denial of historic features/building
- [ ] First of required number of points (base number +/- adjustment)

Specific Requirements:

- [ ] (x) This project is a new project
- [ ] [ ] LEED prerequisite
- [ ] [ ] LEED prerequisite only
- [ ] [ ] LEED prerequisite with credit

Type of Project Proposed (Check box if applicable)

- [ ] GreenPoint Rated Projects
- [ ] Other Non-Residential Projects

OTHER APPLICABLE NON-RESIDENTIAL PROJECTS

- [ ] Add-on 1.000 sq ft of total project area

Instructions:

As part of application for site permit, this form acknowledges the specific green building requirements that apply to a project under San Francisco Green Building Code, California Title 24 Part 11, and related codes. Attached GS2, GS3, GS4, or GS5 will be due with the applicable addendum. To use the form:

(a) Provide basic information about the project in the box at left. This info determines which green building requirements apply. AND

(b) Indicate in one of the columns below which type of project is proposed. If applicable, fill in the blank lines below to identify the number of points the project must meet or exceed. A LEED or GreenPoint checklist is not required to be submitted with the site permit application, but using such tools as early as possible is strongly recommended.

Sold circle or code references indicate measures required by state and local codes. For projects applying LEED or GreenPoint Rated, prerequisites of those systems are mandatory. See relevant codes for details.

Notes

All residential projects of 4 or more occupied floors must meet the "Non-Residential High-Rise" column. Non-residential 3 or fewer occupied floors must meet the "Non-Residential Low-Rise" column. Projects of 4 or more residential roofs must meet "Multi-Family High-Rise" standard, including all prerequisites. The number of points required to achieve Silver depends on unit size. See LEED for Homes Mid-Rise Rating System to confirm the base number of points required.

[Signature] [Date]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DOOR SCHEDULE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>HINGE</th>
<th>OPERATION</th>
<th>HARDWARE</th>
<th>WALL TYPE</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>HEIGHT</th>
<th>WIDTH</th>
<th>THICKNESS</th>
<th>MANUFACTURER</th>
<th>MODEL</th>
<th>FINISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101-1</td>
<td>STUDY A</td>
<td>WOOD</td>
<td>WOOD</td>
<td>1 3/4&quot; Swing</td>
<td>LEVER PRIVACY</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-2</td>
<td>STUDY A</td>
<td>WOOD</td>
<td>WOOD</td>
<td>1/2&quot; Slide</td>
<td>ENTRY ENTRY</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-3</td>
<td>STUDY A</td>
<td>WOOD</td>
<td>WOOD</td>
<td>1/2&quot; Slide</td>
<td>ENTRY ENTRY</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-4</td>
<td>STUDY A</td>
<td>WOOD</td>
<td>WOOD</td>
<td>1/2&quot; Slide</td>
<td>ENTRY ENTRY</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102-1</td>
<td>BATH A</td>
<td>WOOD</td>
<td>WOOD</td>
<td>1 3/4&quot; Swing</td>
<td>LEVER PRIVACY</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103-1</td>
<td>BEDROOM 1 P</td>
<td>WOOD</td>
<td>WOOD</td>
<td>1 3/4&quot; Swing</td>
<td>LEVER PRIVACY</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103-2</td>
<td>BEDROOM 1 D</td>
<td>ALUM. &amp; GLAZ.</td>
<td>ALUM.</td>
<td>3/4&quot; Swing</td>
<td>ENTRY ENTRY</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104-1</td>
<td>BEDROOM 2 P</td>
<td>WOOD</td>
<td>WOOD</td>
<td>1 3/4&quot; Swing</td>
<td>LEVER PRIVACY</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-2</td>
<td>ENTRY M</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>3' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>0&quot; Slide</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-1</td>
<td>MEDIA M</td>
<td>ALUM.</td>
<td>ALUM.</td>
<td>0&quot; Slide</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303-3</td>
<td>FAMILY Q</td>
<td>ALUM. &amp; GLAZ.</td>
<td>ALUM.</td>
<td>1/2&quot; Slide</td>
<td>ENTRY ENTRY</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303-4</td>
<td>FAMILY Q</td>
<td>ALUM. &amp; GLAZ.</td>
<td>ALUM.</td>
<td>1/2&quot; Slide</td>
<td>ENTRY ENTRY</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402-7</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>0' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>3/4&quot; Swing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402-9</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>0' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>3/4&quot; Swing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402-14</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>0' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>3/4&quot; Swing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402-15</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>0' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>3/4&quot; Swing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402-17</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 6&quot;</td>
<td>1 1/2&quot; Slide</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402-19</td>
<td>HH</td>
<td>8' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>3' - 9&quot;</td>
<td>1 1/2&quot; Slide</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402-20</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 8&quot;</td>
<td>1 1/2&quot; Slide</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402-21</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 8&quot;</td>
<td>1 1/2&quot; Slide</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402-22</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 6&quot;</td>
<td>1 1/2&quot; Slide</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402-23</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 10&quot;</td>
<td>1 3/4&quot; Swing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402-24</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 10&quot;</td>
<td>1 3/4&quot; Swing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402-26</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 10&quot;</td>
<td>1 3/4&quot; Swing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402-27</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>3' - 0&quot;</td>
<td>0&quot; Slide</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE:
CONTRACTOR TO MAINTAIN SAFE AND UNINTERRUPTED ACCESS AND EGRESS FOR EXISTING STAIR EASEMENT.
1. EXISTING UNIT. 1 PROPOSED UNIT. 2 TOTAL.

2. TWO UNIT RESIDENTIAL

GENERAL NOTES

1. 2016 SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE (SFBC)
2. 2016 CALIFORNIA MECHANICAL CODE
3. 2016 CALIFORNIA FIRE CODE
4. 2016 CALIFORNIA PLUMBING CODE
5. 2016 CALIFORNIA ELECTRIC CODE
6. 2016 CALIFORNIA ENERGY CODE
7. 2016 CALIFORNIA HISTORICAL BUILDING CODE
8. 2016 CALIFORNIA EXISTING BUILDING CODE
9. 2016 CALIFORNIA FIRE CODE

AS WELL AS ANY AND ALL OTHER GOVERNING CODES AND ORDINANCES.

IN THE EVENT OF CONFLICT, THE MOST STRINGENT REQUIREMENTS SHALL APPLY.

THE CONTRACTOR SHALL REVIEW AND VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS OF THE BUILDING AND SITE.

NOTIFYING THE ARCHITECT OF ANY DISCREPANCIES BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH CONSTRUCTION.

THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL INSPECT THE EXISTING SITE/BUILDING CONDITIONS.

VERIFY ALL ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS AND ALL FINISH CONDITIONS (WHETHER DEPICTED IN DRAWINGS OR NOT) WITH SAME DISCIPLINES.

THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL REPORT, IN WRITING ANY AND ALL ERRORS, OMISSIONS, INCOMPLETE INFORMATION OR CONFLICTS FOUND IN THE CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS TO THE OWNER AND ARCHITECT BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH THE WORK.

DRAWING INFORMATION IS NOT TO BE SCALDED. WRITTEN DIMENSIONS SHALL GOVERN.

DETAILS SHOWN ARE TYPICAL. SIMILAR DETAILS APPLY IN SIMILAR CONDITIONS.

THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ANY AND ALL REQUIRED INSPECTIONS TO CONFORM TO LOCAL BUILDING AND FIRE CODES.

THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE AND INSTALL SUFFICIENT BACKING BLOCKS FOR ALL WALL MOUNTED FIXTURES AND ANY OTHER ITEMS ATTACHED TO THE WALLS.

INSTALL ALL FIXTURES, EQUIPMENT, AND MATERIALS PER MANUFACTURER'S RECOMMENDATIONS AND THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE CODES. ALL APPLIANCES, FIXTURES, AND EQUIPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH PLUMBING, ELECTRICAL, AND MECHANICAL SYSTEMS SHALL BE LISTED BY A NATIONALY RECOGNIZED AND APPROVED AGENCY.

PROVIDE FIRE-BLOCKING AND DEVICES AT ALL CONCEALED DRAFT OPENINGS (VERTICAL AND HORIZONTAL) AS DEPICTED IN THE DRAWINGS.

MECHANICAL, PLUMBING, ELECTRICAL, AND FINISHING OF FLOOR LEVELS, WALLS, CEILINGS SHALL BE SEEN FASTENED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE SPECIFICATIONS AND DRAWINGS, OR AS THE DRAWINGS AND A REVISION OF THE CODES PERMITTED OR RECOMMENDED FOR THE BUILDING SITE. NO MORE STRINGENT REQUIREMENTS WILL BE INCLUDED IN THE CONTRACT.

THE CONTRACTOR SHALL ENSURE THAT GUIDELINES SET FORTH IN THE DOCUMENTS ARE MAINTAINED DURING CONSTRUCTION, INSTALLATION, AND FINISHING OF ALL ASPECTS OF THIS PROJECT.

PROVIDE I.C.O.E. EVALUATION SERVICES INC. REPORT ON TEST DATA FOR ALL SKYLIGHTS.

PROVIDE SAFETY GLAZING AT ALL HAZARDOUS LOCATIONS. INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO GLAZING WITHIN 30 INCHES OF A WALKING SURFACE.

10. ALL TEMPERED GLASS SHALL BE AFFIXED WITH A PERMANENT LABEL PER CBC 246.2

11. ALL SMOKE DETECTORS TO BE HARD WIRED.

12. ALL ASSEMBLIES TO BE APPROVED CONSTRUCTION.

21. SPECIAL INSPECTION or STRUCTURAL OBSERVATION IS NOT A SUBSTITUTE FOR INSPECTION BY THE BUILDING INSPECTOR, AS REQUIRED UNDER THE AUTHORIZED CODES. THE CONTRACTOR IS LIABLE FOR PAYMENT OF SPECIAL INSPECTION FEES WHICH SHALL BE PAID TO THE CONTRACTOR AT THE TIME OF RECEIVING THE SPECIAL INSPECTION OFFICIAL.

22. SPECIAL INSPECTION or STRUCTURAL OBSERVATION SHALL BE REQUIRED TO STRUCTURAL COMPLIANCE OF THE APPROVED PLANS PER CBC Sec 17504.

23. ENGINEER MUST NOTE ON JOB CARD, IN INSPECTION NOTES SECTION, THAT STRUCTURAL OBSERVATION AND BEEN PERFORMED AND STRUCTURE IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE APPROVED PLANS PRIOR TO BUILDING INSPECTION BY SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING INSPECTOR.

24. PLACE AND SECURE ALL ANCHOR BOLTS AND OTHER ITEMS TO BE CAST IN CONCRETE BY FOUNDATION INSPECTION. WHEN INSPECTOR NOTIFIES REINFORCEMENT AFTER PLACEMENT OF CONCRETE IS NOT ALLOWED.

25. SPECIAL INSPECTION IS REQUIRED TO WELDING AND FUSION SET ANCHOR BOLTS.

15. GAS LINE SCHEMATIC DIAGRAM, CALCULATIONS, AND FIRE SIZE MUST BE APPROVED BY THE BUILDING OFFICIAL PRIOR TO REQUESTING AN APPROVAL PRIOR TO READING TO THE CONTRACTOR TO PERFORM ANY WORK.

27. GAS LINE SCHEMATIC DIAGRAM, CALCULATIONS, AND FIRE SIZE MUST BE APPROVED BY THE BUILDING OFFICIAL PRIOR TO REQUESTING AN APPROVAL PRIOR TO READING TO THE CONTRACTOR TO PERFORM ANY WORK.

TWO UNIT RESIDENTIAL

PROPOSED NEW CONSTRUCTION OF A SECOND DETACHED DwELLING UNIT AT A SINGLE STORY MULTIFAMILY DWELLING EXISTING IN THE BEAR YARD OF THE SITE. NO WORK IS PROPOSED FOR THE PROVIDED DWELLING UNIT, THE PROVIDING DWELLING UNIT IS DEEMED TO BE A FURTHER REMODELED PERMITS FOR THE SECOND UNIT.

SITE LOCATION:

Green Building: Site Permit Submittal

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>5920 - 19th st.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>3929 19TH ST, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square Feet</td>
<td>60,000 SQ. FT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>A0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ALL PROJECTS, AS APPLICABLE


Stormwater Control Plan: Projects disturbing over 5,000 sq ft in combined or separate areas, or covering over 2,500 sq ft in a separate cover area, must implement a Stormwater Control Plan meeting SFPUC Stormwater Management Requirements.


Greenpoint Rated Projects

Proposing a GreenPoint Rated Project (Indicate all by checking the box.)

Leed Certifications

Leed Projects

Type of Project Proposed: A0.03

Overall Requirements:

- Leed Certification: A0.03

- Base number of required points: 50

- Adjustment for reduction of demolition and re-use of existing buildings: A0.04

Specific Requirements:

Construction Waste Management — 75% Diversion (A0.05) A0.05

Energy Design

- Leed prerequisite A0.06

- Leed prerequisite A0.07

Other Requirements

- Leed prerequisite A0.08

- Leed prerequisite only

- Other New Non-Residential

- Other New Residential

- Green Building / Site Permit Checklist

Leed Projects

Non Large Commercial

- Non Large Residential

- New High-Rise Commercial

- Large End-Use Commercial Data

- Commercial Roof Arrangement

- Residential Roof Arrangement

Other applicable non-residential projects


- Better Roofs: Buildings of 10 occupied floors or less must: Insulate all exterior wall surfaces with R-9.0 or greater insulation, all interior walls with R-5.0 or greater insulation, all windows with SHGC of 0.50 or less. Energy Design: Compare with California Title 24 part 4 (2012)

- Lighting: Insulate all exterior wall surfaces with R-9.0 or greater insulation, all interior walls with R-5.0 or greater insulation, all windows with SHGC of 0.50 or less. Energy Design: Compare with California Title 24 part 4 (2012)

- Water Conservation: Provide water savings for projects to consume 1,000 gallons or less per day for buildings over 500 sq ft only.

- Indoor Water Conservation: Provide water savings for projects to consume 1,000 gallons or less per day for buildings over 500 sq ft only.

- Commissioning: Projects with 10,000 to 25,000 square feet must perform commissioning. Projects with 25,000 square feet or more must perform commissioning. Energy Design: Compare with California Title 24 part 4 (2012)

- Air Tightness: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- Outdoor Air Infiltration: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- HVAC: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- Insulation: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- Roof Insulation: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- Parking: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- Site Development: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- Other Requirements: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- Air Tightness: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- Outdoor Air Infiltration: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- HVAC: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- Insulation: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- Roof Insulation: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- Parking: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- Site Development: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- Other Requirements: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- Air Tightness: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- Parking: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- Other Requirements: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- Site Development: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- Roof Insulation: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- HVAC: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- Insulation: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- Parking: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- Site Development: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- Other Requirements: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- Air Tightness: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- Outdoor Air Infiltration: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- HVAC: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- Insulation: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- Roof Insulation: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- Parking: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- Site Development: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.

- Other Requirements: Provide high-performance air barriers in all buildings.
### Door Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Door Frame Dimensions

- **Wall Type**: Comment
- **Material Type**: Material
- **Width**: Width
- **Height**: Height
- **Thickness**: Thickness
- **Operation**: Operation
- **Type**: Type
- **Manufacturer**: Manufacturer
- **Model**: Model
- **Finish**: Finish
- **No. of Hinges**: No. of Hinges
- **Closer**: Closer
- **Sectional**: Sectional
- **SFBC SEC 406.3.3**: SFBC SEC 406.3.3

#### Doors

- **001-1**: GARAGE
- **001-2**: ENTRY
- **003-1**: STAIRWELL
- **003-2**: STAIRWELL
- **101-1**: LIBRARY
- **101-3**: LIBRARY
- **103-1**: BATH
- **104-1**: MECH
- **105-1**: STAIR WELL
- **201-1**: ENTRY
- **201-2**: ENTRY
- **201-3**: ENTRY
- **203-1**: POWDER
- **204-1**: 10' 7 1/4" 2' 5 1/4" 3/4" Swing
- **301-1**: READING
- **302-1**: BEDROOM
- **304-2**: D 9' 1" 2' 10 3/4" 3/4" Swing
- **404-2**: D 9' 6 1/4" 2' 10 1/2" 3/4" Swing
- **404-3**: A 7' 0" 2' 8" 1 3/4" Swing
- **404-5**: C 7' 0" 3' - 0" 1 1/2" Slide
- **404-6**: C 7' 0" 3' - 0" 1 1/2" Slide
- **404-7**: P 7' 0" 2' 10" 1 3/4" Swing
- **404-8**: P 7' 0" 2' 10" 1 3/4" Swing
- **404-10**: A 7' 0" 2' 8" 1 3/4" Swing
- **406-1**: MASTER BATH
- **406-2**: MASTER BATH

#### Hardware

- **Lockset**: Lockset
- **Manufacturer**: Manufacturer
- **Model**: Model
- **Finish**: Finish

---

**Drawn By**: [Name]
**Date**: [Date]
**Project Number**: [Number]

**REVISIONS**

**STUDIO 12 ARCHITECTURE**
1501 MARIPOSA ST, SUITE 319
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107
415.503.0212

**DY/DX LLC**
516A DIAMOND ST.
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114
415.654.5767

**SITE PERMIT**
2020/08/25

**SCALE**: 1/4" = 1'-0"
PER CBC §1029.2
MINIMUM 24" PER CBC §1029.3
MAXIMUM 44"

PER CBC 1029.2, EMERGENCY ESCAPE AND RESCUE OPENINGS SHALL HAVE A MINIMUM NET CLEAR OPENING OF 5.7 SQUARE FEET

WINDOW SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>WINDOW SCHEDULE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>ORIENTATION</th>
<th>HEIGHT</th>
<th>WIDTH</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>OPERATION</th>
<th>FRAME</th>
<th>GLAZING</th>
<th>U-VALUE</th>
<th>MANUFACTURER</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101 - LIBRARY</td>
<td>8' - 7&quot;</td>
<td>8' - 11&quot;</td>
<td>77 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>101 - LIBRARY</td>
<td>8' - 7&quot;</td>
<td>5' - 4&quot;</td>
<td>46 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>205 - DINING</td>
<td>10' - 1 1/2&quot;</td>
<td>4' - 7 1/4&quot;</td>
<td>47 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>204 - LIVING</td>
<td>13' - 4&quot;</td>
<td>14' - 6&quot;</td>
<td>193 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>202 - KITCHEN</td>
<td>6' - 8 3/4&quot;</td>
<td>3' - 7 3/4&quot;</td>
<td>25 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>201 - ENTRY</td>
<td>8' - 10&quot;</td>
<td>8' - 11&quot;</td>
<td>79 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>204 - LIVING</td>
<td>10' - 9&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 10&quot;</td>
<td>30 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8' - 7 1/4&quot;</td>
<td>4' - 7 1/4&quot;</td>
<td>40 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>304 - FAMILY</td>
<td>6' - 10 1/4&quot;</td>
<td>14' - 2&quot;</td>
<td>97 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>302 - BEDROOM</td>
<td>6' - 6&quot;</td>
<td>3' - 7 3/4&quot;</td>
<td>24 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>301 - READING</td>
<td>8' - 4&quot;</td>
<td>10' - 11 3/4&quot;</td>
<td>91 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>304 - FAMILY</td>
<td>7' - 9 3/4&quot;</td>
<td>3' - 9 3/4&quot;</td>
<td>30 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>106 - MASTER BATH</td>
<td>9' - 2 1/4&quot;</td>
<td>4' - 7 1/4&quot;</td>
<td>42 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>404 - MASTER BED</td>
<td>9' - 1 3/4&quot;</td>
<td>9' - 4 1/4&quot;</td>
<td>85 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>402 - BEDROOM</td>
<td>7' - 7&quot;</td>
<td>3' - 1 1/2&quot;</td>
<td>24 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>401 - OFFICE</td>
<td>5' - 8 1/2&quot;</td>
<td>11' - 5&quot;</td>
<td>65 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>405 - DRESSING</td>
<td>8' - 4 1/4&quot;</td>
<td>3' - 5 1/4&quot;</td>
<td>29 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3' - 5 1/4&quot;</td>
<td>2' - 11 1/4&quot;</td>
<td>10 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2' - 4 1/4&quot;</td>
<td>6' - 10&quot;</td>
<td>16 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 25, 2020

RE: Discretionary Review Resolution & Settlement
Building Permit No.: 2008.0813.9077
Planning No.: 2014.0243DRP and DRP-02
[3927 19th Street, Block 3601 Lot 073] & [3929 19th Street, Block 3601/Lot 072]
DR Filed by Carolyn Kenady & Bruce Bowen, dated 10.7.2019

Following Discretionary Review (“DR”) Applications filed by the Dolores Heights Improvement Club (“DHIC”) - the long-standing neighborhood association representing Dolores Heights - the Project sponsor met with DHIC and a group of neighbors on 19th street in person, by phone, and over email to work to resolve the items as outlined below.

As a result of the neighbor meeting in November 2019 and subsequent correspondence, conversations and the final meeting on August 6, 2020 both Carolyn Kenady and Bruce Bowen, the applicants on behalf of DHIC, have agreed to withdraw the Discretionary Review (“DR”) Requests filed on or about October 7, 2019 with the following notes and modifications to the Project.

All items listed in the DR are hereby resolved with no additional changes needed to the Project other than as specifically outlined below. With these modifications, the DR requestors are in full support of the Project.

**Item 1: Failure to meaningfully follow Planning’s process for public notice and discussion.**

RESOLVED

**Item 2: Excavation and construction risks on steep hillside**

Project Sponsor shared soils report with neighbors and agrees to share the final shoring and structural designs once completed for DBI approval. Project sponsor also agrees to provide an excavation monitoring plan, ongoing neighbor meetings/updates as needed, adjacent property survey monitoring and soils reporting and observation during construction.
Item 3: Access to neighbors to their homes

Project sponsor to add to general plans the following: “Contractor to maintain safe and uninterrupted access and egress for existing stair easement.”

Item 4 & 5: Plan for the cottages in the rear of the lots

Project sponsor agrees to renovate the cottages under separate permits.

Language has been included on plans that “Renovation of cottages is under separate permit.”

Project Sponsor agrees that after receipt of a Site Permit for either 3927 or 3929 19th Street, a separate renovation permit for renovation of the cottages will be submitted. Project Sponsor agrees to submit such permits as soon as practicable after approval of said Site Permits, but in no case later than the start of construction on either 3927 or 3929 19th Street property.

Item 6: Minimum rear yard space

DR applicants are in support of the Variance (2014.0243VAR) as currently filed due to unique site and slope conditions to create a flat rear yard space between buildings at required percentage of open space. In their support letter, DR applicants will also request the Zoning Administrator to ensure that any variance decisions include the standard condition that any future physical expansion will require review by the Zoning Administrator, and may require a new variance application. See attached and updated plans dated August 25, 2020.

Item 7 & 8: Configuration of lots and existing structures create greater issues related to light, air, privacy and access & Building Scale and Form

See updated plans dated August 25, 2020 which include new stepped back façade for 3927 19th Street and updated East Elevation. Roof Decks have been eliminated from 3927 & 3929 19th as well. Project Sponsors agree not to file subsequent permit applications for roof decks.
As Resolved,

Carolyn Kenady
9/3/2020

Bruce Bowen
9/2/2020

Christine Wade, Manager
9/1/2020

Liberty Hill Holdings LLC
NOTE:
CONTRACTOR TO MAINTAIN SAFE AND UNINTERRUPTED ACCESS AND EGRESS FOR EXISTING STAIR EASEMENT.
- Subject Property
  - 3601 / 072
  - 3929 19th Street

- Neighboring Property
  - 3601 / 073
  - 3927 19th Street

- Neighboring Property
  - 3601 / 071
  - 3931 19th Street

19th Street.

- Proposed Exit Access / Light and Air Easement between properties, 2' - 0" east to west of 3929 19th St. and 2' - 0" east to west of 3931 19th St. plus area shown.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 072
  - 3929 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 073
  - 3927 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 071
  - 3931 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 073
  - 3929 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 071
  - 3931 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 073
  - 3929 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 071
  - 3931 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 073
  - 3929 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 071
  - 3931 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 073
  - 3929 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 071
  - 3931 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 073
  - 3929 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 071
  - 3931 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 073
  - 3929 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 071
  - 3931 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 073
  - 3929 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 071
  - 3931 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 073
  - 3929 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 071
  - 3931 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 073
  - 3929 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 071
  - 3931 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 073
  - 3929 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 071
  - 3931 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 073
  - 3929 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 071
  - 3931 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 073
  - 3929 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 071
  - 3931 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 073
  - 3929 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 071
  - 3931 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 073
  - 3929 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 071
  - 3931 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 073
  - 3929 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 071
  - 3931 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 073
  - 3929 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 071
  - 3931 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 073
  - 3929 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 071
  - 3931 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 073
  - 3929 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 071
  - 3931 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 073
  - 3929 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 071
  - 3931 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 073
  - 3929 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 071
  - 3931 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 073
  - 3929 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 071
  - 3931 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 073
  - 3929 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 071
  - 3931 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 073
  - 3929 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.

- Existing Cottage
  - 3601 / 071
  - 3931 19th Street
  - Existing Single Family House, No Work Proposed.