

## SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

## Discretionary Review Full Analysis

HEARING DATE: DECEMBER 7, 2017

Date:	November 27, 2017
Case No.:	2016-012108DRP
Project Address:	583 47 <sup>th</sup> AVENUE
Permit Application:	2015.10.22.0473
Zoning:	RH-1 (Residential House, One-Family)
	40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot:	1497/016E
Project Sponsor:	Jeff Burris, Studio 12 Architecture
	1501 Mariposa St, #319
	San Francisco, CA 94107
Staff Contact:	Christopher May - (415) 575-9087
	Christopher.May@sfgov.org
Recommendation:	Take DR and approve with modifications.

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

Reception: 415.558.6378

Fax: 415.558.6409

Planning Information: **415.558.6377** 

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposal is to construct a one-story, approximately 425 square-foot third floor vertical addition above the existing two-story, single-family dwelling, a roof deck above the proposed new 3<sup>rd</sup> floor, as well as front and rear roof decks above the existing 2<sup>rd</sup> floor.

#### SITE DESCRIPTION AND PRESENT USE

The project site is located on the west side of 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue between Geary Boulevard and Anza Street in the Outer Richmond neighborhood, Lot 016E in Assessor's Block 1497. The property is located within the RH-1 (Residential, House – One-Family) District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District. The subject property has approximately 25 feet of frontage on 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue and is approximately 70 feet deep, measuring a total of 1,750 square feet. The property slopes laterally along 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue and is currently occupied by a two-story, single-family dwelling constructed circa 1939, which covers approximately 75% of the lot. The subject property is one of twelve similarly-sized, shallower lots on its block, and abuts along its rear lot line the side lot line of a property fronting Anza Street.

#### SURROUNDING PROPERTIES AND NEIGHBORHOOD

This block of 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue slopes down fairly significantly from Geary Boulevard in the north to Anza Street in the south. This portion of the Outer Richmond neighborhood is zoned RH-1(Residential House, One-Family) and is characterized primarily by two-story single-family homes largely constructed from the 1920s to the 1940s. Immediately to the south of the subject property there are two 3-story single-family homes on the northeast and southeast corners of 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Anza Street.

#### BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION NOTIFICATION

ТҮРЕ	REQUIRED PERIOD	NOTIFICATION DATES	DR FILE DATE	DR HEARING DATE	FILING TO HEARING TIME
311 Notice	30 days	May 10, 2017 – June 9, 2017	June 7, 2017	December 7, 2017	183 days

#### **HEARING NOTIFICATION**

ТҮРЕ	REQUIRED PERIOD	REQUIRED NOTICE DATE	ACTUAL NOTICE DATE	ACTUAL PERIOD
Posted Notice	10 days	November 27, 2017	November 27, 2017	10 days
Mailed Notice	10 days	November 27, 2017	October 6, 2017	62 days

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

	SUPPORT	OPPOSED	NO POSITION
Adjacent neighbor(s)	_	2 (Parties to the DR)	-
Other neighbors on the block or directly across the street	3	2 (including one from a Party to the DR)	1 (former Party to the DR)
Neighborhood groups		1 (DR Requestor)	

As of November 27, 2017, the Department has received 4 letters in opposition to the project, including three from neighbors formally listed as Parties to the DR, as well as three letters in support of the project. The Department also received a letter from one neighbor who requested to withdraw their status as a Party to the DR. Their relationships to the subject property are summarized in the table above.

#### DR REQUESTOR

Dan Baroni, Land Use Chair for the Planning Association for the Richmond (PAR).

#### DR REQUESTOR'S CONCERNS AND PROPOSED ALTERNATIVES

- **Issue #1:** 4<sup>th</sup> **floor roof deck.** The proposed 4th floor roof deck is out of character and is an assault on privacy. No other house on block has one. The uppermost roof deck above the proposed 3<sup>rd</sup> floor vertical addition should be removed altogether.
- **Issue #2:** Angled 3<sup>rd</sup> floor rear wall and roof deck. The proposed 3rd floor rear deck violates the required 25% rear yard setback and has a diagonal orientation all other houses have east-west orientation. The rear walls and windows on the proposed 3<sup>rd</sup> floor vertical addition should be

squared off so that they face towards the rear of the property and not obliquely across neighboring properties.

- **Issue #3: Inaccurate plans.** The 311 plans don't reflect the true slope of street, understating the visual impact of the vertical addition on the block. All relevant plans should be revised to reflect the true slope of the street.
- **Issue #4: 3<sup>rd</sup> floor massing.** The bulky 3rd floor vertical addition can be seen from public right-of-way, breaking up an otherwise cohesive block. The proposed 3<sup>rd</sup> floor vertical addition, if permitted, should be set back further from the front main wall and designed to be less conspicuous when viewed from the street.

See attached Discretionary Review Application, dated June 7, 2017.

#### **PROJECT SPONSOR'S RESPONSE**

- **Issue #1: 4**<sup>th</sup> **floor roof deck.** The project sponsor has modified the uppermost roof deck by setting back the northern side and the open stairwell providing access to it from the proposed 3<sup>rd</sup> floor such that it no longer requires solid fire-rated walls along the north and south side lot lines.
- **Issue #2:** Angled 3<sup>rd</sup> floor rear wall and roof deck. The project sponsor has set back the railings along the sides of the rear roof deck above the existing 2<sup>nd</sup> floor such that it no longer requires solid fire-rated walls along the north and south side lot lines. The angled rear wall has not been modified.
- **Issue #3: Inaccurate plans.** Revised front elevations and renderings have been provided to more accurately depict the steeper gradient along 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue.
- **Issue #4: 3rd floor massing.** No modifications have been made to address this issue.

See attached Response to Discretionary Review Application, dated November 20, 2017.

#### **PROJECT ANALYSIS**

- **Issue #1: 4**<sup>th</sup> **floor roof deck.** The Department has reviewed the project per the Residential Design Guidelines, the Planning Code and the General Plan, and the project was reviewed by the Residential Design Advisory Team (RDAT) three times. Relative to the uppermost roof deck, RDAT found that the railings added to the massing of the proposed 3<sup>rd</sup> floor in a way that detracts from the visual pattern of this portion of the block and could present potential overlook and privacy concerns. The subject property has ample usable open space in the existing rear yard as well as on the proposed front and rear roof decks above the existing 2<sup>nd</sup> floor. As such, the Department recommends that the uppermost roof deck above the proposed 3<sup>rd</sup> floor vertical addition be eliminated from the project.
- Issue #2: Angled 3<sup>rd</sup> floor rear wall and roof deck. The Department confirmed with the Zoning Administrator that roof decks over non-complying portions of buildings may project into

required rear yards provided that any railings on their perimeters be open and set back from side lot lines such that they do not require solid fire-rated walls pursuant to the Building Code. Department staff supports the revised rear roof deck, which has been scaled back to no longer require solid fire-rated walls along the side lot lines. The Department does not object to the angled rear wall and windows, finding them to be consistent with the Residential Design Guidelines.

- **Issue #3: Inaccurate plans.** Department staff has determined that the revised front elevations and renderings that have been provided more accurately depict the steeper gradient along 47th Avenue.
- **Issue #4: 3**<sup>rd</sup> **floor massing.** As a result of the revised elevations and renderings which more accurately depict the steeper gradient along 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue, the Department consulted RDAT and it was agreed that the massing of the proposed 3<sup>rd</sup> floor vertical addition appeared to be more visible and disruptive to the pattern of massing along this portion of the block. Staff recommended to the project sponsor several means of minimizing the bulkiness of the addition, including lowering the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor ceiling height to 8 feet or sloping the roof of the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor such that it is less visible from the street. The project sponsor has not made any modifications to address this issue.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The Department has determined that the proposed project is exempt/excluded from environmental review, pursuant to CEQA Guideline Section 15301 (Class 1 - 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 TEAM REVIEW**

After having reviewed the revised front elevation and renderings which more accurately depict the steeper slope of 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue than originally shown in the Section 311 plans, RDAT found that the proposed massing of the proposed 3<sup>rd</sup> floor vertical addition, including the roof deck above, is inconsistent with the existing neighborhood character. RDAT found that the removal of the uppermost roof deck, as well either the lowering or sloping of the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor roof, would adequately minimize the bulkiness of the proposed vertical addition, and would meet the general intent of the Residential Design Guidelines.

#### **BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION**

The Department recommends the Planning Commission take Discretionary Review and approve the Proposed Project with the modifications as specified by the Residential Design Advisory Team.

- 1. Remove the uppermost roof deck above the proposed 3<sup>rd</sup> floor vertical addition.
- 2. Lower the ceiling height or slope the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor roof such that it is less visible from the street.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

#### Take DR and approve with modifications.

#### Attachments:

Block Book Map Sanborn Map Zoning Map Aerial Photographs Context Photos Environmental Document Section 311 Notice DR Application with Exhibits Response to DR Application dated November 20, 2017 Public Comment 311 3-D Renderings Revised 3-D Renderings Reduced 311 Plans Reduced Revised Plans

## **Design Review Checklist**

#### **NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER (PAGES 7-10)**

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

**Comments:** This portion of the Outer Richmond neighborhood is characterized primarily by two-story single-family homes.

#### SITE DESIGN (PAGES 11 - 21)

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

**Comments:** The surrounding context guides the manner in which additions to existing structures fit into the streetscape. Given the lateral slope along 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue, the proposed 3<sup>rd</sup> floor vertical addition appears to increase the bulkiness of the building when viewed from the street and is out of character with the prevailing streetscape.

#### BUILDING SCALE AND FORM (PAGES 23 - 30)

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

**Comments**: The height, width and depth of the proposed addition does not affect the midblock open space as it provides an adequate rear setback. However, in light of the revised front elevations and renderings which more accurately depict the steeper slope of 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue, the Department is of the opinion that the proposed 3<sup>rd</sup> floor vertical addition is more prominent and disruptive to the streetscape than originally expected. Lowering the overall roof height of the proposed vertical addition or sloping the roof such that it is less visible from the street would result in a built form that is more in keeping with the neighborhood character.

#### **ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES (PAGES 31 - 41)**

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A
Building Entrances (pages 31 - 33)			
Does the building entrance enhance the connection between the public realm of the street and sidewalk and the private realm of the building?	x		
Does the location of the building entrance respect the existing pattern of building entrances?	x		
Is the building's front porch compatible with existing porches of surrounding buildings?	x		
Are utility panels located so they are not visible on the front building wall or on the sidewalk?	x		
Bay Windows (page 34)			
Are the length, height and type of bay windows compatible with those found on surrounding buildings?	x		
Garages (pages 34 - 37)			
Is the garage structure detailed to create a visually interesting street frontage?	X		
Are the design and placement of the garage entrance and door compatible with the building and the surrounding area?	x		
Is the width of the garage entrance minimized?	X		

Is the placement of the curb cut coordinated to maximize on-street parking?	x	
Rooftop Architectural Features (pages 38 - 41)		
Is the stair penthouse designed to minimize its visibility from the street?		X
Are the parapets compatible with the overall building proportions and other building elements?		x
Are the dormers compatible with the architectural character of surrounding		
buildings?		x
Are the windscreens designed to minimize impacts on the building's design and	x	
on light to adjacent buildings?	~	

**Comments:** The existing entrance is not proposed for relocation as part of the proposed project. The garage is also remaining in its existing condition. There are no proposed bay windows or dormer windows. The proposed glass railings along the perimeter of the uppermost roof deck add to the bulkiness of the proposed vertical addition and would be out of character with the prevailing roof profiles along this street. Removing the uppermost roof deck would mitigate this concern.

#### **BUILDING DETAILS (PAGES 43 - 48)**

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

**Comments:** The Planning Department believes the proposed exterior materials' finish, quality and details are compatible and appropriately applied.

## **Parcel Map**



ANZA





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



## **Zoning Map**



SUBJECT PROPERTY

 $\mathbf{\mathbf{G}}$ 

## Height & Bulk Map



SUBJECT PROPERTY

# Aerial Photo (Facing West)



SUBJECT PROPERTY

# Aerial Photo (Facing North)







# Aerial Photo (Facing East)







## **Site Photo**







### SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

## **CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination**

#### PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Address		Block/Lot(s)	
Case No.	Permit No.	Plans Dated	
Addition/	Demolition	New	Project Modification
Alteration	(requires HRER if over 45 years old)	Construction	(GO TO STEP 7)
Project description for	Planning Department approval.		

#### STEP 1: EXEMPTION CLASS TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

*Note:	If neither class applies, an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i> is required.*
	Class 1 – Existing Facilities. Interior and exterior alterations; additions under 10,000 sq. ft.
	<b>Class 3 – New Construction/ Conversion of Small Structures.</b> 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.
	Class

#### STEP 2: CEQA IMPACTS TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

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

5	,, 1
	<b>Air Quality:</b> 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 Catex 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. <i>Exceptions: do not check box if the applicant presents documentation of</i>
	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).			
	Transportation: Does the project create six (6) or more net new parking spaces or residential units Does the project have the potential to adversely affect transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle safety (hazards) or the adequacy of nearby transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities?			
	<b>Archeological Resources:</b> 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? ( <i>refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Archeological Sensitive Area</i> )			
	<b>Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment:</b> Does the project site involve a subdivision or lot line adjustment on a lot with a slope average of 20% or more? ( <i>refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Topography</i> )			
	<b>Slope = or &gt; 20%:</b> 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? ( <i>refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Topography</i> ) <b>If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required.</b>			
	<b>Seismic: Landslide Zone:</b> 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? ( <i>refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Seismic Hazard Zones</i> ) <b>If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required.</b>			
	<b>Seismic: Liquefaction Zone:</b> 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? ( <i>refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Seismic Hazard Zones</i> ) <b>If box is checked, a geotechnical report will likely be required.</b>			
	If no boxes are checked above, GO TO STEP 3. <u>If one or more boxes are checked above, an <i>Environmental</i> <i>Evaluation Application</i> is required, unless reviewed by an Environmental Planner.</u>			
	Project can proceed with categorical exemption review. The project does not trigger any of the CEQA impacts listed above.			
Comments and Planner Signature (optional):				

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

<b>PROPERTY IS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING:</b> (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

Che	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. <b>Window replacement</b> that meets the Department's <i>Window Replacement Standards</i> . Does not include storefront window alterations.		
	4. <b>Garage work.</b> A new opening that meets the <i>Guidelines for Adding Garages and Curb Cuts,</i> and/or replacement of a garage door in an existing opening that meets the Residential Design Guidelines.		
	5. Deck, terrace construction, or fences not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.		
	6. <b>Mechanical equipment installation</b> that is not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of- way.		
	7. <b>Dormer installation</b> that meets the requirements for exemption from public notification under <i>Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 3: Dormer Windows</i> .		
	8. <b>Addition(s)</b> 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	Note: Project Planner must check box below before proceeding.		
	Project is not listed. GO TO STEP 5.		
	Project <b>does not conform</b> to the scopes of work. <b>GO TO STEP 5</b> .		
	Project involves <b>four or more</b> work descriptions. <b>GO TO STEP 5</b> .		
	Project involves less than four work descriptions. GO TO STEP 6.		

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

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

9. <b>Other work</b> 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)			
Reclassify to Category A Reclassify to Category C			
a. Per HRER dated: (attach HRER)			
b. Other ( <i>specify</i> ):			
Note: If ANY box in STEP 5 above is checked, a Preservation Planner MUST check one box below.			
<b>Further environmental review required.</b> Based on the information provided, the project requires an			
<i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i> to be submitted. <b>GO TO STEP 6.</b>			
<b>Project can proceed with categorical exemption review</b> . The project has been reviewed by the			
Preservation Planner and can proceed with categorical exemption review. <b>GO TO STEP 6.</b>	, I U I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I		
Comments (optional):			
Preservation Planner Signature:			
Treservation Trainlet Signature.			
STEP 6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION	_		
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER			
<b>Further environmental review required.</b> Proposed project does not meet scopes of work in either ( <i>check</i>			
all that apply):			
Step 2 – CEQA Impacts			
Step 5 – Advanced Historical Review			
STOP! Must file an Environmental Evaluation Application.			
No further environmental review is required. The project is categorically exempt under CEQA.			
Signature:			

Planner Name:	Signature:
Project Approval Action:	
If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project.	
Once signed or stamped and dated, this document constitutes a categorie of the Administrative Code.	cal exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31
In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code within 30 days of the project receiving the first approval action.	e, an appeal of an exemption determination can only be filed

## STEP 7: MODIFICATION OF A CEQA EXEMPT PROJECT TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, when a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exempt project changes after the Approval Action and requires a subsequent approval, the Environmental Review Officer (or his or her designee) must determine whether the proposed change constitutes a substantial modification of that project. This checklist shall be used to determine whether the proposed changes to the approved project would constitute a "substantial modification" and, therefore, be subject to additional environmental review pursuant to CEQA.

#### PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

#### DETERMINATION IF PROJECT CONSTITUTES SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

Compared to the approved project, would the modified project:

1		
	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 beyon is checked, further environmental review is required		

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.			
Name:	Signature or Stamp:		
	s checked, the proposed m nd no additional environm		



### SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1650 Mission Street Suite 400 San Francisco. CA 94103

### NOTICE OF BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION (SECTION 311/312)

On **October 22, 2015**, the Applicant named below filed Building Permit Application No. **2015.10.22.0473** with the City and County of San Francisco.

PROJECT INFORMATION		APPL	APPLICANT INFORMATION	
Project Address:	583 47 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	Applicant:	Jeff Burris, Studio 12 Architecture	
Cross Streets:	Anza Street	Address:	1501 Mariposa St, #319	
Block/Lot No.:	1497/016E	City, State:	San Francisco, CA 94107	
Zoning District(s):	RH-1 / 40-X	Telephone:	(415) 503-0212	
Record No.:	2016-012108PRJ	Email:	jeff@studio12arch.com	

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

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

PROJECT SCOPE		
Demolition	New Construction	Alteration
Change of Use	Façade Alteration(s)	Front Addition
Rear Addition	Side Addition	Vertical Addition
PROJECT FEATURES	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Building Use	Residential	No Change
Front Setback	3 feet	No Change
Side Setbacks	None	No Change
Building Depth	52 feet	No Change
Rear Yard	15 feet	No Change
Building Height	23 feet	29 feet
Number of Stories	2	3
Number of Dwelling Units	1	No Change
Number of Parking Spaces	1	No Change
PROJECT DESCRIPTION		

The proposal is to construct a one-story 425-square foot vertical addition above the existing two-story dwelling, a roof deck above the proposed new 3<sup>rd</sup> floor as well as front and rear roof decks above the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor. No changes to the front façade are proposed. See attached plans.

The issuance of the building permit by the Department of Building Inspection or the Planning Commission project approval at a discretionary review hearing would constitute as the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to Section 31.04(h) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

#### For more information, please contact Planning Department staff:

Planner:	Christopher May
Telephone:	(415) 575-9087
E-mail:	christopher.may@sfgov.org

Notice Date: 5/10/2017 Expiration Date: 6/09/2017

## **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 <u>www.communityboards.org</u> 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 <u>www.sfplanning.org</u>). 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 <u>www.sfplanning.org</u>. If the project includes multiple building permits, i.e. demolition and new construction, a <u>separate request</u> for Discretionary Review must be submitted, with all required materials and fee, for <u>each permit that you feel will have an impact on you.</u>

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 <u>www.sfplanning.org</u>. 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.

Application for Discretionary Review CASE NUMBER

## **APPLICATION FOR Discretionary Review**

1. Owner/Applicant Information

DRAPPLICANTS NAME: Planning Association for the Richmond		
DR APPLICANT'S ADDRESS: 5758 Geary Boulevard, Box #356, San Francisco, CA	ZIP CODE: 94121	TELEPHONE: (415)541-5652
PROPERTY OWNER WHO IS DOING THE PROJECT ON WHICH YOU ARE REQUESTING DISCRI Richard E. Radez and Bonny S Radez	ETIONARY REVIEW NAME:	
ADDRESS: 583 47th Avenue, SF CA	2IP CODE: 94121	TELEPHONE: (203) 255-6514
CONTACT FOR DR APPLICATION: Same as Above D Dan Baroni	with the second	Senter
ADDRESS: 5758 Geary Boulevard, Box #356, San Francisco, CA E-MAIL ADDRESS:	ZIP CODE: , 94121	TELEPHONE: (415) 541-5652
dan_baroni@gensler.com		

#### 2. Location and Classification

583 47th	SS OF PROJECT: Avenue, SF	CA		s		ZIP CODE: 94121
CROSS STREET	rs:	1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -			in some som	Contraction of the second s
ASSESSORS BL 1497	оскіот: / 016E	LOT DIMENSIONS: 70x25	LOT AREA (SQ FT): 1750	ZONING DISTRICT: RH-1		GHT/BULK DISTRICT:
Project	Description					
lense check all th Thange of U		nge of Hours 🗌	New Constru	ction 🗌 🛛 Alterati	ions 🔀 Dem	nolition 🗌 Other 🗌
dditions to	Building:	Rear 🗌 🛛 Fro	nt 🗌 🛛 Heigh	t 🔀 Side Yard		
resent or Pr	evious Use:		14.4			
roposed Us	e: 3rd floor	living space, 3	d floor front de	eck, 3rd floor rear	deck, 4th floo	or deck
uilding Per	mit Applicatio	0045 40	and the second sec		Data Filada	1000.000

Date Filed: 10/22/2016

### 4. Actions Prior to a Discretionary Review Request

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

#### 5. Changes Made to the Project as a Result of Mediation

If you have discussed the project with the applicant, planning staff or gone through mediation, please summarize the result, including any changes there were made to the proposed project.

8

### **Discretionary Review Request**

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

 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.

RDG Neighborhood Character. See attached DR App. for details, including previous Planning Dept. decisions.

1) 4th floor deck out of character, no other house on block has a 4th floor deck. Also a privacy assault.

2) 3rd floor deck violates the 25% setback and has a diagonal orientation (all other houses have east-west

orientation. 3) Front setback - bulky addition can be seen from public right of way, breaking up the otherwise

very cohesive block. 4) Plans submitted don't reflect the true slope of the street, understating impact on block

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:

This is a very short 70 foot lot /14 foot backyard that is uphill and overlooks multiple neighboring homes. See affidavits for impacted families) There are 3 privacy assaulting upper decks. See attached DR App. for details. 4th Floor roof deck extends up to or near neighboring property lines.

On 10/20/16, Planning Commission required removal of 1 of 3 privacy intruding upper decks for 567 47th (4

houses up) and that was on a 120 foot deep lot and therefore further away from neighbors.

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?

1) Remove 4th floor roof deck - privacy assaulting, not within neighborhood character, visible massing

2) 3rd floor - Respect the 25% rear yard setback requirement for privacy and character

3) 3rd floor deck, no diagonal. See RDT comments on 567 47th Avenue of 12/9/2015 about consistency .

4) Further setback at front so that 3rd story not be visible from public right of way, maintaining pristine design

See attached DR App. for details

### FOUR ISSUES ARE INCOMPATIBLE WITH NEIGHBORHHOD

- 1. Three privacy assaulting upper decks (third floor front, third floor rear, fourth floor roof). Remove the 4<sup>th</sup> Floor roof deck.
  - This project is on a very short undersized substandard 70-foot lot, with only a 14-foot backyard that is uphill and looks down over multiple neighboring homes. (See attached Exhibit A and B and H showing proximity of project to many of the DR Applicant Anza Street and 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and Exhibit C showing the view of the neighboring bedroom areas in rear of project from the property one house further from the neighbors.)
  - On October 20, 2016, for house 4 blocks up street at 567 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue Case No 2015-007103DRP, Planning Commission by 7-0 vote and RDT Staff by unanimous vote *required removal of one of three privacy intruding upper story decks*. That house at 567 47<sup>th</sup> was on a full sized mid-block 120-foot-deep lot and therefore further away from neighbors. This lot only 70 feet deep is located near the end of the block and looks right over many neighbors on Anza Street and 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue so it requires more restrictions.
  - Roof deck going right up to or near property line on north and south sides dictates a fire wall and walls on north side and south side add massing to the 4<sup>th</sup> floor.
  - No house on the block has a built roof deck. This house is particularly inappropriate for roof deck given lot substandard size and key lot location.
  - CEQA Exemption relies on addition being "minimally invasive from public right of way".
  - Please note that the architectural plans and 3D renderings that were the basis of the project exemption from further CEQA review do not accurately represent the actual slope of the street. The street is in fact steeper, and the vertical addition will be much more visible from the public right of way than presented and not at all minimally invasive. (See Exhibits D and E).

- 3<sup>rd</sup> floor visible from 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Require 3<sup>rd</sup> floor at front to be set back minimum of three additional feet to match respectful project at 530 – 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue.
  - House is in a group of NINE pristine C.O. Claussen (noted architect) designed homes from 1939 in a row on 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Important that third story not be visible from public right of way to maintain the pristine architecturally cohesive design of the NINE painted ladies of 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue (See attached Exhibits F and G showing the integrity of the block).
- 3. On 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor in rear, respect the 25% rear yard setback requirement. Important for neighborhood privacy and precedent.
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> floor deck is OK but require no deck or railings on the final 35 inches over second floor which is within the 25% setback, to give the houses on Anza street and 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue some privacy. This is a short undersized 70-foot lot and the 25% setback must be respected to maintain the standard of privacy established in this block. Important precedent for block that additions not violate the 25% rear yard setback requirement (see Exhibits A, C).
- 4. To confirm to neighborhood, orient the house east/west, not diagonally.
  - ALL other houses on the block are oriented east west, and a southwest orientation violates that standard in the neighborhood.
  - RDT comments from 12/9/2015 on house 4 houses up the Avenue at 567 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue prohibited any diagonal orientation unless it was five feet off the lot line. See RDT comments on 567 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue of 12/9/2015. Consistency requires no diagonal orientation. (see Exhibits A, C and G).

#### PRISTINE, SIGNATURE CORE BLOCK IN SUTRO HEIGHTS IMMEDIATELY ADJACENT TO SUTRO HEIGHT PARK

 From the Staff report dated October 13, 2016 for October 20, 2016 Case No 2015-007103DRP:

"The surrounding neighborhood is residential in character and comprised primarily of onestory-over garage single-family residences that were constructed between 1931 and 1940 in historic revival styles; **therefore it is very cohesive in design, material and massing.**"

- 38 of the 54 houses on the block are identical designed by same architect CO Claussen, and built by Herman Christensen (See attached Exhibit G and H for aerial view of Block showing cohesive layout and shortness of 583 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue lot)
- Almost 100% owner occupied, unusual for the Richmond
- Planted front yards
- Rare underground utility wiring
- Most beautiful and architecturally cohesive block in the Richmond. Great ocean views. Very desirable premium neighborhood.

## NEAR UNANIOMOUS NEIGHBORHOOD OPPOSITION TO PROJECT AND SUPPORT FOR DR

- 1. Planning Association for the Richmond ("PAR") www.sfpar.org
- 2. Neighbors as Parties to DR

Lisa K Large	Dr. Patricia Yong	Paula Yue
579 – 47 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	587 – 47 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	580 – 47 <sup>th</sup> Avenue
Roberta Chee	Christian Halberstadt	Ada Luong
5618 Anza Street	5624 Anza Street	5630 Anza Street
Dr. James Romano	Vince Rodrigues Dr	BrucePray/Richard Baltz
5636 Anza Street	582 – 48 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	586 – 48 <sup>th</sup> Avenue
Fred K. Baldwin	Mary Lynn Shimeck	Lily Zhang
580 47th Avenue	562 – 48 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	574 – 48 <sup>th</sup> Avenue
Allen K. Wong	Stefanie Nickel-Rather	Manching Wong
576 47th Avenue	595 – 47th Avenue	575 47 <sup>th</sup> Avenue

Supporting Individuals in Neighborhood

Petition Signed by 65 residents in the 500 blocks of 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue & 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue regarding similar issues at 567 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue. (see attached Exhibit I)

#### CONCLUSIONS

We have reviewed this project as presented in the 311 Notice against the *Planning Design Review Checklist*. We note:

- Neighborhood character (pages 7-10) is DEFINED.
- SITE DESIGN:

**Does the front setback provide a pedestrian scale and enhance the street?** NO. This house is one of nine pristine CO Claussen designed homes on 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue. This addition can be seen from public right of way, and it breaks up the Nine pristine historical homes. Further setback required.

• SITE DESIGN:

Is the building articulated to minimize impacts on privacy to adjacent properties? No. This is an undersized substandard short 70-foot lot. Need to remove one of three upper privacy assaulting decks to be consistent with Planning Commission 7-0 Decision of October 20, 2016. This is even a much shorter lot than the lot considered on October 20 so a more restrictive position is certainly appropriate. Need to respect the 25% rear yard requirement and remove railing from last 35 inches on third floor.at rear.

#### BUILDING SCALE:

## Is the building's height and depth compatible with the existing building scale at the mid-block open space?

No, no house on this block has a built roof deck. zoning rules require 25% setback in rear at 3<sup>rd</sup> floor and neighborhood wants no violation of that standard.

#### BUILDING FORM:

Are the buildings proportions compatible with those found on surrounding buildings? No, not a single house on this block has a roof deck, and this is a particularly small lot so development is even more privacy intrusive on this particular lot.

BUILDING FORM:

Is the building's roofline compatible with those found on surrounding buildings? No, the third-floor addition sets a new straight roof line that is jarring when looking at the nine pristine Claussen homes, so very important this 3<sup>rd</sup> floor addition in front be moved back a minimum of three feet to minimize view from public right of way and preserve the nine houses.

### **Discretionary Review Application** Submittal Checklist

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

REQUIRED MATERIALS (please check correct column) Application, with all blanks completed	DR APPLICATION
Address labels (original), if applicable	V
Address labels (copy of the above), if applicable	6
Photocopy of this completed application	
Photographs that illustrate your concerns	
Convenant or Deed Restrictions	10
Check payable to Planning Dept.	1
Letter of authorization for agent	U (PA
Other: Section Plan, Detail drawings (i.e. windows, door entries, trim), Specifications (for cleaning, repair, etc.) and/or Product cut sheets for nev elements (i.e. windows, doors)	v

## NOTES:

O Two sets of origina nd one coury of addresses of adjacent property owners and owners of property across street

M. Comette RECEIVED

#### IUN 07 2017

CITY & COUNTY OF S.F.

For Department Use Only Application received by Planning Department:

By:

Date: 06.06.2017

Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:

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

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

Date: 06.26.17

Daniel M. Baroni, PAR Land Use Chair Owner / Authorized Agent (circle one)

SAN FRANCISCO PLANKING DECORTMENT VOR OT DOTO

10

Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:

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

Signature: Date: Print name, and indicate whether owner, or authorized agent: DIRBEROR OF PLANNENCO APPONINSER BAT BO NOETAES OND TAJON JUNGR 629 ON BEAMLE OF THE PLANNER ArrocatArton OF THE RECHMOND

## 527 47th Avenue

SAN FRANCISCO FLAMMANS DES ARMENT VERDE SHE

1G

SHE REAL COLOR FLANKING GERERANT CONTINUES.

Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:

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

K. Large Signature: an

Date: 5-31-17

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

DiSA K. Lange mer Authorized Ageni (arcle one) 579 47 B Avenue

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

alvicia Your Signature:

Date: 5/29/2017

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

YONG OWNER CIA

## 587 – 47th Avenue

SHA FRANCISCO PLANLING DEPARTMENT VOE OF 2412

10
Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:

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

ul Signature

Date: 5/29/17

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

Paula J. Yue Paula J. Yue Owner i Autorotised Agent (circle pres) 580 47 - ave (directly across from 583)

# 580 47th Avenue

10 SAN FRANCISCO FLANNING DEPARTMENT VICE DT DOTO

Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:

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

ol Signature: POA for Virgence Lee Print name, and indicate whether owner, or authorized agent:

Date: 6-1-17

t name, and indicate whether owner, or authorized agent: <u>ROBERTA</u> CHEE (authorized Agent Owner (Authorized Agent (arcse one)

5618 ANZA SF 47 94121

# 5618 Anza

SHERE FRAME , ALC FLAMMARY CLAMPERTY , LANS .

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

C -L/Ja Signature:

Date: 6-3-

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

Halberstoolt Christan Owner / Authorized Agent (circle one

# 5624 Anza Street

SHO FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPLETIVENT TOP IT THIS

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

Signature:

Date: 5-29-19

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

owner

# 5630 Anza Street

SAN PRANCISCO PLANERS SEPARAMENT VEN CT 2013

Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:

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

m Signature:

Date: 6/1/2017

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

ROMANO JAmes Owner / Authorized A (ow ven)

# 5636 Anza Street

SHN FRANCISCO FLANDING DEFARTMENT .....

-

Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:

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

Signature: Vigenar Date: 6/6/17

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

VINCENT ROBRISTES

 $1 + 5 + 6 + \mu_{1,2} + 1 + \mu_{2,2} + \mu_{1,2} + \mu_{2,2} + \mu_{2,2}$ 

Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:

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

Signature: Kichan B. Bally

Date: June 3, 2017

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

<u>PICHARD</u> B. BALTZ, OWNER Owner / Authorizad Agent (circle one)

# 586 – 48th Avenue

10 BAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT Y GO. 07.2012

Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:

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

Thay Inna K. Signature:

Date: June 3, 2017

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

BRUCE R. PRAY, OWNER

# 586 – 48th Avenue

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING OSPARTMENT V.66.07.3012

Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:

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

Signature:

Zer 7 Date:

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

Fred K. Baldwin Co/anne Som Francisco (A 94/2/

# 580 47th Avenue

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPERTMENT VOI 17 1011

Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:

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

Signature: Whank Bargun Shumh Date: 6-4-3017

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

Onner Lynn Shimek

# 562 48th Avenue

SHN FRIEDBOD FLANDENS, LANKENPY VEB IN 1990

Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:

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

Signature:

6/3/17 Date:

Print name, and indicate whether owner, or authorized agent: LILY 2HANG (owner)

0

# 574 48th Ave

10 SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEMATHENT V.DE.07 2012

States the second second second

Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:

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

allen K. Way Signature:

Date: 6-5-2017

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

ALLEN K. WONG OWNER 576 - 47th AUR ADDress : SF. CA. 94121

Y

Under penalty of penury the following declarations are made:

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

Signature: anie

ahr Date: 614/17\_

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

( )L 01

# 595 47th Avenue

SAN ISANDIBCO F, ANDANG OF LANDDRY S LAND

Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:

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

Signature:

Date: 6-05-2017

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

MANCHING WONG Owner / Authorized Agent (circle one)

575 47 B Avenue

10

SAN FRANCISCO FLANDENIA SEPARADARA PUBE UN COS

CASE NUMBER

### **Discretionary Review Application** Submittal Checklist

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

REQUIRED MATERIALS (please check correct column) Application, with all blanks completed	
Address labels (original), if applicable	e V
Address labels (copy of the above), if applicable	ø
Photocopy of this completed application	
Photographs that illustrate your concerns	
Convenant or Deed Restrictions	國
Check payable to Planning Dept.	V
Letter of authorization for agent	
Diner: Section Plan, Detail drawings (i.e. windows, door entries, trim), Specifications (for cleaning, repair, etc.) and/or Product cut sheets for new lements (i.e. windows, doors)	22

NOTES: Pequired Material. Stoppional Material. O Two sets of original labels and one copy of addresses of adjacent property owners and owners of property across street.

For Department Use Only Application received by Planning Department:

By:

Date: 06.06.2017

Exhibit A

This subject property is on an small 70-foot lot. Expansion has a marked impact on privacy, especially it overlooks all neighboring bedrooms.



Exhibits for DR Application 6.7.17

583 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue Smaller (70') lot

583 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue

Subject Property



5618 Anza Street proximity to home of one of the DR applicants.



# Exhibit C

View from 2<sup>nd</sup> floor on 587 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

1 house downhill from the subjects house

Neighbors have used landscaping to create privacy, but this extends only to the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor. Neighborhood privacy is greatly impacted by building beyond the 2<sup>nd</sup> level.



# Exhibit D

The slope in the 583 plans is less pronounced than the actual scope:

Photos of the street and architectural plans for a neighboring house are: 1) identical and; 2) steeper





# Exhibit E

The roofline of 587 is actually lower than shown in the plans and the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor addition and 4<sup>th</sup> floor deck will be more visible than shown.

SF Planning Dept. approved the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor expansion and 4<sup>th</sup> floor deck based upon plans that are inaccurate and understate what will be visible from the public right of way.

# 583 Plans







# Exhibit F

The subject property (☆) is in a group of 9 pristine C.O. Claussen (noted architect) designed homes from 1939, all in a row on 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

It is important that 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> additions not be visible from public right of way to maintain the pristine architecturally cohesive design of the NINE painted ladies of 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue

# View of 583 47<sup>th</sup> Ave. from downhill



# Exhibit G

From the Staff report dated October 13, 2016 for October 20, 2016 Case No 2015-007103DRP:

"The surrounding neighborhood is residential in character and comprised primarily of one-story-over garage single-family residences that were constructed between 1931 and 1940 in historic revival styles; **therefore it is very cohesive in design, material and massing."** 

Subject property (







Exhibit H

Richard E. Radez Bonny S. Radez 583 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121

Paul J. Cannon Megumi O. Cannon 588 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121

Lisa K. Large 579 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121

Patricia Yong 587 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121

Virginia R. Lee 5618 Anza Street San Francisco, CA 94121

Yue Baldwin Trust 580 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121

Mei San Wong Allen K. Wong 576 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121

James Sancimino Living Trust 584 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121 Shauna Kathleen Oboyle 572 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121

Fong Fong Ga Liang Zhi Rong 568 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121

Manching Wong Trust 575 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121

John Andrew Anzur Trust 571 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121

Christian L. Halberstadt Catherine Halberstadt 5624 Anza Street San Francisco, CA 94121

Ada Luong 5630 Anza Street San Francisco, CA 94121 Impression antibourrage et à séchage rapide Utilisez le gabarit 5162® www.avery.com 1-800-GO-AVERY

James J. Romano Trust 5636 Anza Street San Francisco, CA 94121

Berit A. Pedersen Rodrigues V. Pedersen 582 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121

Jeff Burris Studio 12 Architecture 1501 Mariposa Street #319 San Francisco, CA 94107 Richard B. Baltz Bruce R. Pray 586 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121 **VERY®** 5162

Bruce H. Hinze Mary O. Chan 578 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121

Jason Jungreis Planning Association of the Richmond 5758 Geary Boulevard Box 356 San Francisco, CA 94121

Jason Jungreis Planning Association of the Richmond 5758 Geary Boulevard Box 356 San Francisco, CA 94121 Jeff Burris Studio 12 Architecture 1501 Mariposa Street #319 San Francisco, CA 94107

1-800-GO-AVERY

T

®2912 3TAJ9M3T ® Visva 9:

# Exibit 1

#### NEIGHBORHOOD OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED RENOVATION OF 567 47th AVENUE

NAME ADDRESS EMAIL/TELEPHONE 2 ALONZINGROID GUNIT CON AVE 527 JASON JUNGROIS 30 Anzast siphuong 200 1@ Ya how 30 Anzast Brome com. tw 54 4814 Ale Dor Neidick Ofmail. Com 1630 Anzast 00119 Kuhn. KimzgmAiL. com 48th Ave Komer @maloute Con Toterany



(W)

EMAIL/TELEPHONE NAME ADDRESS 218 45th Am US-five @mindspring.com Garren Katuyhowawa cortalink und 1243 42 der Leine 770 46.44 hiniccolls Ryahoo.com. Niccoll Ave. na Bar-David 510 - 48th Ave ilanabardavid@amail.com 48 \* 546 KUHN -6mostomkuhr. Co 570 485 RELESE 510 48K eso





The undersigned neighbors object to this development because it is completely inappropriate for the neighborhood. The scale and architecture of the new house do not fit with the surrounding houses. The fourth floor glass room and deck, the extension of the house and deck in the rear to the south lot line, the southwest diagonal siting, and the sheer mass of the house in back and front are blatantly inconsistent with the San Francisco Residential Guidelines for remodeled (and new) construction. The proposed renovation increases the square footage to @ 3,600 and substantially degrades the privacy, light, and air of neighbors. We ask the Planning Department to reject the building permit application.

NAME ADDRESS EMAIL/TELEPHONE official bp@yahoo.com 582 49th Ave tecloven 582 484 AVE VINCERUDIGIES sutrations@gmail.com 586-48thAvenue brucepray@cwmcast.net 586-48th Avenue richaudbaltz@comcast.net clairegechite yellos. com 542 - 48th Ave 415-386-5304 mia 526 48th aur 415-387-4203 46 387 42.63 526



(2)

The undersigned neighbors object to this development because it is completely inappropriate for the neighborhood. The scale and architecture of the new house do not fit with the surrounding houses. The fourth floor glass room and deck, the extension of the house and deck in the rear to the south lot line, the southwest diagonal siting, and the sheer mass of the house in back and front are blatantly inconsistent with the San Francisco Residential Guidelines for remodeled (and new) construction. The proposed renovation increases the square footage to @ 3,600 and substantially degrades the privacy, light, and air of neighbors. We ask the Planning Department to reject the building permit application.

EMAIL/TELEPHONE NAME ADDRESS Mary Lynn Shimek 562 48-th Rive int shimek or global r Valerie Sanchez 506 48th are. valey 0122 grail. com Deniel Nunes 52248th Ave. den 1964 Ome. com "Khosrov Shushtar 538-48th Ave akshushtar @ yahoo.com Kathleen Shushtar 538-48th Ave seme PAY SCHLESINGER 568 ANZA ST DAY SCHLEDHART MAKEN int shinek a straf oral net (KORIA HARTER 8331 GEARY BIND, erd Dane Johnson 500 (18th Are anethinks@gmail.com



EMAIL/TELEPHONE NAME ADDRESS 415-668-1453 415-668-1453 580 We 415-666-0835 We 415-420-8730 575-4700 Ave SF0x 94121 14153 221-7755 wore arianne Ave SF, CA 94121 OUNG 55 559-475 HVE SECA 94/21 4153861391

Star.



EMAIL/TELEPHONE NAME ADDRESS JULES ONG Belinda ONG 47TH AVE worryaboutnone @ yahoo, com n 507 47th QUENUE thrmoore Quehoo, com 530 47th AVENUE LAR VARNEY BUSINESS, com Rosemney more LEIGHANNE VARNEY Art Adams 545 47th Ave 545 47th Ave. Leefblue 2000 @ com cast. het 545 47th Arenve Sylvie Adams sylvecmana.com



EMAIL/TELEPHONE NAME ADDRESS JIM ROMAND 5636 ANZA Mail @ JROMAND. COM JASON SUN ENDEN J27 47 NVB. JASON SUN ENDEND COM Marie Tourlos 515-47 Are (415) 710-8644 What Mullay 510 47/4 Are 415-87/-348/ Kathy Beaulier 514-47th Ave 415-386-3906 Den Beaulier 514:47th Ave 45-386-3906



EMAIL/TELEPHONE ADDRESS NAME jonsimers Dedgmail.com Dana Summers 555 47th Ave BEVERLY SHULMING SEE 47th AVE jonsiners Soldgment.com BEVERLY SHULMING SEE 47th AVE MAVETINGE COMPAST. NET Cathav Gunn 538-47 # Ave. Kieranassoc emindspring.com



EMAIL/TELEPHONE NAME ADDRESS Claire . brettaucsF. edu 518 472 Ave 805ma 41 0 3 0hr. 402 415 395-7702 415 395-110-Kgrzffy Dunindspring.com JEFF. H.NEUREN & SBC Global. Net



NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL/TELEPHONE
Maimi Hom	527 47* AVE 571-47th Ave,	mhomehansonbridgett.
Steanie Dicile. Lee RATHE	Bather 595 47th Aue S95 47th Ale	Sheather & comparts bet
	STS 1/ Ne	<u>TEEVarber a) co</u> mcast. M
	$\mathbf{X}$	
	K	
<b>\</b> .		
	-	
3) RENDERING / PHOTO MONTAGE		
## We have two concerns and SF Planning RDAT Staff has agreed that our concerns are valid

We just want the project sponsors to accept the RDAT Staff recommendations

Continued Project Concerns (per the DR)	RDAT Comments:
4th floor roof deck is out of character – no other house on block has one (and also an assault on privacy)	<b>Remove</b> the <b>roof deck</b> above the proposed 3 <sup>rd</sup> floor
Bulky addition can be seen from public right-of-way, breaking up otherwise cohesive block	<b>Reduce</b> the 3 <sup>rd</sup> floor floor-to-ceiling height to 8 feet minimizing the vertical addition

## First, a little bit about the location

38 of the 54 homes on the block are the same,



all designed by CO Claussen and built by Herman Christiansen

Featuring center patio and skylights (bathroom, kitchen and stairway)



Per SF Planning: "The surrounding neighborhood is residential in character and comprised primarily of one-story-over garage single-family residences that were constructed between 1931 and 1940 in historic revival styles; therefore it is very cohesive in design, material and massing."

From the Staff report dated October 13, 2016 for October 20, 2016 Case No 2015-007103DRP:



Exhibits for 583 47th Ave. DR Meeting 12.7.17

The subject property (☆) is in a group of 9 pristine C.O. Claussen (noted architect) designed homes from 1939, all in a row on 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

It is important that additions are minimally visible from public right of way to maintain the pristine architecturally cohesive design of the NINE painted ladies of 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue

Exhibit F

#### View of 583 47<sup>th</sup> Ave. from downhill



View of 583 47<sup>th</sup> Ave. from uphill



## The most recent plans for 583 47<sup>th</sup> show considerable massing

...even with the changes to the 4<sup>th</sup> floor deck

The plans originally present to SF Planning had an inaccurate slope, understating the amount of visible massing

Initially presented to planning for approval (but slope of hill incorrect/understated)





Updated 583 Plan

## The proposed 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> level expansion also have a marked impact on privacy

This subject property is on an small 70-foot lot and overlooks many neighboring bedrooms



583 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue Subject Property 583 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue 70' lot

Exhibit A

Exhibits for 583 47th Ave. DR Meeting 12.7.17

## These houses are very close to each other

Proximity of subject property (583 47<sup>th</sup>) to home of one of the DR applicants at 5618 Anza



# The subject property plans includes three upper decks (privacy intruding)

Two directly overlooking neighboring yards and bedrooms



Exhibits for 583 47th Ave. DR Meeting 12.7.17

Neighbors have used landscaping to create privacy, but this extends only to the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor. Neighborhood privacy is greatly impacted by building beyond the 2<sup>nd</sup> level

View from 2<sup>nd</sup> floor on 587 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue One house south from the subjects house



## Per the October 16<sup>th</sup> RDAT Staff meeting, please remove the 4<sup>th</sup> floor roof deck and reduce the visibility of the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor

• we continue to request the **roof deck** above the proposed 3rd floor be **removed altogether**.

... front and rear roof decks above the existing 2<sup>nd</sup> floor provide sufficient usable open space without adding more massing to the building.

- Secondly, since the renderings have been revised to more accurately depict the slope of the street, the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor appears more visible than it did before.
  - As such, we are recommending that the floor-to-ceiling height be reduced to 8 feet, which should have the effect of minimizing the vertical addition.

## Who we are: PAR and Sutro Heights Neighbors



DR Applicants ★ Subject Property

Exhibit I

## Appendix

Contains exhibits that were included in the original DR application that are out of date

#### Exhibit D

The slope in the 583 plans is less pronounced than the actual scope:

Photos of the street and architectural plans for a neighboring house are: 1) identical and; 2) steeper



STRATE AND

100.0

100.1 C

ALL PROPERTY SET UTS. AUX 1017-1010

587 Actual roof top

587 Roof top in plans

587 Roof line in plans



#### Exhibit E

The roofline of 587 is actually lower than shown in the plans and the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor addition and 4<sup>th</sup> floor deck will be more visible than shown.

SF Planning Dept. approved the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor expansion and 4<sup>th</sup> floor deck based upon plans that are inaccurate and understate what will be visible from the public right of way.





Exhibits for 583 47th Ave. DR Meeting 12.7.17

### REUBEN, JUNIUS & ROSE, LLP

November 20, 2017

#### Delivered Via Email (Christopher.may@sfgov.org)

President Rich Hillis San Francisco Planning Commission 1650 Mission Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor San Francisco, CA 94013

#### Re: 583 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue Brief in Support of Project and Opposition to DR Request Planning Department Case No. 2016-012108DRP Our File No.: 10773.01

Dear President Hillis and Commissioners:

Our office represents Bonny and Richard Radez, the owners of the home at 583 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue ("**Property**"). Bonny and Richard propose a minor 425 square foot 3<sup>rd</sup> story addition to their home with decks to live out their retirement ("**Project**"). The DR request should be denied and the Project should be approved because:

- 1. The Project is Code compliant and contextual, consistent with or betters Residential Design Guidelines, and does not have exceptional or extraordinary circumstances that are necessary in a DR case. Perspectives are attached as **Exhibit A**.
- 2. The Project allows the owners to add indoor and outdoor space on a substandard size lot without intruding into the mid-block open space. It has a deep 23' 6" setback of the upper floor addition in front and 3' 7" in back, subordinating it to the existing building. The Planning Department supported the proposal for the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor and roof deck, and since the DR was filed continues to support the size of the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor addition and decks as proposed, but recommends removing the roof deck. The Planning Commission approved the addition of a larger roof deck four lots to the north less than a year before the Project proposal.
- 3. To address massing concerns, and consistent but not exactly in line with Department staff recommendation, the Project has been modified to eliminate fire-rated walls on the roof without removing the roof deck. The small 198 square foot roof deck provides additional livable open space, supplementing a very limited rear yard.
- 4. A number of neighbors support the Project, and most neighbors do not oppose it.<sup>1</sup>

James A. Reuben | Andrew J. Junius | Kevin H. Rose | Daniel A. Frattin | John Kevlin Tuija I. Catalano | Jay F. Drake | Matthew D. Visick | Lindsay M. Petrone | Sheryl Reuben<sup>1</sup> Thomas Tunny | David Silverman | Melinda A. Sarjapur | Mark H. Loper | Jody Knight Chloe V. Angelis | Corie A. Edwards | Coryn E. Millslagle | Jared Eigerman<sup>2,3</sup> | John McInerney III<sup>2</sup> San Francisco Office One Bush Street, Suite 600, San Francisco, CA 94104 tel: 415-567-9000 | fax: 415-399-9480

Oakland Office 827 Broadway, Suite 205, Oakland, CA 94607 tel: 510-257-5589

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> A comprehensive response to each point raised in the DR request is enclosed as <u>**Exhibit** M</u>.

#### A. Project Background and Rationale for Project

Bonny and Richard purchased the house as their retirement home in October 2014, moving from the East Coast. They have always loved the ocean, and were charmed with the architecturally eclectic neighborhood and its proximity to the ocean since being first introduced to it in the 1960s. As proud new owners of a property in the Sutro Heights community, they have no intention to disrespect its neighborhood character.

They were delighted to find that the Planning Code would allow the addition of a modest  $3^{rd}$  floor sun room/family room, along with decks to supplement the small and uncomfortable rear yard, enhancing livability and increasing the quality of open space at the Property without requiring any intervention into the established mid-block open space. They hope that the Project can enhance their retirement living, and be a space that they can enjoy, along with family and friends. To this end, they have already implemented City approved seismic upgrade, installed energy efficient furnace and on-demand water heater, added insulation where feasible, and intend to continue these environmentally friendly practices in the addition.

#### B. 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Addition Minor and Contextual

The Project's proposed third story addition and corresponding decks are sensitive to neighborhood character, in the near and broader context. Currently, from the second story of the existing house, it is impossible without binoculars to see the movement of neighbors across the mid-block open space. The Project will result in a view plane farther away from the sightlines to the neighbors, considering that the 3<sup>rd</sup> story addition is: (1) set back from the rear of the existing structure by 3' 7", (2) set back progressively more, diagonally to 13' 10" on its southern side, responding to the sloping topography of the block, and (3) articulated so the 3<sup>rd</sup> story rear wall fronting the mid-block open space is minimized. It provides a transition that responds to the topography of the block and is respectful of the downhill neighbor. The rear deck does not project into the mid-block open space—unlike the project approved at 567 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Furthermore, the front setback also keeps the strong existing roofline unchanged, maintaining pedestrian scale and experience on 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The over 23-foot front setback— which far exceeds the Residential Design Guidelines' recommended 15-foot front setback— allows the Project to be minimally visible from the pedestrian level along 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The existing cornice and the existing original hipped roof over the second floor will remain the

REUBEN, JUNIUS & ROSE, LLP

San Francisco Office One Bush Street, Suite 600, San Francisco, CA 94104 tel: 415-567-9000 | fax: 415-399-9480

Oakland Office 827 Broadway, Suite 205, Oakland, CA 94607 tel: 510-257-5589

www.reubenlaw.com

dominant roof line that continues along the block face. It will not be visually disruptive. The Project's visual impact will be minimal.<sup>2</sup>

The Guidelines recognize that a building can be taller than its neighbors and still compatible with the neighborhood, by using features such as façade articulations in addition to upper story setbacks. Behind the hipped roof and the setback, the use of transparent guard rails and by limiting applied ornamentation, the addition is subordinate to the existing primary façade and the existing building, keeping the addition in scale with the neighborhood.

DR requestors suggest the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor addition be set back an additional three feet. This modification cannot be accommodated, however, without disrupting the continuity of the stairwell. The Project proposes to extend the existing stairwell connecting the first and second stories into the third. Moving the addition would make that impossible.

One stated concern of the DR request is that it will allow the Radezs to look into their Anza Street neighbors' homes. The opposite is true. Because the Property is near the corner of  $47^{\text{th}}$  Avenue and Anza Street, the viewing angle from the Property to homes along Anza Street is narrow. The Property is also distant from its rear neighbors across the mid-block open space. Pictures showing these perspectives are attached as **Exhibit B**. The proposed addition elevates this view position by about nine feet directly above the existing condition, and at more of a vertical angle. This would take the new space created by the Project further away from the existing condition.

While a rear extension into the mid-block open space would bring its occupants closer to the neighbors in every direction, the vertical addition that does not protrude into the mid-block open space will move occupants farther away from rear neighbors on  $48^{th}$  Avenue, and side neighbors on Anza Street, than they currently are in the existing structure. The proposed setbacks further lessen the sight line to these neighbors. Photographs into the mid-block open space from the second floor of the current building are enclosed as **Exhibit C**.

Finally, the DR request demands that no "diagonal" orientation in the addition should be allowed because all other houses have east-west orientation. The southwest facing glass door of the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor addition is proposed to be sheltered by a trellis fronted with a fascia facing due west, continuing the existing orientation of the existing two floors below. The trellis creates filtered

San Francisco Office One Bush Street, Suite 600, San Francisco, CA 94104 tel: 415-567-9000 | fax: 415-399-9480

Oakland Office 827 Broadway, Suite 205, Oakland, CA 94607

tel: 510-257-5589

www.reubenlaw.com

 $<sup>^2</sup>$  The DR requestors are expected to claim that the plans originally submitted with the building permit did not reflect the true slope of the street. The architects used slope data from official Department of Public Works records; when compared with private survey data from a neighbor, there was a minor difference in grade. This project opponent then wanted the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition web site be used instead, which had a steeper grade. The rendering's slope was revised to show a grade closely matched to photographs taken. Even with this modified grade, the Project is minimally visible from the street.

light and shadow, adding visual interest. The Project does not project beyond the existing structure or intrude into the mid-block open space. While providing decent indoor and outdoor deck square footage for the owners, at the same time, it provides other benefits: this set back serves to reduce the frontal impact to the mid-block open space by reducing the width of the rear wall; creates a buffer zone from the addition to the downhill building; subordinating it to the existing  $2^{nd}$  floor roofline. The deck is recessed and not "bumped out" into the rear yard. The addition is made to look smaller by this rear facade articulation and set back. Angles and bay windows are common throughout the neighborhood; see **Exhibit D**.

#### C. Roof Deck Necessary for Livable Open Space

The fact that this is a standard size building on a substandard lot supports the need for additional open space supplementing the near unusable rear yard. The rear yard on a standard lot provides approximately 1,400 to 1,600 square feet of open space, depending on if any portion of the building extends into the rear yard. In contrast, the Property's substandard 70-foot deep lot leaves only approximately 360 square feet of rear yard. The small rear yard, together with all three proposed decks, totals about 34% to 43% less than the square footage of a rear yard on a standard size lot.

Expansion options are limited on substandard lots. Any addition to the rear of the structure would require a variance, making a vertical addition the common-sense option. Despite the substandard lot, the Property's rear extends no further into the mid-block open space than its neighbors. The fact that the Property is on a 70-foot deep lot does not affect how far it is from its rear neighbors whose homes front 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Using a flat roof on the addition is not out of character in this neighborhood. Some of these flat roofs are fronted with decorative hipped or slanted parapets, varying in height, width, style and material. The "non-flat" portion of the roofs are functional for some buildings or only decorative for others.

Additionally, the massing of the originally proposed stair accessing the roof deck is as unobtrusive as possible. A stair with straight run would have required a fire rated parapet of double the length. The most recent proposal includes a further modification, a less straightforward design, to access the roof deck by ascending over the bathroom, eliminating the need for the short fire rated wall along the south lot line. To the North, the 42" high fire rated parapet could have been more than double the proposed length. Given the front set back is significantly in excess of Residential Design Guidelines suggestions, the resulting shorter parapet is expected to be only minimally visible from the street due to the hipped roof and topography of the block. And yet, the most recent proposal includes a geometry that balances the south

> San Francisco Office One Bush Street, Suite 600, San Francisco, CA 94104

tel: 415-567-9000 | fax: 415-399-9480

Oakland Office 827 Broadway, Suite 205, Oakland, CA 94607

tel: 510-257-5589

www.reubenlaw.com

perimeter which results in more than the required set back to eliminate the fire rated wall, and a set back to the west perimeter that further reduces its visibility to the rear neighbors.

#### D. Mixed Neighborhood Context

The Residential Design Guidelines advise that new buildings or additions should have unified character, but does not mandate specific architectural styles nor encourage direct imitation of the past. In this neighborhood, building forms and architectural treatments are somewhat varied; the Guidelines call for buildings themselves to express a unified character in this setting.

The section of 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue between Geary Boulevard and Anza Street is a mix of revivalist and vernacular single-family residences. Some of the buildings across the street along 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue were constructed in a Spanish colonial revival style. Some make reference to Art Deco elements. The block faces have carried decorative treatments of different size balconies, shutters, and windows, sometimes mixed from unrelated periods and styles. The common theme is homes two to three-stories high with flat roofs, some fronted with slanted parapets or hipped roofs.

The DR request references potential historic aspects of the neighborhood. Although the Radezs certainly agree that the neighborhood has a lot of charm and are proud to be new owners, the DR overstates the degree to which this neighborhood is "historic." It refers to the "nine painted ladies of  $47^{\text{th}}$  Avenue", with no attributed source, seemingly trying to link a row of buildings along  $47^{\text{th}}$  Avenue to the Victorian houses on Steiner Street across from Alamo Square. The DR requestors claim that the building's architectural style—historic revival—implies preservation merit. In fact, a recent preservation study authored by Tim Kelley Consulting (**Exhibit E**) concluded that the row of houses in this area constructed between 1931-1952 range in height from one to three stories, and more importantly found that there is not a potential historic district that the Property and these other homes could contribute to.

Regarding mid-block open space, many of the houses in the vicinity of the Property have originally designed sun rooms or extensions added at a later date. (see group **Exhibit F**). Amenities in this space are quite varied. Some lots have added detached cottages, some have stair access to the rear yard, some have projecting rear decks at varying levels and depths, and some have bay windows protruding into the open space. By count from Google Maps, there appear to be at least 11 buildings in the neighborhood that have a  $3^{rd}$  floor, some of which have no front or rear set back. **Exhibit F** identifies these buildings. Five are on substandard lots. Additionally, there are some turrets and towers reaching the height of a  $3^{rd}$  floor fitted with windows or doors that are not counted as  $3^{rd}$  floors.

San Francisco Office

One Bush Street, Suite 600, San Francisco, CA 94104 tel: 415-567-9000 | fax: 415-399-9480

Oakland Office

827 Broadway, Suite 205, Oakland, CA 94607 tel: 510-257-5589

www.reubenlaw.com

#### E. Changes Made to Project

Working with Planning Department staff, Bonny and Richard have made a number of substantive changes to the Project since it was first proposed. Those changes include:

- **Roof deck railing**. The roof deck railing has been set back approximately 3' 11" further from 47<sup>th</sup> Street than initially proposed. The street facing railing material was changed from open with metal to transparent, although an open railing is easier to keep clean, does not produce glare, is friendly to birds, and is less wind resistant. Since submitted with the DR permit set, the roof deck railing on the north side has been set back eliminating the need for a 42" high fire rated wall. The roof deck railing on the west has been shortened and set back reducing the visual impact to the rear neighbors.
- **Staircase to roof deck**. A straight run staircase to the roof deck outside of the third story addition was replaced with a spiral staircase. This also allowed the firewall by the south lot line to be reduced. This small firewall is now eliminated in the latest modification by ascending over and cutting into the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor bath's ceiling.
- Eliminate fire-rated parapet wall. At the sides of the rear deck, two proposed 43-inch long fire rated parapet walls along the north and south lot lines were eliminated.

In addition, the Project could have been significantly larger than what was originally proposed and what is before the Commission. It could have included a near-complete 3<sup>rd</sup> floor addition set back 15 feet from the front property line with a high rising roof on top, consistent with the Residential Design Guidelines, and used that as a starting point to negotiate against with neighbors. But Bonny and Richard did not want to play games and have proposed a very modest addition that meets their needs for a comfortable family room, without asking for an unnecessary amount of space.

#### F. Certain Neighbors' Opposition and Project Support

The DR request for the Project was filed by the Planning Association for the Richmond ("PAR") and some individual neighbors. The petition enclosed with the DR application that has 65 signatures on it was for an entirely different project on the block, at 567  $47^{\text{th}}$  Avenue. This Commission approved that project, with modifications requested by staff, in October of 2016 (see DR Action Memo, 567  $47^{\text{th}}$  Avenue, attached as **Exhibit G**).

San Francisco Office One Bush Street, Suite 600, San Francisco, CA 94104 tel: 415-567-9000 | fax: 415-399-9480

Oakland Office 827 Broadway, Suite 205, Oakland, CA 94607 tel: 510-257-5589

www.reubenlaw.com

The DR was requested by PAR and signed by Jason Jungreis, a PAR director. Daniel Baroni is listed as the point of contact for the individual neighbors and for PAR. Mr. Baroni did not attend the Project's community meeting on May 17, 2017 and neither did many of the individual signatories. In fact, one party to the DR admitted that he had no issue with the project and signed the DR only because he was asked to by another neighbor; that DR requestor recently withdrew his DR request (email attached as **Exhibit H**).

In June of 2017, after the DR requests were filed, Richard asked the president of PAR for any written documentation showing how PAR came to its decision to oppose the project. The President of PAR promised to raise the request with the PAR Board of Directors in August (Email exchange attached as **Exhibit I**). Richard and Bonny have not received any information about how PAR came to the decision to formally oppose the Project. It is unclear if the Project was actually presented to the full PAR board or to its land use committee. Richard and Bonny have not received any report—written or oral—about the content of any PAR discussion on the Project. On September 18, 2017, this office emailed Mr. Baroni and the President of PAR following up, and did not receive a response (**Exhibit J**). It is curious that after decades of apparently not filing Discretionary Review requests for residential expansions, PAR filed two within approximately nine months of each other, 4 houses apart and on the block where Jason Jungreis, Robert Fries—another PAR Director—and John Anzur live.

To our knowledge, the two individuals most actively opposing the Project are John Anzur and Berit Pedersen, neither of whom signed the DR (others are copied on emails but not participating in the discussion) (email exchange attached as <u>**Exhibit K**</u>). It is our understanding Mr. Anzur and Ms. Pedersen told Department staff that they actually authored the DR request.

Despite demands for modification in the DR request, it appears the intent of some opponents is to prohibit any addition to the property, and not really ask for reasonable changes. Mr. Anzur stated his intent is to prohibit the Project in its entirety at the May 17, 2017 community meeting. He also continues to mislead the Commission by implying that there are 65 neighbors objecting to the Project. In fact, 65 neighbors objected to the project at 567 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue—which is next door to his home, and for which he did sign a DR request. This is the third project on this block that Mr. Anzur has aggressively opposed. Bonny and Richard have been told that others in the neighborhood are hesitant to do projects on their own homes out of fear that certain neighbors will vociferously oppose it, costing time, money, and emotional distress.

Despite what DR requestors imply, reception to the Project in the neighborhood has been mixed. While certain neighbors oppose it—or at least felt compelled to sign a DR—others actively support it. To date, three neighbors have submitted letters of support for the Project.

San Francisco Office One Bush Street, Suite 600, San Francisco, CA 94104 tel: 415-567-9000 | fax: 415-399-9480

Oakland Office 827 Broadway, Suite 205, Oakland, CA 94607 tel: 510-257-5589

www.reubenlaw.com

Also, one initial DR requestor actually withdrew his request, explaining that he signed it only because his neighbor asked him to. (see group **Exhibit L**).

#### G. Prior Approved Project at 567 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue

As mentioned above, this Commission recently approved a  $3^{rd}$  story addition with decks—including a roof deck—four lots up the street from the Property, in October 2016 (see the DR Action memo for 567 47<sup>th</sup>, attached as **Exhibit G**). DR requestors refer multiple times to this Commission's approval of that project, misleadingly implying that the Commission denied it. They also attempt to use the Commission's design changes as precedent to make this minor 425 square foot  $3^{rd}$  story addition all but infeasible.

The 567 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue project is informative for a few different reasons, both in the ways that proposal differed from the current Project and what the Commission approved:

• The Project is smaller and objections were different. The 567 47<sup>th</sup> project proposed an increase to 567 47<sup>th</sup> Street that would make it approximately 3,600 square feet in size. In contrast, the Project would add 425 square feet to an approximately 2,000 square foot home. With the Project, the house on the Property will be approximately 30% smaller than the 567 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue project this Commission approved.

Four of the five issues raised in the DR for that project are not applicable here: a five-foot side setback on a proposed extension into the rear yard; eliminating three lot-line windows for neighbor privacy; a cantilevering rear roof deck off of the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor; and driveway location. Neighbors also objected to a front deck set back 7.5 feet from the front lot line, which this Commission approved. (A completely new facade and roof were proposed for the 2 story building making this small set back possible). In contrast, the Project's front deck is proposed to be set back 16.5 feet from the front lot line—significantly further than the deck approved at 567 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

• The Project proposes fewer decks that do not intrude into mid-block open space. This Commission eliminated one of four decks proposed in the 567 47<sup>th</sup> project, specifically one that cantilevered over the rear yard, proposing a new intrusion into the mid-block open space. The Project only proposes three decks: a front and rear deck, and a roof deck on top of the 3<sup>rd</sup> story addition. It does not propose a new deck or balcony extending into the mid-block open space. Indeed, the fact the existing structure is a standard-sized building on a substandard lot (regarding depth) should support the need for additional open space supplementing the very limited rear yard.

> San Francisco Office One Bush Street, Suite 600, San Francisco, CA 94104 tel: 415-567-9000 | fax: 415-399-9480

Oakland Office 827 Broadway, Suite 205, Oakland, CA 94607 tel: 510-257-5589

www.reubenlaw.com

• The Commission actually approved a roof deck. The 567 47<sup>th</sup> also proposed a roof deck—at over 400 square feet, it is significantly larger than the roof deck proposed in the Project (now 198 square feet). The Commission did not eliminate the roof deck as part of modifying the 567 47<sup>th</sup> Project. A smaller roof deck set further back from the front property line in the Project should be allowed to remain.

#### H. Conclusion

This modest addition is respectful of existing architectural patterns, does not impact the quality or pattern of mid-block open space, and is necessary to provide usable, functional, and comfortable open space on a substandard lot. We respectfully request this Commission approve the Project as proposed.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

**REUBEN, JUNIUS & ROSE, LLP** 

Mark Loper

Exhibits enclosed

San Francisco Office One Bush Street, Suite 600, San Francisco, CA 94104 tel: 415-567-9000 | fax: 415-399-9480

Oakland Office 827 Broadway, Suite 205, Oakland, CA 94607 tel: 510-257-5589

REUBEN, JUNIUS & ROSE, LLP www.reubenlaw.com

#### **Exhibit List**

А	-	Front and rear perspectives of project
В	-	Photographs showing view angles of homes along Anza Street, opposite mid- block open space
С	-	Views into mid-block open space from existing 2 <sup>nd</sup> story at Property
D	-	Examples of angled structures and bay windows in the neighborhood
E	-	567 47 <sup>th</sup> Avenue Historic Resource Evaluation, Tim Kelley Consulting (7-2015)
F	-	Map Showing Block and 3 <sup>rd</sup> Story Additions, Extensions, Turrets, Towers
G	-	567 47th Street, DR Action Memo, SF Planning Commission
Н	-	Email from Allen Wong to Chris May, November 4, 2017
Ι	-	Email Exchange between Richard Radez and Planning Association of the Richmond
J	-	Email to Planning Association of the Richmond, September 18, 2017
K	-	Email Exchange between Planning Department, Berit Pedersen, and John Anzur
L	-	Letters of Support; Letter Withdrawing Discretionary Review Request
М	-	Detailed Response to Discretionary Review Request, 583 47th Avenue

San Francisco Office One Bush Street, Suite 600, San Francisco, CA 94104 tel: 415-567-9000 | fax: 415-399-9480

Oakland Office 827 Broadway, Suite 205, Oakland, CA 94607

tel: 510-257-5589

www.reubenlaw.com

### Exhibit A









### Exhibit B



Due to the shallow rear yard on this substandard lot, the fence around the yard is only 14 ft. 7 in. from the existing rear wall of the building. In perspective from the rear downhill neighbor on 48th Avenue (this fence currently lower than allowed) screens out most of the existing first floor of this building. (The enormous tree mentioned earlier, rising above the existing 2nd floor, covers 1/2 of the rear facade vertically). *The expanded building is in scale in the rear*. The perspective from a house on 48th Avenue may see across the open space, the height of the 47th Avenue buildings bounded by a fence as far away as 50 to 65 ft. from their uphill neighbors' sun room or main rear wall.

(Unfortunately, I can only get a perspective from the roofs of the 48th Av houses and not from the ground or 2nd floor.)









Exhibit B-3



(at corner of proposed 3rd. floor patio. Will see less of neighbor at proposed set back window wall).



Exibit B-4

## Exhibit C

Taken from right edge of left window.



Exhibit C-1


Taken from middle of Left window.





Taken from left edge of left window.



Taken from left edge of right window.



Taken from middle of right window.





Taken from right edge of right window.

# Exhibit D







549 47th Av Addition including extension into mid block open space no side lot line set back angled rear wall



566 48th Av No front set back No rear set back No facade articulation



Angled window/walls on existing patio and bay windows protruding into mid block open space:

- against discussion on privacy concerns;
- against discussion as objectionable geometry.



659 48th Av (at Sutro Heights) Angled window/walls on existing patio and bay windows against discussion as objectionable geometry.

# Exhibit E

# HISTORICAL RESOURCE EVALUATION PART 1

567 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA



TIM KELLEY CONSULTING, LLC HISTORICAL RESOURCES 2912 DIAMOND STREET #330 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94131 415.337-5824 TIM@TIMKELLEYCONSULTING.COM

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction
II. Summary 2
III. Current Historic Status
A. Here Today 2
B. Department of City Planning Architectural Quality Survey
C. San Francisco Architectural Heritage 3
D. California Historical Resource Status Code
IV. Description
A. Site
B. Exterior 4
V. Historic Context
A. Neighborhood5
B. Project Site History7
C. Construction Chronology9
D. Permit Record10
E. Architectural Style10
F. Owners and Occupants11
VI. Evaluation of Historic Status11
A. Individual Eligibility12
Criterion 1 (Events)12
Criterion 2 (Persons)12
Criterion 3 (Architecture)12
Criterion 4 (Information Potential)13
B. District13
VII. Integrity15
VIII. Conclusion
IX. Bibliography
X. Appendix

# I. INTRODUCTION

Tim Kelley Consulting (TKC) was engaged to conduct a Historical Resource Evaluation (HRE) for 567 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue, a wood-frame single-family residence built in 1938 in the Outer Richmond neighborhood. A scoping discussion via email with Gretchen Hilyard, Planner, on July 9, 2015 identified an area to be visually examined in the vicinity of the subject property, specifically on 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue between Geary Boulevard and Anza Street. This report investigates whether the subject building is eligible for individual listing in the California Register of Historical Resources and whether it is located in a potential historic district.

# II. SUMMARY

TKC has determined that 567 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue is not eligible for individual listing in the California Register, nor is it located within a potential historic district.

# **III. CURRENT HISTORIC STATUS**

TKC searched the San Francisco Planning Department database to determine whether the property has been identified in any recognized register of historical resources. The specific registers included are listed below.

#### A. Here Today

*Here Today: San Francisco's Architectural Heritage* is one of San Francisco's first architectural surveys. Undertaken by the Junior League of San Francisco and published in 1968, the survey did not assign ratings to buildings. However, the survey does provide brief historical and biographical information for what the authors believed to be significant buildings. The San Francisco Board of Supervisors adopted the survey in 1970. The survey files, available in the San Francisco Public Library's San Francisco History Room, contain information on approximately 2,500 properties. This property is not included in the published book.

#### B. Department of City Planning Architectural Quality Survey

The Department of City Planning Architectural Quality Survey, or 1976 Survey, was a reconnaissance survey that examined the entire City of San Francisco to identify and rate architecturally significant buildings and structures on a scale of "0" (contextual) to "5" (extraordinary). No historic research was performed and the potential historical significance of

a resource was not considered when assigning ratings. According to the authors, the 10,000 rated buildings comprise only around 10 percent of the city's building stock. Due to its age and its lack of historical documentation, the 1976 Survey has *not* been officially recognized by the city of San Francisco as a valid local register of historic resources for CEQA purposes, although it is still used on a consultative basis. <u>This property is not included in the 1976 Survey</u>.

#### C. San Francisco Architectural Heritage

San Francisco Architectural Heritage (Heritage) is the city's oldest not-for-profit organization dedicated to the preservation of San Francisco's unique architectural heritage. Heritage has completed several major architectural surveys in San Francisco, including Downtown, South of Market, Richmond District, Chinatown, Van Ness Corridor, Northeast Waterfront, and Dogpatch. Heritage ratings range from "A" (highest importance) to "D" (minor or no importance) and are based on both architectural and historical significance. <u>San Francisco Architectural Heritage has not surveyed this property.</u>

#### D. California Historical Resource Status Code

Properties listed in the California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS) or under review by the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) are assigned status codes of "1" to "7," establishing a baseline record of historical significance. Properties with a status code of "1" are listed in the California or National Register. Properties with a status code of "2" have been formally determined eligible for listing in the California or National Register. Properties with a status code of "3" or "4" appear to be eligible for listing in either register through survey evaluation. Properties with a status code of "5" are typically locally significant or of contextual importance. Status codes of "6" indicate that the property has been found ineligible for listing in any register and a status code of "7" indicates that the property has not yet been evaluated. This property has not been rated.

#### **IV. DESCRIPTION**

#### A. Site

567 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue is located on the west side of 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue between Anza Street and Geary Blvd. This section of the 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue slopes up to the north, and the subject parcel follows the slope of the street. The building abuts both neighbors and is set back from the front lot line; the neighboring buildings have similar setbacks. A concrete driveway accesses a garage on the right side and a concrete walkway accesses a gated entryway left of center. At the far left a low stucco wall is surmounted by a metal screen and encloses an open stairway rising to the primary entrance on the first floor. Planter boxes, enclosed with short concrete walls, flank the concrete walkway (Figure 1).



Figure 1: Planter boxes and entry of 567 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

#### B. Exterior

567 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue is a one-story -over basement, single-family frame residence clad in stucco and topped with a flat roof with a hipped parapet. The plan is rectangular with a cutout left front that contains the primary entrance and terrazzo stairs. There is a recessed segmented garage door with two small narrow windows on the right side of the basement level. On the left is the security gate leading to the enclosed entryway. There is a pedestrian door at the rear wall of the entryway. To the left of the door, quarter turn terrazzo steps rise to the primary entrance on the first story. The primary entrance is recessed and features a wooden door with a scored diamond pattern (Figure 2). The first story features three multi-pane casement windows on the left and four lite French doors with a metal balconette on the right. A stuccoed chimney rises above the roofline on the far right. The building terminates with a straight cornice and hipped parapet.



Figure 2: Detail of primary entrance

# V. HISTORIC CONTEXT

#### A. Neighborhood

The Richmond District is located in the northwest quadrant of San Francisco. Interspersed throughout the district are several hundred nineteenth-century cottages mixed with commercial corridors and rows of spec-built Edwardian-era and mid-century flats and single-family dwellings.

For most of its early recorded history, what is now the Richmond District remained in a natural state of rolling sand dunes and chaparral. In 1866 and 1868, respectively, the Board of Supervisors passed the Clement and Outside Lands Ordinances. This legislation affected nearly all unsurveyed lands within the corporate boundaries of the City and County of San Francisco. In 1870, the "Official Map of the Outside Lands" was published, extending Jasper

O'Farrell's grid into what is now the Richmond, with minor adjustments made to align with the boundaries of the U.S. Army's Presidio Reservation.

Prior to the Outside Lands Ordinances, the Richmond District had already attracted a small number of ranches and dairy farms. In the 1860s, several local dairymen built the Point Lobos and San Francisco Toll Road from the city line to Point Lobos. This road, which eventually became Geary Boulevard, allowed farmers to transport their products to market while simultaneously allowing day-trippers to travel to Point Lobos and Ocean Beach. Early maps of the area depict a landscape of rolling sand dunes and isolated farmsteads consisting of a house, windmill, tankhouse, and assorted stables and outbuildings.

At the ocean, a seaside holiday economy grew up, with the Cliff House restaurant, hotel and gardens (established in 1863) being the principal attraction. In 1881, Adolph Sutro, the successful engineer, real estate speculator, and eventual mayor of San Francisco, purchased the Cliff House and built a railroad to provide access to this attraction, which he soon enhanced with a sculpture garden and his famous Sutro Baths. Meanwhile, he bought up much of the Richmond and became one of the district's major boosters.

Street railway franchises were granted to several different companies in a generally unsystematic fashion, with the primary routes following Geary Boulevard (franchise granted to the Park and Ocean Railroad Company in 1877) and California Street (franchise issued to the California Street Railroad Company in 1878). At first, these lines were operated with horse cars, which were later replaced by steam trains and then electric streetcars in the early 20th century. The growing popularity of Golden Gate Park and the Bay District Race Track in the latter part of the 19th century led to the creation of several cross-district lines running north-south.

The existing 19th century development clustered along the principal transportation lines: California Street, Geary Boulevard, Fulton Street (along the northern edge of Golden Gate Park); and several north-south cross streets. Following the earthquake and fire of 1906 new residential development commenced at a rapid pace, and the Richmond district was largely built out by the late 1920s. The increasing popularity of the automobile minimized the perceived distance between downtown and the Richmond, encouraging more people to build flats and single-family homes, frequently with garages beneath. Geary Boulevard and Clement Street were developed as automobile-scaled commercial corridors in the 1910s and 1920s, and major cultural and religious institutions such as St. John's Presbyterian Church and Temple Emanu-El relocated from downtown and the Western Addition to serve the various ethnic groups now living in the Richmond.

#### B. Project Site History

The first Sanborn map for this area was published in 1913, showing the subject block undeveloped (Figure 3). The subject parcel was vacant.





The 1938 Harrison Ryker aerial photograph shows most of the subject block containing a row of similar buildings (Figure 4). The subject property is one of a group of nine that was constructed beginning in 1938.



Figure 4: 1938 aerial photo showing 567 47<sup>th</sup> Ave noted with arrow.

The 1950 Sanborn Map shows the entire subject block was developed with groups of similar residential buildings (Figure 5). The subject property has a one-story over basement single-family building.



Figure 5: 1950 Sanborn Map showing 567 47<sup>th</sup> Ave noted with arrow.

#### C. Construction Chronology

According to the original building permit, this building was constructed in 1938 by owner and local contractor, Herman Christensen and designed by C.O. Clausen<sup>1</sup>. Christensen also constructed 8 adjacent buildings (563 – 595 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue) in 1938.<sup>2</sup> It is not known if Clausen also designed these buildings as he was not listed on the building announcements. This building has sustained no alterations to the primary façade.

#### C.O. Clausen

Charles Oliver Clausen (1886-1973) was born and raised in California and started his career as a draftsman with the architectural firm Meyer & O'Brien. He began his career designing apartment buildings, flats, and single family homes primarily in the Mission Revival style. Examples include 2853-57 Clay in Pacific Heights (1910), 3600 Jackson in Presidio Heights (1918), and 1457 Jones on Russian Hill (1913). He partnered with F. Frederick Amandes from 1927-1933. In 1933, he reestablished his own practice, designing single family homes, including 50 San Rafael Way in St. Francis Woods (1935). Clausen is also the only master architect to be associated with residential tract designs in the Sunset Neighborhood.<sup>3</sup>

#### Herman Christensen

Herman Christensen was born on December 4, 1892 in Sweden and immigrated to the United States in 1913. Christensen first lived in Queens, New York, where he worked as a carpenter with his older brother Edward. By 1929, Christensen had moved to San Francisco, where he initially resided in the Mission District and was employed as a builder. From 1929 until 1955 Christensen was an active builder in both San Francisco and San Mateo County. He worked from his home at 1422 27th Avenue in the Sunset District from 1930 to 1939 and, later, from his

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Permit Application #35398, May 26, 1938

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Pacific Constructor, "Permits and Contracts San Francisco County," June 4, 1938 page4

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> "Sunset District, Residential Builders, 1925-1950, Historic Context," Prepared by Mary Brown for San Francisco City and County Planning Department, April 3, 2013, 104.

apartment at 1399 21st Avenue. Christensen is known to have engaged the services of architects. In June 1977, at the age of 85, Christensen passed away in Menlo Park California.<sup>4</sup>

#### D. Permit Record

The following permits were found in Department of Building Inspection files for the subject property:

- Permit #35398, May 26, 1938 To build one-story and basement wood-frame singlefamily building.
- Permit #520423, August 31, 1984 Apply Alcoa siding to rear of home
- Permit #555866, October 14, 1986 Repair front siding stucco
- Permit #201401226814, January 22, 2014 Reroof (Permit not available for copy; job card included)

Copies of these permits are in the Appendix to this report.

#### E. Architectural Style

The subject property can be best described as a style recently defined in the Sunset Historic Context Statement: Mixed / Eclectic / Transitional. The Sunset Context statement describes this architectural style as the following:

Although not a style unto itself, there are scattered examples of buildings in the Sunset District that display a mixed fusion of unrelated styles. Such examples may incorporate glass brick, portholes, or speedlines—design elements associated with Streamline Moderne styles—with features more typically associated with Mediterranean or Colonial Revival styles. A fusion of the Streamline Moderne style with traditional design elements such as a hipped roof and shutters may reflect a builder's desire to incorporate emerging Modern design without alienating potential house buyers with too radical a style.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Biography credited to "Sunset District, Residential Builders, 1925-1950, Historic Context," Prepared by Mary Brown for San Francisco City and County Planning Department, April 3, 2013.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> "Sunset District, Residential Builders, 1925-1950, Historic Context," Prepared by Mary Brown for San Francisco City and County Planning Department, April 3, 2013, 100.

#### F. Owners and Occupants

Herman Christensen, a local contractor, constructed this building in 1938. The first owners to reside at the property were Steve and Ida Jancovich in 1939. Steve Jancovich was a salesman. Lloyd and Lucille Starr purchased the property in 1943. Lloyd was an officer in the U.S. Army. The Starrs sold the property in March 1947 to Gordon and Carol Ann Cameron; they immediately sold it to G. Robert and Milan Campbell in October 1947. Robert Campbell was a musician. Judson and Ada Glen purchased the property in 1951. Judson Glen was employed as a secretary. Andrew and Dorothy Wong purchased it in 1964. The subject property was sold to Wing Mon and Susan Mark in 1983. Felix and Vera Braynin purchased the property in 1988, and James Mitchell purchased it in 1989. Timothy Kurlya and Nancy Powel purchased the property in 2008. The current owners purchased the property in 2014.

### VI. EVALUATION OF HISTORIC STATUS

The subject property was evaluated to determine if it is eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, either individually or as a contributor to a historic district. The California Register is an authoritative guide to significant architectural, archaeological and historical resources in the State of California. Resources can be listed in the California Register through a number of methods. State Historical Landmarks and National Register-eligible properties (both listed and formal determinations of eligibility) are automatically listed. Properties can also be nominated to the California Register by local governments, private organizations or citizens. This includes properties identified in historical resource surveys with Status Codes of 1 to 5 and resources designated as local landmarks or listed by city or county ordinance. The evaluative criteria used by the California Register for determining eligibility are closely based on those developed for use by the National Park Service for the National Register. In order to be eligible for listing in the California Register a property must be demonstrated to be significant under one or more of the following criteria:

*Criterion 1 (Event):* Resources that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.

*Criterion 2 (Person):* Resources that are associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history.

*Criterion 3 (Architecture):* Resources that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic values.

*Criterion 4 (Information Potential):* Resources or sites that have yielded or have the potential to yield information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California or the nation.

The following section examines the eligibility of the subject property for listing in the California Register under those criteria.

#### A. Individual Eligibility

• Criterion 1 (Events)

567 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue does not appear to be eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 1. The building was constructed along with several similar single-family buildings during the pre-war development period in the Outer Richmond neighborhood. This building did not make a significant contribution to that building pattern. The building is not associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States. Therefore it is not individually eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 1.

• Criterion 2 (Persons)

This building does not appear to be eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 2. None of the other occupants were listed in the San Francisco Biography Collection or newspaper indexes or otherwise indicated to be important to the history of San Francisco or the State of California. Thus the property is not individually eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 2.

• Criterion 3 (Architecture)

This property is not eligible for individual listing in the California Register under Criterion 3. The building was constructed by Herman Christensen and designed by C.O. Clausen. C.O. Clausen is considered a master architect, but this building is a formulaic vernacular design not representative of his best work. Herman Christensen is not considered a master builder. The building does not embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or possess high artistic values. Thus the property is not individually eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 3.

• Criterion 4 (Information Potential)

This criterion ordinarily refers to potential archeological value. A full analysis of archeological value is beyond the scope of this report. The property does not appear eligible for individual listing on the California Register under Criterion 4.

#### B. District

A property may also become eligible for listing on the California Register as a contributor to a historic district. Guidelines define a district as an area that "possesses a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development".<sup>6</sup> To be listed on the California Register, the district itself must be eligible under the criteria already discussed. The documentation of the district must enumerate all properties within it, identifying each as a contributor or non-contributor. The district itself, as well as each of its contributors, then become historical resources.

The block in which the subject property is located is not formally identified at present as a historic district. To investigate whether a historic district potentially exists in the area, TKC conducted a search of nearby HRERs and visually examined the surrounding buildings. Based on the scoping discussion of July 9, 2015 with the Planning Department, the examined area includes 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue between Geary Blvd and Anza Street.

The area contains 45 properties constructed between 1931 and 1952 and ranging in height from one to three stories (contextual photographs are available in the Appendix). The majority

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Office of Historic Preservation, 1995.

of this area was constructed between 1938 and 1940. Currently, there are three HRERs in the near vicinity. The following table lists the property address, parcel number, construction date (per the Assessor's Office) and use. The subject property is in italics.

 Table 2: Buildings on the 567 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue Subject Block

Address	Parcel	Construction Date	Building Use
501 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1497/001	1931	Single-family
507 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1497/002	1931	Single-family
511 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1497/003	1931	Single-family
515 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1497/004	1931	Single-family
519 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1497/005	1931	Single-family
525 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1497/006	1931	Single-family
527 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1497/007	1939	Single-family
531 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1497/008	1939	Single-family
535 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1497/009	1939	Single-family
539 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1497/010	1939	Single-family
545 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1497/011	1939	Single-family
549 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1497/012	1935	Single-family
555 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1497/013	1938	Single-family
559 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1497/014	1952	Single-family
563 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1497/016	1939	Single-family
567 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1497/016A	1938	Single-family
571 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1497/016B	1938	Single-family
575 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1497/016C	1939	Single-family
579 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1497/016D	1939	Single-family
583 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1497/016E	1939	Single-family
587 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1497/016F	1939	Single-family
591 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1497/016G	1939	Single-family
595 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1497/016H	1939	Single-family
8245 Geary	1498/050	1940	Single-family
506 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1498/049	1932	Single-family
510 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1498/048	1933	Single-family
514 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1498/047	1940	Single-family
518 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1498/046	1933	Single-family
522 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1498/045	1933	Single-family
526 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1498/044	1933	Single-family
530 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1498/043	1933	Single-family
534 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1498/042	1940	Single-family
538 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1498/041	1937	Single-family
542 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1498/039	1937	Single-family
548 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1498/038	1938	Single-family

552 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1498/037	1939	Single-family
560 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1498/035	1940	Single-family
564 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1498/034	1940	Single-family
568 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1498/033	1940	Single-family
572 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1498/032	1940	Single-family
576 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1498/031	1940	Single-family
580 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1498/029	1940	Single-family
584 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1498/028	1940	Single-family
588 47 <sup>th</sup> Ave	1498/027A	1940	Single-family
5546 Anza	1498/027	1936	Single-family

A search of HRERs in the area found the following results:

- 8200 Geary, 1489/008, September 15, 2010 This property is not a historic resource. The report is not available.
- 5440 Anza, 1499/016, March 18, 2015 This property is not a historic resource. The report is not available.
- 5435 Anza, 1588/001L, January 31, 2014 This property is not a historic resource; there is no potential historic district.

The section of 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue between Geary Blvd and Anza Streets is a mix of Revivalist and vernacular/eclectic single-family residences. Some of the buildings on the east side of 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue were designed in a Spanish Colonial Revival style similar to the style used by the Rousseau brothers in nearby neighborhoods (there are two significant Rousseau Historic Districts in the Sunset neighborhood).<sup>7</sup> However, a majority of the buildings in the examined area are mundane tract homes constructed prior to World War II. Although this area is stylistically cohesive and representative of a prevalent building pattern in the Outer Richmond neighborhood, the buildings are unremarkable and did not make a significant contribution to this broad development pattern.

#### **VII. INTEGRITY**

In addition to being determined eligible under at least one of the four California Register criteria, a property deemed to be significant must also retain sufficient historical integrity. The

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> "Sunset Picturesque Period Revival Tracts Historic Districts," San Francisco City and County Planning Department, July 2013.

concept of integrity is essential to identifying the important physical characteristics of historical resources and hence, evaluating adverse change. For the purposes of the California Register, integrity is defined as "the authenticity of an historical resource's physical identity evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource's period of significance" (California Code of Regulations Title 14, Chapter 11.5). A property is examined for seven variables or aspects that together comprise integrity. These aspects, which are based closely on the National Register, are location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. *National Register Bulletin 15, How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* defines these seven characteristics:

- Location is the place where the historic property was constructed.
- *Design* is the combination of elements that create the form, plans, space, structure and style of the property.
- *Setting* addresses the physical environment of the historic property inclusive of the landscape and spatial relationships of the building/s.
- *Materials* refer to the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern of configuration to form the historic property.
- *Workmanship* is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history.
- *Feeling* is the property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.
- *Association* is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.

This building is not a historical resource, therefore no period of significance exists and integrity cannot be determined.

#### VIII. CONCLUSION

567 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue is not individually eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources. The property is not located in a potential historic district.

#### IX. BIBLIOGRAPHY

#### Published

- California Office of Historic Preservation. "Instructions for Recording Historical Resources." (Sacramento: 1995).
- Olmsted, Roger and T. H. Watkins. *Here Today: San Francisco's Architectural Heritage*. San Francisco: Junior League of San Francisco Inc., 1968.
- San Francisco Chronicle, "Seventeen Boulevard Lots in St. Francis Wood Purchased," July 29, 1922.

San Francisco City Directories.

- San Francisco Department of City Planning. "CEQA Review Procedures for Historical Resources." (San Francisco: 2005).
- San Francisco Department of City Planning. "Sunset District, Residential Builders, 1925-1950, Historic Context." (San Francisco: 2013).
- U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service. *National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation.* Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, rev. ed. 1998.

#### Public Records

San Francisco Office of the Assessor-Recorder. Deeds, maps, and sales ledgers.

San Francisco Bureau of Building Inspection, Records Management.

Sanborn Maps, San Francisco California, 1914, 1950.

United States Census Records, 1940.

# X. APPENDIX

West Side of 47<sup>th</sup> Ave Between Geary Blvd and Anza Street













(arrow indicates subject building)




East Side of 47<sup>th</sup> Ave Between Geary Blvd and Anza Street













## Permits for 567 47<sup>th</sup> Ave



DEPARTMENTOF	
BUILDING INSPECTION	Pess-10M-4.47 Write in Ink-File Two Copies
£-	
	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS CENTRAL PERMIT BUREAU
	BLDG. FORM
	2 APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
	FRAME BUILDING
	may 24 100 F
1000	Application is hereby made to the Department of Public Works of the City and County of San Francisco for permission to build in accordance with the plans and specifications submitted herewith and according to the description and for the purpose herainafter set forth :
	(1) Location of Lot Yand Side of Hy Arange Street
	175 Feet No. K. or An Jan St. St. No. Block No.
	(2) Number of Stories Andrew (WITH) (WITHOLT) Basement.
	(3) Total Cost \$.4. 700
	(4) Purpose of Occupancy Decling No. of rooms 6 No. of families 200
	(5) Size of lot X Ft. Front X Ft. Rear 12-20 Ft. Deep
	<ul> <li>(6) Any other building on lot at present 200</li> <li>(7) Contractor (DOES) (DOES) carry Workmen's Compensation Insurance.</li> </ul>
	(1) Contractor (DABS NOTE) carry Worsmen's Compensation Insurance. (8) Supervision of construction by Flurman Christmann
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Address 1801 - 19 France
	I hereby cortify and agrees, if a permit is issued, that all the provisions of the BUILDING LAW, THE BUILDING ZONE ORDINANCES, SET-BACK LINE REQUIREMENTS AND THE FIRE ORDI- NANCES OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO and the STATE HOUSING ACT OF
	I hereby certify and agree, if a permit is issued, that all the provisions of the BUILDING LAW. THE BUILDING ZONE ORDINANCES, SET-BACK LINE REQUIREMENTS AND THE FIRE ORDI- NANCES OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO and the STATE HOUSING ACT OF CALIFORNIA will be complied with, whether herein specified or not; and I hereby agree to save, in- demnify and keep harmless the Giv and County of San Francisco against all liabilities, indgreents, costs and expenses which may in anywise accrue against said city and county in consequence of the granting of this permit, or from the use or occupancy of any sidewalk, street or subsidewalk placed by virtue thereof, and will in all things strictly comply with the conditions of this permit.
	(9) Architect I. O. Llausen
	Certificate NoLicense No
	Certificate No. License No. City and County of San Francisco State of California & To Aramue
	(10) Engineer
ŧ.	Certificate NoLicense No
1	State of California City and County of San Francisco
- A.	Address (11) Plans and specifications prepared by
	Other than Architect or Engineer
	(12) Contractor Horman Christiansen
	License No. 16 e o 3 State of California K City and County of San Francisco
78x -	Address 1801-19 terme
	(13) Owner Hermon Christensen
Part of the second s	Address 1801-19 Avenue
	AND A CONTRACT OF A CONTRACT O
	ByOwner's Authorized Agent
	Side Sewer In Not In Owner's Authorized Agent.
	Side Sewer In Not In Owner's Authorized Agent. The Department will call up telephone No
	Side Sewer In Not In Owner's Authorized Agent.

	3 8
AUGS 1 1504 COMINGE DISTRICT INSPECTOR NAMED ON FACE OF APPLI- CATION AT STATE OF WORK (TREEDWORE NO. 861 5820). THIS AMPLICATION IS APPROVED WITHOUT FIELD INSPECTION AND POES NET CONSTITUTE AN APPROVED WITHOUT FIELD INSPECTION AND WORK AUTHORIZED MUST BE DONE IN STRICT ACCORDINGE WITH ALL APPLICATE COMPLEX IN STRICT ACCORDINGE	-136010 B
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS FORM 3 Resapproval site inspection required FORM 3 Over the counter issuance for Industry of Plan sets // // 2 so of me and on the public set of the s	аррания ини
DATE FORD S-31-84 New Part Room Processing States Code of Car A TATA WE S-31-84 S-31-84 S-31-84 INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY ALL APPLICANTS DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING	
INTER S CORE INTERES Z INTERES Z INTERES IN <u>RESULTED ALTERATION</u> 27 DESCRETION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION 27 INTERES CONTRACT Z INTERES INTO A PROPOSED ALTERATION 27 INTERES Z INTERES Z INTO A PROPOSED ALTERATION 27 I	18: 19:00 19:0
	SZ-007779 (□ 2 □ 3 □ ) /
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FORM 3 APPLICANTS ONLY           (II) SOIL INSTANDO-         III of a fit a fi	70. GALLEVIL 00 2004 da 2 2004 da 2 2014 da 2
Contraction shoes not a way and allow opposition of an international and allow oppositions of a state of	ce of the permit, operation to in Francesce from and oppoint autimg if san operations under only of san Francisco, and to escap oppoint of such column.
<ul> <li>March 200°, a constraining more than 750 rem. which be parted on the grant of the sort is sort which contain the sort of the</li></ul>	Control format durance, other doctor and form (AV or (AU bipdoct denotion) (Y) must be automotive the second of the in automotive (A) the Greector of motion hospitation attacked by on antified by the Director or (B)
LESSE AGENT WITH POWER OF ATTORNEY      LESSE ACCOUNTRACTOR ATTORNEY      CONTRACTOR ATTORNEY IN FACT      APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION      INSERT CERTIFICATION       INSERT CERTIFICATION       INSERT CERTIFICATION       INSERT CERTIFICATION       I	8-31-84



Υ Γ	DOCT 141956
	ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS
	555866 10-14-86 1.800-
	INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY ALL APPLICANTS DESCRIPTION OF EXSTING SURDING INT INCOMPANY AND INCOM
	(1)     State Dissource     110
	Captain (18357) SIDING STATED
•	
	IMPORTANT NOTICES No dongs deal to engot in the donacer of the scappancy or use without first dotaining a during frame undersizing with change. See Son Francess Building Cede and Son Francess undersizing with change. See Son Francess Building the without in Multimore transmission or son and advance construction, to be deser
ε.	Personant to Sam Francisco Subling Code, the building parent shall be posted on the plob. The server is expended for opposed below or shall not posted
	EECTECAL WEBENG OF RULEBENG RESILULATIONS, A SEPARATE FEARINF FOR THE     WING AND PULLINENCE ALL SEXAULT FEARINF FOR THE     ANOVER IS TEST TO ANY OF ALCOME QUESTIONS (10) (11) (12) (13) (23) (22) or (2A).     Machine of the avoid too's according to the second of the second too's according to the second too's according too's according to the second too's according to the second too's according to the second too's according too
	LESSE     AGENT WITH POWER OF ATTOBNEY     Construction       CONTRACTOR     ATTOBNEY IN FACT       APPENDIX CONTRACTOR     APPENDIX Comparendition insurance is contend.



OFFICIAL OF DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION		
ADDRESS OF JOB 567 47TH AV OWNERNAME KURYLA TIMOTHY J	E POWELT. NAN DEPOSITION DEPOSITION	BLOCKLOT APPLICATION NO. 1497/016A 201401226814 TELEPHONE (415)504-2567 NDATE PERMIT NO. EXPIRATION DATE
ESTIMATED COST FILE DATE 988-800 01/22/14	ISSUED 01/22	
8 5 R-3	ANCY CODES PLANS	2 1 5 BID-INSP
G R C ROOFING INC.		4158228860
1 FAMILY DWRLLING SPECIAL USE DISTRICT NO SPECIAL USE DISTRICT	REROOFING	COMPLIANCE WITH REPORTS
9003-18	106	PERMIT INSPECTION RECORD DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING INSPECTION JOB CARD

## Exhibit F



No detail study is available regarading 3rd floors in the original design or later additions. By count on Google Maps, there are at least 11 buildings that have a 3rd floor in the neighborhood, some of which have no front or rear set back at all. Many other houses have a tower, turret, or very high roofs rising to the height of a 3rd story. Of the 11 three-story houses, 5 are on substandard lots.



Exhibit F-1

# No front set back

## Nice set back but still visible

# 

0



AVA



# both sides with





# Multi-story buildings on Anza



story halconV 

441441004740.50

Mostly 3-story homes

<u>, 88</u>



- Rear Extensions, original or later added

- Not highlighted are detached structures and bay windows overhanging in the mid block open space that can be seen on Google Maps

## Exhibit G



## SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

## **Discretionary Review Action DRA-0489**

**HEARING DATE OCTOBER 20, 2016** 

Case No.: 2015-007103DRP **Project Address:** 567 47th Avenue Permit Application: 2015.05.12.6116 RH-1 (Residential House, One Family) Zoning: 40-X Height and Bulk District Block/Lot: 1497/016A Project Sponsor: **Butler Armsden Architects** 1420 Sutter Street, First Floor San Francisco, CA 94109 Alexandra Kirby - (415) 575-9133 Staff Contact: Alexandra.Kirby@sfgov.org

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

Ś,

Reception: 415.558.6378

Fax: 415.558.6409

Planning Information: 415.558.6377

ADOPTING FINDINGS RELATED TO NOT TAKING DISCRETIONARY REVIEW OF CASE NO. 2015-007103DRP AND THE APPROVAL OF BUILDING PERMIT 2015.05.12.6116 PROPOSING CONSTRUCTION OF A ONE-STORY VERTICAL AND HORIZONTAL ADDITIONS TO THE EXISTING ONE-STORY-OVER-GARAGE, SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE AND TO RENOVATE THE FAÇADE OF THE PROPERTY WITHIN THE RH-1 (RESIDENTIAL HOUSE, ONE FAMILY) ZONING DISTRICT AND 40-X HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICT.

## PREAMBLE

On May 12, 2015, Butler Armsden Architects filed for Building Application Permit no. 2015.05.12.6116 proposing to construct vertical and horizontal additions to the existing one-story-over-garage, singlefamily residence and to renovate the façade of the property within the RH-1 (Residential House, One Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District.

On June 15, 2016, The Planning Association of the Richmond ("PAR", hereinafter "Discretionary Review (DR) Requestor") filed an application with the Department for Discretionary Review (2015-007103DRP) of Building Permit Application No. 2015.05.12.6116.

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).

On October 20, 2016, the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") conducted a duly notices public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting on Discretionary Review Application 2015-007103DRP.

www.sfplanning.org

The Commission has heard and considered the testimony presented to it at the public hearing and has further considered written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of the applicant, Department staff, and other interested parties.

## ACTION

The Commission hereby takes Discretionary Review requested in Application No. 2015-007103DRP and approves the Building Permit Application 2015.05.12.6116, subject to the following modifications as recommended by the Residential Design Team:

Design Changes:

- 1. At the rear addition, retain 5-foot side setbacks from the existing main rear wall to grade on both sides of the rear addition to respect the common pattern within the mid-block open space.
- 2. Remove the balcony at the rear of the third level to respect neighborhood privacy. The proposed roof deck provides adequate useable open space at the upper levels.
- 3. Reduce the massing of the third story vertical addition above the rear "bump-out" to not extend more than 5' beyond the common rear wall.

The reasons that the Commission took the action described above include:

- 1. Although, the proposal complies with the Planning Code and the General Plan, the Commission found there to be extraordinary or exceptional circumstances, in that, the subject block has a consistent pattern of approximately 5' side setbacks at the rear "bump-out" at both property lines. Preserving this pattern would help to maintain the existing midblock open space.
- 2. The proposed height and depth of the third story addition are inconsistent with the development pattern of the block and would create an unusually tall rear addition. Reducing the depth of the addition would provide better access to light and air for the adjacent properties.

**APPEAL AND EFFECTIVE DATE OF ACTION:** Any aggrieved person may appeal this Building Permit Application to the Board of Appeals within fifteen (15) days after the date the permit is issued.

For further information, please contact the Board of Appeals at (415) 575-6881, 1650 Mission Street # 304, San Francisco, CA, 94103-2481.

**Protest of Fee or Exaction:** You may protest any fee or exaction subject to Government Code Section 66000 that is imposed as a condition of approval by following the procedures set forth in Government Code Section 66020. The protest must satisfy the requirements of Government Code Section 66020(a) and must be filed within 90 days of the date of the first approval or conditional approval of the development referencing the challenged fee or exaction. For purposes of Government Code Section 66020, the date of imposition of the fee shall be the date of the earliest discretionary approval by the City of the subject development.

If the City has not previously given Notice of an earlier discretionary approval of the project, the Planning Commission's adoption of this Motion, Resolution, Discretionary Review Action or the Zoning Administrator's Variance Decision Letter constitutes the approval or conditional approval of the development and the City hereby gives **NOTICE** that the 90-day protest period under Government Code Section 66020 has begun. If the City has already given Notice that the 90-day approval period has begun for the subject development, then this document does not re-commence the 90-day approval period.

I hereby certify that the Planning Commission did take Discretionary Review and approved the building permit as reference in this action memo on October 20, 2016.

Jonas P. Jonii

Commission Secretary

AYES: Fong, Richards, Hillis, Johnson, Koppel, Melgar and Moore

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ADOPTED: October 20, 2016

## Exhibit H

## REDACTED

From: Allen Wong Sent: Saturday, November 04, 2017 12:05 PM To: Christopher.May@sfgov.org ; rradez@russellandco.com Subject: Review building application

Dear Mr.May,

I am writing to you because I would like to withdraw my name from the petition against the building the third floor and roof deck at 583 47th ave s.f. ca. 94121. The building of the third floor would not impact my view or my home. I only sign the petition as a favor for my neighbor, because she has always been a good neighbor.

Thank you very much

Sincerely, Allen Wong

Richard E. Radez Russell & Co. Inc. 583 47th Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121

Mobile: 203-255-6514 Email: rradez@russellandco.com

## Exhibit I

REDACTED

From: PAR Sent: Tuesday, June 27, 2017 1:39 PM To: Richard Radez Cc: david.lindsay@sfgov.org ; Christopher (CPC) May Subject: Re: PAR Application for a Discretionary Review of 583 47th Avenue

Sir: I refer you to my previous email about bringing your correspondence to the attention of the Board. I will do the same with this one.

Thank you.

Sent from my iPad Richard Corriea

On Jun 27, 2017, at 11:31, Richard Radez <rradez@russellandco.com> wrote:

Mr. Corriea--

There are several points that I want to follow up on your response below, in addition to my request to attend the August 7, 2017 board meeting.

Regarding the "thorough study" that PAR is supposed to do before taking a position on an issue affecting the Richmond District, if the study does exist and you do not want to provide me with a copy, then please provide David Lindsay or Christopher May in the Planning Department with this study about my permit for a third floor and a roof deck at my house at 583 47th Avenue. I have copied them on this email.

I noted in your Commentary in the June 2017 issue of the Richmond Review that no such vote was mentioned. Please ask your assistant to provide me the date when the Board of PAR had a majority vote to file the Application for a Discretionary Review on my house at 583 47th Avenue. This should not need to wait until the August board meeting.

The Application for a Discretionary Review on our house is not written in a business like fashion. The references in the application that PAR filed against our house to the application for a discretionary review that PAR filed against 567 47th Avenue last fall are not applicable, misleading, and prejudicial. We will be happy to discuss this in a meeting with you, Messrs Lindsay and May, and this will also be discussed in detail in our written rebuttal to the application for a discretionary review should there be one.

I do not believe Messrs Broni and Jungreis attended our community meeting on May 17, 2017 as one neighbor insisted that attendees need not identify themselves. The only person who identified himself as from PAR was man named Bob Fries. He arrived late to the meeting, introduced himself to my wife who was standing at the back of the room, and asked her "what structure are we talking about?" I am concerned that your consideration for this application was not well informed.

As for adding discussion of my first email below to the August 7, 2017 meeting agenda, this delay is costing me money and emotional distress. I have been on boards for many years and we had telephone board meetings all the time. We understand that PAR has not requested a discretionary review of a residential project in the Richmond District for about 30 years. It is curious that you have

submitted 2 in the last 9 months. If this is not the scope of issues that PAR should focus on, then it is in everybody's interest for PAR to withdraw the application as soon as possible.

Richard Radez

From: Richard Corriea Sent: Monday, June 26, 2017 11:31 AM To: Richard Radez Subject: Re: PAR Application for a Discretionary Review of 583 47th Avenue

I will bring your email to the attention of the board of directors at our next meeting. The agenda for our July meeting is already full so this new correspondence will be included in our August 7, 2017 meeting agenda. A Member of our Land Use Committee will get back to you after that.

Thank you.

On Jun 26, 2017, at 11:23 AM, Richard Radez <rradez@russellandco.com> wrote:

This is for Richard Corriea, the President of the Planning Association for the Richmond, SF

Dear Mr. Correia:

On June 7, 2017, the Planning Association for the Richmond (PAR) filed an Application for a Discretionary Review of a planned third floor and roof deck addition to my home at 583 47th Avenue. The Applicant's Affidavit was signed by Jason Jungreis, Director of Planning Association of the Richmond on behalf of the Planning Association of the Richmond.

On the PAR's website, there is this statement: "PAR takes positions on issues that affect the Richmond District only after thorough study and a majority vote by the Board of Directors." Can you please provide me with the "thorough study" that was taken on our property and the board minutes showing the majority vote of the directors of PAR and their names. This information was not attached to the Application for a Discretionary Review. Does this "thorough study" discuss what is the extraordinary impact our proposal has on the City's General Plan?

In addition, I would like to know the following:

1. Who wrote the application for PAR and who organized the 15 neighbors who signed affidavits for the application?

2. Why was there extensive reference to the other application for a Discretionary Review that PAR submitted for 567 47th Avenue last year when the 2 proposals are so different? For example, our façade will be kept intact with no change.

3. Did either Jason Jungreis or Dan Baroni, the PAR director who is listed as the point of contact for the application, attend the neighborhood meeting that my wife and I hosted on May 17, 2017, to discuss our third floor addition?

I look forward to hearing from you on this matter.

Very truly yours,

Richard E. Radez

Richard E. Radez 583 47th Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121

Mobile: 203-255-6514 Email: rradez@russellandco.com Richard E. Radez 583 47th Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121

Mobile: 203-255-6514 Email: rradez@russellandco.com

Richard E. Radez Russell & Co. Inc. 583 47th Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121

Mobile: 203-255-6514 Email: rradez@russellandco.com

## Exhibit J

From:	Mark H. Loper
To:	<u>"sfparpresident@gmail.com"; "jzj@jungreislaw.com"; "dan_baroni@gensler.com"</u>
Subject:	583 47th Avenue
Date:	Monday, September 18, 2017 10:28:00 AM
Attachments:	image001.png image002.png image003.png

My office is working with Richard and Bonny Radez on their project at 583 47<sup>th</sup> Ave. I know PAR and Mr. Radez exchanged a few emails about how PAR came to take a position opposing the project, and what materials PAR has documenting its decision. Did anyone bring Mr. Radez's questions and requests to the PAR Board at any meetings held since late June? Does PAR plan to respond? Mr. Radez has not heard from any member of the land use committee yet.

Thank you and please feel free to call me anytime; numbers below.

Mark Loper



Mark Loper, Attorney O. (415) 567-9000 C. (510) 414-6445 <u>mloper@reubenlaw.com</u> <u>www.reubenlaw.com</u>

## SF Office:Oakland Office:One Bush Street, Suite 600827 Broadway, Suite 205San Francisco, CA 94104Oakland, CA 94607



PRIVILEGE AND CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE – This transmittal is intended solely for use by its addressee, and may contain confidential or legally privileged information. If you receive this transmittal in error, please email a reply to the sender and delete the transmittal and any attachments.

## Exhibit K

From:	John Anzur
To:	Berit Pedersen; Lisa Large; Paula Yue; Cheong Yong
Cc:	May, Christopher (CPC); Dan Baroni
Subject:	Re: 583 47th Avenue - DR hearing
Date:	Tuesday, October 10, 2017 2:06:55 PM
Attachments:	image001.png
	Image002 ppg

## Hi Chris,

In connection with the RDAT Oct 16 meeting to consider the revised plans that, contrary to the RDAT, retain the 4th floor deck, please let the Committee know that I along with PAR and the approximately 65 neighbors who signed the neighborhood petition also oppose the 4th floor deck on this project.

1. This is a substandard lot directly to the side of four perpendicular lots coming in from Anza Street. Given its sensitive location and small side, a roof deck is completely inappropriate.

2. The Project has proposed THREE privacy assaulting upper level decks. This is unprecedented in our community. Nearly all houses in our block have 0 or 1 deck, and these decks are on lower floors. This project proposes a third floor front deck, a third floor rear deck, and now a roof deck. That is way to much for a lot in this community and particularly when its substandard and located near the end of the block.

3. The Planning Commission by 7-0 vote (supported by the RDT and by PAR and the Sutro Heights Neighborhood) refused to allow three upper level decks at the house at 567- 47th Avenue citing privacy concerns. This 583 - 47th Ave lot is located in a much more privacy sensitive part of the block.

Please retain the original RDAT decision and do not allow a 4th floor deck to be built on this house.

Thanks for all your work Chris

Best,

John Anzur

On Tue, Oct 10, 2017 at 1:38 PM, Berit Pedersen <<u>beritapedersen@yahoo.com</u>> wrote:

Chris,

I've updated our exhibits based upon the new plans (see attachment). Please refer to these in your meeting next week.

Our concerns remain the same. I've pulled out the most relevant comments from our DR filing and updated the exhibit lettering. (see my comments below)

In addition to notable the privacy concerns, I would also say that when you look at the updated plans with the correct grade, the phrase "minimally visible" doesn't come to mind, even with the modified 4<sup>th</sup> floor deck.

I am happy to hop on the phone and walk you through these updates. I really appreciate your time and efforts.

Thanks,

Berit



Christopher May, Planner San Francisco anning 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103 Phone: (415) 575-9087 (415) 558-6409 Fax: christopher.may@sfgov.org www.sfplanning.org From: John Anzur [mailto:john@raacap.com] Sent: Monday, October 02, 2017 10:40 AM To: May, Christopher (CPC); 'Dan Baroni' Cc: 'Berit Pedersen' Subject: RE: 583 47th Avenue - DR hearing Hi Chris, Can you also show Berit's presentation in her recent email and my recent email to the committee as well. If u would like us to resend pls let us know. You have our input that simple removal of the exterior staircase is inadequate, and we hope the RDAT will hold to its position. Can you also send to Dan, Berit and me the revised drawings..... Thanks.... From: May, Christopher (CPC) [mailto:christopher.may@sfgov.org] Sent: Monday, October 2, 2017 10:36 AM To: Dan Baroni < Dan\_Baroni@gensler.com > **Cc:** john andrew <a href="mailto:johnandrew@earthlink.net">john anzur <john@raacap.com</a>; Berit Pedersen <a href="mailto:beritapedersen@yahoo.com">beritapedersen@yahoo.com</a>; Berit Pedersen Subject: RE: 583 47th Avenue - DR hearing Hi Dan, The Commission packet will be published on Monday November 27, so any materials submitted by either the project sponsor or DR requestor would need to be received by then to make it into the packet. The project sponsor did submit revised plans and renderings last week, which I will be presenting to our RDAT staff for further feedback. Depending on their comments, those plans may be the ones presented to the Commission, but I won't know until after my RDAT meeting (scheduled for October 16). There is no limit to the number of continuances for a DR hearing. Chris

From: Dan Baroni [mailto:Dan Baroni@gensler.com] Sent: Wednesday, September 27, 2017 8:45 AM To: May, Christopher (CPC) Cc: john andrew; john anzur; Berit Pedersen Subject: Re: 583 47th Avenue - DR hearing

Thank You Christopher!

What is the required timetable for the sponsor to submit in advance of the mtg? In addition, what is the limit to the schedule for delayed submission under the DR process?

Thanks,

Dan

Dan Baroni Senior Associate +1 415.836.4514 Direct Gensler

On Sep 27, 2017, at 8:25 AM, May, Christopher (CPC) <<u>christopher.may@sfgov.org</u>> wrote:

Hi Dan,

I'm writing to inform you that since the project sponsor did not submit the requested revisions in a timely manner, I have rescheduled the DR hearing to **Thursday December 7**, **2017**. This item had already been rescheduled from September 21<sup>st</sup> to November 19<sup>th</sup>. Since you are the DR requestor, I am advising you of this change, and it is up to you to inform the other parties listed on your DR application.

Regards,

## Christopher May, Planner

<image001.png>

1650 Mission Street, Suite 400

San Francisco, CA 94103

Phone: (415) 575-9087

Fax: (415) 558-6409

christopher.may@sfgov.org

www.sfplanning.org

## Exhibit L
Hi Chris--

I just want to forward you this email from Ray Auker who is supporting our third floor addition. I saw that he had cc'd you on the email, but I was not sure that you had received it.

I will have several other emails of support that will be coming to you in the next few days.

Kind regards,

Richard

From: racheval@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, October 31, 2017 10:49 AM
To: rradez@russellandco.com
Cc: christopher.may@sfgov.org
Subject: Fwd: Response to Section 311 Notification dated May 10, 2017

Richard E. Radez Russell & Co. Inc. 583 47th Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121

Response to Section 311 Notification dated May 10, 2017

To whom it may concern.

RE: permit application # 2015.10.22.0473 for 583 47th Avenue

My name is Raymond B. Auker. I own and reside at the property at 594 48th Avenue. San Francisco.

I live within the boundaries of those neighbors invited on May 10, 2016 by the SF Planning Dept. to respond to plans provided to me by the Planning Dept. for permit applicant # 2015.10.22.0473 for parties living at 583 47th Avenue.

After careful review of the plans, I would make the following comments:

First, the vertical extension would make an attractive addition to the existing house and enhance the property value to the house and to the homes in the neighborhood.

Second, the proposed design and architectural features conform and blend nicely into those of the neighborhood.

Third, The size and scope of the proposed plans for renovation are not out of proportion or do harm to surrounding neighbors.

Lastly, the plans appear to meet planning dept. codes and requirements.

I have no hesitancy in recommending approval of permit application.

Yours truly,

Raymond B. Auker

Richard E. Radez Russell & Co. Inc. 583 47th Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121

Mobile: 203-255-6514 Email: rradez@russellandco.com

#### REDACTED

From: Allen Wong Sent: Saturday, November 04, 2017 12:05 PM To: Christopher.May@sfgov.org ; rradez@russellandco.com Subject: Review building application

Dear Mr.May,

I am writing to you because I would like to withdraw my name from the petition against the building the third floor and roof deck at 583 47th ave s.f. ca. 94121. The building of the third floor would not impact my view or my home. I only sign the petition as a favor for my neighbor, because she has always been a good neighbor.

Thank you very much

Sincerely, Allen Wong

Richard E. Radez Russell & Co. Inc. 583 47th Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121

Mobile: 203-255-6514 Email: rradez@russellandco.com 11/5/17

Christopher May San Francisco Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

583 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue Re: Letter of Support

Dear Mr. May,

We are the owners of the home at 567 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue, which is three houses up the street from the proposed project.

We have reviewed the drawings for the proposed project at 583 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue put forth by Richard and Bonny Radez.

We would like to express to Planning Department and Planning Commission our full support for the project at 583 47<sup>th</sup> Ave. We believe the improvements are in harmony with the rest of the neighborhood.

The opposition to this project is the same one that has persistently and aggressively opposed our plan (for 567 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue).

Sincerely,

Dr. Michal Z. Steinberg and Dr. Zvi Guterman 567 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue

2234 ( Now . NET 23465

### **Richard Radez**

From:	"Richard Radez" <rradez@russellandco.com></rradez@russellandco.com>
Date:	Thursday, November 09, 2017 11:22 AM
To:	"Christopher (CPC) May" <christopher.may@sfgov.org></christopher.may@sfgov.org>
Subject:	DR for 583 47th Avenue

Dear Mr. May:

My name is James Sancimino. I live at 584 47th Avenue. I have looked at the plans for the third floor addition at 583 47th Avenue. I like the plans and have no objections. My next door neighbor Paula Yue does not like it, but she does not like some changes that I make to my own home.

Sincerely,

James Sancimino

- l an

# Exhibit M

## RESPONSE TO DISCRETIONARY REVIEW (DRP)



# Planning

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNIKE GEPARTWENT LUSG MISSIMM STREET, SUITE 400 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103-2479 MAIN: (419) 558-6378 SPPLANNIME.ORG

Property Address: 583 47th Avenue

Building Permit Application(s): 2015.10.22.0473

Record Number: 2016-012108DRP

Assigned Planner: Christopher Mays

#### **Project Sponsor**

Name: Jeff Burris

Phone: 415-503-0212

Zip Code: 94121

Email: jeff@studio12arch.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.)

See signed attached pages.

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.

See signed attached pages.

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 explaination of your needs for space or other personal requirements that prevent you from making the changes requested by the DR requester.

See signed attached pages.

PAGE · FEEPONSE TO DISCRETIONARY PEVIEW - CLARENT PLANNING

V 50272015 SAN FRANCISCUSTANIENS DEMONT VENT

#### **Project Features**

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

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Dwelling Units (only one kitchen per unit - additional kitchens count as additional units)	<sup>i</sup> 1	1
Occupied Stories (all levels with hebitable rooms)	2	3
Basement Levels (may include garage or windowless storage rooms)	0	0
Parking Spaces (Officier)	1	1
Bedrooms	3	3
Height	23	29
Building Depth	52.5	52.5
Rental Value (monthly)		
Property Value	1000	

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



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

1. Given the concerns of the DR requestor and other concerned parties, why do you feel your proposed project should be approved?

The Planning Association for the Richmond (PAR), after professing 30 years of silence on DRs for residential remodeling projects in the area, is objecting to this modest proposal at 583 47th Av - the 2nd DR PAR has submitted in the past 9 months. The first DR PAR submitted was for 567 47th Av, four houses north of ours. PAR has not objected to the expansions at 549 47th Av and 566 48th Av for example, but PAR is objecting to this modest proposal for #583 which is significantly below zoning height limit, includes deep front setback of the upper floor addition bettering RDG recommendation, subordinating it to the existing building, keeping it in scale with the neighborhood, not changing the pedestrian experience, and maintaining the main rear wall line without intruding into the mid block open space, all consistent with building code and the RDG. We contacted PAR Chairperson Richard Corriea on Jun 26, 2017. He promised to review the case with the board on August 7, 2017 but has not responded since. Our subsequent attempt to contact him and other PAR directors listed on the DR received no response either. The Planning Department was prepared to approve these plans at the expiry of the S311 neighborhood notification if no application for a DR was submitted. After the DR request was submitted, the RDAT continues to support the proposed 3rd floor as is but recommends removing the roof deck thereby eliminating the fire rated walls along the side property lines as a solution to the DR applicants' massing concern. We have made an alternate proposal to the RDAT which will eliminate the fire rated walls without removing the roof deck.

Saying that the plans submitted for #583 do not reflect the true slope of the street is inflammatory since the slope data is from San Francisco DPW records. Our architect reviewed perspectives with Planning and RDAT staffs with potentially steeper slopes as provided by the neighbors. This did not result in any additional recommendations from the Staffs.

Inferring Planning decisions for the DR and petitions against 567 47th Av as precedence is not applicable, misleading and prejudicial to the review of this proposal for #583. The similarity of the proposals for #583 to #567 ends at the title. The project at #567 would result in an increase in square footage to @3600. The proposal for #583 is to add @425 sq. ft bringing the total square footage of the property @30% smaller. The DR for #583 mis-quoted the number of decks in the #567 proposal in the Planning Commission's decision to remove 1 of 3 decks while in fact, it was 1 of 4. There were 4 balconies/decks proposed at #567, of which only the smallest one which protrudes beyond the "sun room" rear wall, therefore a new intrusion into the mid block open space, was disapproved while the remaining 3 were all approved, including the roof deck, the front deck and a rear deck. The approved roof deck is further hidden behind the existing 6+ft. tall hipped roof over the existing facade. There are only 3 decks proposed at #583. There is no sun room, and there is no new deck/balcony proposed that would intrude into the mid block open space. The fact that this is a standard size building on a substandard lot should support the need for additional open space supplementing the near unusable rear yard. The small rear yard, together with all 3 proposed decks totals about 27% to 44% less than the square footage of a rear yard on a standard size lot.

As per Planning process, we held a Pre Application Meeting with our direct neighbors on March 17, 2015. The addition of the 3rd floor and roof deck was presented to them as was required, but additionally including for their information only, the interior work for the existing first and second floor, notification for which was not required. There were no extraordinary concerns.

The DR was requested by PAR, represented by Jason Jungreis, Director; Daniel Baroni, representative of PAR to Housing Action Council, the contact for the Sutro Heights neighbors as parties to DR at 14 addresses,

now 13 (NOT the 65 who signed petitions against the proposal at #567 as inferred in the DR against our proposal at #583). Jason Jungreis and Dan Baroni as well as many of the other signatories did not attend the community meeting on May 17, 2017 or the meeting with the Planning Staff on Jun 7, 2017. John Anzur and Berit Pedersen who claimed to lead the neighbors, and who admitted to authoring the DR request, are not identified as parties to the DR. The DR applicants' understanding of our proposal is questionable as it appears to be confused with issues for the project at 567 47th Avenue.

We strongly believe the intent of some DR parties is to stop the addition from going forward at all, and not to ask the Planning Commission for reasonable changes. John Anzur stated this intent at the May 17, 2017 community meeting.

See supporting information on all above points in the attached detail sheets.

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.

We bought this house for our retirement believing that Building code does allow the desired indoor and outdoor space on this property. Based on Planning Staff advice, changes were made to original plans before filing for permit approval beyond code compliance and RDG recommendation: further set back the roof deck railing above the 3rd floor addition, itself already set back far exceeding RDG recommendation (RDAT acknowledges the significant set back); changed roof deck railing material from open to transparent although the original choice of open railing has many benefits including easier to keep clean, no-glare, friendly to birds and less wind resistant; replaced straight run staircase to the roof deck, continuing the spiral to eliminate 6 steps along the lot line to reduce massing. After filing for permit, based on neighbor's comment, the fire rated parapet walls along the 2 side lot lines of the rear patio, each 43" long 42" high, were eliminated. We are now prepared to modify the stair to the roof deck as shown to Planning and RDAT staffs to eliminate the short firewall above the 3rd floor roof along the south lot line as well as set back the guardrail from the north lot line to eliminate that firewall though these are hardly visible from the street, and set back the guardrail from the west roof perimeter to further reduce the potential minor vertical frontal impact to the rear neighbors.

See more detail in attached sheets.

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.

Our proposal is not a new building. The *building's siting and form will remain as originally built* at the pedestrian level. The proposal is to add living space, indoor and outdoor, *above* the existing building, behind the existing hipped roof over 6 ft high, with significant *front set backs far exceeding the planning RDG recommendation*, maintaining the pedestrian scale by not changing or extending in the plane of the existing facade. The excessive front set backs subordinate the addition. The existing cornice over the *original 2nd floor will remain the dominant roof line* that continues along the block face, presenting *no sudden change that is visually disruptive*. Together with the use of transparent guard rails, and, by limiting the use of applied ornamentation, leaves no doubt that *the addition is subordinate to the existing* primary facade and the original building, keeping *the addition in scale with the neighborhood*.

The minimal view of the new flat roof on the addition from the street through the 3-4 feet slot over the existing flat cornice from the original design appears to offend the 14 (now 13) neighbors who together with PAR, demand an <u>additional 3 ft. front set back</u>. This modification <u>cannot be accommodated because it will</u> <u>destroy the stair well that logically continues from the 1st and 2nd floors to the 3rd floor.</u>

This proposal is sensitive to neighborhood character, in the near and broader context. The allegation in the DR of "Privacy assault" from a roof deck is a gross mischaracterization. We cannot see the movement of our neighbors across the street or the rear yard from the existing second floor of our house at #583. The roof deck will have a view plane farther away from, and the setbacks further impede, the sightline to the neighbors. (In the rear, the sunroom protruding into the mid-block open space at 579 47th Av, north of #583 and owned by a DR party has a much more direct view. Reminder: a roof deck was approved for 567 47th Av). The railing set back from the lot lines at the edge of the existing 2nd floor is allowed by planning code, not in violation of the rear yard requirement. The rear patio progressively increases in set back within our own build-able space, with no projection into the mid block open space, providing a transition responding to topography and the 2-story downhill neighbor. As in front, the proposal also keeps the strong existing roof line in the rear unchanged, maintaining appropriate scale.

We have always loved the ocean. We think we are fortunate to win the bid to buy this house near the ocean and were delighted to find that building and zoning codes would allow the addition of a 3rd floor - a "sun room" that this house does not have; decks to supplement the small rear yard - open space that we have little of, where we can go about our daily living with the view of the Pacific Ocean. Expecting to enhance our retirement living by an addition to this house - enjoying visits with family and friends, having space for an owner's pursuit of her artistic interests - we have invested in environmentally friendly and City permitted updates: efficient furnace, on demand water heater, new wiring, seismic upgrade, added insulation where feasible, corrected a grand-fathered but non-compliant stair.

We could have started with an addition to a full 4th story, and minimal 3rd floor set back as proposed for 567 47th Avenue and then negotiated to scale down...we did not. We do not want to play games and therefore only proposed what we truly need and desire, totally within the parameters of the building code and RDG recommendations.

Again, we strongly believe the intent of some DR parties is to stop the addition from going forward at all, and not to ask the Planning Commission for reasonable changes.

See more detail in attached sheets.

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

In closing, we ask that the Planning Commission approves the plans we originally submitted to the Planning Department with the elimination of the fire rated parapet wall by setting back the railing from the 2 side lot lines of the rear patio, each 43" long 42" high.

#### **Detailed Supporting information**

#### DR Applicants:

1. PAR represented by Jason Jungreis, Director, also a neighbor at 527 47th Av.

2. Sutro Heights neighbors as parties to DR (contact Daniel Baroni, representative of PAR to Housing Action Council): at 14 addresses (NOT the 65 who signed petitions against the proposal at 567 47th Avenue as inferred in the DR against our proposal at #583). John Anzur and Berit Pedersen who claim to lead the neighbors are not identified as parties to the DR.

#### Action Prior to a DR request:

Misrepresented and untrue. Jason Jungreis and Dan Baroni as well as many of the other signatories did not discuss this project with the permit applicant as represented in the DR (or attend the community meeting on May 17, 2017 or the meeting with the Planning Staff on Jun 7, 2017). Neither Anzur or Pedersen is an agent of Richard & Bonny Radez. The DR applicants' understanding of our proposal is questionable as it appears to be confused with issues for the project at 567 47th Avenue. John Anzur and Berit Pedersen claim to lead the neighbors, and Anzur claims to be the designated contact point for PAR without confirmation by PAR. They admitted to authoring the DR. One party to the DR explained that he had no issue with our plans and signed the DR only because a neighbor asked him to. A man who identified himself as Bob Fries joined the May 17, 2017 meeting after it was in progress. He stood next to Bonny Radez and asked which building was being discussed. The DR does not include an affidavit from him as party to the DR and a neighbor at 570 48th Av. or a representative of PAR. We found his name on a list of directors on the PAR web site.

As per Planning process, we held a Pre Application Meeting with our direct neighbors on March 17, 2015. Invitees were: Lisa Large (579 47th Av); Patricia Yong (587 47th Av, represented by son Cheong Yong); Fred Baldwin (580 47th Av); Roberta Chee (5618 Anza St, absent). The addition of the 3rd floor and roof deck was presented to them as was required, but additionally including for their information only, the interior work for the existing first and second floor, notification for which was not required.

Lisa Large brought along her contractor to our pre permit request meeting for advice. His/her main concern at the time was, if our addition causes her to have to extend the height of her chimney, who would pay for it. There were no other questions until after the 311 notification.

Cheong Yong was very supportive and said he liked the rear facade (given we have no proposed changes to the front facade). He asked what if he too put on an addition which may cover up the side of our rear deck. Our reply was, so be it...we would have to live with what the building code allows him to do.

Fred Baldwin attended our pre permit request meeting alone. While he had no concerns, he conveyed that his wife's biggest concern would be alterations to the front facade. He was fine with our plan to keep the existing facade and to include deep set back, but at the community meeting after the 311 notification, his wife claimed that he did not represent her well.

The DR listed objections are based on the perceived disrespect of our proposal for the neighborhood's character. <u>We disagree</u>.

We are starting this discussion with the persistent reference to previous Planning Department decisions citing the DR against <u>the application for Planning approval for a 3rd floor and roof deck addition at **567** 47th Avenue (case # 2015-007103DRP) as well as the support the DR received from the City Staffs (Planning and RDAT). The reference is inappropriate, prejudicial, mostly not applicable and irrelevant and, intentionally <u>misleading</u>. The similarity of the above project to the current application for Planning approval for 583 47th Avenue ends at the title. The neighbors' objection was to a project resulting in an increase in square footage to @3,600 at **567** 47th Av. See DR Request, Exhibit I. Our proposal is a completely different scope at #583 which adds @425 sq. ft. The total square footage will be @30% smaller. The 5 points of objection listed in the DR against the **#567** project are:</u>

1). Side setback of 5 ft. in *rear yard extension* - <u>Not Applicable</u>.

2). Elimination of 3 *lot line windows* - <u>Not Applicable</u>.

3). *3rd floor set back* from 2nd floor in rear yard [ie. over 2nd floor "sun room" area protruding beyond common rear wall into mid-block open space. This is non-existent at #583] - <u>Not Applicable</u>.

4). Elimination of *front deck on 3rd floor* - <u>Approved</u> front deck at **#567**. (It is set back 7.5ft from the front lot line, above the new shallow 2nd floor roof. At #583, the proposed front deck is set back 16.5 ft. from the front lot line behind the existing hipped roof which is over 6 ft. tall).

5). Keep *driveway location* unchanged - <u>Not Applicable</u>.

Planning Commission / Residential Design Advisory Team recommended modifications for **#567**: (See Exhibit G)

1. Side setback of 5 ft. in *rear yard extension* - <u>Not Applicable</u>

2. *Remove balcony at rear of 3rd level to respect neighborhood privacy*. The proposed roof deck provides adequate useable open space at the upper levels - (This is 1 of 4 balconies/decks at **#567**, different from "1 of 3" quoted in the DR against the proposal at #583). There are only 3 decks proposed for #583. <u>There is no protruding 3rd level balcony proposed</u> that potentially causes neighborhood privacy concerns. *Regarding useable open space*, a rear yard on a standard lot provides from about 1400 to over 1600 sq.ft. open space, depending on whether there is a sun room. At #583, a substandard lot of 70ft depth provides only 367 sq.ft without any sunroom intrusion. The 3 proposed decks add up to about 551 sq.ft. <u>The total outdoor space is at least 34% to over 43% less than the rear yard of a standard lot</u>. The allowed intruding "sun room" on a standard lot brings the building 12 to 15 ft closer to its rear neighbor, with windows facing 3 directions, less respectful of neighborhood privacy. For those buildings like that with a rear neighbor in the same configuration, they are 24 to 30 ft closer to each other. Together with their north and south facing windows, privacy concerns are redoubled!

3. *Reduce the massing of the 3rd story vertical addition above the rear "bump-out"* to not extend more than 5ft beyond the common rear wall - <u>Not Applicable</u>. At #583, NO bump-out is proposed, only recesses and set backs within its build-able envelope.

The above establishes how inappropriate, prejudicial, irrelevant and misleading the reference to **#567** is.

The Planning Association for the Richmond (PAR), after professing 30 years of silence on DRs for residential remodeling projects in the area, is objecting to this modest proposal at 583 47th Av - the 2nd DR PAR submitted in the past 9 months. PAR has not objected to the expansion at 549 47th Av, 530 48th Av, and 566 48th Av for example, done without the extensive set backs and/or other neighborhood consideration in this proposal. See Exhibit D.

<u>The DR submitted against</u> the **583** 47th Avenue application for a 3rd floor addition and roof deck lists these <u>conclusions as copied directly from the DR</u>: (and additional changes requested)

1). Neighborhood character (Pg 7-10) is DEFINED.

2). Front set back does not provide pedestrian scale and enhance the street - Further setback required.

3). The building is not articulated to minimize impacts on privacy to adjacent properties - remove one of three upper privacy assaulting decks; need to respect the 25% rear yard requirement; remove railing from the last 35 inches on third floor at rear.

4). The building's height and depth is not compatible with existing building scale at the mid-block open space - no house on this block has a built roof deck; neighborhood wants no violation of the 25% set back in rear at 3rd floor.

5). The building's proportions are not compatible with those found on surrounding buildings - not a single house on this block has a roof deck...more privacy intrusive on this particular lot.

6). The building's roofline is not compatible with those found on surrounding buildings - this 3rd floor addition in front be moved back a minimum of three feet.

(Additional changes requested: Remove 4th floor roof deck; No diagonal).

<u>Below is the response</u> that addresses all these issues in the approximate order presented above but many of them overlap.

We love the neighborhood and its proximity to the ocean since first introduced to it in the late 1960s. It is a big part of why we bought here now in our retirement. As proud new owners of a property in this Sutro Heights area, we have <u>no intention to disrespect its neighborhood character</u>, quite the contrary as should be expected, we want to enhance the quality of living here, the desirability of our house and of the neighborhood.

According to the RDG, the immediate visual context for 583 47th Avenue is 579 and 587 47th Avenue. The broader context includes the buildings on the west side and east side of 47th Avenue between Geary Blvd and Anza Streets. (RDG pg. 8) These houses include the buildings between #563 and #595 to which the DR referred to in DR Exhibit F, as the "NINE painted ladies of 47th Avenue" which apparently has no attributed source. For the proposed addition to #583, the DR widened the context recommended in the RDG described above, a broader neighborhood context has been considered, not only those rear neighbors on 48th Avenue but the entire block 1497 (54 properties + 22 properties on the east side of 47th Avenue). Our liking for these buildings and the broader Sutro Heights neighborhood notwithstanding, the DR applicants are drawing a mistaken conclusion (DR Pg. 5) from RDAT's comment identifying these buildings as being in historic revival styles. Historic revival does not mean these buildings are historic homes. Historic revival is not pure and faithful reproduction of the period they allude to.

A report authored by Tim Kelley Consulting, LLC engaged by John Anzur of #571 47th Avenue (see Exhibit H) for 567 47th Avenue, says the block contains properties constructed between 1931-1952 ranging in height from one to <u>three</u> stories [see Exhibit E]. <u>Much documentation</u> was cited that supports the conclusion that the buildings are <u>not "located in a potential historic district"</u>, consistent with the finding of City Historic review.

The section of 47th Avenue between Geary Blvd and Anza Street is a mix of Revivalist and vernacular/eclectic single-family residences. Some of the buildings on the east side of 47th Avenue were designed in a Spanish Colonial Revival style. Otherwise, the common theme is the rectangular box, approximately 25 ft wide, 2 to 3 stories tall with *flat roofs fronted with slanted parapets or hipped roofs. Many of the 2 story buildings have roofs rising to the height of a 3rd story.* The block faces have varied decorative treatments of different size balconies, shutters and windows, sometimes mixed from unrelated periods and styles. We love the simplicity of the existing facade at #583 and its restrained use of applied decorations. This is why we are *keeping it unchanged*.

The RDG advises that new buildings or additions should have unified character, but does not mandate specific architectural styles, nor encourage direct imitation of the past (RDG pg. 6-7); building forms and architectural character are more varied, yet the buildings still have a unified character (RDG Pg. 9-10).

Around the subject <u>mid block open space</u>, the <u>flat roofs are mostly left unadorned</u>. <u>Amenities</u> in this space are quite varied, with <u>irregular pattern</u>. See Exhibit F. Many houses have originally designed (12) sun rooms or later added (7) extensions according to a study dated Jun 12, 2016 prepared for PAR and John Anzur and included in the DR against #567. (<u>However, no similar study is available regarding 3rd floors in the original design or later additions</u>). As seen on Google Maps, some lots have added detached cottages, some have stair access to the rear yard, some have rear decks at varying levels and depths, and some have bay windows protruding into the mid block open space. Many houses appear to be updated, expanded and personalized according to the owners' needs. **By a count on Google Maps, there are at least 11 buildings that have a 3rd floor in the neighborhood, some of which have no front or rear set back at all. Of the 11, 5 are on substandard lots. See Exhibit F. Some other buildings have towers or turrets, or tall roofs that rise to the height of a 3rd story. From our existing windows and future addition, we see numerous multi-story building. A personal assessment is, some are architecturally successful and some are not. See Exhibit F. Expansion options are limited on the substandard lots but zoning allows a building height of 40 ft. Our proposed project is to add a 3rd story and roof deck, while adhering to planning code and consistent with the RDG's advice to be sensitive to the building's context.** 

Although #583 is on a substandard lot, the building is generally standard in size as originally built - It was apparently the desire of the original builder and/or designer to continue the similar depth for the buildings and the common front and rear walls for both standard and substandard size lots. The fact that *the rear yard on this substandard lot is significantly smaller* than those afforded by the standard lots, <u>the building rear wall is no closer to its rear neighbors</u>. Actually, because there is no opportunity for this house to add a sun room, it <u>will remain about 12 to 15 ft farther away</u> from the rear neighbor than the existing original sun rooms or later extensions on the standard lots. And, because the lot is near the corner of 47th Avenue and Anza Street, <u>the viewing angle from #583 to the Anza street buildings is very obtuse, hardly "privacy assaulting" as the DR requesters believe</u>. See Exhibit B. In fact, the south facing window (and west facing window at the south end of the sunroom) on the next standard lot to the north at #579 (owned by one of the parties to the DR) has a much more direct view into the Anza Street houses, while being about ONE rear yard depth (50 to 60 ft.) away from them. Thank goodness for an enormous tree at the north east corner of 5618 Anza Street's rear yard to partially block the view. This comment is not intended to target the north neighbor at #579, only to put the statements against the proposal at #583 *in the proper context*.

DR Exhibit C shows <u>current existing condition</u> from neighboring bedroom areas in rear of project from the property one house further [south] to the rear neighbors. This <u>picture is irrelevant</u> and misleading. (taken with a telephoto camera lens perhaps?) See comparison Exhibit C. A fence and an enormous tree in the north east corner of 5618 Anza's rear yard reaching about 2 ft. above the 2nd floor roof blocks the view to/from the ground floor completely, and half of the 2nd floor rear windows at 583 47th Avenue. Furthermore, this is intended to mislead because no picture is shown from #579, one house north, which would show it about 12 to 15 ft. closer

at an angle to the rear neighbor of #583, even closer to its own rear neighbor by an estimated 24 to 30 ft. given both houses have sun rooms protruding into the mid block open space, and without a big tree blocking the view! See Exhibit B. (Having said that, we would like to note that we can barely see any movement of our neighbor across the neighbors across the rear yard). <u>What is relevant</u> is the <u>proposed addition elevates the view position</u> by about 9 ft. directly above and more at an angle. This would take the new rear window at #583 <u>farther away</u> from the existing condition. See Exhibit B.

Although reference to #567 should be ignored, 2 statements merit further comments. "...567 47th was on a full sized mid-block 120-foot-deep lot and therefore further away from neighbors. This lot only 70 feet deep..." - The fact that #583 lot is only 70 feet deep does not affect how far it is from the rear neighbors on 48th Avenue. It is short because the <u>Anza neighbors' yards</u> are the open space <u>providing the</u> <u>separation</u> from the rear neighbor while preventing #583 from having a standard size lot! See Exhibit B.

To continue "...located near the end of the block and looks right over many neighbors on Anza Street..." - DR Exhibits A & B only serve, unintentionally we guess, to illustrate the obtuse angle the view into the Anza Street rear windows are and how impossible it is to see what is inside. Furthermore, DR Exhibits B & C are misleading. We surmise DR Exhibit B must be taken from 5618 Anza on the 2nd floor exterior rear deck protruding into the mid block open space and not from the interior at the window. This suspicion is supported also by DR Exhibit C, as compared to sponsor's Exhibit C taken immediately inside the windows of #583. (Note that the fence at #583 is only 5 ft. tall, not the allowed 6 ft. )

The RDG recognizes that a building that is bigger [taller] than its neighbors can be compatible with the smaller [lower] buildings in the area. It can often be made to look smaller by facade articulations and through set backs to upper floors. (RDG pg. 23)

Our proposal is not a new building. The <u>building siting and form will remain as originally built</u> at the pedestrian level. The proposal is to add living space, indoor and outdoor, <u>above</u> the existing building, with significant <u>front</u> <u>set backs far exceeding the planning code and RDG recommendation</u> (RDAT acknowledges the significant set backs proposed), maintaining the pedestrian scale by not changing or extending in the plane of the existing facade. The excessive front set backs subordinate the addition. The existing cornice over the <u>original 2nd floor</u> <u>will remain the dominant roof line</u> that continues along the block face, presenting <u>no sudden change that is</u> <u>visually disruptive</u>. Together with the use of transparent guard rails, and, by limiting the use of applied ornamentation, leaves no doubt that <u>the addition is subordinate to the existing</u> primary facade and the original building, keeping <u>the addition in scale with the neighborhood.</u>

Reference to 530 48th Avenue (DR Pg. 2) for minimal visibility of its addition is misleading. The addition at #530 may be set back 3 ft. more than at 583 47th Avenue (implied by the information provided in the DR) but it has NO rear set back and has a bay window protruding into the mid block open space as seen on Google Maps. See Exhibit D. The <u>front has a decorative *pitched roof like parapet* of moderate height and behind this, a straight cornice about the same height, topped with red terracotta tiles. This is <u>lower than the hipped roof at #583</u> and may have needed the additional set back to minimize the visibility of the addition. Using this example to justify requesting an additional 3 ft front set back is inappropriate. We don't know if the cornice line is original or a later modification for the sole purpose of reducing the visibility of the addition. Furthermore, behind the applied decorative pitched parapet this <u>building has a flat roof</u>. The <u>addition has a flat roof</u> as well, with no decorative cornice treatment. This <u>remains visible</u> though minimally, through the slot above the entrance stair to the building, and that over its north neighbor's entrance. See Exhibit D.</u>

The RDG advises that visibility of the upper floor [should be] limited from the street, and the upper floor [should] appear subordinate to the primary facade (RDG pg. 24) ...*not INvisible*.

Here we would like to address the statement that the "plans submitted don't reflect the true slope of the street, understating impact on a very cohesive block." The slope data used was from official City DPW records. When compared with the private survey data from a neighbor, the difference in grade is less than 1 percent. The neighbor then referenced the San Francisco Bikers' Coalition web site which shows a steeper grade. Nevertheless, in stead of arguing about this new perspectives based on this unofficial data of "worse case scenario" was provided to Planning and RDAT. City Staffs have determined them acceptable. The visibility of the addition is not significantly impacted as the pedestrian is also on the modified grade.

Using a flat roof on the #583 addition is not at all out of character in this neighborhood. All the buildings in their unaltered state *in the area have flat roofs*. As described earlier, some of these flat roofs are fronted with decorative hipped or slanted parapets, varying in height, width, style and material. The "non-flat" portion of the roofs are functional for some buildings or only decorative for others. The hipped roof at #583 is a functional roof more than 6 ft tall over the depth of the living room about 15 ft. The hipped roof does not cover the entire width of the building. It terminates with a lower straight cornice and hipped parapet at the south end, over the front stair and entrance, as in 530 48th Av and many other buildings in the area whether the roof treatment is decorative or functional. *We are maintaining the roof treatment as is*. The potential minimal view of the new flat roof on the addition on the south side only appears to offend the 14 (now 13) neighbors who together with PAR, demand an *additional 3 ft. front set back*. This modification *cannot be accommodated because it will destroy the stair well that logically continues from the 1st and 2nd floors.* 

The illustrations in the RDG for a unified neighborhood include taller and lower buildings with 15 ft. recommended set back.

To <u>further</u> set back the front facade of the addition <u>at #583 near the north neighbor</u> makes no significant difference in public view as acknowledge by City Staffs because from most angles, it is <u>mostly hidden</u> from public view as proposed, <u>behind the existing hipped roof</u> which is over 6 ft tall. It is <u>minimally visible</u> from the north and directly fronting 47th Avenue <u>due to height of neighbor's roofs and topography</u>. See Exhibit A. This further set back requested in the DR serves only to reduce the square footage of the addition for the owners and eliminate the proposed articulation in the addition's front facade. To <u>further</u> set back the front facade of the addition will <u>destroy the addition both architecturally and functionally</u>. The stairwell for the 1st and 2nd floors cannot be logically continued to access the 3rd floor.

The massing of the stair logically accessing the roof deck is as unobtrusive as possible. A stair with straight run would have required a fire rated parapet of double the length. The most recent proposal includes a further modification to the access stair to the roof deck by ascending over the bathroom, a less straight forward solution but eliminates the need for this short fire rated wall along the south lot line. We do not propose a penthouse over the stair even though it would have met code in height. The roof deck guard rail , has a 3 ft. (now 6 ft.) set back increasing to about 13 ft. 3 in. off the south lot line which is NOT required by code but it has been included with the intent to respond to the downhill topography. The guardrail on the east will be done in a transparent material. (We would have preferred an open guard rail around the roof deck to be consistent with the material chosen for the other decks but agreed to the Planning Staff's suggestion of using transparent material like glass. An open railing would be easier to keep clean, have no glare, more friendly to birds, and less resistant to wind). To the North, the 42" fire rated parapet could have been more than double the proposed length. Given the front set back is significantly in excess of RDG \_recommendation, the resulting shorter parapet is expected to be only minimally visible from the street due to the hipped roof. And yet, the most recent

proposal includes a geometry that balance the south perimeter which results in more than the required set back to eliminate the fire rated wall 42" tall, and a set back to the west perimeter that further reduces its visibility to the rear neighbors. It should be noted that the approved roof deck at #567 is larger and higher approaching Planning code limit and was *approved*.

The 25% rear yard requirement put in place subsequent to the construction of this building in 1939 along with the builder and/or designer's decision to keep the rear wall line continuous for both standard and substandard lots, created a resulting encroachment condition (35" at #583 and likely also at other buildings on substandard lots depending on the exact size of the lot) which is not required by the City to be remedied. Further, the *City allows an open guardrail in this encroached area on the 2nd floor roof.* It does however, also require a 42" fire rated parapet within 3 ft adjacent to the side lot lines. The proposal has been modified to resolve the resulting conflict by setting back the open guard rail from each side lot line, eliminating the fire rated parapet in the allowed encroached area. The <u>rear wall of the proposed 3rd floor addition is 43" set back from the existing 2nd floor rear wall (8" in excess</u> of the required rear set back). <u>There is no violation of the 25% requirement</u>.

The DR mis-quoted the number of decks in the #567 proposal in the Planning Commission's decision to remove 1 of 3 decks while in fact, it was 1 of 4. There were 4 balconies/decks proposed at 567 47th Avenue, of which only the smallest one which protrudes beyond the "sun room" rear wall, therefore a new intrusion into the mid block open space, was disapproved (RDAT recommendation #2 for case # 2015-007103DRP) while <u>the remaining 3 were all approved, including the roof deck, the front deck and a rear deck.</u> The approved roof deck is significantly larger than the one proposed for #583, and the front deck is set back 65% less than the one proposed for #583 where this deck is further hidden behind the 6+ft. tall hipped roof. There are only 3 decks proposed at #583. There is no sun room, and there is no new deck proposed that would intrude into the mid block open space. The fact that <u>this is a standard size</u>

<u>building on a substandard lot should support the need for additional open space</u> supplementing the near unusable rear yard. The small rear yard, together with all 3 proposed decks totals 918 sf (about 34% to 43%) less than the square footage of a rear yard on a standard size lot.

Due to the shallow rear yard on this substandard lot, the fence around the yard is only 14 ft. 7 in. from the existing rear wall of the building. In perspective from the rear downhill neighbor on 48th Avenue (this fence currently lower than allowed) screens out most of the existing first floor of this building. *The expanded building is in scale in the rear*. (Furthermore, the enormous tree mentioned earlier, rising above the existing 2nd floor, covers 1/2 of the rear facade vertically). The perspective from a house on 48th Avenue may see across the open space, the full height of the 47th Avenue buildings bounded by a fence as far away as 50 to 65 ft. from their uphill neighbors' sun room or main rear wall depending on vegetation in the open space. See Exhibit B.

The potential for privacy intrusiveness is different between a rear extension into the mid block open space vs. a vertical addition that is entirely contained in a building's existing foot print. While a rear extension brings its occupants closer to the neighbors in every direction, the vertical addition that does not protrude into the mid block open space, <u>moves the occupants of #583 farther away</u> from its rear neighbors on 48th Avenue and its side neighbors on Anza street. The proposed <u>set backs further impede on the sight line</u> to these neighbors.

The DR requester's demand of no "diagonal" orientation because all other houses have east-west orientation. This is again misleading. The existing building at #583 is oriented east-west. It is sited as it has always been. The south west facing glass door of the 3rd floor addition is proposed to be sheltered by a trellis fronted with a fascia facing due west, continuing the existing orientation of the existing 2 floors below. The trellis creates filtered light and shadow, adding visual interest. There is no projection beyond the built boundaries and no intrusion into the mid block open space. The 3rd floor rear wall is <u>set back increasing from the earlier mentioned 43" to about 13ft</u>

<u>10 in. within the lot's build-able</u> (RDG pg. 31) envelope. RDAT states that there is nothing in the RDG that forbids this. While providing decent indoor and outdoor deck square footage for the owners, at the same time, it provides <u>other benefits</u>: This set back serves to reduce the frontal impact to the mid block open space by reducing the width of the rear wall; creates a buffer zone from the addition to the downhill 2 story building; subordinating it to the existing 2nd floor roofline. Since the deck is recessed and not "bumped out" into the rear yard, it contributes to the mid block open space. The addition is made to look smaller by this rear facade articulation and set back, and more set back. (RDG pg. 23)

<u>Angles are not new</u> in the neighborhood - there is an already existing added sun room and roof terrace (at #531 47th Avenue) with a SW facing corner. See Exhibit D. Most of the existing bay windows facing into the mid block open space has angled corners rather than boxy straight corners. A building at Sutro Hts/48th Avenue has its SW facing corner angled. Although that building is not in the subject block, it is one of the 3 buildings at the end of Sutro Heights Avenue from which the subject block got the privilege of its name. See Exhibit D. The proposed 3rd floor rear deck at #583 itself is already far removed from the neighbors, and the recessed glass door further removes the interior viewing plane from the neighbors while bringing into focus the far more desirable ocean view than the neighbors' rear windows downhill! See Exhibit B.

Reference to RDAT comments from <u>12/9/2015</u>, <u>10/13/2016</u> and <u>10/20/2016</u> regarding <u>#567</u> to support the demand for "no diagonal" is inappropriate, irrelevant and misleading again. They are not applicable in the case of the <u>#583</u> proposal. The first 2 comments we could not find on the Planning web site and they were not attached as exhibits. We were able to obtain a copy of the <u>12/9/2015</u> memo subsequent to seeing them quoted in the DR for <u>#583</u>.

The DR quotes a 12/9/2015 comment, "...prohibited any diagonal orientation unless it was five feet off the lot line...Consistency requires no diagonal orientation. (see DR Exhibits A,C and G)." (DR Pg. 2) The comment actually said "...An angled rear facade maybe appropriate within the side setback requested provided the orientation of the rear facade and windows are designed to minimize loss of privacy to adjacent structures/rear yards. (RDGs p. 17, 25-27)" The "five feet off the lot line" is in reference to an earlier proposal for #567 in which an angled addition replaced the existing sunroom in the *mid block open space* abutting its south and north neighbors. Therefore this is <u>not applicable for #583</u> where the addition and the "diagonal" set back is entirely within the build-able space and not beyond the main rear wall.

Comments dated 10/20/2016 (after an alternate proposal in which the angled wall has been removed) in the Planning Commission resolution on #567 regarding consistency on side set back of rear 'bump-out' says "... subject block has a consistent pattern of approximately 5' side set backs at the rear 'bump-out' at both property lines. Preserving this pattern would help to maintain the existing mid block open space." is again not applicable here. <u>#583 is not proposing a 'bump-out', therefore there is nothing to set back</u>. The angle does not take away existing mid block open space and therefore removing it from within our build-able space would not have any consequence and is irrelevant.

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

In closing, we ask that the Planning Commission approves the plans we originally submitted to the Planning Department to include the elimination of the fire rated parapet wall by setting back the 3rd floor guard rail from the 2 side lot lines of the rear deck, each 43" long, 42" high.

Since the DR request submission, the Planning department received 6 letters from neighbors emphasizing their opposition to our proposed addition. Below are our responses:

#### 570 48th Avenue (Owner: Bob Fries; Author: same)

Robert Fries who is a PAR board member over several years (although he does not represent PAR in this matter) should know that if he can get the block designated as an Historic Resource, then there would be additional restrictions on additions or new construction. In addition, he can get the zoning changed to a lower maximum height limit to disallow any vertical addition, he or neighborhood groups opposing change would not need to be involved in DR requests for vertical extensions. Without any further modification to our proposal, all City building codes and RDG recommendations are met and bettered. He continues to find our current proposal out of scale. He considers our addition to be a "monstrous sight". We and our architect disagree with this assessment and we are distressed by this very personal and totally subjective criticism. He again refers to the proposal for 567 47th Avenue. Must we remind him that the 2 proposals are entirely different in program scope and design solution? We could have started with an addition to a full 40 ft height, and minimal 3rd story set back like at #567 and negotiated to scale down...we did not. We do not want to play games and therefore only proposed what we truly need and desire.

#### 582 48th Avenue (Owner: Vince Rodrigues; Author: Berit Pedersen)

Berit Pedersen claims to be the co-leader with John Anzur, of the neighbors but like John, decided not to submit an affidavit for the DR. Her letter reiterates all the points in the DR so we refer the Planning Commission to our detailed responses above. She highlights the new perspective as "with corrected grade". We therefore would like to point out again, that the grade data used originally are official City record. Instead of getting into an argument, our architect provided Planning and RDAT the worse case scenario after she raised a question about different information from her private resource, which only show less than 1 percent difference in grade, then her later reference to the SF Bikers' Coalition web site which shows a steeper grade.

#### 571 47th Avenue (Owner: John Anzur: Author: same)

John Anzur claims to lead the neighbors and to be the contact point for PAR in this DR request, but decided not to submit an affidavit himself as a party to the DR. In his letter, he continues his attempt to mislead the Planning Commission into believing that there are 65 neighbors objecting to our proposal, while in fact, they signed to object to the proposal at 567 47th Avenue which is directly next door to him, and for which he is the DR requester. He also continues to confuse on the Planning Commission's 7-0 vote that allegedly disallowed 1 of 3 decks proposed for #567 while the real number is 1 of 4 decks, being the one that overhangs into the mid block open space, and where the square footage and visibility involved are entirely different from our proposal at #583. Please see our detail response above.

#### 587 47th Avenue (Owner: Patricia Yong; Author: Cheong Yong)

One of the owners/representatives of the 3 houses who attended the pre permit request meeting over 2 years ago. The plans for the addition were presented to them. We have not made any changes since then except for the few recommended by Planning Staff. Cheong Yong attended representing his mother Patricia Yong. He asked a question about his own potential plan of expansion at the time. Why would the <u>number</u> of decks proposed concern him now? Our detailed response above addressed his new concern that the properties on the south end of the block will experience a significant change in privacy and views, but we are at a loss to understand why properties on the south end of the block would experience any change in sunlight.

#### 580 47th Avenue (Owner: Paula Yue + Fred Baldwin; Author: same)

Fred Baldwin and Paula Yue were also fully aware of our planned addition. Paula Yue claims that her husband Fred Baldwin did not represent her well at the Project pre submission meeting. We have addressed her new concerns which now include those in the DR, in our Detailed Responses above. She adds that she expects that the addition will block out most of her sky view. As she described, her living room looks <u>directly</u> across to 583. She can see the expanse of sky above our existing hipped roof over our living room. In perspective, the expanse of sky will continue to be available to her - the impact will be minimal if at all. In fact, the impact will be more to her south neighbor who accepts that he will see part of the addition (if he looks diagonally north). He is supportive of our proposal.

#### 579 47th Avenue (Owner: Lisa Large; Author: same)

We have always loved the ocean and thought that we are fortunate to win the bid to buy this house near the ocean and delighted to find that building code and zoning would allow the addition of a 3rd floor - a "sun room" like hers that this property does not have; decks to supplement the rear yard - open space that we have little of - where we can go about our daily living with the view of the Pacific Ocean. Our architect confirmed that with a modest scope, we can certainly work entirely within RDG recommendations. Lisa Large was also fully aware of our planned addition for over 2 years. Our architectural solution maintains the visual line of vintage homes which is consistent with the RDG. These are not homes the City designated to protect as Historic Resource. We propose not to touch the facade and provide abundant setback voluntarily because we love the simplicity of our house and those next to it, as well as the architectural diversity of various revival styles in the neighborhood as discussed in the detailed responses above. After the 311 notification, she brought up her privacy concern but did not push that discussion very far. A big tree and her own rear 2nd floor sunroom block most of our view into her rear yard but for a small section toward the west. She brought up her sunlight concern over her center patio but because our addition starts west of the patio, it has no effect on the morning and noon sun, while the low afternoon sun is currently already mostly blocked by her own tall walls around this very small patio that is similar to ours - we are aware of the amount of sun that it enjoys. So although our addition is expected to throw a longer shadow, it would not add to the shade already in this patio. Her house is uphill to the north of us, any shadow is not the full height of the addition. We provided shadow drawings for different times of the day and different time of the year to the Planning Staff but was advised that these are not required. We did provide her with one drawing to try to allay her concern. Furthermore, the most recent modification on the proposed roof deck no longer required the 42" high fire rated parapet. Again, she too referred to the Planning Commission vote of 7 - 0 against 567 47th Avenue, and somehow, she is led to believe that the concerns there (which are mostly not applicable) are more serious at our substandard lot. Please see our response in the Detailed Responses above.

Dear Mr. May,

I've seen the latest renderings of this proposed building and find them entirely out of scale. The view from the street will show way too much mass and the view from the back, with the proposed 4<sup>th</sup> story deck, would truly be a monstrous sight for those of us who live behind this house.

As a PAR board member over several years, I've seen many proposed projects that were scaled down by the owners to meet Residential Guidelines, to fit in with other homes, and/or to fit in with their neighbors. Only on a few, rare occasions have I seen owners and architects go overboard and refuse to find common ground (e.g., 567 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue).

Please do reconsider these last few changes to the plans and let me and our whole neighborhood take a breather from having to get involved with another DR.

Thanks very much, Bob Fries, 570 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Robert T. Fries | Carter Carter Fries & Grunschlag | 44 Montgomery #2405, SF, CA 94104 | *Direct* (415) 989-7690 | *Main* (415) 989-4800 | *Fax* (415) 989-4864 | rfries@carterfries.com

If you received this confidential, legally protected email in error, please delete it and advise the sender.

From:	Paula Yue
To:	May, Christopher (CPC)
Cc:	John Anzur; Berit Pedersen
Subject:	583 47th Ave.
Date:	Saturday, October 07, 2017 7:52:40 AM

Dear Mr. May,

My husband and I live directly across from 583 and have lived in our lovely home at 587 47th Ave for more than 30 years.

We are very distressed by the roof deck that is planned for 583. Our living room looks directly across to 583 and the third floor addition already will block out most of our sky view(which we love to see from our living room windows). We strongly oppose the roof deck not only for personal reasons, but also for the following issues:

-privacy for rear neighbors, house is on a substandard lot -visible from 47th Avenue ruining the symmetrical line of original 1939 homes designed by CO Claussen -plan has 3 privacy assaulting upper level decks - front, rear and roof. Planning Commission by 7-0 vote removed one upper deck at <u>567 47th avenue</u>. No other home on the block has an existing roof deck. Houses in block have 0 or 1 deck - this has THREE!

Does a home on our block REALLY NEED THREE decks? The roof deck will block even more of our western sky view and sunset. One of their third floor decks already faces 47th and our home. Please let the planning commission know of our concerns. Thank you. Paula Yue and Fred Baldwin 580 47th Ave. SF 94121

From:	Cheong Yong
To:	May, Christopher (CPC)
Cc:	Berit Pedersen; John Andrew Anzur; Dan Baroni
Subject:	583 47th Ave
Date:	Tuesday, October 10, 2017 9:55:32 AM
Attachments:	20170925 - 583 47th Ave - Site Permit Set R4.pdf

Dear Chris,

I am next door neighbor (587 47th Ave) to project sponsor. This is to request that the 4th level roof deck be removed. The additional 3rd floor is already going to be a very noticeable structure, rising from a row of vintage Claussen houses that currently do not have 3rd levels. A related concern is the number of decks being proposed. Can decks be minimized?

While the project sponsor is entitled to make additions, last year's DR hearing regarding 567 47th Ave has made me aware of how much impact the proposed additions can have on neighbors. In this case, the properties on the south end of the block will experience a significant change in privacy, views and for some, sunlight. Many of us already see, daily, from our windows and gardens, the additions that we wish had not been permitted, or wish they had been done differently, on the block over the past 20-30 years.

I hope that the City will help this special residential city block maintain it's period architectural character as much as possible.

Thank you. Cheong

Cheong Yong

Sent from Windows Mail Dear Mr. May,

I live next door to the project sponsor. I bought my home three years ago and feel so fortunate to live on this special block of 47th Avenue. The symmetrical line and design continuity of the homes, all designed by C.O. Claussen, make this block of 47th Avenue truly unique and I would hate to see the proposed additions ruining the visual line of vintage homes. I am most concerned about the proposed fourth floor deck-no other home on the block has an existing roof deck. This deck would not only compromise my privacy, but would also block some of my natural light. As you know, the Planning Commission voted 7 - 0 to remove the proposed upper deck of 567 47th Avenue last September-and that home, has a full lot, not a sub-standard lot as does 583 47th Avenue.

I would deeply appreciate it if you please let the Planning Commission know of my concerns.

Thank you,

Lisa K. Large 579 47th Avenue 11/5/17

Christopher May San Francisco Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

583 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue Re: Letter of Support

Dear Mr. May,

We are the owners of the home at 567 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue, which is three houses up the street from the proposed project.

We have reviewed the drawings for the proposed project at 583 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue put forth by Richard and Bonny Radez.

We would like to express to Planning Department and Planning Commission our full support for the project at 583 47<sup>th</sup> Ave. We believe the improvements are in harmony with the rest of the neighborhood.

The opposition to this project is the same one that has persistently and aggressively opposed our plan (for 567 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue).

Sincerely,

Dr. Michal Z. Steinberg and Dr. Zvi Guterman 567 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue

2234 ( Now . NET 23465

### **Richard Radez**

From:	"Richard Radez" <rradez@russellandco.com></rradez@russellandco.com>
Date:	Thursday, November 09, 2017 11:22 AM
To:	"Christopher (CPC) May" <christopher.may@sfgov.org></christopher.may@sfgov.org>
Subject:	DR for 583 47th Avenue

Dear Mr. May:

My name is James Sancimino. I live at 584 47th Avenue. I have looked at the plans for the third floor addition at 583 47th Avenue. I like the plans and have no objections. My next door neighbor Paula Yue does not like it, but she does not like some changes that I make to my own home.

Sincerely,

James Sancimino

- l an

Richard E. Radez Russell & Co. Inc. 583 47th Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121

Response to Section 311 Notification dated May 10, 2017

To whom it may concern.

RE: permit application # 2015.10.22.0473 for 583 47th Avenue

My name is Raymond B. Auker. I own and reside at the property at 594 48th Avenue. San Francisco.

I live within the boundaries of those neighbors invited on May 10, 2016 by the SF Planning Dept. to respond to plans provided to me by the Planning Dept. for permit applicant # 2015.10.22.0473 for parties living at 583 47th Avenue.

After careful review of the plans, I would make the following comments:

First, the vertical extension would make an attractive addition to the existing house and enhance the property value to the house and to the homes in the neighborhood.

Second, the proposed design and architectural features conform and blend nicely into those of the neighborhood.

Third, The size and scope of the proposed plans for renovation are not out of proportion or do harm to surrounding neighbors.

Lastly, the plans appear to meet planning dept. codes and requirements.

I have no hesitancy in recommending approval of permit application.

Yours truly,

Raymond B. Auker

Dear Mr.May,

I am writing to you because I would like to withdraw my name from the petition against the building the third floor and roof deck at 583 47th ave s.f. ca. 94121. The building of the third floor would not impact my view or my home. I only sign the petition as a favor for my neighbor, because she has always been a good neighbor.

Thank you very much

Sincerely, Allen Wong


















			A	DJ. PROPERTY 587 47th AVE. 1497 / 016F	9'-9"	25:0° (
						(E) COMPOSITE SHINGLE ROOF
					(E) WINDO	
			EXISTING ELEVATION - EAST   1/4" = 1'-0"		(E) DOOR.	(N) GARAGE DOOR UNDER SEPARATE PERMIT
				DJ. PROPERTY 587 47th AVE. 1497 / 016F	9.9.	25-0" ( 15-3"
				(N) ADDITION BEYOND EXTERIOR FINISH 001; PLASTER (N) PARAPET WALL		(E) COMPOSITE SHINGLE ROOF
					(E) WINDO	W (E) WINDOW
			PROPOSED ELEVATION - EAST 1/4" = 1-0"	(E) EXTERIOR FINISH	(E) DOOR	(E) GARAGE DOOR
RICHARD AND BONNY RADEZ, 583 47TH AVE SAN FRANCISCO CA 94121	583 47TH AVE 583 47TH AVE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121	△ REVISIONS: NO. DATE 3 03/22/2017 REV 3	2 1/4" = 1'-0" DESCRIPTION	SITE PERMIT SET 01/31/2017	STUDIO 12 ARCHITECTURE 1501 MARIPOSA ST, SUITE 319 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107 415.503.0212	



<u> </u>		1		
				25-0* 15'-3* B 9'-9*
			Ť	
		ADJ. PROPE 578 47th A	ERTY VE. 6D	
		1497 / 016		
			ROP	
			u	
				REMOVE (E) WINDOWS AND PORTION OF WALL. PREP FOR (N) DOOR.
				(N) DOOR.
		( <b>L</b>		(E) COMPOSITE NGLE ROOF, BEYOND
				NGLE ROOF, BEYOND
				kanal kanal kanal kanal
/				
				(E) WINDOW
				(E) WINDOW
				(E) DOOR.
		1 EXISTING ELEVATION - WEST		İ
		1/4" = 1'-0"		
			(A)	25-0° B
	/			25-0* 15'-3" 9'-9"
		ADJ. PROPE 578 47th A	VE.	
		1497 / 016		
			EXTERIOR FINISH 001; PLASTER	
			(E) EXTERIOR FINISH	
				3 (00-)
			3.9.	
	$\times$			
				(N) 42° GUARDRAIL (N) 42° GUARDRAIL
			φ	
/				
				(E) WINDOW
				(E) WINDOW
				(E) DOOR.
		PROPOSED ELEVATION - WEST		
		2 PROPOSED ELEVATION - WEST 1/4" = 1'-0"		
RICHARD AND BONNY RADEZ, 583 47TH AVE SAN FRANCISCO CA 94121	583 47TH AVE	SIONS: DATE DESCRIPTION	SITE PERMIT SET	STUDIO 12 ARCHITECTURE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94121	583 47TH AVE     NO.       SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121     2       3     3	DATE     DESCRIPTION       1/31/2017     REV 2       3/22/2017     REV 3	15 01/31/2017	01 MARIPOSA ST. SUITE 319 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107





			1	4'-7"	3-7*	25'-2*	70'-0"
			8	17-6 1/4*		5	
					R0.		
					25% REAR YA		
			PROPE		LINE OF		
				+			
				Ę	LINE OF ADJACENT BUILDING		
						AI	BUTTING PROPERTY LINE WALL
/				18;10 1/2"			BUTTING PROPERTY LINE WALL 587 47TH AVE 1497 / 016F 
						!	
			1 EXISTING ELEVATIO	DN - SOUTH			
			1/4" = 1'-0"				55'-5"
			(8)	17"-6 1/4"	3-7* ) 6	25-2*	4 52/53
					5.0.		H[
			PROPERTY LINE				EXTERIOR FINISH 001: PLASTER (1HR RATED AEEMBLY
				9. 6	AR VARD.		(1HR RATED AEEMBLY
					UILINE OF ADJACENT BUILDING		
							BUTTING PROPERTY LINE WALL 587 47TH AVE 1497 / 016F
					2017/1/1/202		
			$2\frac{\text{PROPOSED ELEVAT}}{1/4"} = 1'-0"$	TION - SOUTH			
RICHARD AND BONNY RADEZ, 583 47TH AVE SAN FRANCISCO CA 94121	583 47TH AVE 583 47TH AVE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121	△ REVISIONS: NO. DATE 3 03/22/2017 REV 3	DESCRIPTION	SITE PERMIT SET	1501 MA SAN I	STUDIO 12 ARCHITECTURE RIPOSA ST, SUITE 319 RANCISCO, CA 94107 415.503.0212	12
						415.503.0212	



# DRAWING INDEX

# GENERAL

- A0.0 TITLE PAGE
- A0.1 GENERAL INFORMATION A0.3 DOOR & WINDOW SCHEDULE / LEGEND

## ARCHITECTURAL



### PROJECT DIRECTORY

OWNER: RICHARD AND BONNY RADEZ 583 47TH AVE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121 203.255.6514

ARCHITECT: STUDIO 12 ARCHITECTURE 1501 MARIPOSA ST. SUITE 319 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107 PRINCIPAL ARCHITECT: JEFF BURRIS 415.503.0212 x201 ioffedtudid Janch com jeff@studio12arch.com CONTACT: JEFF BURRIS 415.503.0212 x201 jeff@studio12arch.com

CONTRACTOR:

STRUCTURAL ENGINEER: BONZA ENGINEERING, INC. 42 OTIS STREET, SUITE 4 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103 CONTACT: KELTON FINNEY 415.516.3569

ENERGY CONSULTANT: ENERGY CALC. CO. 45 MITCHELL BLVD., #16 SAN RAFAEL, CA 94903 CONTACT: CHUCK CLEMONS 415.457.0990





N.

PROPOSED REAR ELEVATION

PROPOSED FRONT ELEVATION

# 583 47TH AVE

583 47TH AVE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121 1497 / 016E

SITE PERMIT SET 09/25/2017



隹

1501 MARIPOSA ST, SUITE 319 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107 415.503.0212









			A		C (1	3 25'-0" 15'-3"	(
						(E) COMPOSITE SHINGLE ROOF	
			1/4" = 1'-0"	f	(E) DOOR.	(N) GARAGE UNDER SEP. PERMI	DOOR ARATE T
				ADJ. PROPERTY 587 47th AVE. 1497 / 016F (N) ADDITION BEYOND EXTERIOR FINISH 001; PLASTER (N) PARAPET WALL	g.g.	25-0" 15-3" 42" GLASS GUARDRAIL 42" GLASS GUARDRAIL (E) COMPOSITE SHINGLE ROOF	
				(E) EXTERIOR FINISH	(E) ENTRY DOOR (E) DOOR		NDOW
RICHARD AND BONNY RADEZ, 583 47TH AVE SAN FRANCISCO CA 94121	<b>583 47TH AVE</b> 583 47TH AVE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121	△     REVISIONS:       NO.     DATE       3     03/22/2017       4     Date 4       Revision 4	(2) PROPOSED ELEVATION - EAST 1/4" = 1'-0" DESCRIPTION	SITE PERMIT SET 09/25/2017	STUDIO ARCHITECTU 1501 MARIPOSA ST. SUIT SAN FRANCISCO, CA 415.503	12 JRE 5319 0212	



RICHARD AND BONNY RADEZ, 583 47TH AVE SAN FRANCISCO CA 94121	583 47TH AVE 583 47TH AVE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121	A REVISIONS:       NO.     DATE       2     01/31/2017       3     03/22/2017       4     Date 4       A evision		ITE PERMIT SET ARCHITECTU 9/25/2017 SAN FRANCISCO, CAS 9/25/2017 415.503	12 JRE 319 4107 0722
			2 PROPOSED ELEVATION - WEST 1/4" = 1'-0"		
				(N) 42" GUARDRAIL	(N) 42" GUARDRAIL
			EXTERIO	(E) EXTERIOR FINISH	SLIDING DOOR.
			<b>ADJ. PROPERTY</b> <b>579 47th AVE.</b> 1497 / 016D	42" CABLE GUARDRAIL.	
				(A) 15-3*	25-0" B 9-9"
			1 <u>EXISTING ELEVATION - WEST</u>		(E) DOOR.
				(E) WINDOW	



25'-0"

15'-3"

(E) COMPOSITE SHINGLE ROOF, BEYOND

( )

9'-9"

ADJ. PROPERTY 579 47th AVE. 1497 / 016D



			Ť	14-7"	2) 7*	70'-0"
			8	17-6 1/4"	<u>3'-7"</u> 6	25-2* (5) (4) 52/53
				17*01/4		
					АЯ Y АЯD. 	
					E OF 25% R	
			H H			
					-	
				E.	LINE OF ADJACENT BUILDING	
						ABUTTING PROPERTY LINE WALL
				8510 4/2"		<b>ABOTTING PROFERT LINE WALL</b> <b>587 4711 AVE</b> 1497 / 016F
				<del>2</del>		
					1	
			1 <u>EXISTING ELEV</u> 1/4" = 1'-0"	I VATION - SOUTH	1	
					→ 3'-7"	25'-2"
			8	17'-6 1/4"		5 42" GLASS GUARDRAIL.
				42" CABLE GUARDRAIL.	3.9 <sup>2</sup>	
				- ture		mint
			PROPERTY LINE		SLIDING DOOR.	EXTERIOR FINISH
						EXTERIOR FINISH 001; PLASTER (1HR RATED AEEMBLY
					- 25% - EE	
				ſ	LINE OF ADJACENT BUILDING	*
				B		ABUTTING PROPERTY LINE WALL 587 47TH AVE
/						1497 / 016F
			2 <u>PROPOSED EL</u> 1/4" = 1'-0"	EVATION - SOUTH		
RICHARD AND BONNY RADEZ, 583 47TH AVE SAN FRANCISCO CA 94121	583 47TH AVE 583 47TH AVE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121	Δ REVISIONS: NO. DATE 3. 03/22/2017 REV 3.	DESCRIPTION	SITE PERMIT SET	STU	DIO 12 ITECTURE TECTURE
SAN I MINUSUU UA 94121	SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121	3 03/22/2017 REV 3 4 Date 4 Revision 4		09/25/2017	1501 MARIPOSA SAN FRANCIS	CCO, CA 94107 415.503.0212



