Discretionary Review
Abbreviated Analysis
HEARING DATE: FEBRUARY 8, 2018

Date: January 29, 2018
Case No.: 2015-001542DRP
Project Address: 2514 Balboa Street
Permit Application: 2015.01.28.6899
Zoning: RH-2 (Residential House, Two-Family)
40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 1596/015
Project Sponsor: Derek Vinh, ICE Design
90 South Spruce Ave, Ste. K
South San Francisco, CA 94080
Staff Contact: Sara Vellve – (415) 588-6263
SaraVellve@sfgov.org
Recommendation: Do not take DR and approve as revised.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposal is to add one dwelling unit and construct horizontal and vertical additions to the existing two-story single-family dwelling. The first and second floors would be extended to the rear by approximately 20 feet. The proposed third floor would cover the entire footprint of the expanded first and second floors. The proposed fourth floor would be set back from the front and rear façades by 15 feet, and 5 feet from the east side property line facing the DR requestor’s property. A roof deck would be located at the rear of the fourth floor.

SITE DESCRIPTION AND PRESENT USE

The site is located towards the east end of the subject block near the intersection with 26th Avenue in the Outer Richmond District. The lot is a “key” lot and the DR requestor’s property is adjacent to the subject property and fronts on 26th Avenue. 2514 Balboa Street is presently used as a single-family dwelling and the proposal would add one dwelling unit.

SURROUNDING PROPERTIES AND NEIGHBORHOOD

Of the six properties on the subject blockface, the subject property is one of two that are two stories tall, with the remaining buildings being three stories tall. The opposite block face contains one two-story and one four-story building fronting Balboa Street. The property immediately across Balboa Street is three stores and fronts on 26th Avenue. The adjacent properties to the east front on 26th Avenue and are two stories, except for the building at the corner of Balboa Street and 26th Avenue, which is three stories. The DR requestor’s property is two stories.
**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 TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>311 Notice</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>January 31 – March 2, 2017</td>
<td>March 2, 2017</td>
<td>February 8, 2018</td>
<td>±337 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</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>10 days</td>
<td>January 30, 2018</td>
<td>January 30, 2018</td>
<td>10 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailed Notice</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>January 30, 2018</td>
<td>January 30, 2018</td>
<td>10 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>5 (including DR Requestor)</td>
<td>2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other neighbors on the block</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These properties front on 26th Avenue. are multi-unit buildings and it is unclear how many neighbors occupy them.

**DR REQUESTOR**

Jack Wong, 693 26th Avenue, SF, CA 94141. Adjacent neighbor to the east fronting 26th Avenue.

**DR REQUESTOR’S CONCERNS AND PROPOSED ALTERNATIVES**


**PROJECT SPONSOR’S RESPONSE TO DR APPLICATION**


**ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

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

In response to the request for Discretionary Review, the Residential Design Advisory Team (RDAT) recommended modifications which are described below.

- Replicate the window size, recess and type of the second floor to the façade of the proposed third floor. Matching the existing second-floor façade bay window would require exceptions to the Code for which there is no justifiable hardship.
- Replicate the parapet design and detailing at the proposed third floor.
- Set the fourth floor back from the front and rear façades by 15 feet.
- Set the fourth floor back from the east side property line by 5 feet.

The project sponsor submitted revised plans incorporating the RDAT’s recommendations and the Department finds that the project as revised meets the standards of the Residential Design Guidelines and that, as revised, the project does not contain or create an exceptional or extraordinary circumstances.

The DR Requestor is also concerned about issues not related to the *Residential Design Guidelines*. These concerns and the Department’s responses are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DR Concerns</th>
<th>Planning Department Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unpermitted Units</td>
<td>The ground floor habitable space meets the requirements of ZA Bulletin No. 1 as it does not contain a full or half bath, or wet bar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of View</td>
<td>The Planning Code does not protect private views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mold, Sewage, Ventilation</td>
<td>These considerations are not within the Department’s purview. The subject property is ± 21 feet from the DR requestor’s property.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**RECOMMENDATION:** Do not take DR and approve project as revised

**Attachments:**
Block Book Map  
Sanborn Map  
Zoning Map  
Aerial Photographs  
Context Photographs  
Section 311 Notice  
Categorical Exemption  
DR Application  
Response to DR Application dated January 22, 2018  
Reduced Plans
Parcel Map
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The Sanborn Maps in San Francisco have not been updated since 1998, and this map may not accurately reflect existing conditions.
Aerial Photo

Number of opposition letters.
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NOTICE OF BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION (SECTION 311/312)

On January 28, 2015, the Applicant named below filed Building Permit Application No. 2015.01.28.6899 with the City and County of San Francisco.

Notices of Building Permit Applications (Section 311/312) are required to be published in the official newspapers of the City and County of San Francisco. The notice must be published at least two times, with the second publication occurring within 10 days of the first. This notice is published at least 15 days before the Expiration Date. The owner of the property or a person residing within 150 feet of the proposed project will receive a written copy of the notice. You are not required to take any action. For more information about the proposed project, or to express concerns about the project, please contact the Applicant listed above or the Planner named below as soon as possible. If you believe that there are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances associated with the project, you may request the Planning Commission to use its discretionary powers to review this application at a public hearing. Applications requesting a Discretionary Review hearing must be filed during the 30-day review period, prior to the close of business on the Expiration Date shown below, or the next business day if that date is on a 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.

For more information, please contact Planning Department staff:
Planner: Wayne Farrens
Telephone: (415) 575-9172
E-mail: wayne.farrens@sfgov.org

Notice Date: 1/31/2017
Expiration Date: 3/02/2017
GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT PROCEDURES

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

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

1. Request a meeting with the project Applicant to get more information and to explain the project’s impact on you.
2. Contact the nonprofit organization Community Boards at (415) 920-3820, or online at [www.communityboards.org](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 to discuss your concerns.

If, after exhausting the procedures outlined above, you still believe that exceptional and extraordinary circumstances exist, you have the option to request that the Planning Commission exercise its discretionary powers to review the project. These powers are reserved for use in exceptional and extraordinary circumstances for projects which generally conflict with the City’s General Plan and the Priority Policies of the Planning Code; therefore the Commission exercises its discretion with utmost restraint. This procedure is called Discretionary Review. If you believe the project warrants Discretionary Review by the Planning Commission, **you must file a Discretionary Review application prior to the Expiration Date shown on the front of this notice.** Discretionary Review applications are available at the Planning Information Center (PIC), 1660 Mission Street, 1st Floor, or online at [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org). You must submit the application in person at the Planning Information Center (PIC) between 8:00am - 5:00pm Monday-Friday, with all required materials and a check payable to the Planning Department. To determine the fee for a Discretionary Review, please refer to the Planning Department Fee Schedule available at [www.sfplanning.org](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, on-line, 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.
# CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination

## PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Address</th>
<th>Block/Lot(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2514 Balboa Street</td>
<td>1569/015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Permit No.</th>
<th>Plans Dated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-001542ENV</td>
<td>201501286899</td>
<td>06/12/2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **✓** Addition/Alteration
- **☐** Demolition (requires HRER if over 45 years old)
- **☐** New Construction
- **☐** Project Modification (GO TO STEP 7)

Project description for Planning Department approval.

Vertical addition to add 3rd & 4th floors to existing two-story home single-family home. Addition of one new dwelling unit. Facade modifications.

## STEP 1: EXEMPTION CLASS

**TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

*Note: If neither class applies, an Environmental Evaluation Application is required.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class 1 — Existing Facilities. Interior and exterior alterations; additions under 10,000 sq. ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class 3 — New Construction/Conversion of Small Structures. Up to three (3) new single-family residences or six (6) dwelling units in one building; commercial/office structures; utility extensions; change of use under 10,000 sq. ft. if principally permitted or with a CU. Change of use under 10,000 sq. ft. if principally permitted or with a CU.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>✓</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class__</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>☐</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## STEP 2: CEQA IMPACTS

**TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

If any box is checked below, an *Environmental Evaluation Application is required.*

- **☐** Air Quality: Would the project add new sensitive receptors (specifically, schools, day care facilities, hospitals, residential dwellings, and senior-care facilities) within an Air Pollution Exposure Zone? Does the project have the potential to emit substantial pollutant concentrations (e.g., backup diesel generators, heavy industry, diesel trucks)? *Exceptions: do not check box if the applicant presents documentation of enrollment in the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) Article 38 program and the project would not have the potential to emit substantial pollutant concentrations.* (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Cate Determination Layers > Air Pollutant Exposure Zone)

- **☐** Hazardous Materials: If the project site is located on the Maher map or is suspected of containing hazardous materials (based on a previous use such as gas station, auto repair, dry cleaners, or heavy manufacturing, or a site with underground storage tanks): Would the project involve 50 cubic yards or more of soil disturbance - or a change of use from industrial to residential? If yes, this box must be checked and the project applicant must submit an Environmental Application with a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. *Exceptions: do not check box if the applicant presents documentation of enrollment in the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) Maher program, a DPH waiver from the*
Maher program, or other documentation from Environmental Planning staff that hazardous material effects would be less than significant (refer to EP_ArcMap > Maher layer).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation:</th>
<th>Does the project create six (6) or more net new parking spaces or residential units? Does the project have the potential to adversely affect transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle safety (hazards) or the adequacy of nearby transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archeological Resources:</td>
<td>Would the project result in soil disturbance/modification greater than two (2) feet below grade in an archeological sensitive area or eight (8) feet in a non-archeological sensitive area? (refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Archeological Sensitive Area)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment:</th>
<th>Does the project site involve a subdivision or lot line adjustment on a lot with a slope average of 20% or more? (refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Topography)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slope = or &gt; 20%:</td>
<td>Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Topography) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seismic: Landslide Zone:</td>
<td>Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Seismic Hazard Zones) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seismic: Liquefaction Zone:</td>
<td>Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Seismic Hazard Zones) If box is checked, a geotechnical report will likely be required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If no boxes are checked above, GO TO STEP 3. If one or more boxes are checked above, an Environmental Evaluation Application is required, unless reviewed by an Environmental Planner.

- Project can proceed with categorical exemption review. The project does not trigger any of the CEQA impacts listed above.

Comments and Planner Signature (optional): Erica Russell

---

**STEP 3: PROPERTY STATUS – HISTORIC RESOURCE**

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

PROPERTY IS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING: (refer to Parcel Information Map)

- Category A: Known Historical Resource. GO TO STEP 5.
- Category B: Potential Historical Resource (over 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 4.
- Category C: Not a Historical Resource or Not Age Eligible (under 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 6.
### STEP 4: PROPOSED WORK CHECKLIST  
**TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

Check all that apply to the project.

1. **Change of use and new construction.** Tenant improvements not included.
2. **Regular maintenance or repair** to correct or repair deterioration, decay, or damage to building.
3. **Window replacement** that meets the Department's *Window Replacement Standards*. Does not include storefront window alterations.
4. **Garage work.** A new opening that meets the *Guidelines for Adding Garages and Curb Cuts*, and/or replacement of a garage door in an existing opening that meets the Residential Design Guidelines.
5. **Deck, terrace construction, or fences** not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
6. **Mechanical equipment installation** that is not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
7. **Dormer installation** that meets the requirements for exemption from public notification under *Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 3: Dormer Windows*.
8. **Addition(s)** that are not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way for 150 feet in each direction; does not extend vertically beyond the floor level of the top story of the structure or is only a single story in height; does not have a footprint that is more than 50% larger than that of the original building; and does not cause the removal of architectural significant roofing features.

Note: Project Planner must check box below before proceeding.

- [x] Project is not listed. **GO TO STEP 5.**
- [ ] Project does not conform to the scopes of work. **GO TO STEP 5.**
- [ ] Project involves four or more work descriptions. **GO TO STEP 5.**
- [ ] Project involves less than four work descriptions. **GO TO STEP 6.**

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

Check all that apply to the project.

1. Project involves a **known historical resource** (CEQA Category A) as determined by Step 3 and conforms entirely to proposed work checklist in Step 4.
2. **Interior alterations** to publicly accessible spaces.
3. **Window replacement** of original/historic windows that are not “in-kind” but are consistent with existing historic character.
4. **Facade/storefront alterations** that do not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.
5. **Raising the building** in a manner that does not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.
6. **Restoration** based upon documented evidence of a building’s historic condition, such as historic photographs, plans, physical evidence, or similar buildings.
7. **Addition(s)**, including mechanical equipment that are minimally visible from a public right-of-way and meet the *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*.
8. **Other work consistent** with the *Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* (specify or add comments):
9. Other work that would not materially impair a historic district (specify or add comments):

(Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator)

10. Reclassification of property status. (Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator)

- [x] Reclassify to Category C
- [ ] Reclassify to Category A

a. Per HRER dated: ____________ (attach HRER)
b. Other (specify): Per PTR form signed on 12/7/2016.

Note: If ANY box in STEP 5 above is checked, a Preservation Planner MUST check one box below.

- [ ] Further environmental review required. Based on the information provided, the project requires an Environmental Evaluation Application to be submitted. GO TO STEP 6.
- [x] Project can proceed with categorical exemption review. The project has been reviewed by the Preservation Planner and can proceed with categorical exemption review. GO TO STEP 6.

Comments (optional):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preservation Planner Signature: Stephanie Cisneros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**STEP 6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION**

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

- [ ] Further environmental review required. Proposed project does not meet scopes of work in either (check all that apply):
  - [ ] Step 2 – CEQA Impacts
  - [ ] Step 5 – Advanced Historical Review

STOP! Must file an Environmental Evaluation Application.

- [x] No further environmental review is required. The project is categorically exempt under CEQA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planner Name: Stephanie A Cisneros</th>
<th>Signature: Stephanie Cisneros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Building Permit

If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project.

Signature: Digitally signed by Stephanie Cisneros
DN: dc=org, dc=sfgov, dc=ityplanning, ou=CityPlanning, ou=Current Planning, cn=Stephanie Cisneros
email=Stephanie.Cisneros@sfgov.org
Date: 2016.12.14 10:52:53 -08'00'

Once signed or stamped and dated, this document constitutes a categorical exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code.

In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, an appeal of an exemption determination can only be filed within 30 days of the project receiving the first approval action.
STEP 7: MODIFICATION OF A CEQA EXEMPT PROJECT
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER
In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, when a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exempt project changes after the Approval Action and requires a subsequent approval, the Environmental Review Officer (or his or her designee) must determine whether the proposed change constitutes a substantial modification of that project. This checklist shall be used to determine whether the proposed changes to the approved project would constitute a "substantial modification" and, therefore, be subject to additional environmental review pursuant to CEQA.

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Address (If different than front page)</th>
<th>Block/Lot(s) (If different than front page)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case No.</td>
<td>Previous Building Permit No. New Building Permit No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans Dated</td>
<td>Previous Approval Action New Approval Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Modified Project Description:

DETERMINATION IF PROJECT CONSTITUTES SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

Compared to the approved project, would the modified project:

☐ Result in expansion of the building envelope, as defined in the Planning Code;

☐ Result in the change of use that would require public notice under Planning Code Sections 311 or 312;

☐ Result in demolition as defined under Planning Code Section 317 or 19005(f)?

☐ Is any information being presented that was not known and could not have been known at the time of the original determination, that shows the originally approved project may no longer qualify for the exemption?

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

DETERMINATION OF NO SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

☐ The proposed modification would not result in any of the above changes.

If this box is checked, the proposed modifications are categorically exempt under CEQA, in accordance with prior project approval and no additional environmental review is required. This determination shall be posted on the Planning Department website and office and mailed to the applicant, City approving entities, and anyone requesting written notice.

Planner Name: Signature or Stamp:
# PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW FORM

**Preservation Team Meeting Date:** [Blank]  
**Date of Form Completion:** 12/1/2016

## PROJECT INFORMATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planner:</th>
<th>Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Cisneros</td>
<td>2514 Balboa Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block/Lot:</th>
<th>Cross Streets:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1569/015</td>
<td>26th Avenue &amp; 27th Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEQA Category:</th>
<th>Art. 10/11:</th>
<th>BPA/Case No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2015-001542ENV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PURPOSE OF REVIEW:

- CEQA
- Article 10/11
- Preliminary/PIC
- Alteration
- Demo/New Construction

## DATE OF PLANS UNDER REVIEW:

06/12/2014

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

**Additional Notes:**  
Submitted: Supplemental Information for Historic Resource Determination prepared by Derek Vinh (dated June 20, 2015).

Proposed Project: Vertical addition to add 3rd & 4th floors to existing two-story single-family home. Addition of one new dwelling unit. Facade modifications.

## PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW:

### Category:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic District/Context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Property is individually eligible for inclusion in a California Register under one or more of the following Criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 1 - Event:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 2 - Persons:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 3 - Architecture:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 4 - Info. Potential:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of Significance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Property is in an eligible California Register Historic District/Context under one or more of the following Criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 1 - Event:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 2 - Persons:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 3 - Architecture:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 4 - Info. Potential:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of Significance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Contributor  
- Non-Contributor
Complies with the Secretary's Standards/Art 10/Art 11:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

CEQA Material Impairment to the individual historic resource:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

CEQA Material Impairment to the historic district:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Requires Design Revisions:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Defer to Residential Design Team:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

PRESERVATION TEAM COMMENTS:

According to the Supplemental Information for Historic Resource Determination prepared by Derek Vinh (dated June 20, 2015) and information found in the Planning Department files, the subject property at 2514 Balboa Street contains a one-story-over-garage, wood-frame, single-family residence designed in a vernacular style. The subject property was constructed in 1920 (source: water tap record) by builder and original owner N. J. Nelson and, soon after construction, was sold to and occupied by Horace Walling, manager of Printers Machine Supply Co., and his wife Margaret. Known exterior alterations to the subject property include installation of two aluminum windows in the living room and dining room (1976) installation of front gate with expanded metal (1977).

No known historic events occurred at the subject property (Criterion 1). Nelson appears to have constructed a number of residential properties throughout San Francisco, however preliminary research indicates that most of his developments were not of architectural importance. None of the owners or occupants have been identified as important to history (Criterion 2). The subject property is a nondescript example of a vernacular style single-family residence. The building is not architecturally distinct such that it would qualify individually for listing in the California Register under Criterion 3.

The subject property is not located within the boundaries of any identified historic district. The subject property is located in the Outer Richmond neighborhood on a block that exhibits a variety of architectural styles, mostly vernacular in nature, and construction dates ranging from 1919 to 1965. Together, the immediate block does not comprise a significant concentration of historically or aesthetically unified buildings.

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

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

(Handwritten Signature)  
12-7-2016

SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
APPLICATION FOR 
DISCRETIONARY REVIEW

1. Owner/Applicant Information

DR APPICANT'S NAME: Jack Wong

DR APPLICANT'S ADDRESS: 693 26th Ave

ZIP CODE: 91121

TELEPHONE: 415-524-5187

PROPERTY OWNER WHO IS DOING THIS PROJECT OR WHO YOU ARE REQUESTING DISCRETIONARY REVIEW NAME:

Li Faihai

ADDRESS: 579 18th Ave

ZIP CODE: 94121

TELEPHONE: 1650-741-6968

CONTACT FOR DR APPLICATION:

SAME AS ABOVE

ADDRESS: 

ZIP CODE: 

TELEPHONE: 

E-MAIL ADDRESS:

2. Location and Classification

STREET ADDRESS OF PROJECT: 2514 Balboa St

ZIP CODE: 94111

CROSS STREETS:

26th Ave

ASSESMENTS BLOCK/LOT: 1569

LOT DIMENSIONS: 1015

LOT AREA (SQ FT): 2500

ZONING DISTRICT: RH2

HEIGHT/BLK DISTRICT: 40-X

3. Project Description

Please check all that apply:

Change of Use □  Change of Hours □  New Construction □  Alterations □  Demolition □  Other □

Additions to Building: Rear □  Front □  Height □  Side Yard □

Present or Previous Use: Single Family

Proposed Use: 2 Units

Building Permit Application No. 2016-01-25-6894

Date Filed: Jan 28, 2015
Discretionary Review Request

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

1. What are the reasons for requesting Discretionary Review? The project meets the minimum standards of the Planning Code. What are the exceptional and extraordinary circumstances that justify Discretionary Review of the project? How does the project conflict with the City's General Plan or the Planning Code's Priority Policies or Residential Design Guidelines? Please be specific and site specific sections of the Residential Design Guidelines.

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 adversely 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 Application
Submittal Checklist

Applications submitted to the Planning Department must be accompanied by this checklist and all required materials. The checklist is to be completed and signed by the applicant or authorized agent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REQUIRED MATERIALS (please check correct column)</th>
<th>OR APPLICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application, with all blanks completed</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address label's (original), if applicable</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address labels (copy of the above), if applicable</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopy of this completed application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographs that illustrate your concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant or Deed Restrictions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check payable to Planning Dept.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter of authorization for agent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Section Plan, Detail drawings (i.e. windows, door entries, trim), Specifications (for cleaning, repair, etc.) and/or Product cut sheets for new elements (i.e. windows, doors)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:
- ❑ Required Material
- ❑ Optional Material
- ❑ Two sets of original labels and one copy of addresses of adjacent property owners and owners of property across street.

**RECEIVED**

MAR 02 2017
CITY & COUNTY OF S.F.
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

For Department Use Only
Application received by Planning Department:

By: Kurt Bohn
Date: 3/12
1. What are the reasons for the requesting Discretionary Review? The project meets the minimum standards of the Planning Code. What are the exceptional and extraordinary circumstances that justify Discretionary Review of the project? How does the project conflict with the City's General Plan or the Planning Codes Priority Policies or the Residential Design Guidelines? Please be specific and site specific sections of the Residential Design Guidelines.

Section 311(c)(1) of the Planning Code provides that Residential Design Guidelines shall be used to review plans for all new construction and alterations. The Residential Design Guidelines (p.7) state that "though each building will have its own unique features, proposed projects must be responsive to the overall neighborhood context. A sudden change in the building pattern can be visually disruptive."

a. There are serious objections to the proposed plans based on the facts that the occupants of the abutting property, 2526 Balboa, and many other neighbors on the block, were not given actual notice of a pre-application meeting per SF Planning Code Section 311. Furthermore, the owner of 2514 Balboa declined to speak to neighbors who requested an opportunity to express concerns and who wished to avoid an official process such as a Discretionary Review. In light of this serious disregard of civic discourse, we ask that this request for Discretionary Review be considered by the commission.

b. The proposed addition, which includes a two-story increase in height, is not compatible with the character of existing buildings near the corner of this particular block (#1569). No other buildings have a fourth floor addition, which alters the visual character of the block itself and the Outer Richmond, generally.

c. Applicants submit that the proposed improvements violate and are in conflict with three of the six sections of the SF Residential Design Guidelines (RDG).

d. Serious health and public safety concerns exist for the DR requester and adjacent neighbors pertaining to mold, sewage, ventilation and loss of natural light.

e. A reputable San Francisco contractor reviewed the plans and expressed immediate concerns that the current designs for expansion are not compatible with a one-unit expansion. Concerns were expressed that the designs, specifically the addition of extraneous rooms, i.e. a large entertainment center and large storage spaces would not be compliant with a two-family RH-2 house in that they could be converted to additional units without proper approval. There is also reasonable suspicion, based on lots of foot traffic in and out of a side garage door, that other units already exist.
2. The Residential Design Guidelines assume some impacts to be reasonable and expected as part of construction. Please explain how this project would cause unreasonable impacts. If you believe your property, the property of others or the neighborhood would be adversely affected, please state who would be affected & how:

The following are primary concerns that fit within the scope of Section 311(c)(1) of the Planning Code and the Residential Design Guidelines:

   a. The two-story addition will significantly reduce light and ventilation of the abutting properties (parcel #1569/#14D, #1569/#14C, #1569/#14B, #1569/#14A and #1569/#016).

   b. The reduction in light and ventilation for the DR requestor’s property will mean a worsening of an already severe mold and health crisis in the requestor’s house and on his side wall facing the 2514 Balboa property (see attached images).

   c. The scale of 2514 Balboa St. is incompatible with the surrounding buildings in that its height will be substantially higher than the surrounding properties and not compatible with the character of other residences on the same block & across Balboa (RDG p. 5).

   d. As designed, 2514 Balboa will obstruct the existing natural light and ventilation to the DR requestor’s property and residence of 2526 Balboa St., specifically that which each unit through a lightwell that will be completely obstructed by the proposed addition. The existing height of the building in question provides tremendous direct sunlight to units 1 and 3 at 2526 Balboa St. and is the only direct sunlight those units receive. All sunlight to those units — and units 2 and 4 which receive substantial indirect light — through the lightwell, will be blocked by the addition towering a full floor above the lightwell.

   e. 2526 Balboa St. unit 3 will have his entire view of the iconic San Francisco skyline obstructed if the construction of the proposed addition moves forward.

   f. In addition, the back patio and kitchen area of apt. 2 will receive minimal sunlight. As designed, the proposed horizontal addition of 2514 Balboa St. will create a very dark shaft, and although they do not have an acquired right to the light, this would seriously impact their enjoyment of unit apartment.

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. Hold a pre planning meeting to notify neighbors about the scope of the project.

   b. Correct the plumbing and sewage problem that has caused sewage to run down the exterior of 2514 Balboa, creating a foul odor and visual scarring.

   c. The neighbors feel that the 2514 Balboa St. addition should follow the RDG’s guidelines and be scaled down to three stories to match the neighborhood character and the height of most other buildings (see attached packet of opposition letters).
Name List

#1569 / #016
Ellas Feldman
2526 Balboa St. #2
San Francisco, CA. 94121

#1569 / #016
Steve Caparelli
2526 Balboa St. #3
San Francisco, CA. 94121

#1569 / #016
Julie Devault
2526 Balboa St. #1
San Francisco, CA. 94121

#1569 / #016
Anna Miller
2526 Balboa St. #4
San Francisco, CA. 94121

#1569 / #014D
Sharon Wong
695 26th Avenue
San Francisco, CA. 94121

#1569 / #014C
Jack Wong
693 28th Avenue
San Francisco, CA. 94121

#1569 / #014B
Kevin Tikker
689 26th Avenue
San Francisco, CA. 94121

#1618 / #001
Conan Li
2510 Balboa St.
San Francisco, CA. 94121

#1618 / #001
Eden E. Mok
2503 Balboa St.
San Francisco, CA. 94121
#1569 / #016
Elias Feldman
2526 Balboa St. #2
San Francisco, CA. 94121

#1569 / #016
Steve Caparelli
2526 Balboa St. #3
San Francisco, CA. 94121

#1569 / #016
Julie Devault
2526 Balboa St. #1
San Francisco, CA. 94121

#1569 / #016
Anna Miller
2526 Balboa St. #4
San Francisco, CA. 94121

#1569 / #014D
Sharon Wong
695 26th Avenue
San Francisco, CA. 94121

#1569 / #014C
Jack Wong
693 26th Avenue
San Francisco, CA. 94121

#1569 / #014B
Kevin Tikker
689 26th Avenue
San Francisco, CA. 94121

#1618 / #001
Conan Li
2510 Balboa St.
San Francisco, CA. 94121

#1618 / #001
Eden E. Mok
2503 Balboa St.
San Francisco, CA. 94121
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City, State, Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1569</td>
<td>Elias Feldman</td>
<td>2526 Balboa St. #2</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA, 94121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1569</td>
<td>Steve Caparelli</td>
<td>2526 Balboa St. #3</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA, 94121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1569</td>
<td>Julie Devault</td>
<td>2526 Balboa St. #1</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA, 94121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1569</td>
<td>Anna Miller</td>
<td>2526 Balboa St. #4</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA, 94121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1569</td>
<td>Sharon Wong</td>
<td>695 26th Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA, 94121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1569</td>
<td>Jack Wong</td>
<td>693 26th Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA, 94121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1569</td>
<td>Kevin Tikker</td>
<td>689 26th Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA, 94121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1618</td>
<td>Conan Li</td>
<td>2510 Balboa St.</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA, 94121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1618</td>
<td>Eden E. Mok</td>
<td>2503 Balboa St.</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA, 94121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4th Floor addition will decrease sunlight & ventilation - more mold and damage in future of 695, 693 and 693 26th Ave.

695 26th Ave

Mold - lack of sunlight

2526 Balboa
2514 Bolbro ST
Mold & Sewage
Lock of light

Mold
Lack of
Sun & Ventilation
2/2017 - Rear Bedroom 693 26th Ave
Mold in room due to open windows - Mold spores

See attached Mold Report of Back Bedroom

Window was open
693 2nd Ave. - No mold in this room
Mold only in Rear Room

01/2007 - Room has no mold
only room in rear has mold window is open, spores get in

Rear Room

RUN!
2/2017 Rear from 693 26th Ave
Looking at 2514 Balboa St
Side - Cannot open Window Spores
2514 Balboa St.
Left Side Wall

2/8/17. Facing West from 60326th Ave.: Area is always damp, dark, no ventilation.
Area has mold, fungi, and bacteria. Enter my windows.

2/28/17 - 12:30 PM Facing West
Area has high amount of spores fungi, cannot go outside - got sick.
Aug 8, 2016

Rear View 693 14th Ave
Mold removal & Painting
See medical record & Jack W

Aug 4, 2016

Owner of 693 20th Ave
Got sick from mold exposure
He is taking Remicade cause auto immune prob
Facing West 4:00 PM Sunset

* 695-699 26th Ave

Propose height will block more sunshine and ventilation

* 2526-Balboa

* 2514 Balboa

Mold

* 203 26th Ave Roof
Currently there are no Federal regulations for evaluating potential health effects of fungal contamination and remediation. This information is subject to change as more information regarding fungal contaminants becomes available. For more information visit http://www.epa.gov/mold or www.nyc.gov/html/health/html/mold/mold.shtml. This document was designed to follow currently known industry guidelines for the interpretation of microbial sampling, analysis, and remediation. Since interpretation of microbial analysis reports is a scientific work in progress, it may as such be changed at any time without notice. The client is solely responsible for the use or interpretation. PRO-LAB/SSPTM Inc. makes no express or implied warranties as to health of a property from only the samples sent to their laboratory for analysis. The Client is hereby notified that due to the subjective nature of fungal analysis and the mold growth process, laboratory samples can and do change over time relative to the originally sampled material. PRO-LAB/SSPTM Inc. reserves the right to properly dispose of all samples after the testing of such samples are sufficiently completed or after a 7 day period, whichever is greater.

For more information please contact PRO-LAB at (954) 384-4446 or email info@prolabinc.com
Background debris qualitatively estimates the amount of particles that are not pollen or spores and directly affects the accuracy of the spore counts. The categories of Light, Moderate, Heavy and Too Heavy for Accurate Count, are used to indicate the amount of deposited debris. Increasing amount of debris will obscure small spores and can prevent spores from impacting onto the slide. The actual number of spores present in the sample is likely higher than reported. If the debris estimate is Light or Too Heavy for Accurate Count, all calculations are rounded to two significant figures and therefore, the total percentage of spore numbers may not equal 100%.

* Maximum Detection Limit. Based on the volume of air sampled, this is the lowest number of spores that can be detected and is an estimate of the lowest concentration of spores that can be read in the sample.

**NA** = Not Applicable.

### Observations & Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollen</th>
<th></th>
<th>Penicillium/Aspergillus spores too numerous to count. Number is estimated.</th>
<th>Presence of current or former growth observed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spore Type &amp; Volume</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Collection Date</th>
<th>Analysis Date</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZS - 25L</td>
<td>OUTSIDE</td>
<td>Feb 12, 2017</td>
<td>Feb 15, 2017</td>
<td>CONTROL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZS - 25L</td>
<td>BACK BEDROOM HALLWAY</td>
<td>Feb 12, 2017</td>
<td>Feb 15, 2017</td>
<td>ELEVATED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZS - 25L</td>
<td>BACK BEDROOM CEILING</td>
<td>Feb 12, 2017</td>
<td>Feb 15, 2017</td>
<td>ELEVATED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Observations & Comments

- Penicillium/Aspergillus spores too numerous to count. Number is estimated.
- Presence of current or former growth observed.

### Spore Analysis

- **Locality**: The samples were taken from various locations including outside, back bedroom, hallway, and back bedroom ceiling.
- **Collection Dates**: The samples were collected on Feb 12, 2017, and Feb 15, 2017.
- **Analysis Dates**: The samples were analyzed on Feb 12, 2017, and Feb 15, 2017.
- **Conclusion**: The samples were categorized as CONTROL, ELEVATED, and ELEVATED.

### Spore Types

- **Spore Types**: The spore types include Penicillium, Aspergillus, and other types.
- **Volume**: The spore volume ranges from ZS - 25L.

### Spore Counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spore Type &amp; Volume</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Collection Date</th>
<th>Analysis Date</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZS - 25L</td>
<td>OUTSIDE</td>
<td>Feb 12, 2017</td>
<td>Feb 15, 2017</td>
<td>CONTROL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZS - 25L</td>
<td>BACK BEDROOM HALLWAY</td>
<td>Feb 12, 2017</td>
<td>Feb 15, 2017</td>
<td>ELEVATED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZS - 25L</td>
<td>BACK BEDROOM CEILING</td>
<td>Feb 12, 2017</td>
<td>Feb 15, 2017</td>
<td>ELEVATED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Background Debris

- **Light**: The background debris is estimated based on the volume of air sampled.
- **Heavy**: The background debris is estimated based on the volume of air sampled.
- **Too Heavy**: The background debris is estimated based on the volume of air sampled.
- **Not Applicable**: The background debris is not applicable.

### Spore Analysis

- **Locality**: The samples were taken from various locations including outside, back bedroom, hallway, and back bedroom ceiling.
- **Collection Dates**: The samples were collected on Feb 12, 2017, and Feb 15, 2017.
- **Analysis Dates**: The samples were analyzed on Feb 12, 2017, and Feb 15, 2017.
- **Conclusion**: The samples were categorized as CONTROL, ELEVATED, and ELEVATED.
Chain of Custody # 1016058

- Back Bedroom
- Outside

**Penicillium/Aspergillus**
- Inside: 120 spores per cubic meter
- Outside: 4500 spores per cubic meter

**Other Basidiospores**
- Inside: 200 spores per cubic meter

**Other Ascospores**
- Inside: 40 spores per cubic meter

**Hyalodendron**
- Inside: 80 spores per cubic meter

**Cladosporium**
- Inside: 280 spores per cubic meter

**Spores per cubic meter**

- Scale: 1, 10, 100, 1000, 10000
Penicillium/Aspergillus

Other Basidiospores

Other Ascospores

Hydodendron

Cladosporium

**Chain of Custody # 1016058**

- Hallway
- Outside

- **Spores per cubic meter**

  - 1, 10, 100, 1000, 10000, 100000

- **Amounts**
  - Penicillium/Aspergillus: 17000
  - Other Basidiospores: 40
  - Other Ascospores: 40
  - Hydodendron: 80
  - Cladosporium: 40
Introduction
The fungi are a large group of organisms that include mold. In nature, the fungi and mold help breakdown and recycle nutrients in the environment. Mold are the most common type of fungi that grow indoors. Mold are microscopic organisms that live on plants, in the soil, and on animals, in fact almost anywhere food and moisture are available. Mold is everywhere present in the outdoor and normal indoor environments. It is in the air and on surfaces as settled dust. Exposure to mold is inevitable in everyday life. Thus, exposure to mold is considered part of a normal activity for most people. Only environments for which extraordinary preparations have been taken don’t have mold present in the air or on surfaces.

Understanding Mold
Under the right conditions (moisture, a food source, and time) mold will grow, multiply and produce spores. Mold grows throughout nature as well as the built environment. Mold reproduces by microscopic cells called “spores” that can be spread easily through the air. Mold spores are always present in the indoor and outdoor air. There are mold that can grow on any organic substrate including wood, paper, carpet, food, ceiling tiles, dried fish, carpet, or any surface where dust has accumulated. When excessive moisture or water accumulates indoors, mold growth will often occur, particularly if the moisture problem remains undiscovered or un-addressed. There is no practical way to eliminate all mold spores in the indoor environment. The way to control indoor mold growth is to control the amount of moisture available to the mold.

Mold growth can become a problem in your home or office where there is sufficient moisture and the right foodstuff is available. The key to preventing mold growth is to prevent all moisture problems. Of course, hidden mold can grow when there is water available behind walls, sinks, floors, etc. Indications of hidden moisture problems are discoloration of ceiling or walls, warped floors or condensation on the windows or walls.

Controlling Moisture
The most critical step in solving a mold problem is to accurately identify and fix the source(s) of moisture that allowed the growth to occur. In order to prevent mold from growing, it is important that water damaged areas be dried within a 24-48 hour period. If a small amount of mold is present in the home, the mold can be cleaned up with a mild detergent and the excess water or moisture removed. It is not necessary to try and kill the mold or its spores. You can carefully remove the moldy materials if necessary. Some of the primary means of moisture entry into homes and buildings are water leakage (such as roof or plumbing leaks), vapor migration, capillary movement, air infiltration, humidifier use, and inadequate venting of kitchen and bath humidity. The key to controlling moisture is to generally reduce indoor humidity within 35% - 60% (depending what climate you live in) and fix all leaks whatever their cause.

Mold Growth Sources
If the source of moisture is not easily detected or you have a hidden water leak, mold testing can be helpful. Often a roof leak or a plumbing leak can be identified as the source. The difficulty arises when there is an odor present or when an occupant shows signs of mold exposure but no visible mold can be seen. Excess water intrusion can also lead to dry rot of lumber and cause a serious structural defect in buildings.

Health Related Risks
Based on the Institute of Medicine and the National Academy of Sciences, dampness and mold in homes is associated with increases in several adverse health effects including cough, upper respiratory symptoms, wheeze, and exacerbation of asthma. Mold and fungi contain many known allergens and toxins that can adversely affect your health. Scientific evidence suggests that the disease of asthma may be more prevalent in damp affected buildings. Dampness and mold in homes, office buildings and schools represent a public health problem. The Institute of Medicine concluded, “When microbial contamination is found, it should be eliminated by means that not only limit the possibility of recurrence but also limit exposure of occupants and persons conducting the remediation”.
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Data Interpretation

Information (data) on mold in buildings can consist of the simple observation of fungal growth on a wall, analytical measurements from hundreds of environmental samples, or the results of a survey of building occupants with and without particular building-related conditions. Data interpretation is the process whereby investigators make decisions on (a) the relevance to human exposure of environmental observations and measurements, (b) the strength of associations between exposure and health status, and (c) the probability of current or future risks. These interpretation steps are followed by decisions on what measures can be taken to interrupt exposure and prevent future problems.

Remediation of Mold

Prevention of mold growth indoors is only possible if the factors that allow it to grow are identified and controlled. When prevention has failed and visible growth has occurred in a home or building, remediation and/or restoration may be required. The extent of the mold growth will determine the scope of the remediation required. The goal of remediation is to remove or clean mold-damaged material using work practices that protect occupants by controlling the dispersion of mold from the work area and protect the workers from exposure to mold. You should consult a professional when contemplating fixing a large area of mold growth. Generally, remediation requires (a) removal of porous materials showing extensive microbial growth, (b) physical removal of surface microbial growth on non-porous materials to typical background levels, and (c) reduction of moisture to levels that do not support microbial growth. Identification of the conditions that contributed to microbial proliferation in a home or building is the most important step in remediation. No effective control strategy can be implemented without a clear understanding of the events or building dynamics responsible for microbial growth.

Following the completion of the remediation process, mold testing should be performed to obtain clearance.

Symptoms of Mold Exposure

The most common symptoms of mold exposure are runny nose, eye irritation, cough, congestion, and aggravation of asthma. Individually, persistent health problems that appear to be related to mold or other types of air quality contaminant exposure should see their physicians for a referral to specialists who are trained in occupational/environmental medicine or related specialties and are knowledgeable about these types of exposures. Decisions about removing individuals from an affected area must be based on the results of such medical evaluation. Mold is naturally present in outdoor environments and we share the same air between the indoor and outdoor, it is impossible to eliminate all mold spores indoors.

Ten Things You Should Know About Mold

1) Potential health effects and symptoms associated with mold exposures include allergic reactions, asthma, and other respiratory problems.
2) There is no practical way to completely eliminate mold and mold spores in the indoor environment. The way to control indoor mold growth is to control moisture.
3) If mold is a problem in your home or building, you must clean up the mold and eliminate sources of moisture.
4) To prevent mold growth any source of a water problem or leak must be repaired.
5) Indoor humidity must be reduced (generally below 60%) to reduce the chances of mold growth by: adequately venting bathrooms, dryers, and other moisture-generating sources to the outside; using air conditioners and de-humidifiers; increasing ventilation; and using exhaust fans whenever cooking, dishwashing and cleaning.
6) Clean and dry any damp or wet building materials and furnishings within 24-48 hours to prevent mold growth.
7) Clean mold off of hard surfaces with water and detergent and dry completely.
8) Prevent condensation: reduce the potential for condensation on cold surfaces (e.g., windows, piping, exterior walls, roof, or floors) by adding insulation.
9) In areas where there is a perpetual moisture problem on the floor, do not install carpeting.
10) Mold can be found almost anywhere. Mold can grow on wood, paper, carpet, foods; almost anything can support some mold growth provided there is moisture, time to grow and food to eat.
References & Resources


Health Implications of Fungi in Indoor Environments, Edited by R.A. Samson. 1994. Elsevier Science, P.O. Box 945, Madison Square Station, New York, NY 10159-9445.

Damp Indoor Spaces and Health, Institute of Medicine of the National Academies, Washington, DC, 2004


Useful Websites

www.acgih.org/resources/links.htm
American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists - information on Indoor Air Quality and useful links

www.caiaq.org
California Indoor Air Quality Program - California Indoor Air Quality resources and useful links

www.health.state.ny.us/environmental/indoors/airmold.htm
New York State Department of Health - New York state recommendations for IAQ, indoor mold inspections, remediation, and prevention

Guidelines for Assessment and Remediation of Fungi in Indoor Environments – a good reference for mold clean up and removal

orfz.dod.nih.gov/PoliciesAndGuidelines/ORFPolicies/MoldPrevPolicy.htm
National Institutes of Health - information on mold prevention and remediation

http://www.niehs.nih.gov/health/topics/agents/mold/index.cfm
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences - information on mold

www.epa.gov/mold/
United States Environmental Protection Agency website on mold and moisture

www.aaaai.org/nab/index.cfm?q=faq
American Academy of Allergy, Asthma, and Immunology – information on mold and allergies and outdoor allergens

http://www.aanma.org/?s=mold
Allergy & Asthma Network – information for homes about allergies and asthma

http://www.homeenergyresource.mn.org
Minnesota Department of Commerce Energy Information Center – good information on moisture control in homes

http://eetd.lbl.gov/fe/
Governmental Indoor Environment Department – good information on indoor health, comfort and energy efficiency in buildings

http://www.osha.gov/dts/etools/shib101003.html
Occupational U.S. Department of Labor (OSHA) - A Brief Guide to Mold in the Workplace
Mold Sampling Methods

The goal of sampling is to learn about the levels of mold growth and amplification in buildings. There are no EPA or OSHA standards for levels of fungi and mold in indoor environments. There are also no standard collection methods. However, several generally accepted collection methods are available to inspectors to study mold and bacteria in indoor environments. Comparison with reference samples can be a useful approach. Reference samples are usually taken outdoors and sometimes samples can be taken from "non-compliant" areas. In general, indoor fungal concentrations should be similar to or lower than outdoor levels. High levels of mold only found inside buildings often suggest indoor amplification of the fungi. Furthermore, the detection of water-indicating fungi, even at low levels, may require further evaluation. There are several types of testing methods that can detect the presence of mold. They can be used to find mold spores that are suspended in air, in settled dust, or mold growing on surfaces of building materials and furnishings. There are different methods that can identify types of live mold and dead mold in a sampled environment. Mold spores can be allergenic and toxic even when dead.

All sampled material obtained in the laboratory is analyzed using modern microscopic methods, standard and innovative mycological techniques, analyzed at 630–1,000 times magnification.

Testing for mold with an accredited laboratory is the best way to determine if you have mold and what type of mold it is.

Surface Sampling Methods

Surface sampling can be useful for differentiating between mold growth and stains of various kinds. This type of sampling is used to identify the type of mold growth that may be present and help investigate water intrusion. Surface sampling can help the interpretation of building inspections when used correctly. The following are the different types of surface samples that are commonly used to perform a direct examination of a specific location. Spore counts per area are not normally useful.

Tape (or tape-lift)

These samples are collected using clear adhesive tape or adhesive slide for microscopic examination of suspect stains, settled dust and spores. Tape lifts are an excellent, non-destructive method of sampling. The laboratory is usually able to determine if there is current or former mold growth or if only normally settled spores were sampled.

Bulk

This is a destructive test of materials (e.g., settled dust, sections of wallboard, pieces of duct lining, carpet segments, return-air filters, etc.) to determine if they contain or show mold growth. Bulk sampling collects a portion of material small enough to be transported conveniently and handled easily in the laboratory while still representing the material being sampled. A representative sample is taken from the bulk sample and can be cultured for species identification or analyzed using direct microscopy for genus identification. The laboratory is usually able to determine if there is current of former mold growth or if only normally settled spores were sampled. Identified spores are generally reported as "present/absent".

Swab

A sterile cotton or synthetic fiber-tipped swab is used to test an area of suspected mold growth. Samples obtained using this method can be cultured for species identification or analyzed using direct microscopy for genus identification. The laboratory is usually able to determine if there is current of former mold growth or if only normally settled spores were sampled. Identified spores are generally reported as "present/absent".

Carpet (filter-type) Cassette

A carpet cassette is used with a portable air pump (flow rate usually doesn't matter) to collect mold, pollen and other particulates. Samples obtained using this method can be cultured for species identification or analyzed using direct microscopy for genus identification. This method is usually used to determine a presence or absence of water-indicating mold in a carpet. The laboratory is usually able to determine if there is current of former mold growth or if only normally settled spores were sampled.
Air Sampling Methods

Air samples are possibly the most common type of environmental sample that investigators collect to study bioaerosols (mold, pollen, particulates). The physics of removing particles from the air and the general principles of good sample collection apply to all airborne materials, whether biological or other origin. Therefore, many of the basic principles investigators use to identify and quantify other airborne particulate matter can be adapted to bioaerosol sampling. Common to all aerosol samplers is consideration of collection efficiency. The following are the two most common forms of air sampling methods.

"Non-Viable Methods" (The Laboratory results are reported in "spores per cubic meter (sp/m3)

**Z5 Cassette**
The Z5 spore trap is used with a portable air pump (5 liters/minute for 1 to 5 minutes) to rapidly collect airborne aerosols including mold, pollen and other airborne particulates. Air is drawn through a small slit at the top of the cassette and spores are trapped on a sticky surface on a small glass slide inside the cassette. They are efficient at collecting spores as small as 1µm.

**Micro5 Cassette**
The Micro5 Microcell spore trap cassette is used with a portable air pump (5 liters/minute for 1 to 5 minutes) to collect airborne aerosols including mold, pollen and other airborne particulates. Air is drawn through a small circular hole at the top of the cassette and spores are trapped on a sticky coated glass slide inside the cassette. They are efficient at collecting spores as small as 0.6µm.

**Air-O-Cell Cassette**
The Air-O-Cell spore trap cassette is used with a portable air pump (15 liters/minute for 1 to 10 minutes) to collect airborne aerosols including mold, pollen and other airborne particulates. Air is drawn through a small opening at the top of the cassette and spores are trapped on a sticky coated glass slide inside the cassette. These cassettes are efficient at collecting spores as small as 2.5µm.

**Allergenco-D Cassette**
The Allergenco-D spore trap cassette is used with a portable air pump (15 liters/minute for 1 to 10 minutes) to collect airborne aerosols including mold, pollen and other airborne particulates. Air is drawn through a small opening at the top of the cassette and spores are trapped on a sticky coated glass slide inside the cassette. These cassettes are efficient at collecting spores as small as 1.7µm.

"Viable Methods" (The Laboratory results are reported in "colony forming units per cubic meter (CFU/m3)

**Agar impaction Plates**
The agar impaction plates are used with a portable air pump (28.3 liters/minute for 1 to 3 minutes) to collect airborne mold. This is called "viable sampling" because it only grows what is alive at the time of testing. Air is drawn through a 200-400 holes at the top of the impactor and spores are trapped in the agar media. The agar plate should be shipped to the laboratory immediately or kept cool until it can be shipped. These cassettes are 90% efficient at collecting spores as small as 0.7µm. The laboratory results are reported in "colony forming units per cubic meter (CFU/m³)".
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Outdoor Habitat</th>
<th>Indoor Habitat</th>
<th>Possible Allergic Potential</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chlamydomspores</td>
<td>Common on all substrates, especially where growth conditions are not optimal.</td>
<td>Commonly found growing indoors, especially on windowsills. This type of growth, when cultured, has been found to be largely the genus Cladosporium.</td>
<td>None known</td>
<td>Chlamydomspores are asexual in nature and all fungi form them. They can form when conditions for growth are not optimal. It is impossible to tell what fungus formed a particular single or group(s) of chlamydomspores unless grown in culture. Sometimes even then the fungus will not produce spores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cladosporium</td>
<td>The most common spore type reported in the air worldwide. Found on dead and dying plant litter, and soil.</td>
<td>Commonly found on wood and wallboard. Commonly grows on window sills, textiles and foods.</td>
<td>Type I (hay fever and asthma), Type III (hypersensitivity pneumonitis) allergies.</td>
<td>A very common and important allergen source both outdoors and indoors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hystodendron</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Very rarely grows indoors</td>
<td>None known</td>
<td>This genus occurs infrequently in the air and only in certain times during the year. It is a colorless Cladosporium-like mold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspergillus</td>
<td>Common everywhere. Constitutes a large part of the airmass outside. Can reach very high numbers in the air outside during the spring and summer. Can increase in numbers during and after rainfalls.</td>
<td>Very few of this group grow inside. The notable exception is Chaetomium, Aspergillus and Penicillium.</td>
<td>Little known for most of this group of fungi. Dependent on the type (see Chaetomium and Aspergillus).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basidiomsporas</td>
<td>Commonly found everywhere, especially in the late summer and fall. These spores are from Mushrooms.</td>
<td>Mushrooms are not normally found growing indoors, but can grow on wet lumber, especially in crawlspaces. Sometimes mushrooms can be seen growing in flower pots indoors.</td>
<td>Some allergenicity reported. Type I (hay fever, asthma) and Type III (hypersensitivity pneumonitis).</td>
<td>Among the group of Mushrooms (Basidiomycetes) are dry rot fungi Sarpula and Polia that are particularly destructive to buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penicillium/Aspergillus</td>
<td>Common everywhere. Normally found in the air in small amounts in outdoor air. Grows on nearly everything.</td>
<td>Wetted wallboard, wood, food, leather, etc. Able to grow on many substrates indoors.</td>
<td>Type I (hay fever and asthma) allergies and Type III (hypersensitivity pneumonitis) allergies.</td>
<td>This is a combination group of Penicillium and Aspergillus and is used when only the spores are seen. The spores are so similar that they cannot be reliably separated into their respective genera.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGREEMENT FOR FURTHER SAMPLING

Mold Screen Results: Based upon the results of the Mold Screen, we recommend that additional samples be taken in the Subject Property. A checked box indicates the condition(s) warranting this recommendation below. You will be provided information within the written Mold Screen Report identifying the areas of the Subject Property where microbial problems or conditions indicating microbial problems were discovered. This Agreement is not intended to be a substitute or replacement for the visual inspection. Any and all additional samples will be sent to an ESA approved Lab that will analyze them for the presence of mold. All sample results will be included in the Mold Screen Report defined in the Mold Screen Inspection Agreement.

☐ Evidence of suspected mold growth is visible in one or more areas of the property. It is recommended that swab samples in these areas be taken and tested.

☐ A visible condition exists in the Subject Property that may indicate that water infiltration has occurred or is occurring. Although there may be no visible signs of mold growth, this condition is conducive to mold growth that could be present in areas not readily visible. The tests recommended are indoor air sampling, which will identify the type(s) of mold present, if any, and the concentrations of mold spores; a carpet test which will give “historical” data; and/or an inner wall sampling.

☐ A musty odor is present in the property. Although there may not be any physical evidence of the presence of mold growth in any readily accessible areas, this odor is consistent with odors commonly associated with the presence of mold growth. An indoor air sample; a carpet test which will give “historical” data; and/or an inner wall sampling is recommended.

Based on the above-checked items, the Client agrees to have the following samples taken in the home, as indicated by Your Initials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Area to be Sampled</th>
<th>Type of Sample</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Initial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outside</td>
<td>Air / Swab / Carpet / Wall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Bedroom</td>
<td>Air / Swab / Carpet / Wall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathroom</td>
<td>Air / Swab / Carpet / Wall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Bedroom</td>
<td>Air / Swab / Carpet / Wall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attic</td>
<td>Air / Swab / Carpet / Wall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*We recommend sampling each of the areas identified in the Mold Screen Report having evidence of microbial problems (or conditions conducive thereto). Whether and which additional samples are taken is in the sole discretion of the Client.*

Clients authorize and request the Inspector to take the samples listed above. Clients understand that by requesting further sampling that this Agreement For Further Sampling becomes an additional addendum to the Mold Screen Agreement and subject to the terms thereof. Clients further acknowledge and agree that the Inspector may notify the homeowner or occupants of the Subject Property (if other than you) of any conditions in the Subject Property that may pose a health or safety concern.*

Approved Signature (Buyer) Date

The undersigned Client(s), acknowledge that Client(s) have been advised and encouraged to have the Subject Property tested for mold, and that Client(s) understand that the presence of certain types of mold prevalent in housing can pose severe health hazards. Client(s) decline that the Inspector conduct the services recommended above. Client(s) agree to hold harmless the Inspector for any damages or responsibility for building conditions which remain undiscovered regarding the discovery of mold and mold spores.

Authorized Signature (Buyer) Date

Fees. The base fee for this Mold Screen Inspection is $50.00. Additional Samples $25.00 (See above table for details). Total Fee $80.00

THIS INSPECTION, INSPECTION AGREEMENT AND REPORT DO NOT CONSTITUTE A WARRANTY, AN INSURANCE POLICY, OR A GUARANTEE OF ANY KIND; NOR DO THEY SUBSTITUTE FOR ANY DISCLOSURE STATEMENT AS MAY BE REQUIRED BY LAW. BY SIGNING BELOW, YOU ACKNOWLEDGE THAT YOU HAVE READ, UNDERSTAND, AND AGREE TO THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THIS AGREEMENT, INCLUDING (BUT NOT LIMITED TO) THE LIMITATION OF LIABILITY, ARBITRATION CLAUSE AND LIMITATION PERIOD, AND AGREE TO PAY THE FEE LISTED IN THE SHADED BOX ABOVE. IN ADDITION, "YOU ACKNOWLEDGE AND AGREE THAT THE INSPECTOR MAY NOTIFY THE HOMEOWNER OR OCCUPANTS OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY (IF OTHER THAN YOU), AS WELL AS ANY APPROPRIATE PUBLIC AGENCY, OF ANY CONDITION(S) DISCOVERED THAT MAY POSE A SAFETY OR HEALTH CONCERN.*

Client Name: Jack Wong

Property Address: 693 26th Ave, San Francisco, CA 94111

Client's Signature Date

COMPANY NAME: All Certified Env - 2-12-17

Inspector Signature Date

Client: Glue Date

Company Name: All Certified Env - 2-12-17

Email: jwong99413@aol.com
ESA MOLD SCREEN INSPECTION AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT LIMITS OUR LIABILITY — PLEASE READ IT CAREFULLY

This Mold Screen Inspection Agreement (the "Agreement") is made effective on the date stated on page 2 of this agreement by and between the ESA affiliated Inspection company named on Page 2 of this agreement (hereinafter "Inspector", "we", "our" and "us") and client named on Page 2 of this agreement (hereinafter "Client", "you" or "Your") (collectively "parties"). We are an independently owned and operated company engaged in the business of providing home inspection services utilizing a ESA approved Lab for environmental laboratory analysis. You desire to have a Mold Screen Inspection (the "Inspection") performed on a home located at the address stated on Page 2 of this agreement.

Purpose: The purpose of the Mold Screen is to detect the presence of a microbial problem in the inspected areas of the Subject Property.

Scope of Mold Screens: The Mold Screen consists of a visual inspection in readily accessible areas for mold and/or conditions that may indicate the presence of mold ("red flag"). For example, musty odor and/or evidence of water penetration. If the visual inspection shows no or one red flag area, then limited samples will be taken ("Limited Sampling") as set out in the "Limited Sampling" section below. If red flags are found in multiple areas, then you will be advised and offered the chance to have additional samples collected in any and all identified areas ("Additional Sampling").

Lastly, if you elect, the Inspector may only take samples in areas designated by the You ("Limited Mold Sampling"). The objective of the Mold Screen is to determine whether mold problems exist in the readily accessible sample area at the time the Mold Screen is performed. As such, the results of the Mold Screen are not a guarantee that mold does or does not exist within the home; the results are indicative of only the presence or absence of mold in the areas sampled at the time the Mold Screen is performed. In light of not currently established Threshold Limit Values (TLVs) for the majority of substances of biological origin that are associated with building-related exposures, We follow the guidance of the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists (ACGIH). Visual Assessment: The purpose of the visual assessment is to identify visual mold contamination and/or conditions that may be conducive to microbial growth, for example, musty odor and/or evidence of water penetration in the areas you designate. The purpose of the visual assessment is to detect the presence of any visible fungal growth in possible mold areas. Furthermore, the inspector will not be able to determine whether mold problems exist in the areas sampled at the time the Mold Screen is performed.

Scope of Visual Inspection/Exclusions: The scope of the visual inspection is limited to readily accessible areas only. We do not remove floor and wall coverings or move furniture, open walls, or perform any type of diagnostic inspection. Certain structural areas or components located behind or beneath surfaces may not be inspected.

Report of Visual Inspection Results: Following the visual inspection and additional sampling if conducted, you will be provided with a written report stating whether mold or conditions indicating mold were found in the designated areas.

Agreement for Further Sampling: If two or more red flag areas within the Subject Property are identified based upon the results of the visual inspection, We recommend that additional sampling be conducted in these areas. You will have an opportunity to sample these areas by executing an Agreement for Further Sampling. The cost of any additional sampling is in addition to the Mold Screen fee.

Additional Sampling/Lab Testing: Following the visual inspection, two air samples (one indoor and one outdoor) along with a carpet, wall, or additional air samples in one of the common areas will be collected. The sampling will be conducted by an ESA approved Lab, which will analyze them for the presence of mold. The Lab will then issue a report detailing the presence and type(s) of mold, if any, found in the samples. A reference guide will be provided, which explains the various types of mold along with any recommended action(s). Please be advised that if the results of the samples taken above only reflect conditions at the time the sampling occurred. Conditions can change over time. This is not guaranteed that mold does not exist in other rooms of the home. You may wish to call the refused an Indoor Air Quality Specialist or other appropriate professional for further advice.

Report of Visual Inspection Results: Following the visual inspection and additional sampling if conducted, you will be provided with a written report identifying Types and levels of mold found in samples along with sample locations, a description of each type of mold discovered, and a summary of findings. Remediation Specifications of identified mold areas are not included as part of a Mold Screen Report and you should seek the advice of an Indoor Air Quality Specialist or other appropriate professional for further advice concerning detailed directions on how to address any mold problems discovered.

Notice of Claims: You understand and agree that if any claim(s) or complaint(s) arising out of or related to any alleged lax or omission in connection with the inspection shall not be rejected by us, in writing, within ten (10) business days of discovery. Unless there is an emergency condition, you agree to show a reasonable period of time to investigate the claim(s) or complaint(s) by, among other things, so inspection before you, or anyone acting on your behalf, makes, alters, stores, or modifies the system or component that is the subject matter of the claim. You understand and agree that any failure to timely notify us and allow adequate time to investigate as stated above shall constitute a complete bar and waiver of any and all claims you may have against us related to the alleged act or omission unless otherwise provided by law.

Asbestos: Any dispute concerning the interpretation of this Agreement or arising from the Inspection and Report (except based on payment of fee) shall be resolved by binding, non-appellate arbitration conducted in accordance with the rules of the American Arbitration Association, except that the parties shall mutually agree upon an Arbitrator who is familiar with the home inspection industry.

Limitation Periods: Any right of action arising from this Agreement or from the Inspection and Report (except based on payment of fee) shall be barred unless timely commenced within one (1) year from the date of the inspection. Failure to bring such a suit within this time period shall be a complete bar to any such action and a full and complete waiver of any rights or claims based thereon. This time limitation period may be shorter than provided by state law.

UNCONSCIONAL RELEASE AND LIMITATION OF LIABILITY: IT IS UNDERSTOOD AND AGREED THAT WE AND THE LAB ARE NOT INSURERS AND THAT THE INSPECTION AND REPORT TO BE PROVIDED UNDER THIS AGREEMENT SHALL NOT BE CONSTRUED AS A GUARANTEE OR WARRANTY OF THE ADEQUACY, PERFORMANCE OR CONDITION OF ANY STRUCTURE, ITEM, OR SYSTEM AT THE SUBJECT PROPERT, YOU HEREBY RELEASE AND DISCHARGE US, THE LAB AND OUR RESPECTIVE EMPLOYEES AND AGENTS FROM ALL LIABILITY AND RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE COST OF REPAIRING OR REPLACING ANY UNREPORTED DEFECT OR DEFICIENCY AND FOR ANY CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGE, PROPERTY DAMAGE OR PERSONAL INJURY FROM ANY NATURE IN THE EVENT THAT WE, THE LAB OR OUR RESPECTIVE AGENT EMPLOYEES ARE FOUND LIABLE DUE TO BREACH OF CONTRACT, BREACH OF WARRANTY, NEGLIGENT MISREPRESENTATION, NEGLIGENT HIRING OR ANY OTHER THEORY OF LIABILITY, THEN THE CUMULATIVE AGGREGATE TOTAL LIABILITY TO US, THE LAB AND OUR RESPECTIVE AGENTS AND EMPLOYEES SHALL BE LIMITED TO A SUM EQUAL TO THE AMOUNT OF THE FEE PAID BY YOU FOR THE INSPECTION AND REPORT.

Confidentiality: You understand that the inspection is being performed (and the Report is being prepared) for your sole, confidential and exclusive benefit and use. The Report, or any portion thereof, is not intended to benefit any person not a party to this Agreement, including (but not limited to) the seller or the real estate agent involved in the real estate transaction ("Third Party") if, currently or indirectly, either grants a license to the Report or any portion thereof to be disclosed or distributed to any third party, you agree to indemnify, defend and hold us harmless for any claims or actions based on the inspection or the Report brought by the Third Party.
February 28, 2017

Re: 2514 Balboa St., San Francisco, CA 94121

Dear San Francisco Planning Department,

My name is Sharon Wong

I reside at 695 26 Ave.

and I have reviewed the Notice of Building Permit Application (Section 311/312) and I oppose the proposed work Permit No. 2015.01.28.6899.

You can contact me at (415) 699-9536

Thank you for your time,

Sharon Wong

major concerns: see attached
2514 Balboa St., pre-expansion, has already been aggressively rented out to many tenants as indicated by the volume of foot traffic in and out of not only the main entrance but the side-door garage entrance. Current plans appear to leave open the possibility of creating further sub-units, post-renovation, to maximize rental income, and the type of tenant favored appears to be individual college-aged students who stay for a short time and then move on, not families. This is a concern for the following reasons:

--This will more than likely double the foot traffic that is already coming in and out of this building.

--Since only a 2-car garage is planned, this will not only increase the vehicular traffic but create an even tougher parking environment. (It must be remembered that the recent bump out of curbs along Balboa St. and other streets in the Richmond district have significantly shrunk the number of parking spaces available. Parking has already been made much tighter.)

--Should the favored type of tenants move in, the amount of illegal dumping will likely increase. In speaking with those at 311, they have noted that during graduation time, there is an increase of illegal dumping around college campuses as students move out. In the past few years, I've had to make many more calls to 311 to have city workers come out to pick up discarded bookshelves, carpets, microwaves, twin-sized mattresses, chairs, tables, pizza boxes, etc... that have been dumped in front of my building. I've literally watched as college-aged tenants from 2514 Balboa dragged out their garbage (beer/wine bottles from the sound of the clinking] to a neighbor's doorstep for disposal. (And these young women giggled all the way to the neighbor's can as they did this.) I unfortunately was not able to document it and did not have the power to stop them from doing this. Incidences of such illegal dumping have been reported and are on record. Having spoken with 311 and Public Works/Street Environmental Services, the best they can do is come out to remove the garbage. They can do nothing to help me curb the problem.

--Should a more gregarious mix of tenants occupy the building, parties thrown by these tenants will probably spill out onto the new outer deck planned, disturbing the surrounding families. I've already had to call the police for assistance because of a couple of loud parties thrown at 2514 Balboa that have lingered into the early mornings with people spilling out onto the street, smoking, drinking, some running up and down 26th Ave., some riding a shopping cart down the hill, yelling and carrying on.

While my concerns may not come to pass, past action is sometimes an indicator of subsequent actions. Given the expense of such an expansion, it only seems fiscally logical to maximize the rental possibilities. Additionally, this building was renovated not too long ago. I can see few sound reasons why one would want to renovate again so soon except if there was the possibility of greater financial gain—especially given the current spike in rent of late.

Finally, environmentally speaking, a four-story building will significantly reduce light and ventilation to neighboring buildings, worsening a mold problem that has already developed on my building as well as my neighbor's—a problem worsened perhaps by a recent sewage pipe leak at 2514 Balboa that drained into our yards, which the owners of 2514 did not clean up and did not inform me of. To allow for the building of a four-story building as designed would be to exacerbate the existing problem, as light is what suspends mold growth. And in the long-term, four stories will limit the light and ventilation that many could and should be able enjoy daily. In short, we should not all be in shadow while one monopolizes the light.

Basically, we live in a damper area here in the Richmond district, and there are down sides to that. We just get less sun here. It's not the Mission district. Let's do a better job of sharing what we have when we have it. I don't think that's too much to ask. A little more consideration on all counts would actually be appreciated—from the type of tenant one brings in, to the type of building one puts up in the neighborhood. We all live here together, not on our own islands.
February 28, 2017

Re: 2514 Balboa St., San Francisco, CA 94121

Dear San Francisco Planning Department,

My name is Julie DeVault

I reside at 2526 Balboa St., Apt. 1, SF CA 94121

and I have reviewed the Notice of Building Permit Application (Section 311/312) and I oppose the proposed work Permit No. 2015.01.28.6899.

You can contact me at (415) 752-9625

Thank you for your time,

Julie M. DeVault
February 28, 2017

Re: 2514 Balboa St., San Francisco, CA 94121

Dear San Francisco Planning Department,

My name is Ryan Holiday

I reside at 2535 Balboa St.

and I have reviewed the Notice of Building Permit Application (Section 311/312), and I oppose the proposed work Permit No. 2015.01.28.6899.

You can contact me at 415-515-6571

Thank you for your time,

[Signature]
February 28, 2017

Re: 2514 Balboa St., San Francisco, CA 94121

Dear San Francisco Planning Department,

My name is **Elias Feldman**

I reside at **2526 Balboa ct. 6Z**

and I have reviewed the Notice of Building Permit Application (Section 311/312) and I oppose the proposed work **Permit No. 2015.01.28.6899**.

You can contact me at **415 336 0889**

Thank you for your time,

[Signature]

[Signature]
February 28, 2017

Re: 2514 Balboa St., San Francisco, CA 94121

Dear San Francisco Planning Department,

My name is Elise Wood

I reside at 2535 Byrleog St.

and I have reviewed the Notice of Building Permit Application (Section 311/312) and I oppose the proposed work Permit No. 2015.01.28.6899.

You can contact me at 415-225-6268

Thank you for your time,

[Signature]
February 27, 2017

Re: 2514 Balboa St., San Francisco, CA 94121

Dear San Francisco Planning Department,

My name is Steven J. Caporelli.

I reside at 2526 Balboa St. Apt. #3 San Francisco, CA 94121

and I have reviewed the Notice of Building Permit Application (Section 311/312) and I oppose the proposed work Permit No. 2015.01.28.6899.

You can contact me at 908-432-6596

Thank you for your time,

[Signature]

Steve Caporelli
February 27, 2017

Re: 2514 Balboa St., San Francisco, CA 94121

Dear San Francisco Planning Department,

My name is **Ryan Herrera**

I reside at **2505 Balboa St.**

and I have reviewed the Notice of Building Permit Application (Section 311/312) and I oppose the proposed work Permit No. **2015.01.28.6899**.

You can contact me at **(415) 507-6515**

Thank you for your time,

**Ryan**
February 27, 2017

Re: 2514 Balboa St., San Francisco, CA 94121

Dear San Francisco Planning Department,

My name is John McAllan

I reside at 2532 Balboa St.

and I have reviewed the Notice of Building Permit Application (Section 311/312) and I oppose the proposed work Permit No. 2015.01.28.6899.

You can contact me at 415 668 6868

Thank you for your time,

John McAllan
February 27, 2017

Re: 2514 Balboa St., San Francisco, CA 94121

Dear San Francisco Planning Department,

My name is [Signature]

I reside at 2501 Balboa St.

and I have reviewed the Notice of Building Permit Application (Section 311/312) and I oppose the proposed work Permit No. 2015.01.28.6899.

You can contact me at 650-361-0032

Thank you for your time,
February 27, 2017

Re: 2514 Balboa St., San Francisco, CA 94121

Dear San Francisco Planning Department,

My name is Marc Ruffalo

I reside at 2550 Balboa St., #7

and I have reviewed the Notice of Building Permit Application (Section 311/312) and I oppose the proposed work Permit No. 2015.01.28.6899.

You can contact me at 415 284-4497

Thank you for your time,

[Signature]

Marc Ruffalo
February 27, 2017

Re: 2514 Balboa St., San Francisco, CA 94121

Dear San Francisco Planning Department,

My name is ________________

I reside at ____________________

and I have reviewed the Notice of Building Permit Application (Section 311/312) and I oppose the proposed work Permit No. 2015.01.28.6899. I would like __________________________.

You can contact me at ____________________

Thank you for your time,

______________________________

John Donelan
February 27, 2017

Re: 2514 Balboa St., San Francisco, CA 94121

Dear San Francisco Planning Department,

My name is [Signature]

I reside at 2525 Balboa St., #201
S.F., CA

and I have reviewed the Notice of Building Permit Application (Section 311/312) and I oppose the proposed work Permit No. 2015.01.28.6899.

You can contact me at 666-0475

Thank you for your time,
February 28, 2017

Re: 2514 Balboa St., San Francisco, CA 94121

Dear San Francisco Planning Department,

My name is Ruslan Sidorov.

I reside at 2525 Balboa St.

and I have reviewed the Notice of Building Permit Application (Section 311/312) and I oppose the proposed work Permit No. 2015.01.28.6899.

You can contact me at 650-491-4993

Thank you for your time,

[Signature]
February 28, 2017

Re: 2514 Balboa St., San Francisco, CA 94121

Dear San Francisco Planning Department,

My name is Linda Sue Edwards

I reside at 2505 Balboa

and I have reviewed the Notice of Building Permit Application (Section 311/312) and I oppose the proposed work Permit No. 2015.01.28.6899.

You can contact me at lisformal@comcast.net

Thank you for your time,

Linda Sue Edwards

I moved here for the view and that would be taken away.
It would make parking in the neighborhood very difficult.
Possible exposure to toxic chemicals blowing by my way during construction.
I never received preplanning meeting nor notice of Building Permit application.
February 27, 2017

Re: 2514 Balboa St., San Francisco, CA 94121

Dear San Francisco Planning Department,

My name is Shannel Busuioc

I reside at 2526 Balboa St. #2

and I have reviewed the Notice of Building Permit Application (Section 311/312) and I oppose the proposed work Permit No. 2015.01.28.6899.

You can contact me at (949) 322-3115

Thank you for your time,

Shannel
**RESPONSE TO DISCRETIONARY REVIEW (DRP)**

### Project Information

- **Property Address:** 2514 BALBOA STREET
- **Zip Code:** 94121
- **Building Permit Application(s):** 201501286899
- **Record Number:**
- **Assigned Planner:** SARA VELLVE

### Project Sponsor

- **Name:** DEREK VINH
- **Phone:** (650) 741-6968
- **Email:** INFO@ICEDESIGNINC.COM

### Required Questions

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

   The proposed project are design and revised based on the San Francisco Planning codes and deemed code compliant. The project goes through proper plan checks. The project go through proper notifications procedure. Therefore, the proposed project should be approved.

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

   Changes are made to the proposed project after filing the application. Per the DR requester concerns we provide a 15 feet rear setback and a 5 feet setbacks on east side on the proposed 4th floor. The front facade is redesign to better compatible to the surrounding buildings.

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

   Changes has been made to the proposed project.
# Project Features

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units (only one kitchen per unit - additional kitchens count as additional units)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Stories (all levels with habitable rooms)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basement Levels (may include garage or windowless storage rooms)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces (Off-Street)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedrooms</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>19'1&quot;</td>
<td>39'1&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Depth</td>
<td>54'3&quot;</td>
<td>72'0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Value (monthly)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Signature:**  

**Date:** 1/22/18

**Printed Name:** DEREK VINH

- Property Owner
- Authorised Agent

*If you have any additional information that is not covered by this application, please feel free to attach additional sheets to this form.*
THRESHOLD AT DOORWAYS SHALL NOT EXCEED 0.75 INCH IN HEIGHT FOR SLIDING DOORS SERVING DWELLING UNITS OR 0.5 INCH FOR OTHER DOORS.

THRESHOLD HEIGHT SHALL BE LIMITED TO 7.75 INCHES (RESIDENTIAL) WHEN THE DOOR IS AN EXTERIOR DOOR THAT IS NOT A COMPONENT OF THE REQUIRED MEANS OF EGRESS; THE DOOR, OTHER THAN AN EXTERIOR STORM OR SCREEN DOOR DOES NOT SWING OVER THE LANDING OR STEP.

ALL EXTERIOR DOOR TO BE INSTALLED WITH WOOD TRIM, U.O.N.