



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Memo to the Planning Commission

HEARING DATE: JUNE 14, 2018

CONTINUED FROM: OCTOBER 12, 2017; DECEMBER 21, 2017; MARCH 22, 2018; MAY 3, 2018;
MAY 17, 2018

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Date: June 7, 2018
Case No.: **2017-001283CUA**
Project Address: **792 Capp Street**
Zoning: RTO-M (Residential Transit Oriented-Mission) Zoning District
Calle 24 Special Use District
40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 3637/019B
Project Sponsor: Lucas Eastwood
3520 20th Street
San Francisco, CA 94110
Staff Contact: Michael Christensen – (415) 575-8742
michael.christensen@sfgov.org
Recommendation: **Approval with Conditions**

BACKGROUND

At the May 17, 2018 Planning Commission hearing, the Planning Commission continued the request for Conditional Use Authorization to demolish the existing single-family home located at 792 Capp Street and construct a new, four-story residential building containing four dwelling units. The continuance was requested by the project sponsor to allow more time to conduct neighborhood outreach. Since the May 17, 2018 hearing, the sponsor has conducted additional neighborhood outreach but no modifications have been proposed to the project design.

ANALYSIS

As no physical changes are proposed from the design proposed at the May 17, 2018 hearing, there are no changes to the Department's analysis of the project. Please refer to the staff report from the May 17, 2018 hearing for the Department's analysis and recommendation for the project. Additionally, the project sponsor has provided a letter regarding the project, which is attached. Department staff has also prepared three additional exhibits regarding the project, which are also attached:

1. A block map detailing what other properties in the block are not designated as historic resources and are unlikely to contain rent controlled units, making them likely to meet the required findings for demolition of Planning Code Section 317.
2. An overlay of the existing site plan detailing staff's recommended modification to the project to retain the first ten feet of the existing building.

3. An overlay of the proposed site plan detailing staff's recommended modification to the project to retain the first ten feet of the existing building.

Attachments:

Area Map

Overlay of Existing Site Plan

Overlay of Proposed Site Plan


Project Sponsor Submittal Dated June 6, 2018

May 17, 2018 Planning Commission Packet

LOTS MERGED


Lot 28 INTO Lot 27 1929
Lot 24 INTO Lot 23 1941
Lot 30 INTO Lot 29 1941
Lot INTO Lot
lot59 into lots80&81 for 1998 roll
lot49 into lots82&83 for 2004 roll
lot53 into lots84&85 for 2012 roll
lot13 into lots86to88 for 2012 roll

REVISED '59
" '62
REVISED '70
Revised 1998
Revised 2004
Revised 2012



Office Building, Non-Historic, no Dwelling Units

22nd




CAPP

23rd

715-717 CAPP ST. A CONDOMINIUM			
LOT	UNIT	% COMM.	AREA
80	715	52.95	
81	717	47.05	


Property has "A"
Historic Rating
AND/OR contains
multiple dwelling units
constructed prior to
1979 (likely subject to
Rent Control)



SOUTH VAN NESS AVE.

755-757 CAPP ST. A CONDOMINIUM			
LOT	UNIT	% COMM.	AREA
82	757	47.99	
83	755	52.01	

Single-Story U.S.
Post Office,
Non-Historic, no
Dwelling Units



1 EXISTING SITE PLAN
3/16" = 1'-0"

WINDER
GIBSON
architects

interiors
planning
architecture

www.archsf.com

t 415.318.8634

1898 mission street
san francisco, ca 94103



792 CAPP ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110

CU REVISION

EXISTING SITE PLAN




A 1.00

DATE 04/13/18

SCALE 3/16" = 1'-0"

DRAWN HP, DV

SEE A0.51 FOR FLOOR BY FLOOR
BUILDING ENVELOPE DIMENSIONS



1 PROPOSED SITE PLAN
3/16" = 1'-0"

WINDER
GIBSON
architects

interiors
planning
architecture

www.archsf.com

t: 415. 318.8634

1898 mission street
san francisco, ca 94103



792 CAPP ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110

CU REVISION

PROPOSED SITE PLAN



A 2.00

DATE 04/13/18

SCALE 3/16" = 1'-0"

DRAWN HP, DV

BRETT GLADSTONE
PARTNER
DIRECT DIAL (415) 995-5065
DIRECT FAX (415) 995-3517
E-MAIL BGLadstone@hansonbridgett.com

June 6, 2018

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL ONLY richhillissf@gmail.com

Rich Hillis
President
San Francisco Planning Commission
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: 792 Capp Street - Conditional Use Hearing
Our File No. 34981.2


Dear President Hillis and Commissioners:

With regard to our client's conditional use hearing with the Planning Commission next week on Thursday, June 14, 2018, we enclose for your review and consideration the following documents:

1. Letter from Lucas Eastwood, part owner of the property at 792 Capp Street, describing recent interactions with the community, and community benefit ideas that resulted.
2. Letter from architect Geoff Gibson, addressing how the project proposed by Planning Staff at the last hearing (one that retains front part of the existing building) is not feasible.

Feel free to contact me by phone at (415) 995-5065 or email at bgladstone@hansonbridgett.com.

Very truly yours,


Brett Gladstone

EASTWOOD DEVELOPMENT
3520 20th Street, Unit B
San Francisco, CA 94110

June 6, 2018

Rich Hillis, President
San Francisco Planning Commission
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: **792 Capp Street – Conditional Use Hearing**

Dear President Hillis and Commissioners:

On May 17, 2018, the date of our scheduled third hearing, I requested a short continuance based on the fact that I was getting closer to coming to a resolution with the portion of the Capp Street community who were in opposition to my project. As of May 17, 2018, I had developed some ideas of contributions that this project could make to the community. On May 17, 2018, I was granted a continuance, and this gave me extra time for the following very fruitful conversations to take place:

- **Phone call with Karoleen Fong, Director of Community Real Estate, Mission Economic Development Association (MEDA)**, in which we discussed the possible outcomes for this project. MEDA suggested: (1) its buying the entire building (though this was thought to be unlikely since MEDA and its funding sources concentrate on larger developments) (2) selling one unit to MEDA at a lower price so MEDA could sell it to a low income person (3) donating a very large amount to the Small Sites program fund or (4) leasing out space in a public place such as a church or rec center for the community to use for the next 5-10 years. We then looked into all of those.
- **Multiple phone calls with Nathan Tinclair and Lillian Bautista**, both from the Scholarship Program of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department. Items discussed: how we can financially contribute to SF Rec and Parks and how to make sure that this funding went to a Mission District park or rec center.
- **In person meeting with the most vocal opponents at La Boheme Cafe**, 24th and Mission, Wednesday, May 30, 2018. **Attended by us and:** Erick Arguello (Calle 24); Karoleen Fong (MEDA); Thomas Plagemann and Davian Contreras (Capp Street residents) and Myrna Melgar. Dorothy Graham (next door neighbor) was invited but did not attend.

Items discussed: Items (1) through (4) in the first bullet points above, plus providing a voluntary Below Market Rate unit off site, but within 3 blocks of 792 Capp. Although not withdrawing opposition, most of the opposition understandably stated that, it would be best to choose an alternative that benefits a lower income person in the new building itself, since this portion of Capp Street is affected more than the rest of the Mission and since affordable housing is the community's main focus. As a result we have since then mostly focused on the DALP idea.

The DALP program is described by the City on the attachment to this letter. Recipients of the DALP money often have a hard time affording a unit even with the City's DALP loan contribution (max. \$375,000), which is later forgiven based on later events such as a sale to another low income buyer. There is often a money gap making a buyer unable to close even when a down payment is combined with the DALP loan and a bank loan. Our company would help the buyer by making a \$40,000 grant to the buyer to supplement the down payment the buyer will make to purchase a two bedroom unit in the new building.

As we had hoped, the additional time you gave us allowed us to find new solutions that we could afford to provide in this limited profit small project, such as underwriting community space in some Mission location; or a contribution to the DALP program; or contribution to the SF Parks Alliance which could help direct our money to a park or rec center in the Mission.

Since that time, the issue was raised as to whether some neutral third party could receive the financial contribution from us before the building is built, to make sure it would be used for this site, or for some other site if for some very unusual reason this project does not get built or takes many years to get built.

We believe we will have answers to this and other logistical issues between now and our hearing before you.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Lucas Eastwood" followed by a stylized flourish and the initials "MBG" inside a circle.

Lucas Eastwood

Information from SFMOHCD.org

Home > Own > Homebuyer Programs > MOHCD Loan Programs
> Downpayment Assistance Loan Program (DALP)

Downpayment Assistance Loan Program (DALP)

Detailed information for lenders

DALP is a downpayment loan up to \$375,000, to bid on a property on the open market. The loan must be used on the downpayment of a single unit that will become a primary residence. The owner can re-sell the unit at market prices.

The DALP is a silent second loan that requires no monthly payments for 30 years, or until the property is sold. The owner pays MOHCD back the principal amount, plus an equitable share of appreciation.

2017 DALP

2017 DALP funds are still being dispersed. Tracking will continue until all funds are dispersed.

[Track funding from 2017 DALP \[/loan-program-funding-balances\]](#)

2018 DALP

Lottery pre-approval applications due 7/31/18

Applicants must work with a [MOHCD-approved lender \[/lender-list\]](#)

[Apply for 2018 DALP lottery \[/apply-for-dalp\]](#)

Loan program details

Funding Availability for 2018

Funding source	Available Balance	Applicants
DALP-Housing Trust Fund (120% AMI)	\$3,000,000	General Public
DALP-2015 Bond (175% AMI)	\$10,000,000	General Public
FRDALP- Housing Trust Fund (200% AMI)	\$1,000,000	SF First Responders
Educators-DALP-TND (200% AMI)	\$1,200,000	SFUSD Educators

Important dates for 2018

2018 Date	Activity
July 31, 5PM	Lottery applications due
August 20, 10am	Lottery at SF Main Library
August 31	Lottery results posted
September 4	Applications begin to be processed

Fees

- No fee to apply for DALP lottery, which uses a pre-approval application.
- \$601 nonrefundable fee to process the paperwork of the DALP application. This will be collected when DALP funds are reserved to close on a property.
 - This fee is \$721 if you're applying with a [Mortgage Credit Certificate \[mortgage-credit-certificate-program-mcc\]](#).

Lottery, using pre-approval application

There is a lottery for the DALP once a year. Note: no lottery preferences are used in the DALP lottery. [Read more about how the lottery works » \[how-lottery-works\]](#)

- MOHCD will process and approve applications in lottery rank order, by the following audiences:
 - First Responders (FRDALP)
 - SFUSD Educators (Educators-DALP)
 - General
- We have a different funding source for applicants above 120% AMI.
 - Both 120% AMI and 175% AMI applicants will be ranked on the same list.
 - Each household can only reserve funds under one program (General, First Responders, or Educators) if selected.
 - First responders or SFUSD educators can still be considered for funding under the General DALP list if they are not selected in under FRDALP or Educators-DALP. However, the applicant must meet the AMI requirements of the funding source they use.

PROJECT: 792 Capp Street

TO: Planning Commissioners, c/o Michael Christensen, SF Planning Dept
VIA :

DATE: 06.05.18

FROM: Geoff Gibson, Project Architect

Project Address: 792 Capp Street
Intersection: one lot north of Capp Street and 23rd Street
Block 3637, Lot 019B
Zoning: RTO-M
Lot Size: 30' x 90', 2700 sf total.

We are writing in rebuttal to the Planning Department's redesigns of 792 Capp Street in its CUA Executive Summary dated 05.14.18. In this summary, Planning recommends trying to retain and add onto the existing building. See Planning's attached drawing.

In order to achieve preservation of the front portion of the building, Planning Staff contends that a program of four mostly family-sized units is still achievable, despite a reduction of 2000+ square feet which cuts the project from a new building of 5500 square feet to a half new/half existing building with a total gross area of 3300 square feet. Planning staff breaks down what it proposes as follows: two 2-bedroom units (of 700 square feet each) and two 1-bedroom units (of 450 square feet each), with a total building habitable area of only 2300 square feet and a total gross area of only 3300 square feet.

We respectfully refute this analysis for the following reasons:

1. The Planning Department calculation did not take into account circulation spaces, spaces for building equipment, second means of egress, etc. when it concluded that the four units (in sizes it proposes) reach a size that can be fit into the building volume it drew.
2. If Staff's calculation of total volume is correct, and if their number of bedrooms are adjusted to take into account the missing needed circulation, equipment area, second means of egress, etc., the total number of bedrooms will be three less than our new-building proposal. With the loss of this many bedrooms, it makes it nearly impossible to make this a project of family sized units.
3. With the cost of construction in San Francisco already at an all-time high, the cost to preserve and rebuild in this case will be nearly the same cost of a full build. There are various reasons for this, ranging from the surgical manner in which mechanical and structural must be carried out, to the difficulties of waterproofing a very old existing structure, preserving its windows, etc. Additionally, the existing structure is out of plumb, and efforts to solve for this imbalance will be costly and not necessarily successful. All of these reasons call into question whether the project is worth doing at all, should the project be approved with Staff's current recommendations.

Additionally:

1) Demolition Calculations

Please see the attached markup showing the Planning proposal overlaid over the existing conditions. It clearly demonstrates that the project would remove a substantial percentage of the total exterior walls and horizontal assemblies. This would invoke Section 317 'tantamount to demolition' and would require a conditional use authorization, thus not saving the time that Planning Staff believes will be saved.

2) Square footage and Unit Count – Section 317 Compliant – Not Tantamount to Demolition

We have previously studied a proposal to add to the existing building, as presented at the December 20 CUA hearing, that does not invoke Section 317. That proposed addition/remodel project was only able to create enough space for a 3-unit building with only 5 bedrooms. A Section 317 compliant proposal would result in a net loss of 1 dwelling unit and a net loss of 4 bedrooms compared with our new-building proposal. This is a significant downgrade of the ability of this project to provide housing simply to allow the retention of a non-historic building.

3) Unit Locations

Our proposed building locates one unit at the partial basement but with direct rear yard access and three units above grade with good light and air. Even if it were possible to squeeze four units into the existing building + addition as Planning proposed, two of these units would be in the partial basement, creating subpar living space.

4) Project Character

The Planning proposal for retention would simply maintain the front façade of 792 Capp Street. This facadism would be undercut by the vertical addition they propose just 10' back. This would dramatically change the character of this building, making it unlike the other existing single family home adjacent but also completely unlike the existing 3-story Victorians in the area. It is not an intact resource and is not typical in style for the context. It is stucco while the majority of the homes are painted wood siding. It features casement and transom windows unlike the double hung windows seen in this context. The vertical addition would presumably carry these same materials and details upwards, thus creating more out-of-context architecture.

Our currently proposed project is neither contemporary or modern in design. It has been designed as a polite background building; it features painted wood siding, double-hung windows, stepped casings and trim, traditional horned window sills, a projecting cornice and other details found in the immediate context. These materials and details are used in a restrained way to avoid faux-historicism and to avoid competing with the nearby historic resources. This is exactly the approach required in a historic context by the Secretary of the Interior standards. Our proposed entirely new building is significantly more contextual and sensitively designed than an addition to the existing atypical non-contextual single-family home would be.


The increased costs and challenges of construction for an addition project, as well as the effect that delays, additional professional fees, renotification and additional permit process will present will undoubtedly have a detrimental effect on the feasibility of the project.

In summary, an addition project does not yield the units, bedrooms or square footage that Planning believes it will. And it does not yield a superior building for the context or the goals of San Francisco.

Sincerely,



Geoff Gibson



1 EXISTING SITE PLAN
3/16" = 1'-0"

WINDER GIBSON ARCHITECTS
MARKUP OF PLANNING DEPT OVERLAY OF ADDITION/
RENOVATION PROPOSAL FOR 792 CAPP STREET

PROJECT WOULD TRIGGER SECTION 317 DEMOLITION

06.05.18

WINDER
GIBSON
architects

interiors
planning
architecture

www.archsf.com

t 415.318.8634

1898 mission street
san francisco, ca 94103



792 CAPP ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110

CU REVISION

EXISTING SITE PLAN



A 1.00

DATE 04/13/18

SCALE 3/16" = 1'-0"

DRAWN HP, DV

1616



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Executive Summary Conditional Use Authorization

HEARING DATE: MAY 17, 2018

CONTINUED FROM: OCTOBER 12, 2017, DECEMBER 21, 2017, MARCH 22, 2018, MAY 3, 2018

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Date: May 14, 2018
Case No.: **2017-001283CUA**
Project Address: **792 Capp Street**
Zoning: RTO-M (Residential Transit Oriented-Mission) Zoning District
Calle 24 Special Use District
40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 3637/019B
Project Sponsor: Lucas Eastwood
3520 20th Street
San Francisco, CA 94110
Staff Contact: Michael Christensen – (415) 575-8742
michael.christensen@sfgov.org
Recommendation: **Approval with Conditions**

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project sponsor proposes to demolish the existing single-family home and construct a new four story, 40 foot tall residential structure containing four dwelling units. The existing 1,939 square foot, two-story structure contains one three-bedroom dwelling unit. The proposed 5,528 square foot, four story replacement structure contains four dwelling units with one one-bedroom (measuring 669 square feet), one two-bedroom unit (measuring 730 square feet), and two three-bedroom units (measuring 1,397 square feet and 1,628 square feet). The project also includes a garage which can accommodate two automobiles and four Class One bicycle spaces.

REQUIRED COMMISSION ACTION

In order for the project to proceed, the Commission must grant Conditional Use Authorization to allow the demolition of the existing residential dwelling unit and construction of a new four-unit, four-story building within the RTO-M Zoning District, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 209.4, 303 and 317.

ISSUES AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- **October 12th, 2017 Hearing.** During the October 12th, 2017 hearing on the project, the Commission expressed concern regarding the design of the building and the compatibility with the neighborhood. The Commission also expressed concern over the impact of the project on surrounding historic properties. The Commission continued the item to the December 21st

- hearing and directed the sponsor to return with a plan which retained the existing structure to the maximum extent possible and to conduct additional neighborhood outreach.
- **December 21st, 2017 Hearing.** During the December 21st, 2017 hearing, the project sponsor returned with revised plans which modified the architectural details of the structure but did not propose retention of any portion of the existing structure. The Commission continued the item to the March 22nd, 2018 hearing with intent to disapprove the project.
 - **Project Updates.** Since the last hearing, the project sponsor has conducted additional outreach to the local community, including conducting a neighborhood meeting to solicit feedback on the proposed project. The additional continuances were requested by the project sponsor to allow additional time to conduct such outreach. The proposed project has been revised to incorporate façade articulations which are common on other properties on the block to bring the design more into character with the surrounding neighborhood, but no changes to the massing or basic features of the project are proposed.
 - **Public Comment & Outreach.** The Department has received significant opposition to the project; the concerns are centered on the demolition of the existing structure which does not meet the criteria for historical significance but holds significant cultural and emotional significance for neighborhood residents. The project sponsor has held multiple meetings with members of the local neighborhood, including a public meeting on April 13, 2018 to solicit feedback on the proposal. Attendees generally expressed concern over dust and debris during the construction period and general opposition to the demolition of the structure. Some attendees expressed preference for a project which preserved the existing structure while accommodating the proposed housing project.
 - **Department Recommendation.** The Commission has directed staff to return with a motion to deny the requested Conditional Use Authorization, which is included in the packet. The Department finds that a housing project including four dwelling units can be accommodated at the subject site while retaining the front portion of the structure to retain the appearance and character of the subject property and thus the Department's recommendation is to approve the requested Conditional Use Authorization with a Condition of Approval to require that the first ten feet of the structure be retained in its current location with any addition to be constructed only behind this portion of the structure, subject to consistency with the Residential Design Guidelines and the Planning Code.

BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION

The Department finds that the Project is consistent with the Objectives and Policies of the General Plan. The Department finds that the addition of housing units at the subject property can be accomplished without requiring demolition of the existing structure, and that adaptive reuse of the structure, including addition of dwelling units, is a preferable project to the demolition of the structure. The Department finds the project to be necessary and desirable for the addition of dwelling units and the project to meet all applicable requirements of the Planning Code.

ATTACHMENTS:

Exhibit A: Draft Motion – Conditional Use Authorization Denial

Exhibit B: Draft Motion – Conditional Use Authorization Approval with Conditions

Exhibit C: Conditions of Approval

Exhibit D: Site Exhibits

- Parcel Map
- Sanborn Map
- Zoning Map
- Height and Bulk District Map
- Aerial Photo
- Site Photo

Exhibit E: CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination

Exhibit F: Historic Resource Evaluation

Exhibit G: Correspondence Received in Opposition to the Project

Exhibit H: Project Sponsor Submittal

- Correspondence and Signatures in Support
- Correspondence from Kate Kuzminski, RE: Confirming the seller of 792 Capp was not evicted
- Correspondence from Ryan J. Patterson, RE: Housing Accountability Act
- Correspondence from Brett Gladstone
- Property Appraisal

Exhibit I: Project Plans



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Planning Commission Motion No. XXXXX

HEARING DATE: MAY 17, 2018

Case No.: **2017-001283CUA**
Project Address: **792 Capp Street**
Zoning: RTO-M (Residential Transit Oriented-Mission) Zoning District
Calle 24 Special Use District
40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 3637/019B
Project Sponsor: Lucas Eastwood
3520 20th Street
San Francisco, CA 94110
Staff Contact: Michael Christensen – (415) 575-8742
michael.christensen@sfgov.org

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

ADOPTING FINDINGS RELATING TO THE DENIAL OF CONDITIONAL USE AUTHORIZATION PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 209.4, 303, AND 317 OF THE PLANNING CODE FOR A PROJECT PROPOSING THE DEMOLITION OF A SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE AND CONSTRUCTION OF A FOUR-UNIT RESIDENTIAL BUILDING LOCATED AT 792 CAPP STREET IN ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 3637, LOT 019B WITHIN THE RTO-M (RESIDENTIAL TRANSIT ORIENTED-MISSION) ZONING DISTRICT, THE CALLE-24 SPECIAL USE DISTRICT, AND A 40-X HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICT.

PREAMBLE

On January 1, 2017, Lucas Eastwood (Project Sponsor) filed an application with the Planning Department (hereinafter "Department") for Conditional Use Authorization under Planning Code Sections 209.4, 303, and 317 to demolish the single-family home located at 792 Capp Street and construct a new, four-story, four-unit residential structure within the RTO-M (Residential Transit Oriented-Mission) Zoning District, the Calle-24 Special Use District, and a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

On October 12, 2017, the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting on Conditional Use Application No. 2016-005411CUA. On October 12, 2017, the Commission continued this project to the public hearing on December 21, 2017. On December 21, 2017, the Commission continued this project to the public hearing on March 22, 2018. On March 22, 2018, the Commission continued this project to the public hearing on May 3, 2018. On May 3, 2018, the Commission continued this project to the public hearing on May 24, 2018.

The Project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") under Class 1 and Class 3 Categorical exemptions.

The Planning Department, Jonas P. Ionin, is the custodian of records, located in the File for Case No. 2017-001283CUA at 1650 Mission Street, Fourth Floor, San Francisco, California.

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.

MOVED, that the Commission hereby denies the Conditional Use Authorization requested in Application No. 2017-001283CUA for the demolition of an existing single-family structure and construction of a new, four-story, four-unit residential structure, based on the following findings:

FINDINGS

Having reviewed the materials identified in the preamble above, and having heard all testimony and arguments, this Commission finds, concludes, and determines as follows:

1. The above recitals are accurate and constitute findings of this Commission.
2. **Project Description.** The project sponsor proposes to demolish the existing single-family home and construct a new four story, 40 foot tall residential structure containing four dwelling units. The existing 1,939 square foot, two-story structure contains one three-bedroom dwelling unit. The proposed 5,528 square foot, four story replacement structure contains four dwelling units with one one-bedroom (measuring 669 square feet), one two-bedroom unit (measuring 730 square feet), and two three-bedroom units (measuring 1,397 square feet and 1,628 square feet). The project also includes a garage which can accommodate two automobiles and four Class One bicycle spaces.
3. **Site Description and Present Use.** The project is located on the west side of Capp Street, between 22nd and 23rd Streets, on Assessor's Block 3637, Lot 019B. The project site is a 2,700 square foot parcel measuring 30 feet wide and 90 feet deep, which is typical of parcels in the area. The subject property is located within the Residential Transit Oriented-Mission Zoning District ("RTO-M") and the 40-X Height and Bulk District. The property is developed with a two-story single-family home.
4. **Surrounding Properties and Neighborhood.** The area surrounding the project site is primarily residential in character. Properties fronting Capp Street are primarily residential, while properties fronting 23rd Street and Mission Street (to the rear of this property) are mixed-use in character, with residential units on upper floors and commercial units at the ground level. The immediately adjacent structure to the south is a three story building with commercial uses at the ground floor and residential uses above. The immediately adjacent structure to the north is a two-story single family home. The existing structure on the project site and the immediately adjacent structure to the north are the only two-story homes on the subject block; all other structures in the immediate area are built to a height of three stories. Capp Street is tucked within a broader neighborhood which has significant commercial activity, but the subject block is completely residential, with commercial uses nearby along 23rd Street.
5. **Public Comment.** The Department has received significant opposition to the project; the concerns are centered on the demolition of the existing structure which does not meet the criteria for historical significance but holds significant cultural and emotional significance for

neighborhood residents. The project sponsor has held multiple meetings with members of the local neighborhood, including a public meeting on April 13, 2018 to solicit feedback on the proposal. Attendees generally expressed concern over dust and debris during the construction period and general opposition to the demolition of the structure. Some attendees expressed preference for a project which preserved the existing structure while accommodating the proposed housing project.

6. **Planning Code Compliance:** The Commission finds that the Project is consistent with the relevant provisions of the Planning Code in the following manner:

- A. **Residential Demolition.** Planning Code Section 317 states that a Conditional Use Authorization is required to demolish a residential unit, that no permit for residential demolition shall be approved prior to final approval of a building permit for a replacement structure, and that the Commission shall consider the replacement structure as part of its decision on the Conditional Use Authorization.

The Project Sponsor has submitted this request for Conditional Use Authorization to comply with this requirement, and the project plans include the demolition of the existing structure as well as the construction of the replacement structure. While the granting of the Conditional Use Authorization would authorize the permit to demolish the existing residential structure, formal approval of the permit to demolish the existing residential structure would not occur until the permit for the replacement structure has been finally approved.

- B. **Residential Density and Dwelling Unit Mix.** Planning Code Section 209.4 establishes no density limit for residential dwelling units in the RTO-M Zoning District. Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each parcel, along with Residential Design Guidelines. Additionally, the section establishes that no less than 40 percent of the total number of proposed dwelling units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30 percent of the total number of proposed dwelling units shall contain at least three bedrooms.

The proposed project provides four new dwelling units to replace the one existing dwelling unit on the site. The overall building massing was found by the Residential Design Advisory Team to be consistent with the Residential Design Guidelines, and the project was found to be compliant with Planning Code Requirements for permitted height and bulk, setbacks, exposure, and open space, as detailed below. The proposed dwelling units comply with the dwelling unit mix requirements by providing 75% of units as two or more bedroom units.

- C. **Height and Bulk.** The project is located in a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

The project is proposed with a total height of 40', which is consistent with the height and bulk district. At the front building wall, the total building height is 30', increasing to 40' after a 12' setback from the front building wall.

- D. **Front Setback.** Planning Code Section 132 requires that the project provide a front setback that is equal to the average of the adjacent neighbor's front setbacks.

The project is designed to provide the required setback using the alternative method of averaging detailed in Planning Code Section 132(b), which allows for the front setback to be provided in an irregular manner provided that the total setback area is equal to what would be required if the front setback was provided as a simple average of the setbacks of the two adjacent properties.

- E. **Rear Yard.** Planning Code Section 134 requires that the project provide a rear yard equal to 45% of the total depth of the lot, provided that the requirement may be reduced based on the conditions of adjacent lots but in no case may be less than 15' of 25% of the total depth of the lot. Additionally, if averaging is used, the total height of the last 10' of building depth is limited to 30'.

The project provides a rear yard equal to 27' 1" (30% of total lot depth) based on the conditions of adjacent properties. Additionally, the last 10' of building depth has been limited to a height of 30'.

- F. **Exposure.** Planning Code Section 140 requires that in all dwelling units at least one room that meets the 120-square-foot minimum superficial floor area requirement of Section 503 of the [Housing Code](#) shall face directly onto a public street or alley, a code-complying rear yard, or an open area meeting certain criteria.

All four proposed dwelling units contain windows which face onto the rear yard, which meets the requirements of the Planning Code.

- G. **Open Space.** Planning Code Section 209.4 requires that usable open space be provided for the proposed dwelling units in the amount of 100 square feet per unit if provided as private open space or 133 square feet per unit if provided as common.

Units 1 and 2 share access to the rear yard, which provides 675 square feet of usable open space. Unit 3 has direct access to a private patio which is 120 square feet in size, and Unit 4 has access to two private patios which total approximately 550 square feet in size. Through this combination of private and common open spaces, the project meets the open space requirements of the Planning Code.

- H. **Automobile Parking.** Planning Section 151.1 of the Planning Code permits up to three automobile parking spaces for each four dwelling units in the RTO-M Zoning District.

The proposed project provides two automobile parking spaces where the Planning Code allows up to three, and thus the project is compliant with this requirement.

- I. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Section 155.2 of the Planning Code requires that one Class One bicycle parking space be provided for each dwelling unit.

The proposed project provides four Class One bicycle parking spaces where the code requires four, and thus the project is compliant with this section.

7. **Planning Code Section 303** establishes criteria for the Planning Commission to consider when reviewing applications for Conditional Use approval. On balance, the project does not comply with said criteria in that:

- A. The proposed new uses and building, at the size and intensity contemplated and at the proposed location, will provide a development that is necessary or desirable, and compatible with, the neighborhood or the community.

While the addition of new dwelling units is necessary and desirable, the demolition of the structure is not required in order to accommodate a housing project at the subject property and thus is not necessary or desirable. A four unit housing project would require a minimum of two two-bedroom units per the required dwelling unit mix of Planning Code Section 209.4. The remaining two dwelling units could be one-bedroom or studio units and remain code-complying. Thus, accommodating four dwelling units on the project site does not require demolition of the structure and construction of a new, 5,528 square foot structure as the proposed units could be accommodated in a much smaller envelope which could be accomplished through a reuse of the existing structure. To qualify for tax credits through the Department of Housing and Urban Development, one-bedroom dwelling units must be a minimum of 450 square feet in size, and two-bedroom units must be a minimum of 700 square feet in size. Thus, a project containing two two-bedroom units and two one-bedroom units which are modestly sized would need a total size of 2,300 square feet, which is less than 400 square feet larger than the existing 1,939 square foot building. Even while factoring in required common areas, utilities, and inefficiencies in the floor plan resulting from retention of the existing structure; the proposed housing project could be accommodated with a modest addition and reconfiguration of the structure.

- B. The proposed project will not be detrimental to the health, safety, convenience or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity. There are no features of the project that could be detrimental to the health, safety or convenience of those residing or working the area, in that:

- i. Nature of proposed site, including its size and shape, and the proposed size, shape and arrangement of structures;

The project site is a 2,700 square foot parcel measuring 30 feet wide and 90 feet deep, which is typical of parcels in the area. The proposed structure is four stories in height, but with a ground floor that is partially underground, which reduces the scale of the structure at the rear. In addition, the fourth floor has been setback 12 feet at the front building wall to establish a massing that is consistent with the structure to the south, and a three foot side setback has been incorporated at the front of the structure on the north side to create a smoother transition to the structure to the north. This side setback also renders the structure more consistent with the overall block pattern, where partial side setbacks are common. As such, the proposed site and structure are both consistent with the development pattern of the neighborhood. However, retention of the existing structure would yield far greater compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood as the character of the existing neighborhood is retained and new, modern architectural design is not introduced into a neighborhood which consists fully of historic buildings or buildings which are age-eligible for historic classification.

- ii. The accessibility and traffic patterns for persons and vehicles, the type and volume of such traffic, and the adequacy of proposed off-street parking and loading;

The project proposes two automobile parking spaces and the required four new Class 1 bicycle parking spaces, and the neighborhood is transit rich. Thus, the proposed project provides adequate off-street parking and loading for the proposed use. The proposed project would not interfere or unduly burden traffic patterns within the surrounding neighborhood. However, the Planning Code does not require off-street parking in the RTO-M Zoning District. Planning Code Section 151.1 instead establishes that a maximum of three parking spaces be provided for each four dwelling units in the RTO-M Zoning District. The existing off-street parking spaces are not required under the Planning Code and may be removed to accommodate the proposed housing units without requiring demolition of the structure.

- iii. The safeguards afforded to prevent noxious or offensive emissions such as noise, glare, dust and odor;

As the proposed Project is residential in nature, it is unlikely to have the potential to produce noxious or offensive emissions.

- iv. Treatment given, as appropriate, to such aspects as landscaping, screening, open spaces, parking and loading areas, service areas, lighting and signs;

The proposed project provides screened off-street parking spaces by enclosing them in a garage, and the front setback area is appropriately landscaped and contains permeable surfaces to comply with the requirements of the Planning Code. As a small project, it does not contain service areas or signage that could detract from the visual quality of the site.

- C. That the use as proposed will comply with the applicable provisions of the Planning Code and will not adversely affect the General Plan.

The Project complies with all relevant requirements and standards of the Planning Code. However, the project is not consistent with objectives and policies of the General Plan as detailed below.

- D. That the use as proposed would provide development that is in conformity with the purpose of the applicable Zoning District.

The proposed project is not consistent with the stated purposes of RTO-M District in that the project does not maintain the moderate scale and segmentation prescribed by the Zoning District.

- 8. **Additional Findings pursuant to Section 317** establishes criteria for the Planning Commission to consider when reviewing applications for Residential Demolition. On balance, the Project does not comply with said criteria in that:

- A. Whether the property is free of a history of serious, continuing code violations;

A review of the Department of Building Inspection and the Planning Department databases showed no active enforcement cases or notices of violation for the subject property.

- B. Whether the housing has been maintained in a decent, safe, and sanitary condition;

The existing structure appears to have been maintained in a decent, safe and sanitary condition.

- C. Whether the property is an “historic resource” under CEQA;

Although the existing structure is more than 50 years old, a review of the supplemental information resulted in a determination that the existing structure at 792 Capp Street is not a historical resource (See Case No. 2017-001283ENV).

- D. Whether the removal of the resource will have a substantial adverse impact under CEQA;

The existing building at 792 Capp Street is not a historical resource.

- E. Whether the Project converts rental housing to other forms of tenure or occupancy;

The existing structure is a single-family residence which was previously an owner-occupied unit and was vacated as part of the sale of the property. As such, the project does not entail conversion of rental housing to other forms of tenure or occupancy.

- F. Whether the Project removes rental units subject to the Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance;

The Planning Department cannot definitely determine whether or not the single-family home is subject to the Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance. This is the purview of the Rent Board; however, the Department can confirm that there are no current tenants living in the existing dwelling unit.

- G. Whether the Project conserves existing housing to preserve cultural and economic neighborhood diversity;

The proposed project demolishes existing housing which is of sound quality to accomplish a housing project which can be accommodated without requiring demolition of the structure. Thus, the project does not conserve existing housing to preserve cultural and economic neighborhood diversity; the project removes existing housing and harms the cultural and economic neighborhood diversity by adding a new, modern structure in a context which is defined by historic buildings or buildings which are age-eligible for historic classification.

- H. Whether the Project conserves neighborhood character to preserve neighborhood cultural and economic diversity;

The proposed project demolishes existing housing which is of sound quality to accomplish a housing project which can be accommodated without requiring demolition of the structure. Thus, the project does not conserve neighborhood character; the project removes existing housing and harms neighborhood character by adding a new, modern structure in a context which is defined by historic buildings or buildings which are age-eligible for historic classification.

I. Whether the Project protects the relative affordability of existing housing;

The Project removes an older single-family residence, which is generally considered more affordable than a more recently constructed unit. The project does not provide any affordable housing and exacerbates development pressure on the surrounding neighborhood, impacting the affordability of other housing units.

J. Whether the Project increases the number of permanently affordable units as governed by Section 415;

The Project is not subject to the provisions of Planning Code Section 415, as the project only proposes four dwelling units.

K. Whether the Project locates in-fill housing on appropriate sites in established neighborhoods;

The Project has not been designed to be in keeping with the scale and development pattern of the mixed neighborhood character. The surrounding neighborhood is an established residential neighborhood and the proposed massing and use are not consistent with other properties in the area. The additional housing can be accomplished without requiring demolition of the structure, and retention of the structure would render the infill housing project more appropriate for the surrounding neighborhood.

L. Whether the project increases the number of family-sized units on-site;

The RTO-M zoning district requires that a minimum of 40% of new dwelling units contain at least two bedrooms. Thus, a housing project on the site would increase the number of family sized units. However, the demolition of the existing sound structure is not required to accommodate a housing project at the site.

M. Whether the Project creates new supportive housing;

The Project does not create supportive housing.

N. Whether the Project is of superb architectural and urban design, meeting all relevant design guidelines, to enhance existing neighborhood character;

The overall scale, design, and materials of the proposed building is not consistent with the block-face and detracts from the neighborhood character with a contemporary design.

- O. Whether the Project increases the number of on-site dwelling units;

The Project will increase the number of on-site units from one dwelling unit to four dwelling units. However, the additional housing units can be accomplished without requiring demolition of the structure.

- P. Whether the Project increases the number of on-site bedrooms.

The existing building contains a total of three bedrooms. The Project will contain a total of nine bedrooms across the four dwelling units. However, additional bedrooms can be accomplished without requiring demolition of the structure.

- Q. Whether or not the replacement project would maximize density on the subject lot; and,

Per Planning Code Section 209.4, there is no maximum residential density in the RTO-M District. The Project proposes the demolition of the existing single-family residence and new construction of a four-unit building, increasing the existing site density from one to four. However, the additional housing units can be accomplished without requiring demolition of the structure.

- R. If replacing a building not subject to the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance, whether the new project replaces all the existing units with new Dwelling Units of a similar size and with the same number of bedrooms.

The Planning Department cannot definitely determine whether or not the single-family home is subject to the Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance. The existing three-bedroom single family home is proposed to be replaced with four dwelling units with one one-bedroom (measuring 669 square feet), one two-bedroom unit (measuring 730 square feet), and two three-bedroom units (measuring 1,397 square feet and 1,628 square feet) As such, the project replaces the existing dwelling unit with two units that are of similar size and with the same number of bedrooms while also providing two additional dwelling units to the City's housing stock. However, the additional housing units can be accomplished without requiring demolition of the structure.

9. **General Plan Compliance.** The Project is, on balance, not consistent with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan:

HOUSING ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 2:

RETAIN EXISTING HOUSING UNITS, AND PROMOTE SAFETY AND MAINTENANCE STANDARDS, WITHOUT JEOPARDIZING AFFORDABILITY.

Policy 2.2:

Discourage the demolition of sound existing housing, unless the demolition results in a net increase in affordable housing.

OBJECTIVE 3:

Protect the affordability of the existing housing stock, especially rental units.

OBJECTIVE 4:

Foster a housing stock that meets the needs of all residents across lifecycles.

The project does not retain existing housing units and proposes an unnecessary demolition of a sound residential structure. The demolition of sound existing housing does not result in a net increase in affordable housing. Thus, the project is not consistent with this policy of the Housing Element of the General Plan.

MISSION AREA PLAN

Objectives and Policies

Housing

OBJECTIVE 2.2

RETAIN AND IMPROVE EXISTING HOUSING AFFORDABLE TO PEOPLE OF ALL INCOMES

OBJECTIVE 2.4

LOWER THE COST OF THE PRODUCTION OF HOUSING

Policy 2.2.1

Adopt Citywide demolition policies that discourage demolition of sound housing, and encourage replacement of affordable units.

Policy 2.4.3

Encourage construction of units that are “affordable by design.”

The proposed project does not retain existing housing and proposed demolition of a sound housing structure which can be modified to incorporate additional units. Alteration of an existing structure is typically less expensive than full demolition and construction of a new structure and thus the proposed project is not affordable by design.

10. **Planning Code Section 101.1(b)** establishes eight priority-planning policies and requires review of permits for consistency with said policies. On balance, the project does not comply with said policies in that:

- A. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses be enhanced.

The project site does not possess any existing neighborhood-serving retail uses.

- B. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods.

The proposed project does not conserve existing housing. The proposed project demolishes existing housing and alters neighborhood character and is not necessary to accommodate the proposed housing project at the subject property.

- C. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced,

The existing single family dwelling is not designated as an inclusionary affordable housing unit.

- D. That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking.

The Project is not anticipated to impede transit service or overburden our streets with neighborhood parking. The project includes required amount of bicycle parking and off-street parking below the principally-permitted amount, thus supporting the City's transit first policies.

- E. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced.

The Project does not include commercial office development and would not affect industrial or service sector uses or related employment opportunities. Ownership of industrial or service sector businesses would not be affected by the Project.

- F. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.

The replacement structures would be built in compliance with San Francisco's current Building Code Standards and would meet all earthquake safety requirements.

- G. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved.

Landmark or historic buildings do not occupy the Project site. The existing building is not a historic resource. However, the building has significant cultural significance to the Mission neighborhood.

- H. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

The project does not exceed the 40-foot height limit, and is thus not subject to the requirements of Planning Code Section 295 – Height Restrictions on Structures Shadowing Property Under the Jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission. The height of the proposed structures is compatible with the established neighborhood development.

11. The Project is not consistent with and would not promote the general and specific purposes of the Code provided under Section 101.1(b) in that, as designed, the Project would not maintain the character and stability of the neighborhood and would not constitute a beneficial development. The requested demolition is not required to accommodate a housing project at the subject site.

12. The Commission hereby finds that denial of the Conditional Use authorization would promote the health, safety and welfare of the City.

DECISION

That based upon the Record, the submissions by the Applicant, the staff of the Department and other interested parties, the oral testimony presented to this Commission at the public hearings, and all other written materials submitted by all parties, the Commission hereby **DENIES Conditional Use Application No. 2017-001283CUA** pursuant to Planning Code Sections 209.4, 303 and 317 to allow the demolition of an existing single-family residence and construction of a new, four-story, four-unit residential structure. The property is located within the Residential Transit Oriented - Mission (RTO-M), and a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

APPEAL AND EFFECTIVE DATE OF MOTION: Any aggrieved person may appeal this Conditional Use Authorization to the Board of Supervisors within thirty (30) days after the date of this Motion No. XXXXX. The effective date of this Motion shall be the date of this Motion if not appealed (After the 30-day period has expired) OR the date of the decision of the Board of Supervisors if appealed to the Board of Supervisors. For further information, please contact the Board of Supervisors at (415) 554-5184, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94012.

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 ADOPTED the foregoing Motion on May 17, 2018.

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES:

NAYS:

ABSENT:

ADOPTED: May 17, 2018



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Planning Commission Motion No. XXXXX

HEARING DATE: MAY 17, 2018

Case No.: **2017-001283CUA**
Project Address: **792 Capp Street**
Zoning: RTO-M (Residential Transit Oriented-Mission) Zoning District
Calle 24 Special Use District
40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 3637/019B
Project Sponsor: Lucas Eastwood
3520 20th Street
San Francisco, CA 94110
Staff Contact: Michael Christensen – (415) 575-8742
michael.christensen@sfgov.org

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

ADOPTING FINDINGS RELATING TO THE APPROVAL OF CONDITIONAL USE AUTHORIZATION PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 209.4, 303 AND 317 OF THE PLANNING CODE TO ALLOW THE DEMOLITION OF AN EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY HOME AND CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW, FOUR-UNIT RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURE WITHIN THE RTO-M (RESIDENTIAL TRANSIT ORIENTED-MISSION) ZONING DISTRICT, THE CALLE 24 SPECIAL USE DISTRICT, AND A 40-X HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICT.

PREAMBLE

On January 1, 2017, Lucas Eastwood (Project Sponsor) filed an application with the Planning Department (hereinafter "Department") for Conditional Use Authorization under Planning Code Sections 209.4, 303, and 317 to demolish the single-family home located at 792 Capp Street and construct a new, four-story, four-unit residential structure within the RTO-M (Residential Transit Oriented-Mission) Zoning District, the Calle-24 Special Use District, and a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

On October 12, 2017, the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting on Conditional Use Application No. 2016-005411CUA. On October 12, 2017, the Commission continued this project to the public hearing on December 21, 2017. On December 21, 2017, the Commission continued this project to the public hearing on March 22, 2018. On March 22, 2018, the Commission continued this project to the public hearing on May 3, 2018. On May 3, 2018, the Commission continued this project to the public hearing on May 24, 2018.

The Project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") under Class 1 and Class 3 Categorical exemptions.

The Planning Department, Jonas P. Ionin, is the custodian of records, located in the File for Case No. 2017-001283CUA at 1650 Mission Street, Fourth Floor, San Francisco, California.

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.

MOVED, that the Commission hereby approves the Conditional Use Authorization requested in Application No. 2017-001283CUA for the demolition of an existing single-family structure and construction of a new, four-story, four-unit residential structure, based on the following findings:

FINDINGS

Having reviewed the materials identified in the preamble above, and having heard all testimony and arguments, this Commission finds, concludes, and determines as follows:

1. The above recitals are accurate and constitute findings of this Commission.
2. **Project Description.** The project sponsor proposes to demolish the existing single-family home and construct a new four story, 40 foot tall residential structure containing four dwelling units. The existing 1,939 square foot, two-story structure contains one three-bedroom dwelling unit. The proposed 5,528 square foot, four story replacement structure contains four dwelling units with one one-bedroom (measuring 669 square feet), one two-bedroom unit (measuring 730 square feet), and two three-bedroom units (measuring 1,397 square feet and 1,628 square feet). The project also includes a garage which can accommodate two automobiles and four Class One bicycle spaces.
3. **Site Description and Present Use.** The project is located on the west side of Capp Street, between 22nd and 23rd Streets, on Assessor's Block 3637, Lot 019B. The project site is a 2,700 square foot parcel measuring 30 feet wide and 90 feet deep, which is typical of parcels in the area. The subject property is located within the Residential Transit Oriented-Mission Zoning District ("RTO-M") and the 40-X Height and Bulk District. The property is developed with a two-story single-family home.
4. **Surrounding Properties and Neighborhood.** The area surrounding the project site is primarily residential in character. Properties fronting Capp Street are primarily residential, while properties fronting 23rd Street and Mission Street (to the rear of this property) are mixed-use in character, with residential units on upper floors and commercial units at the ground level. The immediately adjacent structure to the south is a three story building with commercial uses at the ground floor and residential uses above. The immediately adjacent structure to the north is a two-story single family home. The existing structure on the project site and the immediately adjacent structure to the north are the only two-story homes on the subject block; all other structures in the immediate area are built to a height of three stories. Capp Street is tucked within a broader neighborhood which has significant commercial activity, but the subject block is completely residential, with commercial uses nearby along 23rd Street.
5. **Public Comment.** The Department has received significant opposition to the project; the concerns are centered on the demolition of the existing structure which does not meet the criteria for historical significance but holds significant cultural and emotional significance for neighborhood residents. The project sponsor has held multiple meetings with members of the

local neighborhood, including a public meeting on April 13, 2018 to solicit feedback on the proposal. Attendees generally expressed concern over dust and debris during the construction period and general opposition to the demolition of the structure. Some attendees expressed preference for a project which preserved the existing structure while accommodating the proposed housing project.

6. **Planning Code Compliance:** The Commission finds that the Project is consistent with the relevant provisions of the Planning Code in the following manner:

- A. **Residential Demolition.** Planning Code Section 317 states that a Conditional Use Authorization is required to demolish a residential unit, that no permit for residential demolition shall be approved prior to final approval of a building permit for a replacement structure, and that the Commission shall consider the replacement structure as part of its decision on the Conditional Use Authorization.

The Project Sponsor has submitted this request for Conditional Use Authorization to comply with this requirement, and the project plans include the demolition of the existing structure as well as the construction of the replacement structure. While the granting of the Conditional Use Authorization, as conditioned, would authorize the permit to demolish a portion of the existing residential structure, formal approval of the permit to demolish the existing residential structure would not occur until the permit for the replacement structure has been finally approved. A revised project consistent with the Conditions of Approval of this motion would be required to be submitted, reviewed, and approved by Department staff prior to approval of any permit for demolition on the site.

- B. **Residential Density and Dwelling Unit Mix.** Planning Code Section 209.4 establishes no density limit for residential dwelling units in the RTO-M Zoning District. Density is regulated by the permitted height and bulk, and required setbacks, exposure, and open space of each parcel, along with Residential Design Guidelines. Additionally, the section establishes that no less than 40 percent of the total number of proposed dwelling units shall contain at least two bedrooms; or no less than 30 percent of the total number of proposed dwelling units shall contain at least three bedrooms.

The proposed project provides three new dwelling units in addition to the one existing dwelling unit on the site. The overall building massing was found by the Residential Design Advisory Team to be consistent with the Residential Design Guidelines, and the project was found to be compliant with Planning Code Requirements for permitted height and bulk, setbacks, exposure, and open space, as detailed below. The proposed dwelling units comply with the dwelling unit mix requirements by providing 75% of units as two or more bedroom units. A revised project consistent with the Conditions of Approval of this motion would be required to meet the unit mix requirements of the Planning Code.

- C. **Height and Bulk.** The project is located in a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

The project is proposed with a total height of 40', which is consistent with the height and bulk district. At the front building wall, the total building height is 30', increasing to 40' after a 12' setback from the

front building wall. A revised project consistent with the Conditions of Approval of this motion would be required to meet the height and bulk limits of the Planning Code.

- D. **Front Setback.** Planning Code Section 132 requires that the project provide a front setback that is equal to the average of the adjacent neighbor's front setbacks.

The project is designed to provide the required setback using the alternative method of averaging detailed in Planning Code Section 132(b), which allows for the front setback to be provided in an irregular manner provided that the total setback area is equal to what would be required if the front setback was provided as a simple average of the setbacks of the two adjacent properties. A revised project consistent with the Conditions of Approval of this motion would meet the required front setback as the existing building is compliant with the required front setback.

- E. **Rear Yard.** Planning Code Section 134 requires that the project provide a rear yard equal to 45% of the total depth of the lot, provided that the requirement may be reduced based on the conditions of adjacent lots but in no case may be less than 15' or 25% of the total depth of the lot. Additionally, if averaging is used, the total height of the last 10' of building depth is limited to 30'.

The project provides a rear yard equal to 27' 1" (30% of total lot depth) based on the conditions of adjacent properties. Additionally, the last 10' of building depth has been limited to a height of 30'. A revised project consistent with the Conditions of Approval of this motion would be required to maintain a code-complying rear yard.

- F. **Exposure.** Planning Code Section 140 requires that in all dwelling units at least one room that meets the 120-square-foot minimum superficial floor area requirement of Section 503 of the [Housing Code](#) shall face directly onto a public street or alley, a code-complying rear yard, or an open area meeting certain criteria.

All proposed dwelling units contain windows which face onto the rear yard, which meets the requirements of the Planning Code. A revised project consistent with the Conditions of Approval of this motion would be required to maintain compliance with the exposure requirements of the Planning Code.

- G. **Open Space.** Planning Code Section 209.4 requires that usable open space be provided for the proposed dwelling units in the amount of 100 square feet per unit if provided as private open space or 133 square feet per unit if provided as common.

Units 1 and 2 share access to the rear yard, which provides 675 square feet of usable open space. Unit 3 has direct access to a private patio which is 120 square feet in size, and Unit 4 has access to two private patios which total approximately 550 square feet in size. Through this combination of private and common open spaces, the project meets the open space requirements of the Planning Code. A revised project consistent with the Conditions of Approval of this motion would be required to provide usable open space as required by the Planning Code.

- H. **Automobile Parking.** Planning Section 151.1 of the Planning Code permits up to three automobile parking spaces for each four dwelling units in the RTO-M Zoning District.

The proposed project provides two automobile parking spaces where the Planning Code allows up to three, and thus the project is compliant with this requirement. A revised project consistent with the Conditions of Approval of this motion would be required to maintain a maximum number of automobile parking spaces consistent with the Planning Code and would not be required to provide any minimum number of automobile spaces.

- I. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Section 155.2 of the Planning Code requires that one Class One bicycle parking space be provided for each dwelling unit.

The proposed project provides four Class One bicycle parking spaces where the code requires four, and thus the project is compliant with this section. A revised project consistent with the Conditions of Approval of this motion would be required to provide Class One bicycle parking spaces as required by Planning Code Section 155.2.

7. **Planning Code Section 303** establishes criteria for the Planning Commission to consider when reviewing applications for Conditional Use approval. On balance, the project does comply with said criteria in that:

- A. The proposed new uses and building, at the size and intensity contemplated and at the proposed location, will provide a development that is necessary or desirable, and compatible with, the neighborhood or the community.

The use and size of the proposed project is compatible with the immediate neighborhood. While the Project proposes demolition of an existing single-family residence, the proposed Project increases the number of dwelling units on the site. The proposed units are sized appropriately for the neighborhood with three of the four units containing two or more bedrooms. As noted by the Commission during the hearings for this project, the replacement building is not currently designed to be in keeping with the existing development pattern and respond to the mixed neighborhood character; however, by adding a Condition of Approval to require that the first ten feet of the building be maintained in its current location and that any addition be located behind the first ten feet of the existing building, subject to consistency with the Planning Code and Residential Design Guidelines, the project is rendered in keeping with the existing development pattern and responsive to the mixed neighborhood character. Therefore, the project is considered to be necessary and desirable given the quality and design of the new residences and the amount of new residential units.

- B. The proposed project will not be detrimental to the health, safety, convenience or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity. There are no features of the project that could be detrimental to the health, safety or convenience of those residing or working the area, in that:

- i. Nature of proposed site, including its size and shape, and the proposed size, shape and arrangement of structures;

The project site is a 2,700 square foot parcel measuring 30 feet wide and 90 feet deep, which is typical of parcels in the area. With the recommended Condition of Approval to require that the first ten feet of the building be maintained in its current location and that any addition be located behind the first ten feet of the existing building, subject to consistency with the Planning Code and Residential Design Guidelines, the proposed size, shape, and arrangement of structures will be consistent and compatible with the typical development pattern of the block.

- ii. The accessibility and traffic patterns for persons and vehicles, the type and volume of such traffic, and the adequacy of proposed off-street parking and loading;

The Planning Code does not require off-street parking in the RTO-M Zoning District. Planning Code Section 151.1 instead establishes that a maximum of three parking spaces be provided for each of the new dwelling units in the RTO-M Zoning District. The proposed two off-street parking spaces are not required under the Planning Code, are within off-street parking limits for the four new dwelling units and may be removed to accommodate the proposed housing units as the project is redesigned to retain the front portion of the existing building. The project is also proposing the required four new Class 1 bicycle parking spaces to accommodate alternative means of transit, and the neighborhood is transit rich. Thus, the proposed project provides adequate off-street parking and loading for the proposed use. The proposed project would not interfere or unduly burden traffic patterns within the surrounding neighborhood.

- iii. The safeguards afforded to prevent noxious or offensive emissions such as noise, glare, dust and odor;

As the proposed Project is residential in nature, it is unlikely to have the potential to produce noxious or offensive emissions.

- iv. Treatment given, as appropriate, to such aspects as landscaping, screening, open spaces, parking and loading areas, service areas, lighting and signs;

The proposed project provides screened off-street parking spaces by enclosing them in a garage, and the front setback area is appropriately landscaped and contains permeable surfaces to comply with the requirements of the Planning Code. As a small project, it does not contain service areas or signage that could detract from the visual quality of the site.

- C. That the use as proposed will comply with the applicable provisions of the Planning Code and will not adversely affect the General Plan.

The Project complies with all relevant requirements and standards of the Planning Code and, as conditioned, is consistent with objectives and policies of the General Plan as detailed below.

- D. That the use as proposed would provide development that is in conformity with the purpose of the applicable Zoning District.

As conditioned, the proposed project is consistent with the stated purposes of RTO-M District in that the project provides additional residential units to the City's housing stock while maintaining the moderate scale and segmentation prescribed by the Zoning District.

8. **Additional Findings pursuant to Section 317** establishes criteria for the Planning Commission to consider when reviewing applications for Residential Demolition. On balance, the Project does comply with said criteria in that:

- A. Whether the property is free of a history of serious, continuing code violations;

A review of the Department of Building Inspection and the Planning Department databases showed no active enforcement cases or notices of violation for the subject property.

- B. Whether the housing has been maintained in a decent, safe, and sanitary condition;

The existing structure appears to have been maintained in a decent, safe and sanitary condition.

- C. Whether the property is an "historic resource" under CEQA;

Although the existing structure is more than 50 years old, a review of the supplemental information resulted in a determination that the existing structure at 792 Capp Street is not a historical resource (See Case No. 2017-001283ENV).

- D. Whether the removal of the resource will have a substantial adverse impact under CEQA;

The existing building at 792 Capp Street is not a historical resource.

- E. Whether the Project converts rental housing to other forms of tenure or occupancy;

The existing structure is a single-family residence which was previously an owner-occupied unit and was vacated as part of the sale of the property. As such, the project does not entail conversion of rental housing to other forms of tenure or occupancy.

- F. Whether the Project removes rental units subject to the Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance;

The Planning Department cannot definitely determine whether or not the single-family home is subject to the Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance. This is the purview of the Rent Board; however, the Department can confirm that there are no current tenants living in the existing dwelling unit.

- G. Whether the Project conserves existing housing to preserve cultural and economic neighborhood diversity;

Although the Project proposes the demolition of an existing single-family residence, the new construction Project proposes four new dwelling units with a mix of unit sizes to preserve and enhance

the cultural and economic neighborhood diversity. While the existing structure on the site and its immediately adjacent neighbor to the north are two-story single family homes, every other structure on the block is multi-family in nature and three stories in height. The recommended Condition of Approval to require that the first ten feet of the building be maintained in its current location and that any addition be located behind the first ten feet of the existing building, subject to consistency with the Planning Code and Residential Design Guidelines, would render the project more consistent with this finding by preserving the appearance of the structure from the street, reducing the cultural impact of the modern design which is proposed by the project sponsor.

- H. Whether the Project conserves neighborhood character to preserve neighborhood cultural and economic diversity;

As stated by the Planning Commission during the hearings for the project, the replacement structure does not preserve neighborhood cultural and economic diversity as it radically alters the character of the neighborhood by introducing a modern structure in a context which is defined by historic buildings or buildings which are age-eligible for historic classification. By requiring that the first ten feet of the structure be maintained, the appearance of the structure is maintained and the character of the neighborhood is enhanced.

- I. Whether the Project protects the relative affordability of existing housing;

The Project, as conditioned, would not remove the entirety of an older residence, which is generally considered more affordable than a more recently constructed unit. The project also adds three new dwelling units to the City's housing stock, further increasing the supply of housing. Additionally, multi-family dwelling units are typically more affordable than single-family units as the cost of land is shared between dwelling units.

- J. Whether the Project increases the number of permanently affordable units as governed by Section 415;

The Project is not subject to the provisions of Planning Code Section 415, as the project only proposes four dwelling units.

- K. Whether the Project locates in-fill housing on appropriate sites in established neighborhoods;

The Project, as conditioned to require retention of the first ten feet of the structure, is designed to be in keeping with the scale and development pattern of the mixed neighborhood character. The surrounding neighborhood is an established residential neighborhood and retention of the existing site character is integral to retention of the existing neighborhood fabric.

- L. Whether the project increases the number of family-sized units on-site;

The Project proposes four new dwelling units with one one-bedroom unit, one two-bedroom unit, and two three-bedroom units. As such, the existing three bedroom dwelling unit on the site is replaced as part of the project and the overall number of units that are family sized is increased. A replacement

structure which maintains the first ten feet of the existing building would still accomplish a total size necessary to provide new family-sized dwelling units at the site.

- M. Whether the Project creates new supportive housing;

The Project does not create supportive housing.

- N. Whether the Project is of superb architectural and urban design, meeting all relevant design guidelines, to enhance existing neighborhood character;

The current proposal meets the Residential Design Guidelines but does not enhance the existing neighborhood character; the current proposal detracts from the neighborhood character by introducing a modern design in a context which is defined by historic buildings or buildings which are age-eligible for historic classification. By retaining the first ten feet of the structure, the proposed project would maintain compatibility with the surrounding context.

- O. Whether the Project increases the number of on-site dwelling units;

The Project will increase the number of on-site units from one dwelling unit to four dwelling units.

- P. Whether the Project increases the number of on-site bedrooms.

The existing building contains a total of three bedrooms. The Project will increase the number of bedrooms.

- Q. Whether or not the replacement project would maximize density on the subject lot; and,

Per Planning Code Section 209.4, there is no maximum residential density in the RTO-M District. The Project proposes the demolition of the existing single-family residence and new construction of a four-unit building, increasing the existing site density from one to four.

- R. If replacing a building not subject to the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance, whether the new project replaces all the existing units with new Dwelling Units of a similar size and with the same number of bedrooms.

The Planning Department cannot definitely determine whether or not the single-family home is subject to the Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance. However, the project proposes replacement of the unit with additional housing units, at least 40% of which are required to contain a minimum of two bedrooms.

9. **General Plan Compliance.** The Project is, on balance, consistent with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan:

HOUSING ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 1

IDENTIFY AND MAKE AVAILABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT ADEQUATE SITES TO MEET THE CITY'S HOUSING NEEDS, ESPECIALLY PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

Policy 1.1

Plan for the full range of housing needs in the City and County of San Francisco, especially affordable housing.

Policy 1.10

Support new housing projects, especially affordable housing, where households can easily rely on public transportation, walking and bicycling for the majority of daily trips.

The Project adds additional housing units on an underutilized site in an established residential neighborhood. The Project site is an ideal infill site that currently contains one single-family home where additional density is permitted and transit access is rich. Additional housing can be accommodated while retaining the front portion of the structure.

OBJECTIVE 2:

RETAIN EXISTING HOUSING UNITS, AND PROMOTE SAFETY AND MAINTENANCE STANDARDS, WITHOUT JEOPARDIZING AFFORDABILITY.

Policy 2.1:

Discourage the demolition of sound existing housing, unless the demolition results in a net increase in affordable housing.

The Project, as proposed, requests the demolition of an existing residential structure containing a three-bedroom single-family residence. However, the new construction proposal would result in four new units, and thereby contribute to the general housing stock of the city. With the Condition of Approval, the additional housing can be accommodated while retaining the front portion of the structure.

OBJECTIVE 3:

PROTECT THE AFFORDABILITY OF THE EXISTING HOUSING STOCK, ESPECIALLY RENTAL UNITS.

Policy 3.1:

Preserve rental units, especially rent controlled units, to meet the City's affordable housing needs.

Policy 3.3:

Maintain balance in affordability of existing housing stock by supporting affordable moderate ownership opportunities.

Policy 3.4:

Preserve "naturally affordable" housing types, such as smaller and older ownership units.

While the project will demolish an existing single-family home, the new construction project will result in an increase in the density of the property and contributes three net new dwelling units, to the City's

housing stock. While the project sponsor intends to sell the units and not use them as rental units, the proposed units are more naturally affordable than the existing single-family home as multi-family units are naturally more affordable than single-family homes.

OBJECTIVE 4

FOSTER A HOUSING STOCK THAT MEETS THE NEEDS OF ALL RESIDENTS ACROSS LIFECYCLES

Policy 4.1

Develop new housing, and encourage the remodeling of existing housing, for families with children.

Policy 4.5

Ensure that new permanently affordable housing is located in all of the City's neighborhoods, and encourage integrated neighborhoods, with a diversity of unit types provided at a range of income levels.

The Project will provide additional family sized dwelling units by replacing the existing three bedroom unit on the site and providing three additional dwelling units. In addition, the Project meets the requirements for dwelling unit mix. The additional housing can be accommodated while retaining the front portion of the structure.

OBJECTIVE 11:

SUPPORT AND RESPECT THE DIVERSE AND DISTINCT CHARACTER OF SAN FRANCISCO'S NEIGHBORHOODS.

Policy 11.1:

Promote the construction and rehabilitation of well-designed housing that emphasizes beauty, flexibility, and innovative design, and respects existing neighborhood character.

Policy 11.2:

Ensure implementation of accepted design standards in project approvals.

Policy 11.3:

Ensure growth is accommodated without substantially and adversely impacting existing residential neighborhood character.

Policy 11.5:

Ensure densities in established residential areas promote compatibility with prevailing neighborhood character.

The proposed new construction is appropriate in terms of material, scale, proportions and massing for the surrounding neighborhood. By requiring that the first ten feet of the structure be maintained, the project will not substantially and adversely impact existing neighborhood character. Furthermore, the proposal results in an increase in density on the site while maintaining general compliance with the requirements of the Planning Code.

URBAN DESIGN

OBJECTIVE 1:

EMPHASIS OF THE CHARACTERISTIC PATTERN WHICH GIVES TO THE CITY AND ITS NEIGHBORHOODS AN IMAGE, A SENSE OF PURPOSE, AND A MEANS OF ORIENTATION.

Policy 1.2:

Recognize, protect and reinforce the existing street pattern, especially as it is related to topography.

By maintaining the existing façade, the project will maintain the existing street pattern which would be lost through a full demolition of the structure.

Policy 1.3:

Recognize that buildings, when seen together, produce a total effect that characterizes the city and its districts.

By maintaining the existing façade, the project will maintain the sense of identity of the neighborhood which would be lost through a full demolition of the structure.

MISSION AREA PLAN

Objectives and Policies

OBJECTIVE 1.1

IN AREAS OF THE MISSION WHERE HOUSING AND MIXED-USE IS ENCOURAGED, MAXIMIZE DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL IN KEEPING WITH NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER.

Policy 1.2.1

Ensure that in-fill housing development is compatible with its surroundings.

Policy 1.2.3

In general, where residential development is permitted, control residential density through building height and bulk guidelines and bedroom mix requirements.

Policy 1.2.4

Identify portions of the Mission where it would be appropriate to increase maximum heights for residential development.

The proposed new construction project proposes a permitted height, residential density and dwelling unit mix that are consistent and compatible with its surroundings and the overall development pattern of the block. The additional housing can be accommodated while retaining the front portion of the structure.

OBJECTIVE 2.3

ENSURE THAT NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS SATISFY AN ARRAY OF HOUSING NEEDS WITH RESPECT TO TENURE, UNIT MIX AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

Policy 2.3.3

Require that a significant number of units in new developments have two or more bedrooms, except Senior Housing and SRO developments unless all Below Market Rate units are two or more bedrooms.

Policy 2.3.5

Explore a range of revenue-generating tools including impact fees, public funds and grants, assessment districts, and other private funding sources, to fund community and neighborhood improvements.

Policy 2.3.6

Establish an impact fee to be allocated towards an Eastern Neighborhoods Public Benefit Fund to mitigate the impacts of new development on transit, pedestrian, bicycle, and street improvements, park and recreational facilities, and community facilities such as libraries, child care and other neighborhood services in the area.

Of the proposed dwelling units, a minimum of 40% are required to contain a minimum of two-bedrooms. The Project is subject to the Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee as well as the Residential Child Care Fee both of which will provide funds for community and neighborhood improvements.

OBJECTIVE 3.1

PROMOTE AN URBAN FORM THAT REINFORCES THE MISSION'S DISTINCTIVE PLACE IN THE CITY'S LARGER FORM AND STRENGTHENS ITS PHYSICAL FABRIC AND CHARACTER

Policy 3.1.8

New development should respect existing patterns of rear yard open space. Where an existing pattern of rear yard open space does not exist, new development on mixed-use-zoned parcels should have greater flexibility as to where open space can be located.

OBJECTIVE 3.2

PROMOTE AN URBAN FORM AND ARCHITECTURAL CHARACTER THAT SUPPORTS WALKING AND SUSTAINS A DIVERSE, ACTIVE AND SAFE PUBLIC REALM

Policy 3.2.1

Require high quality design of street-facing building exteriors.

Policy 3.2.3

Minimize the visual impact of parking.

Policy 3.2.4

Strengthen the relationship between a building and its fronting sidewalk.

Policy 3.2.6

Sidewalks abutting new developments should be constructed in accordance with locally appropriate guidelines based on established best practices in streetscape design.

The project will be reviewed for consistency with guidelines for streetscape and pedestrian oriented design guidelines. By maintaining the existing front façade, the existing high quality street facing design will be maintained while accommodating the additional units behind.

10. **Planning Code Section 101.1(b)** establishes eight priority-planning policies and requires review of permits for consistency with said policies. On balance, the project does comply with said policies in that:

- A. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses be enhanced.

Existing neighborhood-serving retail uses would not be displaced or otherwise adversely affected by the proposal, as the existing buildings do not contain commercial uses/spaces. The proposed residential building would house more individuals to patronize the existing neighborhood-serving retail uses.

- B. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods.

With the Condition of Approval to maintain the existing structure for the first ten feet, measured from the front building wall, the existing character of the site and its relationship to the neighborhood is maintained to protect the cultural significance of the neighborhood.

- C. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced,

The existing single family dwelling is not designated as an inclusionary affordable housing unit.

- D. That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking.

The Project is not anticipated to impede transit service or overburden our streets with neighborhood parking. The project includes required amount of bicycle parking and off-street parking below the principally-permitted amount, thus supporting the City's transit first policies.

- E. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced.

The Project does not include commercial office development and would not affect industrial or service sector uses or related employment opportunities. Ownership of industrial or service sector businesses would not be affected by the Project.

- F. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.

The replacement structures would be built in compliance with San Francisco's current Building Code Standards and would meet all earthquake safety requirements.

- G. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved.

Landmark or historic buildings do not occupy the Project site. The existing building is not a historic resource.

- H. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

The project does not exceed the 40-foot height limit, and is thus not subject to the requirements of Planning Code Section 295 – Height Restrictions on Structures Shadowing Property Under the Jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission. The height of the proposed structures is compatible with the established neighborhood development.

11. The Project is consistent with and would promote the general and specific purposes of the Code provided under Section 101.1(b) in that, as designed, the Project would contribute to the character and stability of the neighborhood and would constitute a beneficial development.
12. The Commission hereby finds that approval of the Conditional Use Authorization would promote the health, safety and welfare of the City.

DECISION

That based upon the Record, the submissions by the Applicant, the staff of the Department and other interested parties, the oral testimony presented to this Commission at the public hearings, and all other written materials submitted by all parties, the Commission hereby **APPROVES Conditional Use Application No. 2017-001283CUA** subject to the following conditions attached hereto as "EXHIBIT A" in general conformance with plans on file, dated October 2, 2017, and stamped "EXHIBIT B", which is incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth.

APPEAL AND EFFECTIVE DATE OF MOTION: Any aggrieved person may appeal this Conditional Use Authorization to the Board of Supervisors within thirty (30) days after the date of this Motion No. XXXXX. The effective date of this Motion shall be the date of this Motion if not appealed (After the 30-day period has expired) OR the date of the decision of the Board of Supervisors if appealed to the Board of Supervisors. For further information, please contact the Board of Supervisors at (415) 554-5184, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102.

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 ADOPTED the foregoing Motion on October 12, 2017.

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES:

NAYS:

ABSENT:

ADOPTED: March 17, 2018

AUTHORIZATION

This authorization is for a conditional use to allow the demolition of a single-family residence and construction of a four-story, 40-foot tall, residential building containing four dwelling units located at 792 Capp Street on Assessor's Block 3637, Lot 019B, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 209.4, 303, and 317 within the RTO-M District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District; in general conformance with plans, dated September 28, 2017, and stamped "EXHIBIT B" included in the docket for Case No. 2017-001283CUA and subject to conditions of approval reviewed and approved by the Commission on October 12, 2017 under Motion No. XXXXXX. This authorization and the conditions contained herein run with the property and not with a particular Project Sponsor, business, or operator.

RECORDATION OF CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Prior to the issuance of the building permit or commencement of use for the Project the Zoning Administrator shall approve and order the recordation of a Notice in the Official Records of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco for the subject property. This Notice shall state that the project is subject to the conditions of approval contained herein and reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission on October 12, 2017 under Motion No. XXXXXX.

PRINTING OF CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL ON PLANS

The conditions of approval under the 'Exhibit A' of this Planning Commission Motion No. XXXXXX shall be reproduced on the Index Sheet of construction plans submitted with the Site or Building permit application for the Project. The Index Sheet of the construction plans shall reference to the Conditional Use authorization and any subsequent amendments or modifications.

SEVERABILITY

The Project shall comply with all applicable City codes and requirements. If any clause, sentence, section or any part of these conditions of approval is for any reason held to be invalid, such invalidity shall not affect or impair other remaining clauses, sentences, or sections of these conditions. This decision conveys no right to construct, or to receive a building permit. "Project Sponsor" shall include any subsequent responsible party.

CHANGES AND MODIFICATIONS

Changes to the approved plans may be approved administratively by the Zoning Administrator. Significant changes and modifications of conditions shall require Planning Commission approval of a new Conditional Use authorization.

Conditions of Approval, Compliance, Monitoring, and Reporting

PERFORMANCE

1. **Validity.** The authorization and right vested by virtue of this action is valid for three (3) years from the effective date of the Motion. The Department of Building Inspection shall have issued a Building Permit or Site Permit to construct the project and/or commence the approved use within this three-year period.

For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org

2. **Expiration and Renewal.** Should a Building or Site Permit be sought after the three (3) year period has lapsed, the project sponsor must seek a renewal of this Authorization by filing an application for an amendment to the original Authorization or a new application for Authorization. Should the project sponsor decline to so file, and decline to withdraw the permit application, the Commission shall conduct a public hearing in order to consider the revocation of the Authorization. Should the Commission not revoke the Authorization following the closure of the public hearing, the Commission shall determine the extension of time for the continued validity of the Authorization.

For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org

3. **Diligent Pursuit.** Once a site or Building Permit has been issued, construction must commence within the timeframe required by the Department of Building Inspection and be continued diligently to completion. Failure to do so shall be grounds for the Commission to consider revoking the approval if more than three (3) years have passed since this Authorization was approved.

For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org

4. **Extension.** All time limits in the preceding three paragraphs may be extended at the discretion of the Zoning Administrator where implementation of the project is delayed by a public agency, an appeal or a legal challenge and only by the length of time for which such public agency, appeal or challenge has caused delay.

For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org

5. **Conformity with Current Law.** No application for Building Permit, Site Permit, or other entitlement shall be approved unless it complies with all applicable provisions of City Codes in effect at the time of such approval.

For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org

DESIGN – COMPLIANCE AT PLAN STAGE

6. **Demolition Maximum.** The project shall retain the first ten feet of the existing building, measured from the primary front building wall. The project sponsor shall work with Department staff to design an alteration to the structure to incorporate the additional dwelling units while maintaining all new massing at least ten feet behind the location of the existing front building wall, subject to compliance with the Planning Code and the Residential Design Guidelines. The existing façade may be altered only to the extent necessary to provide access to the dwelling units on the site, and character defining features such as the parapet wall, cornice, entryway shape, and façade articulation shall be maintained.

For information about compliance, contact the Case Planner, Planning Department at 415-558-6378, www.sf-planning.org

7. **Final Materials.** The Project Sponsor shall continue to work with Planning Department on the building design. Final materials, glazing, color, texture, landscaping, and detailing shall be subject to Department staff review and approval. The architectural addenda shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department prior to issuance.

For information about compliance, contact the Case Planner, Planning Department at 415-558-6378, www.sf-planning.org

8. **Garbage, Composting and Recycling Storage.** Space for the collection and storage of garbage, composting, and recycling shall be provided within enclosed areas on the property and clearly labeled and illustrated on the building permit plans. Space for the collection and storage of recyclable and compostable materials that meets the size, location, accessibility and other standards specified by the San Francisco Recycling Program shall be provided at the ground level of the buildings.

For information about compliance, contact the Case Planner, Planning Department at 415-558-6378, www.sf-planning.org

9. **Rooftop Mechanical Equipment.** Pursuant to Planning Code 141, the Project Sponsor shall submit a roof plan to the Planning Department prior to Planning approval of the building permit application. Rooftop mechanical equipment, if any is proposed as part of the Project, is required to be screened so as not to be visible from any point at or below the roof level of the subject building.

For information about compliance, contact the Case Planner, Planning Department at 415-558-6378, www.sf-planning.org

10. **Transformer Vault.** The location of individual project PG&E Transformer Vault installations has significant effects to San Francisco streetscapes when improperly located. However, they may not have any impact if they are installed in preferred locations. Therefore, the Planning Department recommends the following preference schedule in locating new transformer vaults, in order of most to least desirable:

- a. On-site, in a basement area accessed via a garage or other access point without use of separate doors on a ground floor façade facing a public right-of-way;
- b. On-site, in a driveway, underground;
- c. On-site, above ground, screened from view, other than a ground floor façade facing a public right-of-way;

- d. Public right-of-way, underground, under sidewalks with a minimum width of 12 feet, avoiding effects on streetscape elements, such as street trees; and based on Better Streets Plan guidelines;
- e. Public right-of-way, underground; and based on Better Streets Plan guidelines;
- f. Public right-of-way, above ground, screened from view; and based on Better Streets Plan guidelines;
- g. On-site, in a ground floor façade (the least desirable location).

Unless otherwise specified by the Planning Department, Department of Public Work's Bureau of Street Use and Mapping (DPW BSM) should use this preference schedule for all new transformer vault installation requests.

For information about compliance, contact Bureau of Street Use and Mapping, Department of Public Works at 415-554-5810, <http://sfdpw.org>

11. **Bicycle Parking.** The Project shall provide no fewer than four Class 1 bicycle parking spaces as required by Planning Code Sections 155.1.

For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org

12. **Parking Maximum.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 151.1, the Project shall provide no more than three (3) off-street parking spaces.

For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org

13. **Child Care Fee - Residential.** The Project is subject to the Residential Child Care Fee, as applicable, pursuant to Planning Code Section 414A.

For information about compliance, contact the Case Planner, Planning Department at 415-558-6378, www.sf-planning.org

14. **Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee.** The Project is subject to the Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee, as applicable, pursuant to Planning Code Section 423.

For information about compliance, contact the Case Planner, Planning Department at 415-558-6378, www.sf-planning.org

MONITORING - AFTER ENTITLEMENT

15. **Enforcement.** Violation of any of the Planning Department conditions of approval contained in this Motion or of any other provisions of Planning Code applicable to this Project shall be subject to the enforcement procedures and administrative penalties set forth under Planning Code Section 176 or Section 176.1. The Planning Department may also refer the violation complaints to other city departments and agencies for appropriate enforcement action under their jurisdiction.

For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org

16. **Monitoring.** The Project requires monitoring of the conditions of approval in this Motion. The Project Sponsor or the subsequent responsible parties for the Project shall pay fees as established

under Planning Code Section 351(e) (1) and work with the Planning Department for information about compliance.

For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org

17. **Revocation due to Violation of Conditions.** Should implementation of this Project result in complaints from interested property owners, residents, or commercial lessees which are not resolved by the Project Sponsor and found to be in violation of the Planning Code and/or the specific conditions of approval for the Project as set forth in Exhibit A of this Motion, the Zoning Administrator shall refer such complaints to the Commission, after which it may hold a public hearing on the matter to consider revocation of this authorization.

For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org

OPERATION


18. **Sidewalk Maintenance.** The Project Sponsor shall maintain the main entrance to the building and all sidewalks abutting the subject property in a clean and sanitary condition in compliance with the Department of Public Works Streets and Sidewalk Maintenance Standards.

For information about compliance, contact Bureau of Street Use and Mapping, Department of Public Works, 415-695-2017, <http://sfdpw.org>

19. **Community Liaison.** Prior to issuance of a building permit to construct the project and implement the approved use, the Project Sponsor shall appoint a community liaison officer to deal with the issues of concern to owners and occupants of nearby properties. The Project Sponsor shall provide the Zoning Administrator with written notice of the name, business address, and telephone number of the community liaison. Should the contact information change, the Zoning Administrator shall be made aware of such change. The community liaison shall report to the Zoning Administrator what issues, if any, are of concern to the community and what issues have not been resolved by the Project Sponsor.


For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org

Parcel Map



Conditional Use Authorization Hearing
Case Number 2017-001283CUA
792 Capp Street


Sanborn Map*



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




Zoning Map



Conditional Use Authorization Hearing
Case Number 2017-001283CUA
792 Capp Street

Height and Bulk District Map



Conditional Use Authorization Hearing
Case Number 2017-001283CUA
792 Capp Street

Aerial Photo

SUBJECT PROPERTY



Conditional Use Authorization Hearing
Case Number 2017-001283CUA
792 Capp Street

Site Photo



Conditional Use Authorization Hearing
Case Number 2017-001283CUA
792 Capp Street



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Address		Block/Lot(s)	
Case No.	Permit No.	Plans Dated	
<input type="checkbox"/> Addition/ Alteration	<input type="checkbox"/> Demolition (requires HRER if over 45 years old)	<input type="checkbox"/> New Construction	<input type="checkbox"/> Project Modification (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.
	Class 3 – New Construction/ Conversion of Small Structures. Up to three (3) new single-family residences or six (6) dwelling units in one building; commercial/office structures; utility extensions.; ; change of use under 10,000 sq. ft. if principally permitted or with a CU. Change of use under 10,000 sq. ft. if principally permitted or with a CU.
	Class ___

STEP 2: CEQA IMPACTS TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

If any box is checked below, an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i> is required.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality: Would the project add new sensitive receptors (specifically, schools, day care facilities, hospitals, residential dwellings, and senior-care facilities) within an Air Pollution Exposure Zone? Does the project have the potential to emit substantial pollutant concentrations (e.g., backup diesel generators, heavy industry, diesel trucks)? <i>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)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	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 enrollment in the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) Maher program, a DPH waiver from the</i>

	<i>Mahe program, or other documentation from Environmental Planning staff that hazardous material effects would be less than significant (refer to EP_ArcMap > Maher layer).</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	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?
<input type="checkbox"/>	Archeological Resources: 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 > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Archeological Sensitive Area)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment: Does the project site involve a subdivision or lot line adjustment on a lot with a slope average of 20% or more? <i>(refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Slope = or > 20%: 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 > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography)</i> If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Seismic: Landslide Zone: 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 > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones)</i> If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Seismic: Liquefaction Zone: 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 > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones)</i> If box is checked, a geotechnical report will likely be required.
If no boxes are checked above, GO TO STEP 3. <u>If one or more boxes are checked above, an Environmental Evaluation Application is required, unless reviewed by an Environmental Planner.</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	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

PROPERTY IS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING: <i>(refer to Parcel Information Map)</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Category A: Known Historical Resource. GO TO STEP 5.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Category B: Potential Historical Resource (over 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 4.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Category C: Not a Historical Resource or Not Age Eligible (under 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 6.

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

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

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

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>9. Other work that would not materially impair a historic district (specify or add comments):</p> <p>(Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator) _____</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>10. Reclassification of property status. (Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator)</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"> <input type="checkbox"/> Reclassify to Category A <input type="checkbox"/> Reclassify to Category C </p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a. Per HRER dated: _____ (attach HRER)</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">b. Other (specify): _____</p>
<p>Note: If ANY box in STEP 5 above is checked, a Preservation Planner MUST check one box below.</p>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Further environmental review required. Based on the information provided, the project requires an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i> to be submitted. GO TO STEP 6.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Project can proceed with categorical exemption review. The project has been reviewed by the Preservation Planner and can proceed with categorical exemption review. GO TO STEP 6.</p>
<p>Comments (optional):</p> 	
<p>Preservation Planner Signature:</p> 	

**STEP 6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Further environmental review required. Proposed project does not meet scopes of work in either (check all that apply):</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"> <input type="checkbox"/> Step 2 – CEQA Impacts <input type="checkbox"/> Step 5 – Advanced Historical Review </p> <p>STOP! Must file an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i>.</p>			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>No further environmental review is required. The project is categorically exempt under CEQA.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <p>Planner Name:</p> <p>Project Approval Action:</p> <p>If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project.</p> </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <p>Signature:</p> </td> </tr> </table> <p>Once signed or stamped and dated, this document constitutes a categorical exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code.</p> <p>In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, an appeal of an exemption determination can only be filed within 30 days of the project receiving the first approval action.</p>		<p>Planner Name:</p> <p>Project Approval Action:</p> <p>If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project.</p>	<p>Signature:</p>
<p>Planner Name:</p> <p>Project Approval Action:</p> <p>If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project.</p>	<p>Signature:</p> 			

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:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Result in expansion of the building envelope, as defined in the Planning Code;
<input type="checkbox"/>	Result in the change of use that would require public notice under Planning Code Sections 311 or 312;
<input type="checkbox"/>	Result in demolition as defined under Planning Code Section 317 or 19005(f)?
<input type="checkbox"/>	Is any information being presented that was not known and could not have been known at the time of the original determination, that shows the originally approved project may no longer qualify for the exemption?
If at least one of the above boxes is checked, further environmental review is required.	

DETERMINATION OF NO SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposed modification would not result in any of the above changes.
If this box is checked, the proposed modifications are categorically exempt under CEQA, in accordance with prior project approval and no additional environmental review is required. This determination shall be posted on the Planning Department website and office and mailed to the applicant, City approving entities, and anyone requesting written notice.	
Planner Name:	Signature or Stamp:

HISTORICAL RESOURCE EVALUATION PART 1

792 CAPP STREET

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	2
II. Summary	2
III. Current Historic Status	2
<i>A. Here Today</i>	2
<i>B. Department of City Planning Architectural Quality Survey</i>	2
<i>C. San Francisco Architectural Heritage</i>	3
<i>D. California Historical Resource Status Code</i>	3
IV. Description	3
<i>A. Site</i>	3
<i>B. Exterior</i>	4
V. Historic Context	5
<i>A. Neighborhood</i>	5
<i>B. Project Site History</i>	8
<i>C. Construction Chronology</i>	14
<i>D. Permit Record</i>	15
<i>E. Architectural Style</i>	16
<i>F. Owners and Occupants</i>	16
VI. Evaluation of Historic Status	19
<i>A. Individual Eligibility</i>	19
• Criterion 1 (Events)	19
• Criterion 2 (Persons)	20
• Criterion 3 (Architecture)	20
• Criterion 4 (Information Potential)	20
<i>B. District</i>	20
VI. Integrity	22
VIII. Conclusion	23
IX. Bibliography	24
X. Appendix	25

I. INTRODUCTION

Tim Kelley Consulting (TKC) was engaged to conduct a Historical Resource Evaluation (HRE) for 792 Capp Street, a circa 1870s one-story-over-basement, wood-frame, single family residence with a one story auxiliary building at the rear. Although this property is already identified as not being an historical resource and no HRE is required by the Planning Department for the proposed project, the property owners opted to have one completed. A scoping discussion conducted by email with Allison Vanderslice, Planner, on August 18, 2016 established that although the subject building was previously evaluated in the South Mission Survey and determined to not be a resource, TKC would complete the report per the owners' request. This report provides information lacking in the existing documentation, including owners and occupants, construction and permit history, and a detailed analysis under California Register Criteria. It also addressed questions raised but not addressed on the DPR A form completed for the South Mission Survey.

II. SUMMARY

792 Capp Street is not individually eligible for listing in the California Register and currently has a historic resource code of 6Z. This report confirms that finding. The property is not located in any existing or potential historic district.

III. CURRENT HISTORIC STATUS

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

A. Here Today

This property is not included in the published book.

B. Department of City Planning Architectural Quality Survey

This property is not included in the 1976 Survey.

C. San Francisco Architectural Heritage

This property was not surveyed by San Francisco Architectural Heritage.

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 was given a rating of “6Z” in the South Mission Survey. (Found ineligible for NR, CR or Local designation through survey evaluation.)

IV. DESCRIPTION

A. Site

792 Capp Street is located on the west side of Capp Street between 22nd and 23rd Streets on a 2,700 square foot lot. This section of Capp Street is flat and the parcel is level. The building is separated from the neighboring buildings. The main building is set back from the front lot line, slightly above street grade behind a low retaining wall. The surrounding buildings have varying setbacks. On the right side of the lot is a concrete driveway flanked by concrete retaining walls (**Figure 1**). On the left side are concrete steps that lead to brick steps accessing the primary entrance.



Figure 1: 792 Capp Street, primary façade and driveway.

B. Exterior

792 Capp is a roughly rectangular plan, one-story-over-basement, single-family structure clad in stucco on the primary façade and rustic siding on the secondary facades and capped with a front-facing gable roof. There is a cutout on the left side, revealing a recessed volume set back from the primary façade. The basement level features a modern garage door on the right side. The primary entrance is located on the left side of the first story and is accessed by brick steps with stepped brick skirt walls and metal handrails. The primary entrance is recessed within a shoulder arched entryway and features a multi-pane and paneled door with an infilled transom (**Figure 2**). To the right of the entrance is a sectioned picture window. A large fixed central pane is flanked by jalousie windows with transom windows above. Above the window is a shield cartouche. The recessed volume on the left side is punctuated with a vinyl double-hung window. The roofline of the recessed volume extends above the roofline of the primary section

of the building. The building terminates with a straight parapet accented by decorative brackets and a projecting cornice.



Figure 2: Recessed volume, left side

V. HISTORIC CONTEXT

A. Neighborhood

The subject property is located in the Mission District, which comprises approximately 100 square blocks. 792 Capp Street is located specifically in the Southern Mission neighborhood, which was documented in a 2010 San Francisco Planning Department survey (Figure 3).




Figure 3: South Mission Historic Resources Survey Comprehensive Survey Findings Map 792 Capp noted with red star

Source: City and County of San Francisco Planning Department

Southern Mission Neighborhood

The Mission District is San Francisco's most self-contained district: a "city within a city" with its own downtown, neighborhoods, commercial and entertainment districts, factories, and rows of wood-frame Victorian-era dwellings.¹ Settlement began in the Mission District as early as the Gold Rush. Throughout the second half of the nineteenth century, transportation from downtown San Francisco to the Mission District steadily improved, bringing the district into the

¹ Christopher VerPlanck, "Mission District," unpublished, July, 2006.

orbit of downtown.² By 1867, there were several horse-drawn omnibus lines operating between downtown and Mission Dolores, as well as a steam railroad line along Harrison Street. Residential and commercial development increased near the transit lines. As San Francisco's economy grew, the city's population doubled and many migrated to the Mission, spurring a build-out.³ By 1900, dense rows of Italianate, Eastlake and Queen Anne rowhouses lined the long straight streets of the Mission as far south as Army Street.⁴ During this period, the population of the Mission District was mostly Irish, German, Italian and Scandinavian.⁵ "As these communities grew, they established churches, religious schools, and fraternal halls that focused on maintaining cultural ties to homelands and traditions."⁶ According to the context statement included in the Multiple Property Documentation Form, entitled, "Historic Neighborhoods of the Mission District," the subject building was constructed during the "U.S. Expansionism and Pioneer Settlement, 1850-1880." The residential development period is briefly described as follows:

Construction of single-family dwellings prevailed during the pioneer era. Variations in sizes, styles, and lot layouts reflected a pattern of individualized development, as landowners built according to their own means and needs. Some early dwellings were pre-fabricated houses shipped "around the horn" from the eastern U.S.; some were moved from elsewhere in San Francisco (including the Mission District); and others were ordered from local mills and assembled on site. "From the early 1860s on, building activity was essentially independent of the East Coast. By the 1870s, the originally rather simple constructions were evolving into more sizable buildings...The new structures emerged as products of the local building industry, which continued to use the versatile wood construction with an ever-increasing sophistication."⁷

After the 1906 Earthquake and Fire, the Mission District shifted from an area of middle-class Victorian residences and amusement parks into a thoroughly urban industrial and working-class district. The fire destroyed the South of Market District and moved into the Mission, destroying everything in its path until it was halted at 20th Street. Despite the destruction, almost two-thirds of the Mission escaped unscathed. Downtown businesses destroyed in the conflagration relocated to Mission Street. After 1906, the Mission grew as a healthy admixture

² Ibid.

³ Matt Weintraub, "Multiple Property Documentation Form for Historic Neighborhoods of the Mission District," San Francisco Planning Department, October 14, 2010.

⁴ VerPlanck 2006.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ "Multiple Property Documentation Form".

of ethnic groups. One-third of the Mission's 1910 population was foreign-born, including 3,800 Irish, 3,200 Germans, and over 1,000 Italians, Swedes, and English.⁸ It was in this period that the Mission took on the basic physical appearance it has today.

The Mission District developed its own cohesive downtown retail/commercial district along Mission Street after 1906. Many downtown department stores, such as Sherman Clay and Hale Brothers, continued to maintain Mission branches after downtown was reconstructed. The Mission District's own "Miracle Mile" developed throughout the early portion of the twentieth century with discount furniture stores, branches of downtown department stores, and at least a dozen motion picture palaces. Mission Street gradually became home to the city's largest entertainment district, which by World War II included the El Capitan, Tower, Grand, New Lyceum, Rialto and the colossal 3,000-seat New Mission Theater.

B. Project Site History

The first Sanborn map illustrating the subject block was published in 1889. The block was mostly developed with residential and commercial buildings (**Figure 4**). The subject parcel contains the first known illustration of the subject building's footprint, a one-story, wood-frame single-family building with an enclosed rear porch and south facing cutout. A non-extant small outbuilding is shown on the left rear side.

⁸ Weintraub 2010.




Figure 4: 1889 Sanborn Map showing 792 Capp Street (formerly 742) noted with arrow.

The 1900 Sanborn Map shows alterations and use changes to the extant buildings on the subject block. The subject building shows a rear addition was added since the 1889 map (**Figure 5**). The illustration also indicates the building is a one-story and basement. This is probably just a change in notation, not a physical change, since the neighboring buildings show the same shift.




Figure 5: 1900 Sanborn Map showing 792 Capp Street noted with arrow.

The 1905 Sanborn Map shows that the area is mostly similar to the 1900 map (Figure 6). The subject property is unchanged from the previous map.




Figure 6: 1905 Sanborn Map showing 792 Capp Street noted with arrow (the map is mislabeled 795).

The 1914 Sanborn Map shows the changes to the neighborhood after the 1906 Earthquake and Fire (**Figure 7**). Mission Street has progressed to a more commercial rather than residential street. There is no change to the subject building. The map has mislabeled the subject building as one-story instead of one-story and basement.




Figure 7: 1914 Sanborn Map showing 792 Capp Street noted with arrow.

The 1938 Harrison Ryker aerial photograph shows the rear addition has been enlarged again (Figure 8).



Figure 8: 1938 aerial photo showing 792 Capp Street noted with arrow.

The 1950 Sanborn Map shows an increase in density on Capp Street (**Figure 9**). The subject property has no changes. The building is labeled in error as one-story only.




Figure 9: 1950 Sanborn Map showing 792 Capp Street noted with arrow.

C. Construction Chronology

792 Capp Street was constructed circa the 1870s. Based on Block Book ownership and City directory listings, it appears the building was constructed in the early 1870s by parcel owner Nathan Parrish. He lived at 778 Capp (formerly 738) and owned the larger parcel that included similar single-family buildings at 786 and 798 Capp and 3240 23rd Street; 798 Capp and 3240 23rd are no longer extant. 786 Capp remains. The original appearance of these buildings is unknown. Their similar footprints are shown on the 1886, 1900, 1905 and 1914 Sanborn maps. No building announcement or original permit was located for the subject building or the similar buildings. The water tap record indicates that the Spring Valley Water Company began service in 1903 and was requested by Nathan Parrish's son Ellis H. Parrish. Early Sanborn maps show that the Parrish property (778 Capp) contained a water tower that probably accounts for the subject property not needing water service until 1903.

Permits on file discuss several interior remodels and a new foundation. Permit #103398, December 19, 1921 discusses a garage and retaining walls. The permit's description of the scope of the project is unclear. A picture was drawn of the garage but it is unknown if it is the current garage inserted into the basement or a one-story detached/ or projecting volume. The double-leaf garage doors have been modernized to a roll-up segmented door. The cladding has been changed to stucco and the windows and primary entrance were changed. However, the appearance of the original design is unknown and alterations are based on visual inspection.

D. Permit Record

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

- Permit #103398, December 19, 1921 – Put in cement floor in basement 20' x 50' and two concrete bulkheads 15' x 3' high 6 inches thick. Take out ? in front of house 13' x 3' x 8' for carriage and put in cement floors 15' x 8'. Build two frame walls from 2' x 4' on top of bulkheads 5' high x 13' put on rustic and said two walls 5' x 13' shingle roof carriage doors 7' x 7'. Lower down curbstone from entrance of carriage fill out with cement to sidewalk.
- Permit #199271, May 16, 1932 – Repair wall and fence.
- Permit #329503, May 4, 1966 – New kitchen cabinets and lower ceiling.
- Permit #478767, February 9, 1982 – Repair roof leaks along with water damage.
- Permit #508215, November 16, 1983 – Tear out existing tile shower walls (over tub). Install waterproof sheet rock walls. Install new tile and grout. Frame in 6" end wall (at rear of tub) to eliminate leaky "shelf design." Install new aluminum slider and new shower door.
- Permit #664030, January 28, 1991 – Remove and replace approximately 460 square feet of siding. Repair dry rot trim around the window. Replace rotten gutters. Replace trims around left side windows.

- Permit #982352, November 27, 2002 – Remove replace tile wall over tub 11 x 5 area. Reinforce with 3/8 plywood exterior grade #14 building paper, ½ tile board, cover with 4 ¼ tile, ½ sheetrock (water resistant) over tub wall above 5' to ceiling. Remove replace ¾ subfloor under tub, reinforce joists with 2x8 joists, replace tub, toilet, vanity.
- Permit #1294547, May 24, 2013 – Replace perimeter concrete foundation (approx. 204' lineal). Replace approx. 8 sheets subflooring. Build approx. 48' lineal cripple wall.
- Permit #132427, April 8, 2014 - Reroof

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

E. Architectural Style

The subject property can be best described as vernacular due to the previous alterations. The original architectural style is unknown.

F. Owners and Occupants

The subject parcel was originally part of a much larger parcel owned by Nathan Parrish. The parcel measured 120' x 122.5' (**Figure 10**). This parcel was split into five separate parcels in the 1920s; lot 19, 19A, 19B, 19C, 19D. This larger parcel contained five similar homes. Parrish resided at 778 Capp (formerly 738) and rented the other four single-family buildings.




Figure 10: 1894 Block Book showing the original parcel.

Nathan Parrish moved from New York to California in 1852. He owned a manufacturing company that produced tubs and pails and was a City Supervisor in the early 1880s.⁹ During the last decade of his life he worked for the Fireman's Fund Insurance Company.¹⁰ Parrish died in 1898, leaving his estate to his two sons, H.A. and E.A. Parrish.¹¹ His estate was sold in 1921 to Theresia Steinauer. She divided the large parcel and sold the subject parcel to Henry George White in December 1921. White did not reside at the subject property but maintained it as rental property. Stella Mullaly purchased the property in 1925. Stella resided at the subject property with her husband Charles Nelson and several lodgers. Charles Nelson was a San Francisco Fireman. The subject property was inherited by Stella's children Lucille Seidel and George Nelson in May 1964. They sold the property to Charles and Hazel Tadlock in September 1964. Gladys Crivello purchased the property in 1966 and sold it to Irwin and Jane Herscowitz in 1967. James and Linda Corazzini purchased the property in 1968. Linda Peterson became sole owner in 1981 after she and James Corazzini divorced.¹² Relatives (John Corazzini and Cynthia Scagliola) inherited the property in 2006. Kathleen Kuzminski purchased the property in 2012, and the current owners purchased the property in 2016. None of the owners after Stella Mullaly resided at the subject property. The following table lists all lodgers and occupants of the building.

Table 1: Occupants of 792 Capp

Date	Occupant	Occupation
1878-1886	Johh P Weil	Salesman
1881-1886	Mrs. A.M. Norton	Unknown
1883	Samuel Sinsheimer	Student
1885	Lizzie Shay	Domestic
1887-1889	Charles Hills	Hills Twang Dairy
1890	Leota Biddle	Unknown
	George Ewers	Operator
1892-1894	Edward and Anna Daly	Butcher

⁹ *San Francisco Chronicle*, "Death of N.C. Parrish," February 17, 1898.

¹⁰ *San Francisco Call*, "Death of N.C. Parrish," February 17, 1898.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² California, Divorce Index, 1940-1997

1896	Charles G. Bush	Unknown
1900	Dan Ferguson	Salesman
1901-1909	Robert J. Loughery	Clerk
1910-1912	George Reeves	Glassblower
1910-1911	Adeline Gattie	Saleswoman
1914-1918	Paul and Luella Sonderup	Waiter
1915	Nick Torras	Waiter
1918	Ora Morgan William Noland	Cashier Shoemaker
1919	James Murphy	Ironworker
1920	James McElvoise	Watchman
1922-1924	Walter Farrow	Peddler
1924	William Faust	Blacksmith
1925	Charles Haake	Painter
1930	Oscar Hontman	Longshoreman
1931	Harmon Harris Edith Kurcher Francis Martin	Cook Waiter Waiter
1932	George Murray	Chauffeur
1933	Laurene Blyler Ella Hall	Unknown Unknown
1934-1935	Ramola Canessa Ernest Canessa Alia Canessa	Cook Laborer Garment Finisher
1937	Alice Mitchell	Operator
1940	Jessie Baundage	Unknown
1963	Rudolph Schulken	Bricklayer
1966	Mrs. Louis Airla	Unknown
1967	Mrs. Clara Alorrano	Unknown
1968	Mitchell Gadda	Unknown
1969-1970	Luis Echegoye	Unknown
1972-1978	Emmett Williams	Williams Owl Cleaners
1981-1982	Maria Acosta Eliseo Escalante	Janitor Unknown

VI. EVALUATION OF HISTORIC STATUS

This property has been identified as not eligible for listing in the California Register for unspecified reasons, most likely due to loss of integrity. TKC therefore reevaluated the property to clarify this determination.

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.

A. Individual Eligibility

- Criterion 1 (Events)

792 Capp Street is not individually eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 1. This property is one of several on the block constructed during the 1850-1880s era. It is not known to have made an individually significant contribution to the history of San Francisco or the State of California. Nor is it known to be associated with any 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. Thus the property is not individually eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 1.

- Criterion 2 (Persons)

This property does not appear to be eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 2. The original owner is a California Pioneer, but he did not reside at the subject property. Otherwise, it is not associated with any significant persons in the history of San Francisco or the State of California, as none of the owners or occupants are 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 eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 2.

- Criterion 3 (Architecture)

This property does not appear to be eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 3. The original architect/builder is unknown. The original build date is unknown, and the original design is unknown. The building has also been substantially altered. This building does not embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic values. Thus it is 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 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.”¹³ 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.

¹³ Office of Historic Preservation. “Instructions for Recording Historical Resources,” Sacramento. 1995.

At present, the subject property's block is not included in any formally identified historic district. The east side of Capp Street contains buildings included in the Von Schroeder-Welsh Block Historic District with a period of significance from 1889-1895. This building predates this period of significance and would not be considered a contributor. Thirteen districts were identified in this vicinity in the South Mission Survey none of which include this property. Those districts are listed below for informational purposes.

- Shotwell Street Victorians (1865-1905) – high style single-family buildings
- South Mission Avenues and Alleys (1885-1914) – residential buildings
- East Mission Florida to Hampshire Streets (1885-1908) – residential and commercial working-class buildings
- Horner's Addition East (1865-1905) – high style residential buildings, and extension of Liberty-Hill Historic District
- Gottlieb Knopf Block (1889-1892, 1920-1940) – Stick-style row-houses by Gottlieb Knopf
- Von Schroeder-Welsh Block (1889-1895) – Row-houses associated with builder John Welsh and real-estate developer Mary E. Von Schroeder
- 23rd Street Shops and Row-houses (1873-1895) – Late 19th century residential and commercial buildings
- Alabama Street Pioneers (1865-1884) – Pioneer-era cottages
- Hampshire Street False-Fronts (1885-1895) – False-front Italianate residential buildings
- Juri Street (1890-1895) – Cul-de-sac representing late 19th century urban residential tract design
- Olsen's Queen Anne Cottages (1893) – Row of residential buildings developed by Alfred Olsen
- O'Donnell-Fowler Homes (1889) – Residential buildings built by merchant builder C.C. O'Donnell and landowner George W. Fowler
- Orange Alley Stables and Lofts (1895-1913) – Pre-automobile accessory buildings

The DPR “A” form for the subject property discussed the possibility that this building “may have been one of a pair of identical cottages.” This is partially true. Based on the research conducted for this report, TKC believes this building was part of a group of four or five similar residential building constructed for owner Nathan Parrish. Two of the buildings are non-extant: 798 Capp and 3240 23rd Street. 786 Capp Street is still extant but it has most likely been substantially altered. Nathan Parrish’s residence, 778 Capp, has also been significantly altered. Due to the alterations, loss of two of the buildings, and the unknown original design of these buildings, this cluster does not constitute an historic district.

TKC also investigated whether a potential historic district not yet identified might exist that would include this property. A visual examination of the area and of HRERs in the vicinity does not indicate the existence of such a district.

VI. 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 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 is identified and integrity cannot be determined. For informational purposes, this building has been altered.

Alterations include but not limited to:

- Recladding in stucco
- Change window shapes, sizes, types
- Removal and addition of none historic ornament
- Addition of garage in basement
- Rear additions

VIII. CONCLUSION

This report confirms the Mission Survey findings that 792 Capp Street is not individually eligible for listing in the California Register. The property is not located in any existing or potential historic district.

IX. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Published

Olmsted, Roger and T. H. Watkins. *Here Today: San Francisco's Architectural Heritage*. San Francisco: Junior League of San Francisco Inc., 1968.

San Francisco City Directories.

San Francisco Department of City Planning. "CEQA Review Procedures for Historical Resources." (San Francisco: 2005).

San Francisco Call

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.

Weintraub, Matt. "Multiple Property Documentation Form for Historic Neighborhoods of the Mission District," San Francisco Planning Department, October 14, 2010.

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, 1889, 1900, 1905, 1914, 1950.

X. APPENDIX

Associated Contextual Themes for the Mission District Neighborhoods

Context/Theme	Geographic Area/Sites (general)	Period
Early History: Ohlone, Spanish, and Mexican	Mission Dolores area	pre-1850
U.S. Expansionism and Pioneer Settlement	Southern Mission (south of 20 th Street)* East and west edges of Inner Mission North (east of Shotwell Street /South Van Ness Avenue/Capp Street; west of Dolores Street)* *These areas were not destroyed by the Earthquake and Fires of 1906.	1850-1880
Streetcar Suburbs of the Gilded Age	Southern Mission (south of 20 th Street)* East and west edges of Inner Mission North (east of Shotwell Street /South Van Ness Avenue/Capp Street; west of Dolores Street)* *These areas were not destroyed by the Earthquake and Fires of 1906.	1880-1906
Post-Earthquake and Fire	Inner Mission North (bounded by Market Street to north, 20 th Street to south, Shotwell Street /South Van Ness Avenue/Capp Street to east, and Dolores Street to west)* *This area was destroyed by the Earthquake and Fires of 1906.	1906-1920
Interwar Period: Modernizing the Mission	In-fill sites Commercial corridors (Mission, Valencia, 16 th and 24 th Streets)	1920-1941
World War II and Postwar Period	"Mission Miracle Mile" commercial corridors (Mission, Valencia, 16 th and 24 th Streets)	1941-1960

Source: "Multiple Property Documentation Form for Historic Neighborhoods of the Mission District, San Francisco, Section B (1).

DPR "A" Form for 792 Capp Street

State of California - The Resources Agency DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION PRIMARY RECORD	Primary # _____ HRI # _____ Trinomial _____ CHR Status Code: _____
Other Listings _____ Review Code _____	Reviewer _____ Date _____

Page 1 of 1

Resource Name or #: (Assigned by recorder) 792 CAPP ST

P1. Other Identifier:

*P2. Location: ☐ Not for Publication ☒ Unrestricted

*a. County: San Francisco

*b. USGS Quad: San Francisco North, CA Date: 1995

c. Address: 792 CAPP ST

City: San Francisco

ZIP 94110

d. UTM Zone: Easting: Northing:

e. Other Locational Data: Assessor's Parcel Number 3637 019B

*P3a. Description: (Describe resource and major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)

792 Capp Street is located on a 30' x 90' rectangular lot on the west side of Capp Street between 22nd and 23rd Streets. Built circa 1875, 792 Capp Street is a 1-story over raised basement, wood frame, single-family residence that has been altered from its original architectural style. The rectangular-plan building, clad in smooth stucco, is capped by a gable roof. The foundation is not visible. The primary façade faces east. Entrances include a flush wood door and a recessed, paneled wood door reached by a straight flight of brick steps. Fenestration includes a wood-sash tripartite picture window. Remaining original architectural details include a bracketed cornice. The building appears to originally have been one of a pair of identical cottages (now altered), including 786 Capp Street.

The building appears to be in good condition.

*P3b. Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes) HP2. Single Family Property

*P4. Resources Present: ☒ Building ☐ Structure ☐ Object ☐ Site ☐ District ☐ Element of District ☐ Other

P5a. Photo



P5b. Description of Photo:

Primary facade on Capp St.
1/17/2008

*P6. Date Constructed/Age:

☒ Historic ☐ Prehistoric ☐ Both

ca. 1875 Sanborn Maps / estimate

*P7. Owner and Address

PETERSON LINDA M
1610 A FERNSIDE BLVD

ALAMEDA CA

*P8. Recorded By:

Page & Turnbull, Inc.(JGL/GH)
724 Pine Street
San Francisco, CA 94108

*P9. Date Recorded: 1/21/2008

*P10. Survey Type:

Reconnaissance

*P11. Report Citation: (Cite survey report and other sources, or enter "None")

Eastern Neighborhoods Mission Survey

*Attachments: ☒ NONE ☐ Location Map ☐ Sketch Map ☐ Continuation Sheet ☐ Building, Structure, and Object Record☐ Archaeological Record ☐ District Record ☐ Linear Feature Record ☐ Milling Station Record ☐ Rock Art Record☐ Artifact Record ☐ Photograph Record ☐ Other (list):

DPR 523 A (1/95)

*Required Information

Contextual photos of the immediate neighborhood

West side of Capp Between 22nd and 23rd Streets





(Subject building noted with arrow)







East side of Capp between 22nd and 23rd Streets













Permits for 792 Capp Street

OFFICIAL COPY

SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF
BUILDING INSPECTION

APPLICATION
No. 103378

OF
Owner
Harry West

To make additions, alterations or repairs
to building

Location 792
Street Capp

Estimated Cost \$2800

Filed DEC 17 1921

Referred to Inspector MCG
For Report

Approved
DEC 19 1921

Chief Building Inspector

OFFICIAL COPY



Bureau of Building Inspection,
Dep't. of Public Works No. 1

Mercury Press

ALTERATION BLANKS

WRITE IN INK—FILE TWO COPIES

TO THE HONORABLE

THE BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS


OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Gentlemen:

The undersigned respectfully petition your Honorable Board for permission to do the following work at corner

side of 792 Capp Street street _____ feet _____ street _____
of _____ street _____

WRITE PLAINLY FULL DESCRIPTION OF WORK TO BE DONE

Estimated cost of work, \$ 280.00Building to be used as Dwelling + private garage

In consideration of the granting of the foregoing application, I hereby agree to save the City and County of San Francisco harmless from all costs and damages which may accrue from the use or occupancy of the sidewalk, street or sub-sidewalk space in the said work.

Name of Architect _____

Address _____

Name of Builder John WeltonAddress 1968 Geary Street

Report _____ favorably _____

Studying to be set 16' on center
Roof to be covered with fire proof material
Obtain separate permit to lower curb

John Welton
Inspector

Mr. Mary White Owner
Address _____

Per _____

W. H. Hagfield
Inspector
Dec 19 1921

[illegible]

OFFICIAL COPY

SAN FRANCISCO
 DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
 BUILDING INSPECTION

Classified Permit Bureau F. No. 3

Write in Ink—File Two Copies

Regal Service Press, Inc.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

CENTRAL PERMIT BUREAU

BLDG. FORM

APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT

ALTERATION

3

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 hereinafter set forth:

- (1) Location 792 Capp St
- (2) For what purpose is present building now used? Dwelling
- (3) For what purpose will building be used hereafter? Same
- (4) Total Cost \$ 100.00
- (5) Description of work to be done Repair ^{End} wall & fence

- (6) Contractor ☒ (DOES) carry Workmen's Compensation Insurance.
☐ (DOES NOT)
- (7) Supervision of construction by Owner

Address

253 Lexington St

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 ORDINANCES 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, indemnify and keep harmless the City and County of San Francisco against all liabilities, judgments, 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 sub-sidewalk placed by virtue thereof, and will in all things strictly comply with the conditions of this permit.

- (8) Architect None

Certificate No. _____
State of CaliforniaLicense No. _____
City and County of San Francisco

Address _____

- (9) Engineer None

Certificate No. _____
State of CaliforniaLicense No. _____
City and County of San Francisco

Address _____

- (10) Plans and specifications prepared by
Other than Architect or Engineer _____

Address _____

- (11) Contractor Day Work

License No. _____
State of CaliforniaLicense No. _____
City and County of San Francisco

Address _____

- (12) Owner B. Nelson

Address

253 Lexington St

By _____

Owner's Authorized Agent.

THE DEPARTMENT WILL CALL UP TELEPHONE NO. _____
IF ANY ALTERATIONS OR CHANGES ARE NECESSARY ON THE PLANS SUBMITTED.

OFFICIAL COPY

SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF
BUILDING INSPECTION

BLDG. FORM No. 3 APPLICATION OF
FOR PERMIT TO MAKE
ADDITIONS, ALTERATION or REPAIRS
TO BUILDING

Location 792 Capp St.

Total Cost \$ 4000-

Filed 5-4 1946

APPROVED:
A
Dep. Public Works
MAY 9 1966
Phat C. Long

Superintendent, Bureau of Building Inspection
Permit No. 1487 294639

Issued MAY 9 1966

REFER TO:
Bureau of Engineering
BBI Struct. Engineer
Boiler Inspector
Art Commission
Dept. of Public Health
Dept. of Electricity
Redevelopment Agency
Parking Authority

Approved 5-6 1946
Provided the following conditions are complied with:

Approved: _____
Department of Public Health

Approved: _____
Department of Electricity

Approved: _____
Art Commission

Approved: _____
Boiler Inspector

Approved: _____
Redevelopment Agency

Approved: _____
Parking Authority

No portion of building or structure or scaffolding used during construction to be closer than 6' to any wire containing more than 750 volts. See Sec. 385 California Penal Code.

Approved: _____
Civil Engineer, Bureau of Building Inspection

Approved: _____
Bureau of Engineering

Approved: _____
Bureau of Fire Prevention & Public Safety

Approved: _____
Department of City Planning

Approved: _____
CPC Setbacks

Approved: _____
Bureau of Engineering

I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of this various Bureaus or Departments noted herein.

Owner or Owner's Authorized Agent

OFFICIAL COPY

SAN FRANCISCO

CENTRAL PERMIT BUREAU F435

DEPARTMENT OF
BUILDING INSPECTIONDEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
BLDG. FORM

Write in Ink—File Two Copies

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

CENTRAL PERMIT BUREAU

3

Application is hereby made to the Department of Public Works 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 hereinafter set forth:

- (1) Location 792 Capp St.
- (2) Total Cost (\$) 4000 (3) No. of Stories 1 (4) Basement or Cellar Yes
yes or no
- (5) Present Use of building Res (6) No. of families 1
yes or no
- (7) Proposed Use of building Frame (8) No. of families 1
yes or no
- (9) Type of construction 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 (10) Proposed Building Code Classification 18-2
(must be shown on plot plan if answer is yes.)
- (11) Any other building on lot No yes or no
- (12) Does this alteration create an additional story to the building? No yes or no
- (13) Does this alteration create a horizontal extension to the building? No yes or no
- (14) Does this alteration constitute a change of occupancy Yes yes or no
- (15) Electrical work to be performed No (16) Plumbing work to be performed Yes
yes or no
- (17) Automobile runway to be altered or installed No yes or no
- (18) Sidewalk over sub-sidewalk space to be repaired or altered No yes or no
- (19) Will street space be used during construction? No yes or no
- (20) Write in description of all work to be performed under this application:
(Reference to plans is not sufficient)

New Kitchen Cabinets & lower ceiling

- (21) Supervision of construction by Western Const. Address 6237 Mission
- (22) General Contractor Western Const. California License No. 6237
- (23) Architect or Engineer — California Certificate No. —
(for design)
- (24) Architect or Engineer — California Certificate No. —
(for construction)

- (25) I hereby certify and agree that if a permit is issued for the construction described in this application, all the provisions of the permit and all laws and ordinances applicable thereto will be complied with. I further agree to save San Francisco and its officials and employees harmless from all costs and damages which may accrue from use or occupancy of the sidewalk, street or sub-sidewalk space or from anything else in connection with the work included in the permit. The foregoing covenant shall be binding upon the owner of said property, the applicant, their heirs, successors and assigns.

- (26) Owner L.D. Tadlock (Phone 755 4328)
Address 90 Westgate Dr. SF
By Western Const. Address 6237 Mission

Owner's Authorized Agent to be Owner's Authorized Architect, Engineer or General Contractor.
CERTIFICATE OF FINAL COMPLETION AND/OR PERMIT OF OCCUPANCY MUST BE OBTAINED ON COMPLETION OF WORK OR ALTERATION INVOLVING AN ENLARGEMENT OF THE BUILDING OR A CHANGE OF OCCUPANCY PURSUANT TO SEC. 808 AND 809, SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE, BEFORE BUILDING IS OCCUPIED.

Pursuant to Sec. 304, San Francisco Building Code, the building permit shall be posted on job. Owner is responsible for approved plans and application being kept at building site.

APPROVAL OF THIS APPLICATION DOES NOT CONSTITUTE AN APPROVAL FOR THE ELECTRICAL WIRING OR PLUMBING INSTALLATIONS. A SEPARATE PERMIT FOR THE WIRING AND PLUMBING MUST BE OBTAINED.

THIS IS NOT A BUILDING PERMIT. NO WORK SHALL BE STARTED UNTIL A BUILDING PERMIT IS ISSUED.

FOR DEPARTMENTAL USE ONLY

OFFICIAL COPY

SAN FRANCISCO

APPROVED FOR ISSUANCE: FEB 02 1982

DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

APPROVED

DEPT. Public Works

FEB 9 - 1982

Superintendent

BUREAU BUILDING INSPECTION

DATE FILED: 1/29/82

FILED: 107051

PERMIT NO. 478767

ISSUED: FEB 9 - 1982

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT

ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

APPLICATION IS HEREBY MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS 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 HEREIN SET FORTH.

OFFICE COPY

(1) STREET ADDRESS OF JOB: 792 Capp Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94110

(2) ESTIMATED COST OF JOB: \$1400.00

FEB 1 1982

BLDG. FORM 3

08200699

DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING

(1A) TYPE OF CONSTR. 1-4 ☐ 5 ☐ (1B) NUMBER OF STORIES OF OCCUPANCY: 1 (1C) NUMBER OF BASEMENTS AND CELLARS: 1 (1D) PRESENT USE: *Residential Home* (1E) BLDG. CODE OCCUP. CLASS: *I* (1F) NO. OF DWELLING UNITS: 1

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION

(2A) TYPE OF CONSTR. 1-4 ☐ 5 ☐ (2B) NUMBER OF STORIES OF OCCUPANCY: 1 (2C) NUMBER OF BASEMENTS AND CELLARS: 1 (2D) PROPOSED USE: *Same* (2E) BLDG. CODE OCCUP. CLASS: *I* (2F) NO. OF DWELLING UNITS: 1

(3A) DOES THIS ALTERATION CREATE ADDITIONAL STORY TO BUILDING? YES ☐ NO ☒ (3B) DOES THIS ALTERATION CREATE DECK OR HORIZ. EXTENSION TO BUILDING? YES ☐ NO ☒ (3C) IF YES, STATE NEW GROUND FLOOR AREA: SQ. FT. (3D) WILL SIDEWALK OVER SUB-ADJACENT SPACE BE REPAIRED OR ALTERED? YES ☐ NO ☒ (3E) IS AUTO RUNWAY TO BE CONSTRUCTED OR ALTERED? YES ☐ NO ☒ (3F) WILL STREET SPACE BE USED DURING CONSTRUCTION? YES ☐ NO ☒ (3G) PLUMBING WORK TO BE PERFORMED? YES ☐ NO ☒ (3H) ELECTRICAL WORK TO BE PERFORMED? YES ☐ NO ☒ (3I) ANY OTHER EXISTING BLDG. ON LOT? (IF YES, SHOW ON PLAN) YES ☐ NO ☒ (3J) DOES THIS ALTERATION CONSTITUTE A CHANGE OF OCCUPANCY? YES ☐ NO ☒ (3K) CALIF. LICENSE NO. (3L) PHONE

(4) GENERAL CONSTRUCTION ADDRESS: *To Be Determined*

(5) ARCHITECT OR ENGINEER (DESIGN ☐ CONSTRUCTION ☐) ADDRESS: *none*

(6) CONSTRUCTION LENDER (ENTER NAME AND BRANCH DESIGNATION IF ANY. IF THERE IS NO KNOWN CONSTRUCTION LENDER, ENTER "UNKNOWN"). ADDRESS: *none*

(7) OWNER (ISSUE SEPARATE FOR ONE) ADDRESS: *Linda Peterson 2000 Inwoodale Building* PHONE FOR CONTACT BY BUREAU: *#206*

(8) WRITE A DESCRIPTION OF ALL WORK TO BE PERFORMED UNDER THIS APPLICATION (REFERENCE TO PLANS IS NOT SUFFICIENT).

Repair Roof leaks along with water damage.

697-3562

IMPORTANT NOTICES

No change shall be made in the character of the occupancy or use without first obtaining a Building Permit authorizing such change. See Sec. 103, 104.8, 104.8.1, 104.C, 502, 502.1, San Francisco Building Code and Sec. 104, San Francisco Housing Code. No portion of building or structure or scaffolding used during construction, to be closer than 6'0" to any wire containing more than 750 volts. See Sec. 385, California Penal Code.

Pursuant to Sec. 302 A.B. San Francisco Building Code, the building permit shall be posted on the job. The owner is responsible for approved plans and application being kept at building site.

Grade lines as shown on drawings accompanying this application are assumed to be correct. If actual grade lines are not the same as shown revised drawings showing correct grade lines, cuts and fills together with complete details of retaining walls and wall footings required must be submitted to this bureau for approval.

ANY STIPULATION REQUIRED HEREIN OR BY CODE MAY BE APPEALED.

BUILDING NOT TO BE OCCUPIED UNTIL CERTIFICATE OF FINAL COMPLETION IS POSTED ON THE BUILDING OR PERMIT OF OCCUPANCY GRANTED, WHEN REQUIRED.

APPROVAL OF THIS APPLICATION DOES NOT CONSTITUTE AN APPROVAL FOR THE ELECTRICAL WIRING OR PLUMBING INSTALLATIONS. A SEPARATE PERMIT FOR THE WIRING AND PLUMBING MUST BE OBTAINED. SEPARATE PERMITS ARE REQUIRED IF ANSWER IS "YES" TO ANY OF ABOVE QUESTIONS (15) (16) (17) (20) (21) or (22). THIS IS NOT A BUILDING PERMIT. NO WORK SHALL BE STARTED UNTIL A BUILDING PERMIT IS ISSUED.

In dwellings all insulating materials must have a clearance of not less than two inches from all electrical wires or equipment.

CHECK APPROPRIATE BOX:

☒ OWNER ☐ ARCHITECT ☐ ENGINEER

☐ LESSEE ☐ AGENT WITH POWER OF ATTORNEY

☐ CONTRACTOR ☐ ATTORNEY IN FACT

APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY AND AGREE THAT IF A PERMIT IS ISSUED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION DESCRIBED IN THIS APPLICATION, ALL THE PROVISIONS OF THE PERMIT AND ALL LAWS AND ORDINANCES THERETO WILL BE COMPLIED WITH.

NOTICE TO APPLICANT

HOLD HARMLESS CLAUSE: The Permittee(s) by acceptance of this permit, agrees(s) to indemnify and hold harmless the City and County of San Francisco from and against any and all claims, demands and actions for damages resulting from operations under this permit, regardless of negligence of the City and County of San Francisco, and to assume the defense of the City and County of San Francisco against all such claims, demands and actions.

In conformity with the provisions of Section 3800 of the Labor Code of the State of California, the applicant shall have on file, or file with the Central Permit Bureau, either Certificate (I) or (II) or (III) designated below or shall indicate item (IV) or (V) or (VI) below, whichever is applicable. If however, item (VI) is checked then item (V) must be checked as well. Mark the appropriate method of compliance below:

() I. Certificate of Consent to Self-Insure issued by the Director of Industrial Relations.

() II. Certificate of Workman's Compensation Insurance issued by an admitted insurer.

() III. An exact copy or duplicate of (I) certified by the Director or (II) certified by the insurer.

() IV. The cost of the work to be performed is \$100 or less.

() V. I certify that in the performance of the work for which this Permit is issued, I shall not employ any person in any manner so as to become subject to the workman's compensation laws of California. I further acknowledge that I understand, in the event that I should become subject to the workman's compensation provisions of the Labor Code of California and fail to comply therewith with the provisions of Section 3800 of the Labor Code, that the Permit herein applied for shall be deemed revoked.

() VI. I certify as the owner (or the agent of the owner) that in the performance of the work for which this Permit is issued, I will employ a contractor who complies with the workman's compensation laws of California and who has on file, or prior to the commencement of any work will file, with the Central Permit Bureau evidence that workman's compensation insurance is carried.

Applicant's Signature: *Linda Peterson* Date: *1-29-82*

SAN FRANCISCO		CONDITIONS AND STIPULATIONS	
OFFICIAL COPY	APPROVED: 2-7-82	<p>The approval of this application and issuance of permit applies to specific work only and does not constitute an approval of the building.</p> <p><i>[Signature]</i> BUILDING INSPECTOR, BUR. OF BLDG. INSP.</p>	<p>DATE: _____</p> <p>REASON: _____</p> <p>NOTIFIED MR. _____</p>
	APPROVED: 2-7-82	<p>Not reviewed by the Department of City Planning. Issuance of the requested permit constitutes no finding that use of this property does or does not conform to the City Planning Code.</p> <p><i>[Signature]</i> DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING</p>	<p>DATE: _____</p> <p>REASON: _____</p> <p>NOTIFIED MR. _____</p>
	APPROVED:	<p>BUREAU OF FIRE PREVENTION & PUBLIC SAFETY</p>	<p>DATE: _____</p> <p>REASON: _____</p> <p>NOTIFIED MR. _____</p>
	APPROVED:	<p>CIVIL ENGINEER, BUR. OF BLDG. INSPECTION</p>	<p>DATE: _____</p> <p>REASON: _____</p> <p>NOTIFIED MR. _____</p>
	APPROVED:	<p>BUREAU OF ENGINEERING</p>	<p>DATE: _____</p> <p>REASON: _____</p> <p>NOTIFIED MR. _____</p>
	APPROVED:	<p>DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH</p>	<p>DATE: _____</p> <p>REASON: _____</p> <p>NOTIFIED MR. _____</p>
	APPROVED:	<p>REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY</p>	<p>DATE: _____</p> <p>REASON: _____</p> <p>NOTIFIED MR. _____</p>
	APPROVED:	<p>RESIDENTIAL ENV. INSPECTOR, DIV. OF APT. & HOTEL INSP., B.H.I.</p>	<p>DATE: _____</p> <p>REASON: _____</p> <p>NOTIFIED MR. _____</p>
<p>I AGREE TO COMPLY WITH ALL CONDITIONS OR STIPULATIONS OF THE VARIOUS BUREAUS OR DEPARTMENTS NOTED ON THIS APPLICATION, AND ATTACHED STATEMENTS OF CONDITIONS OR STIPULATIONS, WHICH ARE HEREBY MADE A PART OF THIS APPLICATION.</p> <p>NUMBER OF ATTACHMENTS <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><i>[Signature]</i> SIGNATURE OF OWNER, LESSEE OR AUTHORIZED AGENT FOR OWNER OR LESSEE.</p>		<p>NOTE: DATES AND NAMES OF ALL PERSONS NOTIFIED DURING PROCESSING</p>	

SAN FRANCISCO
FOR DEPARTMENTAL USE ONLY

APPROVED
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
BUILDING INSPECTION

APPROVED
SUPERINTENDENT
BUILDING INSPECTION
SIE

APPROVED
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS
I OCCUPANCY WITH NO PLANS

OFFICE COPY

792 CAPP ST. S.F.
\$3000.00

PERMIT NO. 508215 11-16-83

DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING

1. TYPE OF BUILDING	2. NUMBER OF STORIES	3. NUMBER OF UNITS	4. NAME OF BUILDING	5. PRESENT USE
10 20 30 40 X	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
10 20 30 40 X	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION

1. TYPE OF BUILDING	2. NUMBER OF STORIES	3. NUMBER OF UNITS	4. NAME OF BUILDING	5. PROPOSED USE
10 20 30 40 X	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
10 20 30 40 X	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

GENERAL CONTRACTOR: OCEANA CONSTRUCTION CO. BOX 267 BURLINGAME CA 94010

OWNER: MRS. LINDA PETERSON 2405 LEXINGTON SAN FRANCISCO 94115

WORK TO BE PERFORMED: TEAR OUT EXISTING TILE SHOWER WALLS (OVER TUB) INSTALL WATERPROOF SHEET ROCK WALLS INSTALL NEW TILE + GROUT FRAME IN 6" END WALL (AT REAR OF TUB) TO ELIMINATE LEAKY "SHOE DESIGN" INSTALL NEW ALUMINUM SLIDER + NEW SHOWER DOOR

IMPORTANT NOTICES

No charge shall be made in the character of the occupancy or use without first obtaining a Building Permit authorizing such change. See Sec. 102, 104 B, 104 C, 104 D, 104 E, 104 F, 104 G, 104 H, 104 I, 104 J, 104 K, 104 L, 104 M, 104 N, 104 O, 104 P, 104 Q, 104 R, 104 S, 104 T, 104 U, 104 V, 104 W, 104 X, 104 Y, 104 Z, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000.

APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY AND AGREE THAT IF A PERMIT IS ISSUED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION DESCRIBED IN THIS APPLICATION, ALL THE PROVISIONS OF THE PERMIT AND ALL LAWS AND ORDINANCES, CONDITIONS AND STIPULATIONS THEREOF WILL BE COMPLIED WITH.

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT:

- THE WORK CONTEMPLATED UNDER THIS PERMIT DOES NOT AFFECT ANY BEARING WALLS WITHIN THE STRUCTURE NOR DOES IT CONTEMPLATE THE REMOVAL OR REVISION OF ANY LOAD BEARING MEMBERS.
- IN CONFORMITY WITH THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 3800 OF THE LABOR CODE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, THE APPLICANT SHALL HAVE ON FILE, OR FILE WITH THE GENERAL PERMIT BUREAU, EITHER CERTIFICATE (I) OR (II) OR (III) DESIGNATED BELOW OR SMALL INDICATE ITEM (IV) OR (V) OR (VI) BELOW, WHICHEVER IS APPLICABLE. CHECK ONE OF THE FOLLOWING METHODS OF COMPLIANCE:

- Certificate of Consent to Self-Insure issued by the Director of Industrial Relations.
- Certificate of Workman's Compensation Insurance issued by an admitted insurer.
- An exact copy or duplicate of (I) certified by the Director or (II) certified by the insurer.
- The cost of the work to be performed is \$100 or less.
- I certify that in the performance of the work for which this Permit is issued, I shall not employ any person in any manner so as to become subject to the workman's compensation laws of California. I further acknowledge that I understand, in the event that I should become subject to the workman's compensation provisions of the Labor Code of California and fail to comply therewith, with the provisions of Section 3800 of the Labor Code, that the Permit herein applied for shall be deemed revoked.
- I certify as the owner or the agent of the owner that in the performance of the work for which this Permit is issued, I will employ a contractor who complies with the workman's compensation laws of California and who has on file, or will file, with the General Permit Bureau evidence that workman's compensation insurance is carried.

APPROVED: James Lewis AT START OF WORK 558 3851. THIS APPLICATION APPROVED WITHOUT FIELD INSPECTION AND DOES NOT CONSTITUTE AN APPROVAL OF THE BUILDING. WORK AUTHORIZED MUST BE DONE IN STRICT ACCORDANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE CODES.

BUILDING INSPECTOR, BUR. OF BLDG. INS.

APPLICANT'S SIGNATURE: Robert L. Lewis DATE: 11-16-83

CHECK APPROPRIATE BOX:
OWNER ☐ ARCHITECT ☐ ENGINEER ☐ LESSEE ☒ CONTRACTOR
AGENT WITH POWER OF ATTORNEY ☐ ATTORNEY IN FACT ☐

TIM KELLEY CONSULTING

OFFICIAL COPY

CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

CONDITIONS AND STIPULATIONS

APPROVED:	DATE:	REASON:	NOTIFIED MR.
<input type="checkbox"/> [Signature] BUILDING INSPECTOR, BUREAU OF BLDG. INSPECTION			
<input type="checkbox"/> OFFICE COPY DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING			
<input type="checkbox"/> BUREAU OF FIRE PREVENTION & PUBLIC SAFETY			
<input type="checkbox"/> CIVIL ENGINEER, BUREAU OF BLDG. INSPECTION			
<input type="checkbox"/> BUREAU OF ENGINEERING			
<input type="checkbox"/> DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH			
<input type="checkbox"/> REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY			
<input type="checkbox"/> HOUSING INSPECTION DIVISION			

Figure to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various bureaus or departments noted on this application, and attached statements of conditions or stipulations, which are hereby made a part of this application.

Number of attachments ☐ OWNER'S AUTHORIZED AGENT

HOLD SECTION — NOTE DATES AND NAMES OF ALL PERSONS NOTIFIED DURING PROCESSING

OFFICIAL COPY

SAN FRANCISCO

APPROVED

Dept. of Building Inspection

NOV 27 2002

RESIDENTIAL NON-STRUCTURAL REPAIR WORK ONLY

PAID IN HAND OR BETTER BUILDING INSPECTOR MAY RE-EXAMINE ADDITIONAL PERMIT(S) AND/OR PLANS FOR ANY STRUCTURAL WORK OF FOR ANY WORK BEYOND SCOPE OF PERMIT, OBSERVED DURING INSPECTION.

NOV 18 2002

APPROVED FOR INSURANCE

BLDG. FORM 36

NOV 18 2002

APPLICATION NUMBER 2002 11 27 2474

APPROVAL NUMBER

DIRECTOR

APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT

ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

FORM 3 ☐ OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED

FORM 8 ☒ OVER-THE COUNTER ISSUANCE

NUMBER OF PLAN SETS 0

DO NOT WRITE ABOVE THIS LINE

DATE FILED 11/27/02

FILED RECEIPT NO. 11/27/02

ISSUED NOV 27 2002

STREET ADDRESS OF JOB 792 CAPP ST. S

BLOCK & LOT 3637/19B

ESTIMATED COST OF JOB \$2800

REVISER COST: \$2800

BY: VM u/f/02

DATE: 11/27/02

INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY ALL APPLICANTS

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING

(A) TYPE OF CONSTR. 50

(B) NO. OF STORIES OF OCCUPANCY 2

(C) NO. OF BASEMENTS AND CELLARS 0

(D) PRESENT USE: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL

(E) OCCUP. CLASS R3

(F) NO. OF DWELLING UNITS 1

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION

(A) TYPE OF CONSTR. 50

(B) NO. OF STORIES OF OCCUPANCY 2

(C) NO. OF BASEMENTS AND CELLARS 0

(D) PROPOSED USE (LEGAL USE): RESIDENTIAL

(E) OCCUP. CLASS R3

(F) NO. OF DWELLING UNITS 1

(10) IS AUTO RUMWAY TO BE CONSTRUCTED OR ALTERED? YES ☐ NO ☒

(11) WILL STREET SPACE BE USED DURING CONSTRUCTION? YES ☐ NO ☒

(12) ELECTRICAL WORK TO BE PERFORMED? YES ☐ NO ☒

(13) PLUMBING WORK TO BE PERFORMED? YES ☐ NO ☒

(14) GENERAL CONTRACTOR: OWNER/Builder

(15) OWNER - LESSEE (CROSS OUT ONE): ESTATE OF LYNN PATRICKSON 792 CAPP ST

(16) WRITE IN DESCRIPTION OF ALL WORK TO BE PERFORMED UNDER THIS APPLICATION (REFERENCE TO PLANS IS NOT SUFFICIENT): REMOVE REPLACE TILE WALL OVER TUB 11X5 AREA, REINFORCE WITH 3/8 PLYWOOD EXTEND GRAB #14 BUILDING PAPER, 1/2 TILE BOARD COVER WITH 4/4 TILE, 1/2 SHEETROCK (WATER RESISTANT) OVER TUB WALL ABOVE 5' TO CEILING REMOVE REPLACE 3/4 SUBFLOOR UNDER TUB, REINFORCE JOISTS W/ 2X8 JOISTS, REPAIR TOILET, VANIT.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

(17) DOES THIS ALTERATION CREATE ADDITIONAL HEIGHT OR STORY TO BUILDING? YES ☐ NO ☒

(18) IF (17) IS YES, STATE NEW HEIGHT AT CENTER LINE OF FRONT FT.

(19) DOES THIS ALTERATION CREATE DECK OR PORCH EXTENSION TO BUILDING? YES ☐ NO ☒

(20) IF (19) IS YES, STATE NEW GROUND FLOOR AREA SQ. FT.

(21) WILL SIDEWALK OVER SUB-SIDEWALK SPACE BE REPAIRED OR ALTERED? YES ☐ NO ☒

(22) WILL BUILDING EXTEND BEYOND PROPERTY LINE? YES ☐ NO ☒

(23) ANY OTHER EXISTING BLDG. OR CITY OF YES, SHOW ON PLAT PLAN

(24) DOES THIS ALTERATION CONSTITUTE A CHANGE OF OCCUPANCY? YES ☐ NO ☒

(25) ARCHITECT OR ENGINEER (DESIGN) ☐ CONSTRUCTION ☒

(26) CONSTRUCTION LENDER (ENTER NAME AND BRANCH DESIGNATION IF ANY, IF THERE IS NO KNOWN CONSTRUCTION LENDER, ENTER "UNKNOWN")

ADDRESS

IMPORTANT NOTICES

No change shall be made in the character of the occupancy or use without first obtaining a Building Permit authorizing such change. See San Francisco Building Code and San Francisco Housing Code.

No portion of building or structure or scaffolding used during construction, to be closer than 6' to any wire containing more than 750 volts. See Sec. 380, California Penal Code.

Pursuant to San Francisco Building Code, the building permit shall be posted on the job. The owner is responsible for approved plans and application being kept at building site.

Grade lines as shown on drawings accompanying this application are assumed to be correct. If actual grade lines are not the same as shown, revised drawings showing correct grade lines, cuts and fills together with complete details of retaining walls and wall footings required must be submitted to this department for approval.

ANY STIPULATION REQUIRED HEREIN OR BY CODE MAY BE APPEALED.

BUILDING NOT TO BE OCCUPIED UNTIL CERTIFICATE OF FINAL COMPLETION IS POSTED ON THE BUILDING OR PERMIT OF OCCUPANCY GRANTED, WHEN REQUIRED.

APPROVAL OF THIS APPLICATION DOES NOT CONSTITUTE AN APPROVAL FOR THE ELECTRICAL WIRING OR PLUMBING INSTALLATIONS. A SEPARATE PERMIT FOR THE WIRING AND PLUMBING MUST BE OBTAINED. SEPARATE PERMITS ARE REQUIRED IF ANSWER IS "YES" TO ANY OF ABOVE QUESTIONS (18) (19) (21) (22) OR (24).

THIS IS NOT A BUILDING PERMIT. NO WORK SHALL BE STARTED UNTIL A BUILDING PERMIT IS ISSUED.

In dwellings all insulating materials must have a clearance of not less than two inches from all electrical wires or equipment.

CHECK APPROPRIATE BOX

☐ OWNER

☐ ARCHITECT

☐ LESSEE

☐ AGENT

☐ CONTRACTOR

☐ ENGINEER

APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY AND AGREE THAT IF A PERMIT IS ISSUED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION DESCRIBED IN THIS APPLICATION, ALL THE PROVISIONS OF THE PERMIT AND ALL LAWS AND ORDINANCES THERE TO WILL BE COMPLIED WITH.

2003-03 (REV. 1/02)

NOTICE TO APPLICANT

HOLD HARMLESS CLAUSE. The permittee(s) by acceptance of the permit, agree(s) to indemnify and hold harmless the City and County of San Francisco from and against any and all claims, demands and actions for damages resulting from operations under this permit, regardless of negligence of the City and County of San Francisco, and to assume the defense of the City and County of San Francisco against all such claims, demands or actions.

In conformity with the provisions of Section 2600 of the Labor Code of the State of California, the applicant shall have coverage under (i), or (ii) designated below or shall indicate item (iii), or (iv), or (v), whichever is applicable. If however item (v) is checked item (iv) must be checked as well. Mark the appropriate method of compliance below.

I hereby affirm under penalty of perjury one of the following declarations:

() I. I have and will maintain a certificate of consent to self-insure for worker's compensation, as provided by Section 3700 of the Labor Code, for the performance of the work for which this permit is issued.

() II. I have and will maintain worker's compensation insurance, as required by Section 3700 of the Labor Code, for the performance of the work for which this permit is issued. My worker's compensation insurance carrier and policy number are:

Carrier _____

Policy Number _____

() III. The cost of the work to be done is \$100 or less.

() IV. I certify that in the performance of the work for which this permit is issued, I shall not employ any person in any manner so as to become subject to the workers' compensation laws of California. I further acknowledge that I understand that in the event that I should become subject to the workers' compensation provisions of the Labor Code of California and fail to comply herewith with the provisions of Section 3800 of the Labor Code, that the permit herein applied for shall be deemed revoked.

() V. I certify as the owner (or the agent for the owner) that in the performance of the work for which this permit is issued, I will employ a contractor who complies with the workers' compensation laws of California and who, prior to the commencement of any work, will file a completed copy of this form with the Central Permit Bureau.

Signature of Approver or Agent _____

Date 11/27/02

ORIGINAL

OFFICIAL COPY

SAN FRANCISCO

DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

CONDITIONS AND STIPULATIONS

REFER TO: APPROVED: By Vivian B. Huang, DBI DATE: _____
 NOV 18 2002 REASON: _____

BUILDING INSPECTOR, DEPT. OF BLDG. INSP. NOTIFIED MR. _____
 DATE: _____
 REASON: _____

APPROVED: N/A NOTIFIED MR. _____
 DATE: _____
 REASON: _____

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING NOTIFIED MR. _____
 DATE: _____
 REASON: _____

BUREAU OF FIRE PREVENTION & PUBLIC SAFETY NOTIFIED MR. _____
 DATE: _____
 REASON: _____

MECHANICAL ENGINEER, DEPT OF BLDG. INSPECTION NOTIFIED MR. _____
 DATE: _____
 REASON: _____

CIVIL ENGINEER, DEPT. OF BLDG INSPECTION NOTIFIED MR. _____
 DATE: _____
 REASON: _____

BUREAU OF ENGINEERING NOTIFIED MR. _____
 DATE: _____
 REASON: _____

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH NOTIFIED MR. _____
 DATE: _____
 REASON: _____

REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY NOTIFIED MR. _____
 DATE: _____
 REASON: _____

HOUSING INSPECTION DIVISION NOTIFIED MR. _____
 DATE: _____
 REASON: _____

I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various bureaus or department noted on this application, and attached statements of conditions or stipulations, which are hereby made a part of this application.

Number of attachments ☐ OWNERS AUTHORIZED AGENT _____

HOLD SECTION - NOTE DATES AND NAMES OF ALL PERSONS NOTIFIED DURING PROCESSING



APPROVED
Dept. of Building Insp.

MAY 24 2013

Tom C. Hui
TOM C. HUI, S.E.
ACTING DIRECTOR
DEPT. OF BUILDING INSPECTION

BLDG. FORM 3/8
MAY 24 2013
APPROVED FOR ISSUANCE
APPLICATION NUMBER
2013-0524-1753
APPROVAL NUMBER

**APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS**

FORM 3 ☐ OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIREDFORM 8 ☒ OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUANCE

2 NUMBER OF PLAN SETS 1513

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION**

APPLICATION IS HEREBY MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION 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 HEREINAFTER SET FORTH.

DO NOT WRITE ABOVE THIS LINE

DATE FILED 5-24-13	FILED FOR RECEIPT NO. 1294547	(1) STREET ADDRESS OF JOB 792 CAPP ST.	BLOCK & LOT 3637-D198
PERMIT NO. 1294547	ISSUED 5-24-13	(2) ESTIMATED COST OF JOB \$59,700.00	(3) REVISED COST: \$59,700.00
INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY ALL APPLICANTS			
LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING			
(4) TYPE OF CONSTR. V	(5) NO. OF STORIES OF OCCUPANCY 2	(6) NO. OF BARRIERS AND CELLARS 0	(7) PRESENT USE SFD
(8) OCCUP. CLASS R2 R3	(9) NO. OF DWELLING UNITS 1		
DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION			
(10) TYPE OF CONSTR. V	(11) NO. OF STORIES OF OCCUPANCY 2	(12) NO. OF BARRIERS AND CELLARS 0	(13) PROPOSED USE (SFD OR)
(14) OCCUP. CLASS R2 R3	(15) NO. OF DWELLING UNITS 1		
(16) IS AUTO RIGGING TO BE CONSTRUCTED OR ALTERED?			
(17) WELL STREET SPACE TO BE USED DURING CONSTRUCTION?			
(18) ELECTRICAL WORK TO BE PERFORMED?			
(19) MECHANICAL WORK TO BE PERFORMED?			
(20) PLUMBING WORK TO BE PERFORMED?			
(21) GENERAL CONTRACTOR			
ADDRESS JIM PATTERSON - 7410 4th ST 33512 MAY 31, 13			
(22) OWNER - JAMES CHONG (SEE 2ND)			
ADDRESS KATE KUZANAKI 792 CAPP ST 41219 415 823 4146			
(23) WRITE A DESCRIPTION OF ALL WORK TO BE PERFORMED UNDER THIS APPLICATION (REFERENCE TO PLANS IS NOT SUFFICIENT)			
REPLACE PERIMETER CONCRETE FOUNDATION (APPROX 204' LINEAL)			
REPLACE APPROX 8 SHEETS SUBFLOORING			
BUILD APPROX 48' LINEAL Cripple WALL			
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION			
(24) DOES THIS ALTERATION CREATE ADDITIONAL HEIGHT OR EXCEED TO BUILDING CODE?			
(25) IF YES, STATE EXCEED LINE OF FRONT			
(26) DOES THIS ALTERATION CREATE DECK OR PORCH EXTENSION TO BUILDING?			
(27) IF YES, STATE EXCEED LINE OF FRONT			
(28) DOES THIS ALTERATION EXCEED ANY OTHER EXISTING BLDG OR LOT PLANS?			
(29) IF YES, STATE EXCEED LINE OF FRONT			
(30) ARCHITECT OR ENGINEER (SEE 2ND)			
ADDRESS DAVID WILSON 170 COLUMBUS AVE C3567			
(31) CONSTRUCTION LEADER (ENTER NAME AND ADDRESS DESIGNATION IF ANY, IF THERE IS NO DESIGN CONSTRUCTION LEADER, ENTER "NONE")			

IMPORTANT NOTICES

No change shall be made in the character of the occupancy or use without first obtaining a Building Permit and following such change. See San Francisco Building Code and San Francisco Housing Code.

No portion of building or structure or scaffolding used during construction, to be closer than 10' to any wire carrying more than 750 volts flow the 200, California Power Code.

Pursuant to San Francisco Building Code, the building permit shall be posted on the job. The owner is responsible for removal, care and replacement being kept at building site.

Details from as shown on drawings accompanying this application are assumed to be correct. If actual ground lines are not the same as shown on drawings showing correct ground lines, note and file together with complete details of existing walls and wall footings required must be submitted to this department for approval.

ANY VIOLATION REQUIRED HEREIN ON BY CODE MAY BE APPEALED.

BUILDING NOT TO BE OCCUPIED UNTIL CERTIFICATE OF FINAL COMPLETION IS POSTED ON THE BUILDING OR PERMIT OF OCCUPANCY GRANTED, WHEN REQUIRED.

APPROVAL OF THIS APPLICATION DOES NOT CONSTITUTE AN APPROVAL FOR THE ELECTRICAL WORKS OR PLUMBING INSTALLATIONS. A SEPARATE PERMIT FOR THE WORKS AND PLUMBING MUST BE OBTAINED. SEPARATE PERMITS ARE REQUIRED IF ANSWER IS "YES" TO ANY OF ABOVE QUESTIONS (16) (17) (18) (19) (20) OR (24).

THIS IS NOT A BUILDING PERMIT. NO WORK SHALL BE STARTED UNTIL A BUILDING PERMIT IS ISSUED.

In drawings all building materials must have a dimension of not less than two inches from all obstructions or equipment.

CHECK APPROPRIATE BOX

☐ OWNER ☐ ARCHITECT

☐ ENGINEER ☐ ENGINEER

☐ CONTRACTOR ☐ CONTRACTOR

APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY AND AGREE THAT IF A PERMIT IS ISSUED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION DESCRIBED IN THIS APPLICATION, ALL THE PROVISIONS OF THE PERMIT AND ALL LAWS AND ORDINANCES THEREOF WILL BE COMPLIED WITH.

2003-03 (REV. 1/02)

NOTICE TO APPLICANT

HOLD HAZARDOUS CLAIMS. The permittee by acceptance of the permit, agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the City and County of San Francisco from and against any and all claims, demands and actions for damages resulting from operations under this permit, regardless of negligence of the City and County of San Francisco, and to assume the defense of the City and County of San Francisco against all such claims, demands or actions.

In conformity with the provisions of Section 2600 of the Labor Code of the State of California, the applicant shall have coverage under (1), or (2) designated below or shall indicate term (3), or (4), or (5), whichever is applicable. If however term (4) is checked term (5) must be checked as well. Mark the appropriate method of compliance below.

I hereby affirm under penalty of perjury under the following declarations:

(1) I have and will maintain a certificate of agreement to self-insure for workers' compensation, as provided by Section 2700 of the Labor Code, for the performance of the work for which this permit is issued.

(2) I have and will maintain workers' compensation insurance, as required by Section 2700 of the Labor Code, for the performance of the work for which this permit is issued. My workers' compensation insurance number and policy number are:

Owner *YONG*
Policy Number *WCC 0298600*

(3) The cost of the work to be done is \$100 or less.

(4) I certify that in the performance of the work for which this permit is issued, I shall not employ any person in any manner so as to become subject to the workers' compensation laws of California. I further acknowledge that I understand that in the event that I should become subject to the workers' compensation provisions of the Labor Code of California and not to comply herewith with the provisions of Section 2600 of the Labor Code, that the permit herein applied for shall be deemed revoked.

(5) I certify as the owner (or the agent for the owner) that in the performance of the work for which this permit is issued, I will employ a contractor who complies with the workers' compensation laws of California and, prior to the commencement of any work, will file a completed copy of this form with the County Clerk's Office.

Jim Patterson 5/24/13
Signature of Applicant or Agent Date

OFFICE COPY

OFFICIAL COPY

SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

CONDITIONS AND STIPULATIONS

REFER TO:	APPROVED:	DATE:	REASON:
	Vivian Huang, DBI MAY 24 2013		
	BUILDING INSPECTOR, DEPT. OF BLDG. Insp.	NOTIFIED MR.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	APPROVED:	DATE:	REASON:
	N/A		
	DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING	NOTIFIED MR.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	APPROVED:	DATE:	REASON:
	BUREAU OF FIRE PREVENTION & PUBLIC SAFETY	NOTIFIED MR.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	APPROVED:	DATE:	REASON:
	MECHANICAL ENGINEER, DEPT. OF BLDG. INSPECTION	NOTIFIED MR.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	APPROVED:	DATE:	REASON:
	Vivian Huang, DBI MAY 24 2013		
	CIVIL ENGINEER, DEPT. OF BLDG. INSPECTION	NOTIFIED MR.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	APPROVED:	DATE:	REASON:
	N/A		
	BUREAU OF ENGINEERING	NOTIFIED MR.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	APPROVED:	DATE:	REASON:
	DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH	NOTIFIED MR.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	APPROVED:	DATE:	REASON:
	REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY	NOTIFIED MR.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	APPROVED:	DATE:	REASON:
	HOUSING INSPECTION DIVISION	NOTIFIED MR.	

I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various bureaus or department noted on this application, and attached statements of conditions or stipulations, which are hereby made a part of this application.

Number of stipulations ☐ OWNER'S AUTHORIZED AGENT _____

HOLD SECTION - NOTE DATES AND NAMES OF ALL PERSONS NOTIFIED DURING PROCESSING

OFFICIAL COPY

SAN FRANCISCO DEPT. OF BUILDING INSPECTION

APPROVED

APR 08 2014

Tom C. Hui
TOM C. HUI, S.E.
DIRECTOR
DEPT. OF BUILDING INSPECTION

REROOFING

PLEASE CALL THE INSPECTION SERVICES AT 575-6955 FOR A FINAL INSPECTION APPOINTMENT, NEW OR REPLACEMENT SHEATING AND SKYLIGHTS REQUIRES A SEPARATE BUILDING PERMIT.

BLDG. FORM 3/8

4/8/14

APPROVAL NUMBER: 2014-08-2714

APPROVAL NUMBER: 2014-08-2714

APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

FORM 3 ☐ OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED

FORM 8 ☒ OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUANCE

NUMBER OF PLAN SETS: 2

▼ DO NOT WRITE ABOVE THIS LINE ▼

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

APPLICATION IS HEREBY MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION 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 HEREINAFTER SET FORTH.

INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY ALL APPLICANTS

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING

(1A) TYPE OF CONSTR. ☒ (1B) NO. OF STORIES OF OCCUPANCY: 1 (1C) NO. OF BASEMENTS AND CELLARS: 0 (1D) PRESENT USE: Single Family Residence (1E) OCCUP. CLASS: R3 (1F) NO. OF DWELLING UNITS: 1

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION

(2A) TYPE OF CONSTR. ☒ (2B) NO. OF STORIES OF OCCUPANCY: 1 (2C) NO. OF BASEMENTS AND CELLARS: 0 (2D) PROPOSED USE (LEGAL USE): Single Family (2E) OCCUP. CLASS: R3 (2F) NO. OF DWELLING UNITS: 1

(10) IS AUTO RAILWAY TO BE CONSTRUCTED OR ALTERED? YES ☐ NO ☒ (11) WILL STREET SPACE BE USED DURING CONSTRUCTION? YES ☐ NO ☒ (12) ELECTRICAL WORK TO BE PERFORMED? YES ☐ NO ☒ (13) PLUMBING WORK TO BE PERFORMED? YES ☐ NO ☒

(3A) GENERAL CONTRACTOR: [Signature] ADDRESS: 830 AVENUE ST 94140 PHONE: 415-355-8894 CALIF. LIC. NO.: 886945 EXPIRATION DATE: 6-30-15

(14) OWNER - LESSOR (CROSS OUT ONE): Kuzminsky, Kathleen ADDRESS: 792 CAPP ST SAN FRANCISCO CA 94109

(16) WRITE IN DESCRIPTION OF ALL WORK TO BE PERFORMED UNDER THIS APPLICATION (REFERENCE TO PLANS IS NOT SUFFICIENT): ONE LAYER OF BASE ASPHALT #30 MIXED COMPOSITION SKIOL GKS REBAR EDGE METAL FLASHING

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

(17) DOES THIS ALTERATION CREATE ADDITIONAL HEIGHT OR STORY TO BUILDING? YES ☐ NO ☒ (18) IF (17) IS YES, STATE NEW HEIGHT AT CENTER LINE OF FRONT: 20'1" (19) DOES THIS ALTERATION CREATE DECK OR PORCH EXTENSION TO BUILDING? YES ☐ NO ☒ (20) ANY OTHER EXISTING BLDG. ON LOT (IF YES, SHOW ON LOT PLAN)? YES ☐ NO ☒ (21) WILL SIDEWALK OVER SUB-GRADWALK SPACE BE REPAIRED OR ALTERED? YES ☐ NO ☒ (22) WILL BUILDING EXTEND BEYOND PROPERTY LINE? YES ☐ NO ☒ (23) DOES THIS ALTERATION CONSTITUTE A CHANGE OF OCCUPANCY? YES ☐ NO ☒ (24) DOES THIS ALTERATION CONSTITUTE A CHANGE OF OCCUPANCY? YES ☐ NO ☒

(25) ARCHITECT OR ENGINEER (DESIGN ☒ CONSTRUCTION ☐): [Signature] ADDRESS: [Signature]

(26) CONSTRUCTION LEADER (ENTER NAME AND BRANCH DESIGNATION IF ANY, IF THERE IS NO KNOWN CONSTRUCTION LEADER, ENTER "UNKNOWN")

IMPORTANT NOTICES

No change shall be made in the character of the occupancy or use without first obtaining a Building Permit authorizing such change. See San Francisco Building Code and San Francisco Planning Code.

No portion of building or structure or existing work during construction is to be closer than 8' to any wall or structure more than 7' high. See Sec. 300, California Penal Code.

Pursuant to San Francisco Building Code, the building permit shall be posted on the building site.

Grade lines as shown on drawings accompanying this application are assumed to be correct. If actual grade lines are not the same as shown, revised drawings showing correct grade lines, cuts and fills, and complete details of retaining walls and wall footings must be submitted to this department for approval.

ANY VIOLATION OF THIS PERMIT OR OF ANY OTHER LAW MAY BE APPEALED.

BUILDING NOT TO BE OCCUPIED UNTIL CERTIFICATE OF FINAL COMPLETION IS POSTED ON THE BUILDING OR PERMIT OF OCCUPANCY GRANTED, WHEN REQUIRED.

APPROVAL OF THIS APPLICATION DOES NOT CONSTITUTE AN APPROVAL FOR THE ELECTRICAL WIRING OR PLUMBING INSTALLATIONS. A SEPARATE PERMIT FOR THE WIRING AND PLUMBING MUST BE OBTAINED. SEPARATE PERMITS ARE REQUIRED IF ANSWER IS "YES" TO ANY OF ABOVE QUESTIONS (10) (11) (12) (13) (22) OR (24).

THIS IS NOT A BUILDING PERMIT. NO WORK SHALL BE STARTED UNTIL A BUILDING PERMIT IS ISSUED.

In drawings, all insulating materials must have a minimum of not less than two inches from all electrical wires or equipment.

CHECK APPROPRIATE BOX:

☒ OWNER ☐ ARCHITECT

☐ LESSOR ☐ AGENT

☒ CONTRACTOR ☐ ENGINEER

APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY AND AGREE THAT IF A PERMIT IS ISSUED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION DESCRIBED IN THIS APPLICATION, ALL THE PROVISIONS OF THE PERMIT AND ALL LAWS AND ORDINANCES THEREIN WILL BE COMPLIED WITH.

REV 06/13

NOTICE TO APPLICANT

HOLD HARMLESS CLAUSE. The permittee(s) by acceptance of the permit, agree(s) to indemnify and hold harmless the City and County of San Francisco from and against any and all claims, demands and actions for damages resulting from operations under this permit, regardless of negligence of the City and County of San Francisco, and to assume the defense of the City and County of San Francisco against all such claims, demands or actions.

In conformity with the provisions of Section 3800 of the Labor Code of the State of California, the applicant shall have worker's compensation coverage under (1) or (2) designated below, or shall indicate that (3), (4), or (5), whichever is applicable. If however item (5) is checked, item (3) must be checked as well. Mark the appropriate method of compliance below.

I hereby affirm under penalty of perjury one of the following declarations:

(1) I have and will maintain a certificate of consent to self-insure for worker's compensation, as provided by Section 3700 of the Labor Code, for the performance of the work for which this permit is issued.

(2) I have and will maintain worker's compensation insurance, as required by Section 3700 of the Labor Code, for the performance of the work for which this permit is issued. My worker's compensation insurance carrier and policy number are:

Carrier: STATE FUND INSURANCE

Policy Number: 40324413

(3) The cost of the work to be done is \$100 or less.

(4) I certify that in the performance of the work for which this permit is issued, I shall not employ any person in any manner so as to become subject to the worker's compensation laws of California. I further acknowledge that I understand that in the event that I should become subject to the worker's compensation provisions of the Labor Code of California and fail to comply forthwith with the provisions of Section 3800 of the Labor Code, that the permit herein applied for shall be deemed revoked.

(5) I certify as the owner (or the agent for the owner) that in the performance of the work for which this permit is issued, I will employ a contractor who complies with the worker's compensation laws of California and who, prior to the commencement of any work, will file a completed copy of this form with the Central Permit Bureau.

Signature of Applicant or Agent: [Signature] Date: 4-8-2014

OFFICE COPY

SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION		CONDITIONS AND STIPULATIONS			
OFFICIAL COPY	REFER TO:	APPROVED:	<u>H. Zee</u> HOWARD ZEE, DBI	DATE:	
			APR 08 2014	REASON:	
			BUILDING INSPECTOR, DEPT. OF BLDG. INSP.	NOTIFIED MR.	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	APPROVED:	<u>mlg</u>	DATE:	
			DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING	REASON:	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	APPROVED:		NOTIFIED MR.	
			BUREAU OF FIRE PREVENTION & PUBLIC SAFETY	DATE:	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	APPROVED:		REASON:	
			MECHANICAL ENGINEER, DEPT. OF BLDG. INSPECTION	NOTIFIED MR.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	APPROVED:		DATE:		
		CIVIL ENGINEER, DEPT. OF BLDG. INSPECTION	REASON:		
<input type="checkbox"/>	APPROVED:		NOTIFIED MR.		
		BUREAU OF ENGINEERING	DATE:		
<input type="checkbox"/>	APPROVED:		REASON:		
		DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH	NOTIFIED MR.		
<input type="checkbox"/>	APPROVED:		DATE:		
		REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY	REASON:		
<input type="checkbox"/>	APPROVED:		NOTIFIED MR.		
		HOUSING INSPECTION DIVISION	DATE:		
			REASON:		
			NOTIFIED MR.		

HOLD SECTION - NOTE DATES AND NAMES OF ALL PERSONS NOTIFIED DURING PROCESSING

I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various bureaus or departments noted on this application, and attached statements of conditions or stipulations, which are hereby made a part of this application.

Number of attachments ☐

OWNER'S AUTHORIZED AGENT _____

Good evening

I've been living next to 792 Capp Street for more many years and I'm against the project proposal ..I pay hundreds of dollars for the apartment I lived in and this apartment was advertised with a nice view..literally I'm paying for the view and the proposal project of 4 story building it will block my view and I won't have privacy in apartment. I am against this particular proposal. Please preserve our neighborhood.....

Sincerely

FV

To: Michael Christensen

Hello! My name is Davian Contreras and I am a lifelong resident of the 700 block of Capp Street.

I am writing to express my deep fear concerns regarding the proposal to demolish 792 Capp Street, a beautiful home on a historic block.

This neighborhood has taken on more than its fair share new arrivals and disruptive construction, and we can no longer afford to let the integrity and soul of our historic neighborhood die.

This new construction is not intended to benefit anyone of modest means - it only forces more of us out. The neighborhood will not allow a greedy developer to destroy our beautiful neighborhood. Greed cannot be rewarded, and this project is not welcomed by us residents.

Can you please send me information on this? I look forward to hearing back from you soon. Thank you!

Best,

Davian Contreras

Hello Michael,

Please oppose this application to replace the 2 story single family home with a 40ft 4 luxury apartment on our beloved Capp Street. The home was just remodeled to stay as a single family home. Our street is one of the last that remain untouched. It is like if you built a 40ft story apartment building in the middle of the painted ladies in SF, that would be wrong. It is a landmark the last of the original homes. My window view in my Livingroom looks out to that home, you would be taking away my view and replace it with a 40ft tall shadow on my street. I have been a resident of Capp Street my entire life and could not bear to see such an intrusive building let alone the additional traffic it would create as well even more parking hurdles with more people moving to a street that has exceeded its capacity. On Saturdays the neighbors often play music on the corner. The newbies that would live in this luxury apartment would not understand the importance of our community music on Saturdays, block parties and it would give big developers to frequent more homes they can chop down and build monstrous building in our neighborhood. There is no benefit to our community, you will threaten our community and provoke big deals to our property owners and risk the families that are already here renting. Please use this as a lesson to them and vote NO on this for our community's sake.

Thank you,

Andrea

Dear Michael,

I am saddened to see that 792 Capp Street, where local musicians play, will be demolished and replaced by a 4 story, 4 unit luxury complex. The last thing the San Francisco bay area needs is another un-affordable housing complex that the people from your community cannot afford; mainly low income people of color. I personally have been pushed out of housing three times and I am a 34 year old Microbiologist with a M.S. in Biology and a huge student debt that allows me not to be able to afford housing. We bay area community members would like to see our arts and music thrive in the communities they originate from and without these necessary arts and artists that culture and community will be lost. We all love to go to San Francisco to see local music, eat local foods and interact with the locals that have historical stories about the community they were raised in and the indigenous Ohlone land we reside on. I do not want it to just be another soulless rich community filled with privileged people that just want to make a dollar for themselves and not help San Francisco become vibrant with the arts and local community events.

Sincerely,

Katie Vigil

I am a concerned Capp Street Resident that this is even a topic of consideration. SF is losing more and more native residents due to developers like this one, coming into a community neighborhood rich in culture and want to build something that does not belong. The Mission District has been under attack with high rent increases and you are jeopardizing all of us renters that are still here. You will make it appealing to the building owners to sell out to greedy developers like this one. PLEASE STOP THIS FOR THE CHILDREN, FAMILIES and ELDERLY RESIDENTS ON CAPP STREET AND THE REST OF SAN FRANCISCO!!!!!!

Thank you,

David Avelar

Hello Michael-

I am a resident of 751 Capp St and I am writing to provide my feedback re: the proposal to demolish the current building at 792 Capp St and to replace it with a 4 story building.

I am a business owner who moved to the Mission from SOMA where I lived in the 4th and Folsom area and located my business in the 7th and Howard neighborhood. I watched how development changed the community from an independent up--and-coming neighborhood where it was safe for my all-female workforce to an empty set of streets filled with luxury condos up above and the homeless and the addicted down below.

For this reason, I am opposed to the development of a set of condos at 792 Capp St. Affordable single family housing is important to the neighborhood - these residents frequent the numerous produce and meat shops (plus other independent businesses) on Mission St, they socialize on their porches and they watch out for each other so that I feel safe as a lone

female walking at night. They are part of the fabric of the neighborhood. When I look at the condos on 15th and Van Ness, I do not see this kind of community and I see the rise of the same issues on Mission St north of 16th that I saw 3-5 years in SOMA.

A community needs to be thoughtful about new construction and the impact it would have on social fabric, traffic congestion, safety, the precedent it would set for future projects. To date, I have not seen an open dialogue nor have I seen responsible building practices that consider the total cost to a community of this kind of change.

Please support the community by saying no to the 792 Capp proposal.

Thanks for your time,

Michelle

Hello, my name is Paris Moore. I live at address 751 Capp Street which is across the street from the 792 Capp Street which is currently being looked at to convert into a 4 story 40 foot complex. I am strongly against this idea for many reasons.

1. The complex if built would ruin the block and its Victorian style look on the block which would make for an awkward look.
2. Capp Street is not designed for large 4 story structures like this.
3. Parking is already a pain for us residents; if this complex is built we have to compete with 4 more families worth of cars to compete with. Also during the construction of the complex parking would be even more difficult as spots in the front of the construction area would be hogged by workers and applies on the street. There is already a large complex being built less than a block away and construction area has been hogging 4 entire parking spots in the last 5 months. Not to mention it would also block traffic on the street which is already clustered with cars coming in and out of the street all day.
4. Capp street is not for sale, we've seen this before and it simply doesn't work. Gentrification is killing this city and reconstructing a property which has already been renovated before. There is nothing wrong with the current complex. There's no need for a ridiculous large complex like this.
5. Capp Street is an already busy street and this construction would add further more to the noise pollution. We don't need more unnecessary noise for more unnecessary new residents on an already crowded block. Also once these high rise complexes would be built I'm worried about the kind of people that would be accommodating these luxury complexes. Also will they be used for Airbnb and if it will just be used as a party house which will add too necessary noise pollution.
6. Will the complexes be used for low income San Francisco residents? Or strictly high income renters? We don't need more buyouts and high rises in the mission its simply degrading the integrity of the neighborhood. We don't want more people on this block. Also the new complex if built would block the sun and view from my apartment which is very upsetting to me as I own a cat who enjoys the sun. And I feel it's unfair that my view and sunlight which beams all of the Victorian houses would ruin many things. It's unfair that us residents which have lived on this block anywhere from 5 years to 60+ years would be impacted by some new people

I hope you take my points and other neighbor's points into consideration. Thank you

Paris Moore

Good Afternoon City and County Planner of San Francisco, I am writing to express my concern about the proposed demolition of a beautiful Victorian home located at 792 Capp Street, San Francisco. I am a resident of the Mission District, who's had family living here for generations and added to diverse community, which the Mission District use to be. The first point I want to make to my objection of demolishing this beautiful historic home is that the building itself adds to the history and culture of the neighborhood and the city. There are very few Victorian style homes left in the Mission, and replacing it with a luxury complex will just add onto the gentrification and erasing of the Mission District's identity. The demolition of this home will stand as precedent for future similar homes to meet the same fate.

The second point I want to make is that the Mission District historically has been home to San Francisco's Latino community; a community made up of first, second, third and so on generation Salvadorians, Mexicans, Guatemalans, Colombians, and many other Latin American country descendants. The majority of these populations come from immigrant backgrounds and are generally of low to middle economic class. Building a luxury complex not only will do a disservice to its long standing residents because the majority cannot afford a monthly high-priced luxury unit. For years a majority of the Mission's long-standing residents have been pushed out of their homes because of unlawful evictions and high rent prices.

My final point is that adding a multi-unit luxury housing to the neighborhood and the street will create traffic congestion, in an area that already has a high-volume of traffic congestion. I personally know the neighborhood, and already there are issues with insufficient street parking and hit-and-run accidents in the neighborhood. Adding more people and families to an already congested area will not only further add to present day issues, but create future new issues as well.

Please object to the demolition of 792 Capp Street, San Francisco, and preserve this beautiful home, which adds character to a neighborhood that has been losing it's character for some time now. Thank you for your time Mr. Christensen, I hope you will strongly consider my objections when discussing this proposal.

Kind Regards,

Jonathan Martinez, MSW

Case #2017-001283CUA

Hello Michael,

I hope this email finds you well.

I am writing to you today to voice my disapproval and displeasure for the project/case mentioned above.

The block in question is home to one of the most storied reserve of Classic Victorian homes in San Francisco. These homes are just as much art as are our murals, music and culture. Going

forward with this project will not only be detrimental to the history, culture and overall ambiance of the neighborhood, but will create unnecessary troubles for all residents. Traffic, congestion, parking, and construction noise are some of my concerns with this project. The Mission District has been through enough in recent years, I think it's time that we residents take a stand and take ownership of what is ours and the little that we have left to call our own

I invite you to strongly reconsider the proposal for this project to move forward. It would be great for once if our politicians, leaders and government officials would consider the needs of the residents first as opposed to favoring big money and profits as always. Please help us preserve our historic neighborhood for generations to come.

I am strongly against the demolition of the beautiful home at 792 Capp Street! Please do not move forward with this project!

Dear Commissioners,

My name is Elsa Contreras, I have been a resident of 743 Capp street for 32 years. I am urging you all to oppose the proposal for demolition and construction of four unit luxury condos at 792 Capp Street. SAN FRANCISCO DOES NEED MORE LUXURY HOUSING. Please do not support furthering the divide between the rich and the poor. Longtime residents and sf natives, poor people, working class, people of color-are continually being pushed out of the city we love and have built. Please consider the negative impact this will have on our neighborhood and vote on the side that will serve the greater good of the community, the side that takes social justice and human rights into consideration.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Elsa Contreras

I am a property owner at 688 Capp Street. I have lived at this property for over 10 years. The Mission District and particularly Capp Street does not need luxury housing. It needs housing for working class citizens who have inhabited the Mission for decades. Please do not allow 792 Capp Street to be demolished. Thank you for considering my request.

Ann Nore

Hello My name is Andrea Contreras, My family has lived on Capp Street since 1960

My family are both homeowners and renters on Capp street. My family has lived here since the early 60's. I was raised on Capp Street and my son is the 4th generation to grow up on Capp Street. Natives are a dying breed and we need to preserve our classic and should be a historic San Francisco street which has been thankfully preserved unlike many others in San Francisco. Our street has vibrant culture; neighbors have known each other for decades. We have block parties with live music which many gather around the 792 Capp Street single family home. There are some things that do not belong and one of them is demolishing a beautiful home that we have passed by our entire lives with a 40ft tall luxury complex. This is not what our neighborhood needs. You will block the beautiful sunshine that my living room gathers which makes me feel at home and gives me and my cat peace of mind. We already do

not have enough parking on our street and more people mean more cars. If anything we should be discussing improving the streets like fixing the pot holes and adding speed bumps and better lighting but here we are discussing the possible threat of our future as residents. I AM AFRAID THAT BUILDING A 40FT TALL 4 STORY LUXURY UNIT WOULD CHANGE WHAT WE HAVE NOW. YOU WILL JEOPARDIZE OTHER RESIDENTS BY MAKING IT APPEALING TO WEALTHY DEVELOPERS to contact our landlords and entice them to make the same deals that would force many of us out. These developers ARE NOT INTERESTED IN OUR HISTORY or THE FLIGHT THAT WE MUST TAKE TO STAY IN OUR BELOVED MISSION DISTRICT. This is not affordable housing for those that have been displaced by high rent evictions and questionable fires in the pass 3 years. This proposal is not to benefit our community but actually harm our community. This will make us renters vulnerable, you are sending messages to our landlords to consider that they too may want to sell off their property to big developers and this leaves us, the many renting families with an unknown certainty of where we may have to go if our landlords decide to do the same. Enough is enough we do not have any more capacity in our city to keep building in small neighborhoods streets like ours. A 40ft building does not belong on my street nor does 4 other tenants who may bring on air BnBs, they may rent out each room and double each unit with more people that we cannot take.

PLEASE Keep Developers out of our historic street and Decline this proposal for us San Franciscans!!!!

Thank you,
Andrea

Subject: OPPOSITION TO DEMOLITION/CONSTRUCTION AT 792 CAPP STREET (Project 2017-001283 CUA)

SF Planning Commission

RE: OPPOSITION TO DEMOLITION/CONSTRUCTION AT 792 CAPP STREET
(Project 2017-001283 CUA)

Planning Commission Members:

I oppose the demolition/construction at 792 Capp Street. I have lived at 701 Capp Street for 35 years.

The neighborhood is outraged that this gentrification is being forced down our throats. Nobody wants this except for a few outside developers. This escalates rent and food prices.

Parking has become impossible. The street I live on is blocked by people double parking, waiting for a space. Two construction permits already take up space on my block. More spaces will be taken by construction permit parking and a debris box for this project. When it is finished the new residents will probably take up six more spaces.

The building being demolished is obviously from the asbestos/lead paint era. Previous projects on our block have failed to contain dangerous airborne debris.

This is obviously a city for sale. Major changes are needed in city government.

William Sparks

Dear Planning Commission Members

I am a resident of the 700 block of Capp Street and am sending this letter to inform you of my opposition to the proposed demolition of the single family residence at 792 Capp Street.

I have reviewed the Planning Department Executive Summary Report which was prepared for the original October 12, 2017 hearing date and have many concerns.

Health and Safety

Pertaining to the demolition there was no discussion of whether any analysis had been done of the existing dwelling to verify if it contains asbestos, lead paint, mold or any other harmful materials that need to be abated prior to a demolition. Absent this analysis, the report makes the unfounded conclusion that

"The proposed project will not be detrimental to the health, safety, convenience or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity. There are no features of the project that could be detrimental to the health, safety or convenience of those residing or working the area." (Page 5 of Draft Motion, October 12, 2017, paragraph B.)"

There is absolutely no basis for asserting the demolition will not be harmful to nearby residents without analyzing the presence of potential harmful materials in the existing structure. I was present at the November 27, 2017 meeting of the BOS Land Use Committee where a different but comparable project was discussed and residents noted how flakes of lead-based paint blanketed their street and contaminated their residences after a residential demolition.

Even if specifically toxic materials are not present in the existing structure, (which again has NOT been determined) the planning document provided no was no discussion of how dust and debris would be contained during demolition in a dense urban environment.

Under the section of the planning report regarding "The safeguards afforded to prevent noxious or offensive emissions such as noise, glare, dust and odor;" the report makes the following baseless assertion:

"As the proposed Project is residential in nature, it is unlikely to have the potential to produce noxious or offensive emissions." (Page 6 of Draft Motion, October 12, 2017, paragraph iii.)

This comment completely ignores the potential for airborne dust and debris to affect the neighborhood. No dust control measures such as continuous watering down the site to prevent escape of dust, barriers, and daily removal of dirt piles are specified. A recent construction project at 711 Capp Street (not a demolition) resulted in a dirt pile in the street for weeks which released asthma-causing dust into the environment, demonstrating the obvious need for specific construction controls to be required.

I have lung disease and am extremely worried about these issues. I couldn't possibly stay here during the demolition or external construction phase.

Parking during Construction

Parking for residents of Zone I on Capp Street is already extremely limited and is exacerbated by the many construction projects already underway. The two block stretch of Capp between 22nd and 24th Streets is already full of "no parking" zones due to current construction with many of the signs having two or three months' duration for the "no parking." These blocks cannot absorb a further "no parking construction zone" due to 792 Capp Street.

Permanent Parking Impact

The planning report said there would be just two parking spaces for a four unit building with a potential for eight residents with cars. That leaves six new cars potentially added to on-street parking. Residential parking is already extremely limited on the 700 block of Capp Street, which includes a bar whose patrons occupy much of the available parking until 2 AM. Once the additional residents' cars from 792 Capp Street are added it will greatly exacerbate the untenable parking situation permanently. Despite paying for residential parking we frequently find none is available.

No Affordable Housing

The proposed construction of four luxury units at 792 Capp Street after the demolition of the existing single family home will do NOTHING to help address San Francisco's affordable housing crisis. None of the replacement units will be affordable housing but all will be "market rate." This will only speed up the gentrification process already underway in the Mission, adding to the overall price increases that are forcing long-term residents from their homes. This project sets a terrible precedent of destroying existing housing stock while resulting in a net loss of affordable homes for the community at risk of displacement. There is no compelling reason for this demolition and construction, which is opposed by the impacted surrounding community.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dorothy Graham

701 Capp Street, SF 94110

Planning Commissioners-

We are writing to request that you deny the project at 792 Capp Street as proposed.

As long time Mission residents and business owners, we have witnessed the direct and indirect harm that gentrification has on a community. We ourselves have lost more than 30 friends and neighbors to no-fault and Ellis evictions. Most were forced to leave the city, three of the ones that stayed live in vans on the streets, three couples divorced and all suffered the trauma of having their lives uprooted from their community within short notice. Some are so traumatized they cannot come back to the city to visit us.

In all of the situations, they were evicted for speculation as the land around their homes was gentrified. If the 792 Capp Street project is allowed to move forward in it's current proposal, it will set forth the precedent that land owners can pull a viable single family residence from the market for speculation and every family, many multigenerational, in single family residences

in the Mission district and the entire city will be at risk at a time when we are proposing housing our displaced families in school gymnasiums like a third world country, so that the children can continue their education.

Speculation and greed are the name of the game and Lucas Eastwood has made his intentions clear in the way that he has held a vital family residence in a great time of need off of the rental market to provide a rental property for corporations. In great time of need for affordable housing, he wants to develop 4 luxury units that will not provide housing to our Mission families but will instead put them and the entire community in radius around it at risk. Neighbors and businesses will be displaced with impossible rent increases where allowed and receive notices of Ellis Act and no-fault eviction where rent increases can't get the job done.

We attended a community meeting with Lucas Eastwood where he chose the the Mission Police Station as the venue, knowing that such a location would be an intimidating and fearful space to many of the neighbors of color. But with the tight knit support of one another, many did attend and spoke of the trauma, grief and mental health issues that the gentrification of the Mission has created in the community. They pleaded with Mr. Eastwood to take the longview and consider future effects on the community and to families in single family residences throughout the Mission. They asked him make a compromise to mitigate the harm and yet still make a profit. And the fact that he has not asked for continuance to amend the project, says what many feared.

Lucas Eastwood is in this to wring maximum profit from this piece of land and is agnostic to the contributions to the systematic dismantling of the Mission community and it's diverse culture his project will bring. Please deny this project.

Larisa Pedroncelli

Kelly Hill

1875 Mission Street

Lucas Eastwood
3520 20th Street, Suite B
San Francisco, CA 94110

Re: 792 Capp Street and Outreach Work Since the Last Commission Hearing

Dear President Rich Hillis and Commissioners,

My name is Lucas Eastwood and for the past 10 years, I have been a builder in San Francisco. My office is in the Mission, and while I used to live in the Mission, my family and I now live in Bernal Heights. I spent my childhood on the Umatilla Indian reservation in Oregon and am an enrolled member of the Cayuse Nation (a federally recognized Indian tribe).

Seeking a way out of reservation life, I joined the US Army as an opportunity to serve my country and also access education; I enlisted on September 4, 2001, and quickly found myself overseas. I served in Iraq and Afghanistan soon after 9/11, and moved to San Francisco 13 years ago.

I have always considered myself someone who is dedicated to service, and whether it applies to my country or my community, I do not take the responsibility lightly. For example, I have been working with the Friendship House for over ten years, a Mission-based non-profit that helps Native Americans through the recovery process, then assists them with job placement. I am also proud to be involved with Mission Bit, a Mission-based non-profit that aims to end generational poverty by providing free computer coding education to inner city kids in San Francisco (there's a letter from their CEO attached).

I moved to the Mission in 2005 and started building homes in 2007; I am lucky enough to now employ over 20 full-time employees who live in and around San Francisco, including in the Mission itself. We are proud of the quality of our work and I am proud of the relationships I have built with my employees, my clients, and the community. My hope is to continue to live, work and build in San Francisco for a long time to come.

As we approach our third hearing, I want to make known the outreach efforts that my team and I have made, in earnest, to the Mission community. To be candid, this has been an extremely humbling process. I am grateful for the commission's suggestion that I perform outreach, as it has provided valuable insight into the community in which I am working and building; insight that I did not have when I first brought this project to the Commission.

Having done extensive outreach, I feel more connected to my neighbors, and more aligned with the concerns of this community. I have had difficult conversations with folks with whom I might not necessarily have otherwise connected. It's been a series of teachable moments and I have learned a lot. I am grateful for the recent support I have received from the Capp Street residents and other Mission residents; attached are 16 letters of support from members of the community, and I anticipate more to follow.

The following is a brief recap of our outreach efforts: In December of 2017, I gathered the names and email addresses of the community members who had showed opposition to my project. I sent emails to Davian Contreras, Erick Arguello, Dorothy Graham and others, requesting a phone call or a meeting, and called all the phone numbers I could find. We were successful in getting in touch with Father Jimenez, a community member who spoke in opposition to my project at the December hearing but was gracious enough to take our call. His advice was to keep reaching out to Erick Arguello as he thought Calle 24 would likely be willing to have a meaningful conversation.

I continued making phone calls and sending emails for the next couple months to Mr. Arguello and Mr. Contreras, but didn't have any luck from any of those efforts. (See attached documentation of calls, voicemails and emails to community members.) By not being able to have any conversations, I feel that there was a missed opportunity for dialogue on both sides.

In March, along with my planner Michael Christensen, I started planning a community meeting, to be held in April, at the Mission Community Police Station. We mailed 200+ letters to residents within 150 feet of 792 Capp and invited them to the meeting. There were 19 neighbors who showed up to voice their concerns, as well as a few supporters of the project. The meeting was not as productive as I had hoped; attached is the sign-in sheet, a summary of comments and our team's response to the feedback.

Also in April, we hosted two neighborhood meet-and-greets, in which we set up a table in front of the home, offered donuts and coffee, and spoke with any neighbor or passerby who was willing to talk. We spent one Sunday and one Saturday, from 9:30am to noon, meeting the neighbors (photos and signatures of support attached). We spoke with about 50 people, and were able to get 14 signatures of support and vows of support from a handful of them, many of them Capp Street residents. We also were able to have conversations with folks who didn't support our project, and we were able to hear their reasons, ranging from 'we need affordable housing' to 'I prefer old-style homes over new'. It was beneficial to meet the community members who we weren't already familiar with, and to hear their support, their ideas, and their concerns.

In the meantime, my team and I have been trying to understand how we can contribute to the culture and community that is the Mission; part of why we want to have conversations with this community is to understand what causes are important to them. We have developed a relationship with Arriba Juntos, the Mission-based non-profit that provides job and language training to mostly Latino/Hispanic under-employed members of the Mission community. We are setting up a hiring funnel in an effort to provide entry-level opportunities to the people they serve, and are looking to establish a similar relationship with Swords to Plowshares, a non-profit that supports veterans.

We are also in touch with La Colectiva, a Mission-based non-profit that empowers immigrant women through a cleaning business. We are using them on our projects and are considering renovating their headquarters at cost, with the assistance of their brother organization, SF Day Laborers.

We have also committed to a portion of all new hires coming directly from SF Day Laborers, Arriba Juntos, and the Friendship House, the Mission-based non-profit that helps Native Americans through the rehabilitation and job placement process. Although our project is too small to be required to use the city's First Source hiring program, we have met with their team and have committed to engaging voluntarily in this program.

This has been a humbling experience, from which my team and I have learned a lot. For future projects, we'll begin at the community level, gathering input long before the project goes to commission. We better understand the sensitive nature of the Mission community and we are doing our best to make positive connections and have honest, meaningful dialogue with our neighbors. We have spent the past five months trying to build these community relationships and we will continue to do so, regardless of the outcome of my project.

Lastly, several weeks ago I brought to the Commission my two unit project at 284 Roosevelt Way. I feel that my outreach experience in the Mission, and my style of working with neighbors generally, was demonstrated before you at that hearing. I have attached a letter from former project opponent Neil Hart, a former Planning Department senior staff member who retired after decades of work. Neil describes well my interaction with him and his neighbors. I have put into practice the lessons I have learned thus far, and will continue to be transparent and communicative as I continue to build in San Francisco.

Thank you for guidance throughout this process.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to be 'Lucas Eastwood', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Lucas Eastwood

Neil Hart
278 Roosevelt Way
neilehart@gmail.com
415 793 5629

Re: Case No.:2016-000556CUA
284 Roosevelt Way
Hearing Date: 26 April 2018

25 April 2018


Dear Planning Commissioners:

I live two properties east of, and 25 feet from, the proposed project at 284 Roosevelt Way. Other neighbors involved live to the west of the subject property. The purpose of this letter is to update the Commission on the change in our stance regarding this project. Since submitting my original letter, we have been able to have a highly productive dialogue with Lucas Eastwood, the project sponsor. We have worked together with other neighbors and stakeholders (neighbors on each side, the Residential Builders Association and project sponsor) to come to a resolution that we are happy with, which incorporates the following changes:

1. The third floor set back be extended from 15' to 17'
2. The third floor roof deck be reduced from 10' in depth to 5'
3. All building elevations be painted rustic v-groove siding

I would like to point out that Lucas went out of his way to hear the neighbors' concerns and work with us until we felt comfortable supporting his project. We think this project will be a great addition to our neighborhood and are happy to be in support.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Neil Hart', with a long, sweeping horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Neil Hart
278 Roosevelt Way
San Francisco, CA 94114
neilehart@gmail.com

Davian Contreras	Dorothy Graham	William Sparks
Community member who spoke at hearing and emailed concerns to San Francisco Planning Department	Community member who spoke at hearing and emailed concerns to San Francisco Planning Department	Community Member who emailed concerns to San Francisco Planning Department
dvncontreras@gmail.com; cc'ed savecappstreet@gmail.com on all emails	dorothygraham@msn.com	sparksw@igc.org
Brief phone call: asked Davian for a meeting; he said he would consider 12/20/2017	Email requesting meeting 12/20/2017	Email requesting meeting 12/20/2017
Follow up email requesting meeting 12/20/2017	Email requesting meeting 01/19/2018	Email requesting meeting 01/19/2018
Email requesting meeting 01/19/2018	Email requesting meeting 02/18/2018	Email requesting meeting 02/18/2018
Email requesting meeting 02/18/2018	Email requesting meeting 02/26/2018	Email requesting meeting 03/14/2018
Email requesting meeting 02/22/2018	Email requesting meeting 03/14/2018	No response
Facebook message requesting meeting or call 02/23/2018	No response	Emailed and sent hard copy letter re: community outreach meeting 04/04/2018
Called and left voicemail 02/26/2018	Emailed and sent hard copy letter re: community outreach meeting 04/04/2018	
Email requesting call or meeting 03/14/2018		
No response		
Emailed and sent hard copy letter re: community outreach meeting 04/04/2018		

Paul Monge Rodriguez	Erick Arguello	Jon Jacabo
Community member	Community member / Co-founder of Calle 24	Community member
pmongerodriguez@gmail.com	erick@calle24sf.org (work) eriq94110@gmail.com (personal)	(650) 676-0031
Introduced via Stevon Cook	Recommended by Father Jimenez	Introduced via Niki Solis
Email requesting meeting 02/19/2018	Email requesting phone call 02/26/2018	Phone call, left voicemail 02/20/2018
Facebook message requesting meeting or phone call 02/22/2018	Introduced via email through Stevon Cook 02/26/2018	Phone call, left voicemail 02/21/2018
Email requesting phone call or meeting 02/26/2018	Email requesting meeting or phone call 03/01/2018	Official email introduction via Stevon Cook 02/28/2018
Phone call scheduled with Eastwood 03/02/2018	Email requesting call or meeting 03/14/2018	Follow up introductory email requesting meeting 03/01/2018
Paul no answer; waiting on response to reschedule call	No response	No response
Follow-up email requesting phone call reschedule 03/14/2018	Emailed and sent hard copy letter re: community outreach meeting 04/04/2018	
Status: in progress		
Phone call on 03/16/2018; discussed best practices for involving the community in our work		

Roberto Hernandez	Juan Carlos Cancino	Father John Jimenez
Community member	Project Manager at San Francisco Office of Economic and Workforce Development	Community member who spoke at hearing
latinzoneprod@aol.com	juancarlos.cancino@sfgov.org	(415) 240-8095
Email requesting meeting 03/14/2018	Email requesting meeting 03/14/2018	Phone call, left voicemail 02/19/2018
No response	Status: In progress	Phone call, left voicemail 02/21/2018
Emailed and sent hard copy letter re: community outreach meeting 04/04/2018	Emailed and sent hard copy letter re: community outreach meeting 04/04/2018	Phone call, left voicemail 02/26/2018
		Spoke with Father Jimenez: recommended we reach out to Erick Arguello 02/26/2018
		Says that Calle 24 would likely be willing / open to some dialogue.
		Attempt to reach Calle 24 in progress 03/06/2018

**Mission Community discussion
regarding 792 Capp Street**

March 28, 2018

Dear fellow neighbors and Mission Community members,

You are cordially invited to a community discussion regarding the proposed residential project at 792 Capp Street.

We welcome your input and look forward to having an open discussion about the proposed project.

Details:

Date: **Friday, April 13, 2018**


Time: **6:00 to 8:00 pm**

Location: **Community Room, SFPD Mission Station (17th & Valencia)**

All are welcome.

If you have questions, feel free to call our office at (415) 341-0473 or email info@eastwoodsf.com.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Lucas Eastwood', written in a cursive style.

Lucas Eastwood

Misión Asamblea Comunitaria sobre 792 Capp Street

28 de marzo de 2018

Queridos vecinos y miembros de la Comunidad de
Misión,

Está cordialmente invitado a una asamblea comunitaria
sobre el proyecto residencial propuesto en 792 Capp
Street.

Agradecemos su aportación y esperamos tener una
charla abierta sobre el proyecto que se propone.

Detalles:

Fecha: **viernes, 13 de abril de 2018**


Hora: **6:00 a 8:00 pm**

Ubicación: **Sala comunitaria, estación de
misión SFPD (17th y Valencia)**

Todos son bienvenidos.

Si tiene alguna pregunta, no dude en llamar a nuestra
oficina al (415) 341-0473 o envíe un correo electrónico a
info@eastwoodsfc.com.

Gracias



Lucas Eastwood

COMMUNITY OUTREACH MEETING

For

792 Capp Street, San Francisco

Held: Friday, April 13, 2018 at the Community Room, Mission SFPD Station

Attendees:

NAME	ORGANIZATION	EMAIL/TELEPHONE NUMBER
<u>ERICK Arguello</u>	<u>Calles 24 LCA</u>	<u>ERICK@Calles24SF.org</u>
<u>Mark Sorenson</u>	<u>USM/calle 24</u>	<u>mariesorenson@yahoo.com</u>
<u>Robert Ostertag</u>	<u>neighbor directly adjacent</u>	<u>bob.ostertag@mac.com</u>
<u>Elizabeth Bell</u>	<u>neighbor</u>	<u>obispa@sbcglobal.net</u>
<u>Kelly Hill</u>	<u>neighbor</u>	<u>factory 1 @ mac.com</u>
<u>LARISA PEDRONCELLI</u>	<u>USM</u>	<u>factory 1 @ mac.com</u>
<u>Michael Christensen</u>	<u>Planning</u>	<u>415-575-8742</u>
<u>Dorothy Graham</u>	<u>neighbor on Capp Street</u>	<u>dorothygraham@msn.com</u>
<u>Carlos Bocanegra</u>	<u>Mission Neighborhood Centers 362 Capp St</u>	<u>Carlos.bocanegra@mncsf.org</u>
<u>Elsa Contreras</u>	<u>Capp St. Neighbor</u>	<u>ec42@humboldt.edu</u>
<u>Marina Binsack</u>		<u>marinabinsack@gmail.com</u>

COMMUNITY OUTREACH MEETING

For

792 Capp Street, San Francisco

Held: Friday, April 13, 2018 at the Community Room, Mission SFPD Station

Attendees:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>EMAIL/TELEPHONE NUMBER</u>
<u>Estela R Garcia</u>	<u>Instituto Familiar de la Raza, Inc</u>	<u>^{estela.} egarcia@ifrsf.org</u>
<u>Kassandra Kaeher</u>	<u>518 Valencia</u>	<u>KKaeher15@gmail.com</u>
<u>VICTOR</u>	<u>415 3094703</u>	<u></u>
<u>Virginia S.</u>	<u>751 Capp</u>	<u>415)260 5123</u>
<u>Andrea Contreras</u>	<u>Neighbor</u>	<u>onlyonandrea@gmail.com</u>
<u>MARIA Jo Hernandez</u>	<u>719-721 Capp</u>	<u>MyNEmini@Comcast-Net</u>
<u>Fr John Jimenez</u>	<u>SF Charles / ACCE</u> <u>713 S. Van Ness</u>	<u>jajimenez4@yahoo.com</u>
<u>Vanessa</u>	<u>Alvarado</u> <u>778 Capp St.</u> <u>San Francisco, CA</u> <u>415.410.6241</u>	<u>Vanessa778415@</u> <u>hotmail.com.</u>
<u>Robyn Stukalin</u>	<u>Neighbor 757 Capp</u>	<u>robyn.stukalin@gmail.com</u>
<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>

COMMUNITY OUTREACH MEETING

792 Capp Street, San Francisco

Held: Friday, April 13, 2018 (6:00 PM to 8:00 PM) at the Community Room, Mission SFPD Station

Attendees:

Nineteen neighbors and members of neighborhood groups (including Calle 24; Mission Neighborhood Centers; Instituto Familiar de la Raza; Save Capp Street and St. Charles Church)

Michael Christensen, San Francisco Planning Department (assigned project planner)

Lucas Eastwood, Project Sponsor

Daniel Villanueva, Project Architect

Macro Issues raised by neighbors and members of neighborhood groups:

PIPELINE IMBALANCE: More market-rate housing is in the development pipeline than affordable housing for the Mission district.

Developments need to truly benefit and not hurt the local community

Projects need to provide equity for lower income people and not displace them

Market-Rate Development brings a new class of people not connected with the neighborhood

Project Team Response:

To correct the pipeline imbalance and associated problems, large sites should be targeted for affordable housing in the Mission such as the parking lot a few doors down from the project site that encompasses half of the west side of the 700 block of Capp Street. Small market-rate projects such as this four-unit infill add much needed housing for people who do not qualify for affordable housing programs.

Project alternatives expressed:

Optimal solution: Single 100% affordable residence

Sale of property to a Mission nonprofit

Project Team Response:

Mission Housing Development Corporation, Mission Economic Development Agency and every other group in the Planning Department's list of Mission Neighborhood Groups have received all notifications about this project.

Thus far neither MHDC nor MEDA have contacted the project team about the project.

If either of these affordable-housing developers wishes to make a bone fide offer to acquire this project, it will be seriously entertained.

Project appearance and construction concerns expressed:

Why is the building proposed at this height?

Why does Planning set such a low bar on design?

Demolition will cause health problems for neighbors in close proximity.

Planning Department (Michael Christensen) Response:

The project is code compliant. Planning has worked with the project team on the height, massing and setback to soften its appearance. The project was reviewed by the Planning Department's Environmental Review Team and found to be exempt under the California Environmental Quality Act.

Future occupancy concern:

This is luxury housing for people with excessive income.

This development would set a precedent for other landlords to displace tenants and develop their properties

Project Team Response:

The current single family residence (purchased two years ago for \$1.5 million) when restored would be significantly more expensive than the proposed units, which are anticipated to sell for \$700k to \$800k for the single-bedroom unit; \$1.0 million for the two-bedrooms unit; and \$1.4 to \$1.8 Million for the three- bedrooms units.

This property was purchased from the owner occupier. No one was displaced. The parcel will go from a single family residence with three bedrooms to four family residences with a combined total of nine bedrooms.

EASTWOOD DEVELOPMENT

BUILDING - DEVELOPMENT - CONSULTING

LICENSE B-959948

3520 20th Street, Suite B

San Francisco, CA 94110

office: (415) 341-0473

email: info@eastwoodsf.com



April 11, 2018

Dear Capp Street friends and community,

My name is Lucas Eastwood and I'm a general contractor in the Mission. I own a business building and remodeling homes in San Francisco and I am writing today because I am working on a project on Capp Street.

By now I am sure you have heard of the proposed project at 792 Capp, or have received an invite to our community meeting on April 13. I invite you to come by 792 Capp Street to learn more about the project. I would love the opportunity to introduce myself, have a coffee and donut with you, and hope to be able to answer any questions or concerns you might have.

A little about me: I am a Native American and was raised on the Umatilla Reservation in Oregon. I am a war veteran and I moved here after serving in Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan and Syria. I am a husband and a father to three beautiful and crazy kids under the age of four.

I would like the opportunity to introduce myself to this community because it's special to me: my wife and I started our family in the Mission and my office is located here. I plan on being part of this vibrant community for a long time.

I would love to continue meeting members of the Capp Street community and I would be grateful if you joined me on either Sunday, April 22 or Saturday, April 28 from 10:00am to 12:00pm for coffee and conversation.

Please stop by and introduce yourself if you can make the time. If you're not available but would still like to chat, my door is always open: feel free to drop by my office at 3520 20th Street or call 415-341-0473.

With appreciation,

Lucas Eastwood

EASTWOOD DEVELOPMENT

BUILDING - DEVELOPMENT - CONSULTING

LICENSE B-959948

3520 20th Street, Suite B

San Francisco, CA 94110

office: (415) 341-0473

email: info@eastwoodsf.com



11 de Abril de 2018

Queridos amigos y comunidad de Capp Street:

Mi nombre es Lucas Eastwood y soy contratista general en la Misión. Tengo un negocio de construcción y remodelación de viviendas en San Francisco y hoy escribo porque estoy trabajando en un proyecto en Capp Street.

Por ahora, estoy seguro de que han oído hablar del proyecto propuesto en 792 Capp, o han recibido una invitación para nuestra reunión comunitaria el 13 de abril. Los invito a pasar por 792 Capp Street para obtener más información sobre el proyecto. Agradezco la oportunidad de presentarme, tomar un café y una dona con usted, y espero poder responder cualquier pregunta o inquietud que pueda tener.

Un poco sobre mí: soy nativo americano y crecí en Umatilla Reservation en Oregon. Soy un veterano de guerra y me mudé aquí después de servir en Iraq, Afganistán, Pakistán y Siria. Soy esposo y padre de tres niños hermosos y locos menores de cuatro años.

Me gustaría la oportunidad de presentarme a esta comunidad porque es especial para mí: mi esposa y yo comenzamos nuestra familia en la Misión y mi oficina se encuentra aquí. Planeo formar parte de esta vibrante comunidad durante mucho tiempo.

Me encantaría seguir reuniéndome con miembros de la comunidad de Capp Street y le agradecería que se uniera a mí el domingo 22 de abril o el sábado 28 de abril de 10:00 a.m. a 12:00 p.m. para tomar un café y conversar.

Pase por aquí y preséntese si puede hacer el tiempo. Si no está disponible pero todavía desea charlar, mi puerta siempre está abierta: siéntase libre de pasar por mi oficina en 3520 20th Street o llame al 415-341-0473.

Con aprecio,

Lucas Eastwood







MON
EXCEPT VEHICLES WITH
AREA PERMITS
MS 12/08 CCST 2M

REDUCED
CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO
CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

MON
EXCEPT VEHICLES WITH
AREA  PERMITS

92





**Supporters for more Housing
At
792 Capp Street, San Francisco**

Please let the San Francisco Planning Commission know that I
support the plans for a new four-unit residential building to replace the
undersized single residence at 792 Capp Street, San Francisco

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>EMAIL/TELEPHONE NUMBER</u>
<u>Lord Ha</u>	<u>769 Capp St.</u>	<u>aastf.org@gmail.com</u>
<u>Brian Kuo</u>	<u>831 Capp St. Apt B</u>	<u>brianpkuo@gmail.com</u>
<u>Chinmay Patwardhan</u>	<u>672 Capp St</u>	<u>703-248 chinmaychin19@gmail.com</u>
<u>Tyler Nisonoff</u>	<u>672 Capp St</u>	<u>ti tylernisonoff@gmail.com</u>
<u>Michael Kremer</u>	<u>763 Capp</u>	<u>mlkremer21@gmail.com</u>
<u>Erasmio Estrada</u>	<u>3258 23rd St</u>	<u>(415) 410-4429</u>
<u>OWEN LINZMAYER</u>	<u>651 CAPP ST.</u>	<u>OWEN.LINZMAYER@gmail.com</u> <u>415 519-1418</u>
<u>JOAQUIN</u>	<u>DIAZ</u>	<u>CAPPA</u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

**Supporters for more Housing
At
792 Capp Street, San Francisco**

Please let the San Francisco Planning Commission know that I support the plans for a new four-unit residential building to replace the undersized single residence at 792 Capp Street, San Francisco

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>EMAIL/TELEPHONE NUMBER</u>
<u>Ruben Vazquez</u>	<u>467 14th</u>	<u>(415) 946 9899</u>
<u>Grissella Perezara</u>	<u>829 Capp St.</u>	<u></u>
<u>Daniel Olson</u>	<u>829 Capp St.</u>	<u></u>
<u>Patti Eng</u>	<u>249 Victoria Street</u>	<u>patti526@yahoo.com</u>
<u>Tina Meadows</u>	<u>1108 9th Ave W 98119</u>	<u>tnamariemeadows@yahoo.com</u>
<u>Bob Sing</u>	<u>725 Capp 94110</u>	<u>(415) 386-1143</u>
<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>
<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>
<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>


792 Capp Support

792 Capp



Letters / Signatures of Support

- 2545 24th St
- 2663 Mission St
- 2669 Mission St
- 2834 Mission St
- 3133 24th St
- 3258 23rd St
- 3345 17th St
- 3435 Cesar Chavez
- 467 14th St
- 651 Capp St
- 672 Capp St
- 68 Landers St
- 715 Florida St
- 725 Capp St
- 763 Capp St
- 765 Capp St
- 769 Capp St
- 780 Capp St
- 829 Capp St
- 831 Capp St
- 970 Hampshire St



**Grand Mission Corp.
c/o: Rosenquest and Associates
2720 Taylor Street, Suite 420
San Francisco, California 94133**

April 25, 2018

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

Subject: 792 Capp – Proposed Demo and Construction of 4-unit Building


Dear Planning Department,

The purpose of this letter is to formally voice my support for the proposed project (demo and proposed construction of a 4-unit building) at 792 Capp Street. Based on the drawings by Winder Gibson Architects, I feel that the project suits the neighborhood and adds much needed housing in our city.

I believe the owner and architect were sensitive to the historical nature of the neighborhood in the design of the proposed building, and I am confident that the proposed design has reflected this.

To reiterate, I am in full support of the proposed project at 792 Capp Street.

Sincerely,



Grand Mission Corporation for
FCW Corp., Owner of
Grand Theater
2663-2669 Mission Street
San Francisco, California 94110

April 3, 2018

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

Subject: 792 Capp – Proposed Demo and Construction of 4-unit Building

Dear Planning Department,

The purpose of this letter is to formally voice my support for the proposed project (demo and proposed construction of a 4-unit building) at 792 Capp Street. Based on the drawings by Winder Gibson Architects, I feel that the project suits the neighborhood and adds much needed housing in our city.

I believe the owner and architect were sensitive to the historical nature of the neighborhood in the design of the proposed building, and I am confident that the proposed design has reflected this.

To reiterate, I am in full support of the proposed project at 792 Capp Street.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark blue ink, appearing to read 'CDAB' with a large, sweeping initial 'C' and a stylized 'D'.

Chris DaCosta
(650) 888-4390
3133 24th Street, #3 (owner)
San Francisco

Elizabeth Bell

October 6, 2017 at 12:03:22 PM PDT

To: Geoff Gibson, Lucas Eastwood

Reply-To: Elizabeth Bell

Re: 792 Capp Street

Hi Geoff and Lucas,

Thanks so much for this! It is much appreciated, and I see no reason not to be supportive of the project. It's beautiful that you maintain communications with neighbors - I expect they will be few and friendly.

All best,
Elizabeth

From: Geoff Gibson <Gibson@archsf.com>

To: Elizabeth Bell <obispa@sbcglobal.net>; Lucas Eastwood <lucas@eastwoods.com>

Sent: Thursday, October 5, 2017 3:14 PM

Subject: RE: 792 Capp Street

Elizabeth,

I have checked in with the owner/builder Lucas. He is ok with an 8am start time for louder construction noises as long as you are supportive of the project. Hopefully this was your only significant concern. As you note, louder construction noises will mean "*use of jackhammers, drills, buzz saws and the like*". Lucas like to maintain a good open line of communication with neighbors throughout construction and is very easy to deal with.

I have cc'd Lucas here so that you are both on this email thread for future reference. We appreciate you working with us on this.

Take care,
Geoff

Geoff Gibson | **Partner**
gibson@archsf.com

t: 415-318-8634 x103
m: 415-577-5310

1898 mission street
san francisco, ca 94103

WINDERGIBSON
a r c h i t e c t s

Geoff Gibson

September 26, 2017 at 1:37:37 PM PDT

To: doron@starboardnet.com

Cc: Christensen, Michael (CPC), Lucas Eastwood

RE: 792 Capp

Doron,

Thanks so much for your support. I have cc'd the planner and the owner here as well.

Take care,

Geoff

Geoff Gibson | **Partner**

gibson@archsf.com

t: 415-318-8634 x103

m: 415-577-5310

1898 mission street

san francisco, ca 94103

W I N D E R G I B S O N

a r c h i t e c t s

From: doron@starboardnet.com [mailto:doron@starboardnet.com]

Sent: Tuesday, September 26, 2017 1:36 PM

To: Geoff Gibson <Gibson@archsf.com>

Subject: 792 Capp

I am the owner of the building directly across the street from 792 Capp. Your project will be a great benefit to the area and I wholeheartedly support this project as proposed. Thank you for your effort in creating more much needed housing.

Doron Baruth

Sent from my iPhone

April 29, 2018

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

Subject: 792 Capp – Proposed Demo and Construction of 4-unit Building

Dear Planning Department,

The purpose of this letter is to formally voice my support for the proposed project (demo and proposed construction of a 4-unit building) at 792 Capp Street. Based on the drawings by Winder Gibson Architects, I feel that the project suits the neighborhood and adds much needed housing in our city.

I believe the owner and architect were sensitive to the historical nature of the neighborhood in the design of the proposed building, and I am confident that the proposed design has reflected this.

To reiterate, I am in full support of the proposed project at 792 Capp Street.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Chris McGee", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Chris McGee

Address
970 Hampshire St. , San Francisco , CA 94110

March 30, 2018

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

Subject: 792 Capp – Proposed Demo and Construction of 4-unit Building

Dear Planning Department,

The purpose of this letter is to formally voice my support for the proposed project (demo and proposed construction of a 4-unit building) at 792 Capp Street. Based on the drawings by Winder Gibson Architects, I feel that the project suits the neighborhood and adds much needed housing in our city.

I believe the owner and architect were sensitive to the historical nature of the neighborhood in the design of the proposed building, and I am confident that the proposed design has reflected this.

To reiterate, I am in full support of the proposed project at 792 Capp Street.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Farbod Farzin', with a stylized flourish at the end.

name

Farbod Farzin

Address

2834 Mission St #302
San Francisco, CA 94110

May 6, 2018

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

Subject: 792 Capp – Proposed Demo and Construction of 4-unit Building

Dear Planning Department,

The purpose of this letter is to formally voice my support for the proposed project (demo and proposed construction of a 4-unit building) at 792 Capp Street. Based on the drawings by Winder Gibson Architects, I feel that the project suits the neighborhood and adds much needed housing in our city.

I believe the owner and architect were sensitive to the historical nature of the neighborhood in the design of the proposed building, and I am confident that the proposed design has reflected this.

To reiterate, I am in full support of the proposed project at 792 Capp Street.

Sincerely,

name



address

GRAND COFFEE
2663 Mission St.
S.F. CA 94110

March 30, 2018

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

Subject: 792 Capp – Proposed Demo and Construction of 4-unit Building

Dear Planning Department,

The purpose of this letter is to formally voice my support for the proposed project (demo and proposed construction of a 4-unit building) at 792 Capp Street. Based on the drawings by Winder Gibson Architects, I feel that the project suits the neighborhood and adds much needed housing in our city.

I believe the owner and architect were sensitive to the historical nature of the neighborhood in the design of the proposed building, and I am confident that the proposed design has reflected this.

To reiterate, I am in full support of the proposed project at 792 Capp Street.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Gottlieb

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jennifer Gottlieb", with a stylized, flowing script.

715 Florida St
San Francisco CA

March 28, 2018

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

Subject: 792 Capp – Proposed Demo and Construction of 4-unit Building


Dear Planning Department,

The purpose of this letter is to formally voice my support for the proposed project (demo and proposed construction of a 4-unit building) at 792 Capp Street. Based on the drawings by Winder Gibson Architects, I feel that the project suits the neighborhood and adds much needed housing in our city.

I believe the owner and architect were sensitive to the historical nature of the neighborhood in the design of the proposed building, and I am confident that the proposed design has reflected this.

To reiterate, I am in full support of the proposed project at 792 Capp Street.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:

ACDBDFF840E447D...

Joe Garvey

415-623-9629
3345 17th Street #5, SF 94110

March 28, 2018

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

Subject: 792 Capp – Proposed Demo and Construction of 4-unit Building

Dear Planning Department,

The purpose of this letter is to formally voice my support for the proposed project (demo and proposed construction of a 4-unit building) at 792 Capp Street. Based on the drawings by Winder Gibson Architects, I feel that the project suits the neighborhood and adds much needed housing in our city.

I believe the owner and architect were sensitive to the historical nature of the neighborhood in the design of the proposed building, and I am confident that the proposed design has reflected this.

To reiterate, I am in full support of the proposed project at 792 Capp Street.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Joshua Gold". The script is fluid and cursive, with the first letter of each word being capitalized and prominent.

Joshua Gold

Phone: 650-336-4346

Address: 68 Landers St, SF

March 30, 2018

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

Subject: 792 Capp – Proposed Demo and Construction of 4-unit Building

Dear Planning Department,

The purpose of this letter is to formally voice my support for the proposed project (demo and proposed construction of a 4-unit building) at 792 Capp Street. Based on the drawings by Winder Gibson Architects, I feel that the project suits the neighborhood and adds much needed housing in our city.

I believe the owner and architect were sensitive to the historical nature of the neighborhood in the design of the proposed building, and I am confident that the proposed design has reflected this.

To reiterate, I am in full support of the proposed project at 792 Capp Street.

Sincerely,

Matan-Paul Shetrit

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'MP Shetrit', with a stylized flourish at the end.

715 Florida St
San Francisco CA

April 16, 2018

San Francisco Planning Department

Subject: 792 Capp – Proposed Demo and Construction of 4-unit Building

Dear Planning Department,

The purpose of this letter is to voice my support for the proposed project at 792 Capp Street. Based on the design of the building and unit mix I think this project is perfect for the Mission.

As a business owner in the community and witness firsthand to extreme shortage of housing in the neighborhood, I strongly believe that small infill projects such as the one proposed are vital to offset the demand for housing of all types.

Lastly, I've known Lucas (project sponsor) for many years and in several capacities. I believe him to be extremely ethical and sensitive to those coming from underrepresented communities. He and his family are long standing members of the community and I'm proud to know them. I respectfully ask that when you decide on the outcome of this project you keep in mind that Lucas and his family are members of the Mission community.

To reiterate, I am in full support of the proposed project at 792 Capp Street.

Sincerely,



OWNER OF JUNIOR BAR 2545 24TH STREET
415.656.6779

March 30, 2018

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

Subject: 792 Capp – Proposed Demo and Construction of 4-unit Building

Dear Planning Department,

The purpose of this letter is to formally voice my support for the proposed project (demo and proposed construction of a 4-unit building) at 792 Capp Street. Based on the drawings by Winder Gibson Architects, I feel that the project suits the neighborhood and adds much needed housing in our city.

I believe the owner and architect were sensitive to the historical nature of the neighborhood in the design of the proposed building, and I am confident that the proposed design has reflected this.

To reiterate, I am in full support of the proposed project at 792 Capp Street.

Sincerely,

Scott Holden

name

Scott I Holden

address

944 Hampshire Street
San Francisco, CA 94110

May 6, 2018

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

Subject: 792 Capp – Proposed Demo and Construction of 4-unit Building

Dear Planning Department,

The purpose of this letter is to formally voice my support for the proposed project (demo and proposed construction of a 4-unit building) at 792 Capp Street. Based on the drawings by Winder Gibson Architects, I feel that the project suits the neighborhood and adds much needed housing in our city.

I believe the owner and architect were sensitive to the historical nature of the neighborhood in the design of the proposed building, and I am confident that the proposed design has reflected this.

To reiterate, I am in full support of the proposed project at 792 Capp Street.

Sincerely,

name 
address

April 3, 2018

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

Subject 792 Capp -- Proposed Demo and Construction of 4-unit Building


Dear Planning Department,

The purpose of this letter is to formally voice my support for the proposed project (demo and proposed construction of a 4-unit building) at 792 Capp Street. Based on the drawings by Winder Gibson Architects, I feel that the project suits the neighborhood and adds much needed housing in our city.

I believe the owner and architect were sensitive to the historical nature of the neighborhood in the design of the proposed building, and I am confident that the proposed design has reflected this.

To reiterate, I am in full support of the proposed project at 792 Capp Street.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Will Zempel". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Will" and last name "Zempel" clearly distinguishable.

Will Zempel

Phone

Address 3133 24th Street, #3

San Francisco (owner)

May 3, 2018

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

Subject: 792 Capp – Proposed Demo and Construction of 4-unit Building


Dear Planning Department,

The purpose of this letter is to formally voice my support for the proposed project (demo and proposed construction of a 4-unit building) at 792 Capp Street. Based on the drawings by Winder Gibson Architects, I feel that the project suits the neighborhood and adds much needed housing in our city.

I believe the owner and architect were sensitive to the historical nature of the neighborhood in the design of the proposed building, and I am confident that the proposed design has reflected this.

To reiterate, I am in full support of the proposed project at 792 Capp Street.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Justin Newton", with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

name

JUSTIN NEWTON

address

3435 CESAR CHAVEZ
SF, CA 94110



missionbit

415 Jackson St, Suite B San Francisco, CA 94111 | (415) 979-5380

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I am writing a letter that speaks to the character, thoughtfulness and generosity of Lucas Eastwood of Eastwood Development. I have gotten to know Lucas and his family over the course of several years through our shared interest in creating opportunities for communities of color.

Lucas is a contributor to Mission Bit, the nonprofit of which I serve as Chief Executive Officer. At Mission Bit we're focused on using coding education to end generational poverty. Given my upbringing in low-income housing and Lucas' on an Indian Reservation, we both know firsthand what education and an affirming community can do to turn someone's life around.

Lucas has done more than just talk about creating opportunities or written a check. He's been creating jobs on his construction projects for people that have been traditionally unemployed. I think his approach is a great model for more people seeking to do business in San Francisco.

Not only do I commend his hiring practices, but I believe he's engaged residents of the neighborhood in a persistent and thoughtful way. He's reached out to several community leaders to start conversations, hosted community meetings, and attended events to learn how he can partner around solutions that support communities we want to keep in San Francisco.

As a native of San Francisco that has seen the effects of gentrification and income-inequality, I know firsthand the implications of these decisions. The members of this commission have been asked to lead our city through this housing shortage while also balancing a number of other important priorities. I commend your work.

On this matter, I ask you to consider the character of the business leader behind this project. We need more developers to follow his example in hiring, philanthropy and community engagement.

Best,



Stevon Cook
Chief Executive Officer
Mission Bit

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

From: **Kate Kuzminski** <kate.kuzminski@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Jan 19, 2018 at 3:00 PM
Subject: Re: Confirming the seller at 792 Capp was not evicted
To: Mary Minor Huck <huckrealty@gmail.com>

Sure. I owned [792 Capp St](#) and it was my primary residence. I vacated it willingly at the time of escrow. Lucas Eastwood purchased the property from me. He did not evict me.

Kate

On Jan 19, 2018, at 2:45 PM, Mary Minor Huck <huckrealty@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Kate,

Kira (buyer's agent) said there had been an assertion by a neighbor that they buyer of Capp Street did some sort of eviction. They have asked if you could please clarify by responding to the email below.

Mary



MARY MINOR HUCK



Realtor, Partner BRE #01723896
P 415.515.9786 **W** core7realestate.com
E huckrealty@gmail.com

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

From: **Kira Mead** <kira@realsfproperties.com>
Date: Fri, Jan 19, 2018 at 2:38 PM
Subject: Confirming the seller at 792 Capp was not evicted
To: Mary Minor Huck <huckrealty@gmail.com>

Hi Mary,

I'm emailing to confirm the transfer of ownership of the sale of [792 Capp St](#) in 2016. When Lucas Eastwood purchased the property from Kathleen Kuzminski she was occupying it as her primary residence. He did not evict her from the home and and she vacated willingly at close of escrow.

Can you please have Kathleen confirm this.

Thank you,

Kira Mead

ZACKS, FREEDMAN & PATTERSON

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

235 Montgomery Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, California 94104
Telephone (415) 956-8100
Facsimile (415) 288-9755
www.zfplaw.com

April 16, 2018

VIA U.S. MAIL AND EMAIL

President Rich Hillis
San Francisco Planning Commission
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: 792 Capp Street (Case No. 2016-001283CUA)
Housing Accountability Act

Dear President Hillis and Planning Commissioners:

Our office represents Lucas Eastwood, who has applied to replace a single family home at 792 Capp Street with a four-unit building (the "Project"). We write regarding the Planning Commission's December 19, 2017 vote of intent to deny the Project.

California's Housing Accountability Act ("HAA"), Government Code § 65589.5, compels the Commission to approve the Project. It would be unlawful for the Commission to treat the HAA as an optional guideline or to deny the Project for reasons not specified in the HAA.

At the Project hearings on October 21 and December 21, 2017, various Commission members raised objections to the Project. While we understand the sentiment behind them, as a matter of law they cannot be used to deny a housing development project under the HAA. Disapproving or conditioning the Project based on subjective criteria such as "neighborhood character" would expose the City to significant litigation risk.

Housing Accountability Act

The HAA applies to market-rate housing development projects and requires that code-compliant projects be approved. Pursuant to new amendments which took effect on January 1, 2018,¹ the HAA imposes significant limitations on a city's discretion to deny permits for housing. The HAA requires, *inter alia*:

When a proposed housing development project complies with applicable, objective general plan and zoning standards and criteria, including design review standards, in effect at the time that the housing development project's application is determined to be complete, but the local agency proposes to disapprove the project or to approve it upon the condition that the project be developed at a lower density, the local agency shall base its

¹ See SB-167 and AB-1515.

decision regarding the proposed housing development project upon written findings supported by substantial evidence on the record that both of the following conditions exist:

(1) The housing development project would have a specific, adverse impact upon the public health or safety unless the project is disapproved or approved upon the condition that the project be developed at a lower density. As used in this paragraph, a “specific, adverse impact” means a significant, quantifiable, direct, and unavoidable impact, based on objective, identified written public health or safety standards, policies, or conditions as they existed on the date the application was deemed complete.

(2) There is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the adverse impact identified pursuant to paragraph (1), other than the disapproval of the housing development project or the approval of the project upon the condition that it be developed at a lower density.

(Gov’t Code § 65589.5(j))

In order to deny the Project, the Commission has the burden of proving that the “proposed project in some manner fail[ed] to comply with ‘applicable, objective general plan and zoning standards and criteria, including design review standards, in effect at the time that the housing development project’s application [was] determined to be complete. . .,’” or making the findings required by the HAA. (Honchariw v. County of Stanislaus (2011) 200 Cal.App.4th 1066, 1081.) Moreover, a housing development project must be deemed:

. . . consistent, compliant, and in conformity with an applicable plan, program, policy, ordinance, standard, requirement, or other similar provision if there is substantial evidence that would allow a reasonable person to conclude that the housing development project . . . is consistent, compliant, or in conformity.

The Project is Compliant

In its report dated October 5, 2017, the Planning Department determined that the Project “meets all applicable requirements of the Planning Code.” (Staff Report at p. 4.) The Project adds three housing units to a currently under-utilized site, in a Zoning District that has no density limits for residential units (RTO-M). The Project thus fulfils Objective 1 of San Francisco’s Housing Element, which aims to increase the City’s housing stock by identifying and making available

for development “adequate sites to meet the City’s housing needs.” The Project site is an appropriate location for denser development, as proposed by the Project.

The Planning Commission raised concerns about the demolition of sound housing, and suggested this as a basis for Project denial. Section 317(g)(5) of the Planning Code lists a number of criteria the Commission can use to determine whether to allow demolition, and *none* includes consideration of whether the housing is “sound.” In fact, this subsection asks whether the property has a history of being maintained in a “decent, safe, and sanitary condition.” (§ 317(g)(5)(B).) If a property has been neglected, it is less likely that the Commission will approve demolition, because the owner has purposely allowed the building to deteriorate in order to increase the likelihood of demolition. Similarly, § 317(g)(5)(A) asks whether there are current building code violations, which implicates similar policy interests. These criteria suggest that an owner who has looked after his or her building should not be disadvantaged when the Commission is considering a demolition application.

Moreover, the existing house is not a “historical resource” under CEQA, and demolition will have no adverse impact under CEQA (§ 317(g)(5)(C)-(D)). The Project will not convert rental housing to other forms of tenure or occupancy (§ 317(g)(5)(E)). And the Project increases the number of on-site Dwelling Units and bedrooms (§ 317(g)(5)(O)-(P)). These criteria all weigh in favor of demolition.

In any case, to the extent any of the 317(g)(5) criteria is not met, this cannot be used to deny or condition the Project. These criteria do not function as an “objective standard” for the purposes of the HAA. Rather, the conditional use “criteria” for residential demolition are inherently subjective. To wit, none of the criteria is dispositive; an application may not satisfy any of the criteria, but the Commission may still approve the demolition. This type of requirement is entirely discretionary; it is not an “objective” standard under the HAA. (Gov. Code, § 65589.5(j)(1)). For example, “whether the project conserves neighborhood character to preserve neighborhood cultural and economic diversity” (SFPC § 317(g)(5)(H)) is precisely the type of consideration the HAA exists to override. Put simply, a provision directing the Planning Commission to “consider” certain criteria does not elevate those criteria to the status of “standards” that can be used under the HAA to deny or condition a project.

Commission Members also asked questions about the affordability of the Project’s housing units. A single-family home on “a site in a RH-1 or RH-1(D) District that is demonstrably not affordable or financially accessible” may be exempted from applying for a Conditional Use Permit for demolition (SFPC § 317(d)(3)). But this subsection cannot be used to deny a code-compliant project based on the affordability of the new housing created. This is doubly true in this case, because the Project is located in an RT-O zone, and Section 317(d)(3) applies only in RH-1 and RH-1(D) zones.

In short, there is no basis for the Commission to deny or condition the Project. Should the Commission disapprove the Project without making the findings required by the HAA, our client would be entitled to a court order or judgment compelling compliance with the HAA within 60 days. Moreover, San Francisco would be liable for our client's attorney's fees and costs. (Gov't Code § 65589.5(k)(1)(A).) If the City failed to comply with any court order or judgment, the court would additionally impose fines of at least \$10,000 per housing unit. (Gov't Code § 5589.5(k)(1)(B).)

The Project Cannot be Denied for Subjective Reasons

Throughout the Project hearings, Commission members raised various objections that are not authorized under the HAA. For example, at the hearing on October 12, 2017, one Commissioner noted "there's not one single modern structure on that block," and expressed concern about demolishing the existing house. Other Commissioners commented that the Project architecture "is modern and not necessarily contextual" and cited the Project's location within the Calle 24 Cultural District as grounds to reduce the number of units.

The primary intent of the Calle 24 Cultural District is to preserve culture, as opposed to buildings. This was brought to the Commission's attention at the second hearing. No objective standards exist related to land use or building design in the Calle 24 Cultural District, and it would not withstand judicial scrutiny to disapprove the Project on the basis that it is located within this District.

Nonetheless, at the second hearing on the project, the Commission requested design modifications to make the Project appear less modern, citing not the buildings on the same block-face as the project, but buildings across the street. Most of the Commission member's comments on design making the building more "compatible" with the neighborhood character. Yet neighborhood character and subjective design choices are not lawful reasons to deny or condition the Project under the HAA. The Project's location in a cultural district does not change this.

In particular, there has been no "specific, adverse impact upon the public health or safety" identified in connection with the Project. Under the HAA, a "'specific, adverse impact' means a significant, quantifiable, direct, and unavoidable impact, based on objective, identified written public health or safety standards, policies, or conditions as they existed on the date the application was deemed complete." (Gov. Code, § 65589.5(j)(1)(A)) A subjective aesthetic or cultural impact has no bearing on any written public health or safety standard.

Despite the questionable validity of the Commission's requests, our client cooperated by providing an updated project design at the second hearing, one which utilizes painted wood siding and fascia board rather than stucco, and changed the garage door to make it more "residential" in character. Again, Planning Department staff recommended approval of the Project, on the basis it "complies with the Planning Code." (Memo to the Planning Commission, December 21, 2017, at p. 1.) Despite these revisions, members of the Commission reiterated their objections at the hearing on December 21, 2017. Their comments included:

The proposed project will affect the neighborhood character. I think it's out of line with neighborhood character. It's not just buildings. We as humans have attachments to places and spaces in this city. We love the city because of the building configuration, the streets, things that make up our environment.

Another Commission member commented: "We talked about the dominos falling and this will be the first of the entire street [that will be demolished] and then there goes the entire street." This statement was made notwithstanding counsel's presentation of other buildings on the same block-face, which demonstrated that all but one building on the block-face has an historic rating or is rent-controlled. The City will very rarely allow demolition of historic or rent-controlled buildings.

The Commission has improperly relied on subjective criteria such as design elements and neighborhood character in its consideration of the Project. The Commission cannot invoke these reasons to deny or condition the Project.

Post Hoc Rationalizations are Not Permitted

At several points, members of the Commission expressed frustration that they might be compelled to approve the Project because of the HAA. At the December hearing, one Commissioner suggested that invoking the HAA was tantamount to "putting a gun to [their] head." Commission members also discussed how to circumvent the HAA by rezoning the neighborhood "so less could be built," or seeking changes to the HAA so that "you can't demolish sound housing."

When the Commission indicated its intent to deny the Project, it did not articulate a basis for the required HAA findings, or even indicate what the findings might be. The closest the Commission came to providing a rationale was that although the property in question is not in an Historic District and none of the buildings on the same side of the street is in an Historic District, "it's a sensitive street with historic resources, and this building is a contributor to it. And that would be

President Rich Hillis

April 16, 2018

Page 6

the rationale.” However, the Staff Report had concluded that the building is not historic and not contributory to any historic district.

When the City Attorney reminded the Commission of its obligation to make specific findings under the HAA to deny the Project, one Commissioner said:

I would ask the Director [of the Planning Department] who gave a strong nod to his interpretation of the Housing Affordability Act to meet with this Commission and have a discussion, together with [the] City Attorney, what reasonable arguments we could make for the City of San Francisco and this particular neighborhood to indeed create strong arguments of why we deny this project.

The record clearly establishes the Commission’s unlawful reasons for denying the Project, and the Commission cannot advance retrospective justifications for its decision. Administrative findings are “not supposed to be a post hoc rationalization for a decision already made. To the contrary, findings are supposed to ‘conduce the administrative body to draw legally relevant sub-conclusions supportive of [the Commission’s] ultimate decision . . .’” (Bam, Inc. v. Board of Police Com’rs (1992) 7 Cal.App.4th 1343, 1346, citing Topanga Assn. for a Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 11 Cal.3d 506, 516).

The Commission’s apparent reluctance to follow the HAA does not change the fact it is bound by it. The HAA and SB-167 were enacted to curtail local agencies’ ability to deny housing development projects. It would also be unlawful to deny or condition a housing development project based on non-compliance with hypothetical future standards that one Commission member suggested adopting to thwart the HAA. The HAA compels approval of a housing development project if it “complies with objective general plan, zoning, and subdivision standards and criteria, including design review standards, **in effect at the time that the . . . application is determined to be complete.**” (Gov’t Code § 65589.5(j), emphasis added.)

Conclusion


We request that the Planning Commission approve the Project. The HAA compels approval of the Project. In the broader context, it is important to recognize that we are in a housing crisis. In September 2017, the Governor signed a package of fifteen bills to address the need for housing, including legislation that further restricts a municipality’s ability to deny or unduly condition the approval of housing development projects. These recent actions by the Legislature and Governor highlight the need to supply sufficient housing.

President Rich Hillis
April 16, 2018
Page 7

We hope that calling your attention to the Housing Accountability Act and related legislation will help resolve the Project application. Please contact me if you would like to discuss this matter further.

Very truly yours,

ZACKS, FREEDMAN & PATTERSON, PC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ryan Patterson", written over a horizontal line.

Ryan J. Patterson

CC: John Rahaim, Director
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Kate Stacy, Deputy City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA 94102

BRETT GLADSTONE
PARTNER
DIRECT DIAL (415) 995-5065
DIRECT FAX (415) 995-3517
E-MAIL BGLadstone@hansonbridgett.com

BY EMAIL ONLY

May 9, 2018

Rich Hillis, President
San Francisco Planning Commission
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: 792 Capp Street – Conditional Use Hearing

Dear President Hillis and Commissioners:

We will be presenting this matter for the third time to you. This letter will describe the changes in the project, and will answer some of the questions from Commissioners at the last hearing. You are also receiving a letter from my client Lucas Eastwood, the general contractor client who is proposing this project, and his letter will bring you up to speed on community outreach and new neighborhood support.

You may recall that this building was recommended for approval by Staff and would build four new units, and no design changes were recommended by Staff. However, the Commission recommended that the façade be changed to take away its modern look because there are some older buildings in an historic district that covers lots across the street (but not lots on the project's side of the street). Please see the changes between the first design and the current one, as shown in Exhibit A. A list of those changes is attached in Exhibit B.

At the last hearing, some opponents suggested that my client did an eviction, and Commissioners asked for the documents showing otherwise. We have presented to your Staff the documents showing my client bought this building for about \$1.4 million from the owner occupant, who desired to sell and relocated. We have also shown Staff there have been no evictions by Lucas Eastwood. The current single-family home was last occupied by an owner-occupant on July 22, 2016 and is vacant today. It was last rented above \$7,000 per month.

I. Staff has recommended approval in its past staff reports and hearing presentations, for several reasons:

1. Building is not historic and is not in an historic district and Calle 24 is a district dealing with culture and local business in buildings but not the buildings themselves.
2. The project is in a high density zoning district intended to maximize units, very close to the Mission Street transit lines.

3. Being small, most of the units are affordable by design (e.g., a three bedroom unit with only one bathroom).
4. The project is next door to a 11 unit apartment building which is four stories.
5. With a two year old appraisal showing \$1.45 million, the value is likely well above that today and is not considered affordable.
6. The previous occupant was the previous owner and there have been no evictions by my client.
7. The Project is not subject to the Mission 2016 Interim Zoning Controls, as it does not result in the loss of a rent-controlled unit, and is not a "medium or large project" as defined by Planning Commission Resolution No. 19865.
8. The existing building is not rent controlled since it is a legal single family home.
9. 75% of the dwellings will have two or more bedrooms, where only 40% is required.
10. The Project is subject to the Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee as well as the Residential Child Care Fee, both of which will provide funds for community and neighborhood improvements.

II. Addressing Discussion At Last Hearing as to Whether Sound Housing Should be Demolished In Favor of New Units.

A Commissioner who was about to vote against the project asked Deputy City Attorney Kate Stacy if the Commission could create a finding under the HAA that this building is "sound housing" and that "sound housing" should not be demolished. Kate Stacy said nothing but other Commissioners then stated that voting against the project by citing the building as "sound housing" runs counter to the Mayor's Directive on new housing, and to Commission policy and numerous Commission votes in favor of density on a property zoned for highest density near a major transit corridor.

In this housing crisis, the Directive and your votes make it clear that when choosing between keeping a non affordable, non-historic dwelling and replacing it with four units in a transit density zoning district, the concern has never been whether a unit is too sound to be demolished. In fact, the Commission has penalized owners for asking for demolition approval where owners have made a property unsound by their own efforts.

You created building demolition criteria (Section 317(g)(5) of the Planning Code) which you use weekly to determine whether to allow demolition, and *none* of the criteria involve keeping a building when it is good condition. In fact, a subsection within the Section 317 you created asks whether the property has a history of being maintained in a "decent, safe, and sanitary condition." (§317(g)(5)(B).) If an owner has been neglecting a building to the point where it is not "sound", it is less likely that the Commission will approve demolition, because it is assumed the owner has purposely allowed the building to deteriorate in order to increase the likelihood of

a demolition approval.¹ In sum, the Section 317 criteria your Commission created means that an owner who has looked after his or her building should not be disadvantaged when the Commission is considering a demolition application.

The Commission set up Section 317 to look at (1) affordability, (2) whether an owner has purposely let the building go downhill to show more easily that renovation is more than 50% of the cost to build new and thus should be demolished, and (3) whether the existing housing is historic, or affordable, or has been subject to bad ownership activity.

The Commission would be going in a new direction, and sending a conflicting message to the public, if it disapproves four new units because an owner has kept his non affordable and non-historic building in sound condition. Such a finding does not contribute to Commission credibility and public understanding of its housing goals. Given it is not written into Section 317 or elsewhere in the Code itself, it would be an HAA violation and a grounds for denial.

III. Addressing Discussion At Last Hearing Whether This Demolition Would Be More Likely to Lead To Demolitions on the Same Side of the Street.

At the last hearing, Commissioner Richards asked how we would respond to Commissioner Melgar's concern that the demolition of this building would start a precedent for the block face, and there would be one demolition after another.

The photos attached in Exhibit C indicate that to not be likely. These photos show that except for the small building next door, the buildings on the block face and across the street are three or four stories and reach a height of about forty feet. That means they are rental buildings and protected by Rent Control. And we demonstrated at the last hearing that except for the subject property, all buildings except 786 Capp Street have historic designations. It has not been the custom and practice of the Commission to allow demolition of historic buildings or rental housing, and we doubt that will change anytime soon. As a result, we feel that the so called "domino effect" on this side of the block is not a realistic possibility.

Very truly yours,



Brett Gladstone

cc: Planner Michael Christensen
Property Owner Lucas Eastwood
Architect Geoffrey Gibson

¹ For the same reason, Section §317(g)(5)(A) asks whether there are current building code violations, and this is meant to trigger a Staff and Commission discussion as to whether the owner is trying to make a demolition easier by making a building "unsound."

EXHIBIT A

Original Design Drawings

1 of 3



Original Design Drawings

2 of 3



Original Design Drawings

3 of 3



Current Design Drawings

(Attached)



2 STREET VIEW - FORMER DESIGN



1 STREET VIEW - CURRENT DESIGN

WINDER
GIBSON
architects

interiors
planning
architecture

www.archsf.com

t: 415. 318.8634

1898 mission street
san francisco, ca 94103



792 CAPP ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110

CU REVISION

PROJECT REPRESENTATIONS



A 9.02

DATE 04/13/18

SCALE

DRAWN HP, DV

CURRENT DESIGN DRAWINGS



③ STREET VIEW - SOUTHEAST



② STREET VIEW - NORTHEAST



① STREET VIEW - FRONT

WINDER
GIBSON
architects

interiors
planning
architecture

www.archsf.com

t: 415. 318.8634

1898 mission street
san francisco, ca 94103



792 CAPP ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110

CU REVISION


VIEWS FROM STREET

A 9.01


DATE 04/13/18

SCALE

DRAWN HP, DV



① MAXIMUM PLANNING ENVELOPE



② MAXIMUM PLANNING ENVELOPE


WINDER
GIBSON
architects

interiors
planning
architecture

www.archsf.com

t: 415. 318.8634

1898 mission street
san francisco, ca 94103



792 CAPP ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110

CU REVISION


MAXIMUM PLANNING ENVELOPE

A 0.50

DATE 12/13/17

SCALE

DRAWN HP, DV



1 EXISTING SITE PLAN
3/16" = 1'-0"

WINDER
GIBSON
architects

interiors
planning
architecture

www.archsf.com

t. 415. 318.8634

1898 mission street
san francisco, ca 94103



792 CAPP ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110

CU REVISION

EXISTING SITE PLAN



A 1.00

DATE 04/13/18

SCALE 3/16" = 1'-0"

DRAWN HP, DV

EXHIBIT B

List of Changes in Design

Lucas Eastwood has taken the design recommended by Planning Staff to you. Due to Commission suggestions at the last hearing Lucas has changed the façade design, fenestration and materials to better reflect the Mission District context and to integrate commonly found elements from the two adjacent buildings.

Those changes include but are not limited to:

1. More contextual and traditional elements in keeping with the streetscape and Mission area.
2. A two-step casing and well as traditional sills with horns at all windows.
3. Further banding and stepping at the cornices, base band, and other locations.
4. Entry door has a more traditional appearance and style as well as the canopy above.
5. A front door stoop that Commissioner Christine Johnson asked be made more prominent.
6. A cornice made up of multiple horizontal bands has been created.
7. The windows will now be clad-wood, in the double hung window style of nearby buildings.
8. The windows will now have more pronounced casings.
9. The building now has a projecting cap and fascia board at the top of the front volumes.
10. The garage door style and entry doors have become more residential in design.
11. More of the façade is showing a horizontal wood type siding.

EXHIBIT C


Photos of Block Face & Subject Property

(Attached)



792 CAPP STREET

PHOTO KEY PLAN



1. SUBJECT PROPERTY. LOOKING WEST.

CHURTON & ASSOCIATES
A REAL ESTATE APPRAISAL COMPANY

File No. 1607032LE

07/21/2016

SCOTT VALLEY BANK
590 YGNACIO VALLEY RD SUITE 100
WALNUT CREEK, CA 94596

File Number: 1607032LE

In accordance with your request, I have appraised the real property at:

792 Capp St
San Francisco, CA 94110-3223

The purpose of this appraisal is to develop an opinion of the market value of the subject property, as improved.
The property rights appraised are the fee simple interest in the site and improvements.

In my opinion, the market value of the property as of July 19, 2016 is:


\$1,450,000
One Million Four Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars

The attached report contains the description, analysis and supportive data for the conclusions,
final opinion of value, descriptive photographs, limiting conditions and appropriate certifications.



LEE ELDRED
AR006113

<div><div>1. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL VISIT THE SITE AND BE FULLY COGNIZANT OF ALL EXISTING CONDITIONS PRIOR TO SUBMITTING ANY PROPOSITIONS OR BIDS. IF ANY ASBESTOS, KNOWN MATERIALS CONTAINING ASBESTOS OR ANY MATERIALS CLASSIFIED BY THE EPA AS HAZARDOUS MATERIALS ARE DISCOVERED, THEN THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE TO COORDINATE WITH THE OWNER, AS REQUIRED, FOR THE REMOVAL OF THESE CONDITIONS, PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF THIS PROJECT. IF THE CONTRACTOR PARTICIPATES IN ANY PORTION OF THE REMOVAL PROCESS IN HIS COORDINATION WITH THE OWNER, THEN THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE THE OWNER WITH A WRITTEN STATEMENT RELEASING THE OWNER OF ANY FUTURE LIABILITY FROM THE CONTRACTOR, HIS EMPLOYEES AND ANY SUBCONTRACTORS HIRED BY THE CONTRACTOR RELATED TO THIS WORK. THESE DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS DO NOT REPRESENT AN ASSESSMENT OF THE PRESENCE OR AN ASSESSMENT OF THE ABSENCE OF ANY TOXIC OR HAZARDOUS MATERIALS ON THIS PROJECT SITE. THE OWNERS ARE SOLELY RESPONSIBLE FOR SUCH AN ASSESSMENT AND SHOULD BE CONSULTED FOR ANY QUESTIONS THEREIN. IF THE CONTRACTOR DISCOVERS ANY TOXIC OR HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, AS DEFINED BY THE APPROPRIATE GOVERNING AUTHORITIES, IN THE COURSE OF HIS WORK, HE MUST NOTIFY THE OWNERS IN WRITING, AS PER THE GUIDELINES BY ALL GOVERNING AUTHORITIES. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL RESOLVE THE APPLICABLE REGULATIONS AND PROCEDURES WITH THE OWNER AT THE TIME OF DISCOVERY.</div><div>2. ALL WORK IS TO BE PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE CODES, LAWS, ORDINANCES AND LOCAL MUNICIPAL REGULATIONS AND AMENDMENTS RELATED TO THIS PROJECT, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO: STATE OF CALIFORNIA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE TITLE 24; THE 2013 CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE (CBC) INCLUDING THE HISTORICAL BUILDING CODE; THE LATEST EDITION OF THE UNIFORM FEDERAL ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS INCLUDING THE FEDERAL FAIR HOUSING ACT; THE 2013 CALIFORNIA FIRE CODE; THE 2013 CALIFORNIA ENERGY CODE; THE 2013 CALIFORNIA ELECTRICAL CODE; THE 2013 CALIFORNIA MECHANICAL CODE; THE 2013 CALIFORNIA PLUMBING CODE, INCLUDING ALL AMENDMENTS AS ADOPTED IN ORDINANCE 1856-2013; THE 2013 NFPA 72 (FIRE ALARMS) AND THE 2013 NFPA 1313R (SPRINKLERS). THIS PROJECT WILL COMPLY WITH THE 2013 CALIFORNIA ENERGY EFFICIENCY STANDARDS. NOTE: IF THE PLANNING COMMISSION HAS NOT APPROVED THE PROJECT PRIOR TO 5:00 PM ON DECEMBER 31, 2013 THEN THIS PROJECT MUST COMPLY WITH THE 2013CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODES. IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR TO NOTIFY THE ARCHITECT AT ONCE UPON DISCOVERY OF ANY CONFLICTS OR DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THE AFOREMENTIONED AND THE WORK CONTRACTED FOR THIS PROJECT OR A CHANGE OF AN APPLICABLE CODE OR STATUTE BY LOCAL AUTHORITIES.</div><div>3. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL COORDINATE AND BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL WORK BY HIS SUBCONTRACTORS AND THEIR COMPLIANCE WITH ALL THESE GENERAL NOTES. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL IDENTIFY ANY CONFLICTS BETWEEN THE WORKS OF THE SUBCONTRACTORS, AS DIRECTED BY THESE DRAWINGS, DURING THE LAYOUT OF THE AFFECTED TRADES. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL REVIEW THESE CONDITIONS WITH THE ARCHITECT FOR DESIGN CONFORMANCE BEFORE BEGINNING ANY INSTALLATION.</div><div>4. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL FIELD VERIFY ALL EXISTING AND PROPOSED DIMENSIONS AND CONDITIONS. IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR TO NOTIFY THE ARCHITECT AT ONCE UPON THE DISCOVERY OF ANY CONFLICTS OR DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THE AFOREMENTIONED AND THE DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS OF THIS PROJECT. THE CONTRACTOR SHOULD FOLLOW DIMENSIONS AND SHOULD NOT SCALE THESE DRAWINGS. IF DIMENSIONS ARE REQUIRED BUT NOT SHOWN, THEN THE CONTRACTOR SHALL REQUEST THE DIMENSIONS FROM THE ARCHITECT BEFORE BUILDING ANY PART OF THE PROJECT, WHICH REQUIRES THE MISSING DIMENSIONS.</div><div>5. ANY CHANGES, ALTERNATIVES OR MODIFICATIONS TO THESE DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS MUST BE APPROVED IN WRITING BY THE ARCHITECT AND OWNER, AND ONLY WHEN SUCH WRITTEN APPROVAL CLEARLY STATES THE AGREED COST OR CREDIT OF THE CHANGE. ALTERNATIVE OR MODIFICATION TO THIS PROJECT. FOR INFORMATION, DRAWINGS OR OTHER DOCUMENTS, NOT SHOWN OR INCLUDED IN THE PERMIT OR CONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS OR SPECIFICATIONS, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL REQUEST THE MISSING INFORMATION, DRAWINGS OR DOCUMENTS FROM THE ARCHITECT BEFORE STARTING OR PROCEEDING WITH THE CONSTRUCTION AFFECTED BY THE MISSING INFORMATION, DRAWINGS OR DOCUMENTS.</div><div>6. THE INTENT OF THESE DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS IS TO PROVIDE THE DESIGN GUIDANCE FOR THE CONTRACTOR TO REASONABLY PLAN FOR ALL ITEMS NECESSARY FOR A COMPLETE JOB. IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR TO PROVIDE ALL MATERIALS, LABOR AND EXPERTISE NECESSARY TO ACHIEVE A COMPLETE JOB AS INTENDED IN THESE DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS. THE CONTRACTOR IS FULLY RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL CONSTRUCTION MEANS, METHODS, TECHNIQUES, SEQUENCES, FINAL DIMENSIONS AND PROCEDURES FOR THE WORK SHOWN ON THESE DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS. IT IS THE CONTRACTOR'S RESPONSIBILITY TO ENACT THE AFOREMENTIONED IN COMPLIANCE WITH GENERALLY ACCEPTED STANDARDS OF PRACTICE FOR THE CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY FOR THE TYPE OF WORK SHOWN ON THESE DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS. THE ARCHITECT RESERVES THE RIGHT OF REVIEW FOR ALL MATERIALS AND PRODUCTS FOR WHICH NO SPECIFIC BRAND NAME OR MANUFACTURER IS IDENTIFIED IN THESE DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY WITH THE ARCHITECT THE NEED FOR SHOP DRAWINGS OR SAMPLES OF MATERIALS OR PRODUCTS, WHICH WERE NOT IDENTIFIED IN THESE DRAWINGS OR SPECIFICATIONS, AS WELL AS ANY MATERIAL, PRODUCT OR EQUIPMENT SUBSTITUTIONS PROPOSED IN PLACE OF THOSE ITEMS IDENTIFIED IN THESE DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS.</div><div>7. IT IS THE CONTRACTOR'S RESPONSIBILITY TO VERIFY AND COORDINATE ALL UTILITY CONNECTIONS, UTILITY COMPANIES' REQUIREMENTS AND INCLUDE ANY RELATED COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS RESPONSIBILITY IN THE PROPOSAL OR BID. THE CONTRACTOR IS ALSO RESPONSIBLE FOR WRITING LETTERS OF CONFORMANCE REGARDING OPERATIVE AGREEMENTS FOR THIS PROJECT BETWEEN THE CONTRACTOR AND THE LOCAL FIRE DEPARTMENT; THE LOCAL WATER AGENCY; THE LOCAL NATURAL OR PROPANE GAS PROVIDER; THE LOCAL ELECTRICITY PROVIDER; THE LOCAL TELEPHONE SERVICE PROVIDERS; THE LOCAL CABLE TV PROVIDER; THE OWNER'S SECURITY SERVICE PROVIDER AND ANY UNNAMED UTILITY TYPE SERVICE PROVIDER. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE COPIES OF ANY SUCH AGREEMENTS TO THE ARCHITECT AND OWNER, IF REQUIRED OR REQUESTED.</div><div>8. THE CONTRACTOR IS FULLY RESPONSIBLE TO ENACT THE APPROPRIATE SAFETY PRECAUTIONS REQUIRED TO MAINTAIN A SAFE WORKING ENVIRONMENT. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL ALSO INDEMNIFY AND HOLD HARMLESS THE OWNER, THE ARCHITECT, THEIR CONSULTANTS AND EMPLOYEES FROM ANY PROBLEMS, WHICH RESULT FROM THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE OF THE WORK RELATED TO THE SAFETY OF THE CONSTRUCTION SITE. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL CARRY THE APPROPRIATE WORKMAN'S COMPENSATION AND LIABILITY INSURANCE, AS REQUIRED BY THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT AGENCY HAVING JURISDICTION FOR THIS ISSUE, AS WELL AS COMPLY WITH THE GENERALLY ACCEPTED INDUSTRY STANDARDS OF PRACTICE FOR A PROJECT OF THIS SCOPE. IT SHALL BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY WITH THE OWNER, IF HE WILL BE REQUIRED TO CARRY FIRE INSURANCE OR OTHER TYPES OF INSURANCE, AS WELL AS, MAKING THE OWNER AND/OR THE ARCHITECT ADDITIONALLY INSURED ON THEIR POLICIES FOR THE DURATION OF THE PROJECT. HE SHOULD ALSO ASSIST THE OWNER IN IDENTIFYING THE AMOUNT OF COVERAGE REQUIRED FOR THEIR CO-INSURANCE NEEDS.</div><div>9. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL MAINTAIN A CLEAN AND ORDERLY JOB SITE ON A DAILY BASIS. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOT UNREASONABLY ENCUMBER THE SITE WITH MATERIALS OR EQUIPMENT. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOT ENDANGER EXISTING STRUCTURES AND ANY NEWLY CONSTRUCTED STRUCTURE BY OVERLOADING THE AFOREMENTIONED WITH MATERIALS OR EQUIPMENT. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PROTECT ALL EXISTING CONSTRUCTION TO REMAIN AND NEW CONSTRUCTION AFTER IT IS INSTALLED. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE TO PROVIDE TEMPORARY ENCLOSURES OR PROTECTION, AS NEEDED, TO PROTECT THE EXISTING STRUCTURE AND ANY NEWLY CONSTRUCTED STRUCTURES FROM THE ILL EFFECTS OF WEATHER FOR THE DURATION OF THE ENTIRE CONSTRUCTION PROCESS.</div></div> <div><div>10. THE CONTRACTOR IS FULLY RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY DAMAGE INCURRED BY HIM OR HIS SUBCONTRACTORS TO ANY EXISTING STRUCTURE OR WORK, ANY STRUCTURE OR WORK IN PROGRESS, UNLESS MATERIAL INTENDED FOR USE IN THE PROJECT, OR ANY EXISTING SITE CONDITION WITHIN THE SCOPE OF WORK INTENDED BY THESE DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS. THIS RESPONSIBILITY WILL INCLUDE ANY MATERIALS AND LABOR REQUIRED TO CORRECT SUCH DAMAGE TO THE OWNER'S SATISFACTION AT NO COST TO THE OWNER UNLESS AGREED TO BY THE OWNER IN WRITING.</div><div>11. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL WARRANTY ACCORDING TO STATE CONSTRUCTION LAW ALL WORK DONE BY HIM, HIS EMPLOYEES AND HIS SUBCONTRACTORS AGAINST ALL VISIBLE DEFECTS OR ERRORS THAT BECOME APPARENT WITHIN THE FIRST YEAR AFTER THE COMPLETION OF THE PROJECT, AS ACCEPTED BY THE OWNER. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL, ADDITIONALLY, WARRANTY ALL DEFECTS AND ERRORS NOT VISIBLE, BUT CONTAINED WITHIN CONSTRUCTED WORK, FOR A PERIOD OF TEN YEARS FROM THE COMPLETION OF THE PROJECT, ALSO ACCORDING TO STATE CONSTRUCTION LAW. ANY AND ALL DEFECTS AND ERRORS THAT DO BECOME APPARENT SHALL BE PROMPTLY REPAIRED BY THE CONTRACTOR TO THE OWNER'S SATISFACTION AT NO COST TO THE OWNER FOR MATERIALS OR LABOR. ALTERATIONS OR CHANGES TO THIS WARRANTY MUST BE MUTUALLY AGREED TO IN WRITING BY BOTH THE CONTRACTOR AND THE OWNER.</div><div>12. IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY THE APPROPRIATENESS OF THE APPLICATION OF ALL THE PRODUCT SELECTIONS SHOWN OR INTENDED IN THESE DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS. THE INTENDED MEANING OF "APPROPRIATENESS" IS THE PROPER SYSTEM, MODEL AND SPECIFIC SELECTION REQUIRED FOR THE INTENDED USE AS SHOWN ON THESE DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE TO VERIFY THE MOST CURRENT MODEL NAME OR NUMBER FROM THE SELECTED MANUFACTURER. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE TO VERIFY THAT ANY INSTALLERS, WHICH HE SELECTS FOR THE VARIOUS PRODUCTS WILL FOLLOW ALL THAT PRODUCT MANUFACTURER'S REQUIRED AND RECOMMENDED METHODS AND PROCEDURES TO ACHIEVE THE DESIRED RESULTS CLAIMED BY SUCH MANUFACTURERS FOR THEIR PRODUCTS. IN ADDITION, THESE DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS IDENTIFY SOME REQUIRED SYSTEMS AND PRODUCTS IN GENERIC TERMS. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE TO MAKE SPECIFIC SELECTIONS FOR THESE SYSTEMS AND PRODUCTS THAT SATISFY THE SAME CONDITIONS OUTLINED ABOUT THE IDENTIFIED MANUFACTURED ITEMS.</div><div>13. IT IS THE INTENT OF THESE DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS TO IDENTIFY THE SCOPE OF WORK FOR A DESIGN AND BUILD TYPE OF ELECTRICAL INSTALLATION. IT SHALL BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR TO PROVIDE THE NECESSARY LABOR FAMILIAR WITH THIS TYPE OF INSTALLATION, ALL NECESSARY MATERIALS, TOOLS, EQUIPMENT, TRANSPORTATION, TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION; AND ANY SPECIAL OR OCCASIONAL SERVICES REQUIRED TO INSTALL A COMPLETE WORKING ELECTRICAL SYSTEM AS DIAGRAMMATICALLY DESCRIBED AND SHOWN IN THESE DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL ALSO BE RESPONSIBLE TO VERIFY ANY INFORMATION THAT IS NOT INDICATED IN THESE DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS BUT IS REQUIRED FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF THE INSTALLATION.</div><div>14. IT IS THE INTENT OF THESE DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS TO IDENTIFY THE SCOPE OF WORK FOR A DESIGN AND BUILD TYPE OF MECHANICAL AND PLUMBING INSTALLATION. IT SHALL BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR TO PROVIDE THE NECESSARY LABOR FAMILIAR WITH THIS TYPE OF INSTALLATION; ALL NECESSARY MATERIALS, TOOLS, EQUIPMENT, TRANSPORTATION, TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION; AND ANY SPECIAL OR OCCASIONAL SERVICES, INCLUDING THE PROCUREMENT OF ALL PERMITS REQUIRED TO INSTALL A COMPLETE WORKING SYSTEM. THE CONTRACTOR WILL ALSO BE RESPONSIBLE TO VERIFY ANY INFORMATION THAT IS NOT INDICATED IN THESE DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS BUT IS REQUIRED FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF THE INSTALLATION.</div><div>15. IT IS THE INTENT OF THESE DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS TO IDENTIFY THE SCOPE OF WORK FOR A DESIGN AND BUILD TYPE OF FIRE SPRINKLER INSTALLATION THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE STRUCTURE. IT WILL BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR TO PROVIDE THE NECESSARY LABOR FAMILIAR WITH THIS TYPE OF INSTALLATION; ALL NECESSARY MATERIALS, TOOLS, EQUIPMENT, TRANSPORTATION, TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION; AND ANY SPECIAL OR OCCASIONAL SERVICES, INCLUDING THE PROCUREMENT OF ALL PERMITS REQUIRED TO INSTALL A COMPLETE WORKING SYSTEM. THE CONTRACTOR WILL ALSO BE RESPONSIBLE TO VERIFY ANY INFORMATION THAT IS NOT INDICATED IN THESE DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS BUT IS REQUIRED FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF THE INSTALLATION.</div><div>16. IF THE CONTRACTOR FINDS FAULT WITH, DISAGREES WITH, OBJECTS TO, OR WOULD LIKE TO CHANGE THE SCOPE OF THESE GENERAL NOTES OR HIS STATED RESPONSIBILITIES, AS OUTLINED IN THESE GENERAL NOTES, THEN THE CONTRACTOR MUST RESOLVE SUCH CHANGES WITH THE OWNER IN WRITING BEFORE SIGNING A CONTRACT. FAILURE TO DO SO SHALL CONSTITUTE AN UNDERSTANDING OF THESE GENERAL NOTES AND THEIR ACCEPTANCE BY THE CONTRACTOR.</div><div>17. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL IDENTIFY IN HIS PROPOSAL OR BID, WHICH PERMITS HE EXPECTS TO OBTAIN AND WHICH PERMITS AND APPLICATION FEES HE EXPECTS THE OWNER TO PROVIDE.</div><div>18. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE TO IDENTIFY ANY CONFLICTS BETWEEN HIS CONTRACT WITH THE OWNER AND THESE DRAWINGS. THE ARCHITECT, THE CONTRACTOR AND THE OWNER SHALL REVIEW THESE CONFLICTS IN ORDER TO AMEND ONE OF THESE DOCUMENTS BEFORE THE START OF THE CONSTRUCTION. IF A CONFLICT IS DISCOVERED WITHOUT THIS PRIOR RESOLUTION, THEN THESE DRAWINGS SHALL TAKE PRECEDENCE OVER ANY OTHER DOCUMENTS IN RESOLVING A CONFLICT.</div><div>19. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL ASSUME THAT SITE MEETINGS WITH THE OWNER, THE ARCHITECT AND THE CONTRACTOR PRESENT SHALL BE HELD ONCE EVERY WEEK, UNLESS THEY ARE MUTUALLY CHANGED OR CANCELLED. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL KEEP WRITTEN NOTES OF ALL RELEVANT INFORMATION DISCUSSED AT THESE MEETINGS AND PROVIDE COPIES TO THE OWNER AND THE ARCHITECT, UNLESS DIFFERING ARRANGEMENTS ARE RESOLVED WITH THE ARCHITECT AND THE OWNER. THE ARCHITECT SHALL PROVIDE ANY REQUESTED SKETCHES OR ANY REQUESTED INFORMATION THAT IS REQUIRED AND REQUESTED DURING THESE MEETINGS. THE OWNER AND THE CONTRACTOR SHALL ALSO PROVIDE ANY REQUESTED INFORMATION THAT IS REQUIRED DURING THESE MEETINGS.</div><div>20. THE ARCHITECT OR THE OWNER CAN WRITE AND ISSUE FIELD ORDERS FOR CHANGES TO THE DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS, AS REQUESTED BY OWNER OR THE CONTRACTOR. IF ADDITIONAL (OR DELETION OF) COST TO THE PROJECT IS REQUIRED, THEN THESE FIELD ORDERS SHALL BECOME THE BASIS OF A CHANGE ORDER.</div><div>21. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL WRITE AND ISSUE ALL CHANGE ORDERS, WHICH SHALL INCLUDE A COST BREAKDOWN FOR ALL THE WORK DESCRIBED IN SUCH A CHANGE ORDER. ANY CHANGE ORDER WILL NOT BE BINDING TO THE OWNER UNTIL BOTH THE CONTRACTOR AND THE OWNER HAVE SIGNED IT.</div><div>22. UPON SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETION THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE ARCHITECT, WHO SHALL COORDINATE A WALK-THROUGH OF THE PROJECT WITH THE OWNER AND THE CONTRACTOR AND THEN PROVIDE A PUNCH LIST OF ITEMS TO COMPLETE. ARRANGEMENTS FOR FINAL PAYMENT WILL BE MADE AT THAT TIME.</div></div> <div><div><div>AFF</div><div>ALUM</div><div>BD</div><div>BLDG</div><div>BLKG</div><div>BM</div><div>B.O</div><div>CLG</div><div>CLR</div><div>CONC</div><div>DTL</div><div>DWG</div><div>(E)</div><div>ELEC</div><div>ELEV</div><div>EQ</div><div>EXT</div><div>F.F</div><div>GA</div><div>GSM</div><div>GYP</div><div>HDR</div><div>HVAC</div><div>HW</div><div>INT</div></div><div><div>ABOVE FINISHED FLOOR</div><div>ALUMINUM</div><div>BOARD</div><div>BUILDING</div><div>BLOCKING</div><div>BEAM</div><div>BOTTOM OF</div><div>CEILING</div><div>CLEAR</div><div>CONCRETE</div><div>DETAIL</div><div>DRAWING</div><div>EXISTING</div><div>ELECTRICAL</div><div>ELEVATION</div><div>EQUAL</div><div>EXTERIOR</div><div>FINISHED FLOOR</div><div>GAUGE</div><div>GALVANIZED SHEET METAL</div><div>GYPSUM</div><div>HEADER</div><div>HEATING, VENTILATION AND AIR CONDITIONING</div><div>HOT WATER HEATER</div><div>INTERIOR</div></div><div><div>LAM</div><div>LAMINATE</div><div>MAX</div><div>MAXIMUM</div><div>MECH</div><div>MECHANICAL</div><div>MIN</div><div>MINIMUM</div><div>MTL</div><div>METAL</div><div>(N)</div><div>NEW</div><div>N.I.C</div><div>NOT IN CONTRACT</div><div>O.C</div><div>ON CENTER</div><div>PL</div><div>PLASTIC</div><div>PLY</div><div>PLYWOOD</div><div>REQ'D</div><div>REQUIRED</div><div>SIM</div><div>SIMILAR</div><div>SHTG</div><div>SHEATING</div><div>S.S.D</div><div>SEE STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS</div><div>STL</div><div>STEEL</div><div>T.B.D</div><div>TO BE DETERMINED</div><div>TO</div><div>TOP OF</div><div>TYP</div><div>TYPICAL</div><div>U.O.N</div><div>UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED</div><div>V.I.F</div><div>VERIFY IN FIELD</div><div>W</div><div>WITH</div><div>W/C</div><div>WATER CLOSET</div><div>WD</div><div>WOOD</div><div>WP</div><div>WATERPROOF</div></div></div> <div><div><div>DRAWING INDEX</div><div><div>A 0.00</div><div>TITLE PAGE</div></div><div><div>A 0.50</div><div>MAXIMUM PLANNING ENVELOPE</div></div><div><div>A 0.51</div><div>PLANNING COMPLIANCE BY FLOOR</div></div><div><div>A 1.00</div><div>EXISTING SITE PLAN</div></div><div><div>A 1.01</div><div>EXISTING FLOOR PLANS</div></div><div><div>A 1.02</div><div>EXISTING FRONT (EAST) ELEVATION</div></div><div><div>A 1.03</div><div>EXISTING SIDE (SOUTH) ELEVATION</div></div><div><div>A 1.04</div><div>EXISTING REAR (WEST) ELEVATION</div></div><div><div>A 1.05</div><div>EXISTING SIDE (NORTH) ELEVATION</div></div><div><div>A 1.06</div><div>EXISTING LONGITUDINAL SECTION</div></div><div><div>A 2.00</div><div>PROPOSED SITE PLAN</div></div><div><div>A 2.01</div><div>PROPOSED BASEMENT FLOOR PLAN</div></div><div><div>A 2.02</div><div>PROPOSED 1ST FLOOR PLAN</div></div><div><div>A 2.03</div><div>PROPOSED 2ND FLOOR PLAN</div></div><div><div>A 2.04</div><div>PROPOSED 3RD FLOOR PLAN</div></div><div><div>A 2.05</div><div>PROPOSED ROOF PLAN</div></div><div><div>A 3.00</div><div>PROPOSED FRONT (EAST) ELEVATION</div></div><div><div>A 3.01</div><div>PROPOSED SIDE (SOUTH) ELEVATION</div></div><div><div>A 3.02</div><div>PROPOSED REAR (WEST) ELEVATION</div></div><div><div>A 3.03</div><div>PROPOSED SIDE (NORTH) ELEVATION</div></div><div><div>A 3.04</div><div>PROPOSED LONGITUDINAL SECTION</div></div><div><div>A 3.05</div><div>PROPOSED LONGITUDINAL SECTION THROUGH STAIRS</div></div><div><div>A 3.06</div><div>PROPOSED TRANSVERSE SECTION</div></div><div><div>A 8.00</div><div>EXTERIOR DOOR AND WINDOW SCHEDULE</div></div><div><div>A 8.01</div><div>EXTERIOR DOOR AND WINDOW SCHEDULE</div></div><div><div>A 8.02</div><div>EXTERIOR DOOR AND WINDOW SCHEDULE AND WINDOW DETAILS</div></div><div><div>A 9.00</div><div>3D AXONOMETRIC REPRESENTATIONS</div></div><div><div>A 9.01</div><div>VIEWS FROM STREET</div></div><div><div>A 9.02</div><div>PROJECT REPRESENTATIONS</div></div><div><div>C 1</div><div>SITE SURVEY</div></div><div><div>C 2</div><div>RECORD OF SURVEY</div></div></div></div> <div><div><div>BUILDING DATA</div><div>EXISTING</div><div>ALLOWABLE</div><div>PROPOSED</div></div><div><div>CONSTRUCTION TYPE</div><div>V-B</div><div>V-B</div><div>V-B</div></div><div><div>OCCUPANCY TYPE</div><div>R-3</div><div>R-3, R-2</div><div>R-2</div></div><div><div>BUILDING HEIGHT</div><div>25'-2"</div><div>40'-0"</div><div>40'-0"</div></div><div><div>STORIES/BASEMENTS</div><div>2/0</div><div>4/1</div><div>3/1</div></div><div><div>NUMBER OF UNITS</div><div>1</div><div>-</div><div>4</div></div><div><div>PARKING</div><div>2</div><div>3</div><div>2</div></div><div><div>BIKE PARKING</div><div>0</div><div>3</div><div>4</div></div><div><div>FIRE SPRINKLERS</div><div>NO</div><div>N/A</div><div>YES</div></div><div><div>SEISMIC UPGRADE</div><div>NO</div><div>N/A</div><div>YES</div></div></div> <div><div><div>FLOOR AREAS BY TYPE</div><div>EXISTING</div><div>CHANGE</div><div>PROPOSED</div></div><div><div>RESIDENTIAL</div><div>1939 SF</div><div>+3609 SF</div><div>5548 SF</div></div><div><div>COMMERCIAL/RETAIL</div><div>0 SF</div><div>0 SF</div><div>0 SF</div></div><div><div>OFFICE</div><div>0 SF</div><div>0 SF</div><div>0 SF</div></div><div><div>INDUSTRIAL PDR</div><div>0 SF</div><div>0 SF</div><div>0 SF</div></div><div><div>PARKING</div><div>0 SF</div><div>0 SF</div><div>0 SF</div></div><div><div>USABLE OPEN SPACE</div><div>1031 SF</div><div>418 SF</div><div>1449 SF</div></div><div><div>PUBLIC OPEN SPACE</div><div>0 SF</div><div>0 SF</div><div>0 SF</div></div><div><div>HABITABLE</div><div>1067 SF</div><div>+3886 SF</div><div>4943 SF</div></div><div><div>NON-HABITABLE (GARAGE)</div><div>872 SF</div><div>-26 SF</div><div>846 SF</div></div><div><div>GROSS FLOOR AREA</div><div>1939 SF</div><div>+3589 SF</div><div>5528 SF</div></div></div> <div><div><div>FLOOR AREAS</div><div>EXISTING</div><div>CHANGE</div><div>PROPOSED</div></div><div><div>BASEMENT (W/ GARAGE)</div><div>872 SF</div><div>+707 SF</div><div>1579 SF</div></div><div><div>FIRST FLOOR</div><div>1067 SF</div><div>+465 SF</div><div>1532 SF</div></div><div><div>SECOND FLOOR</div><div>-</div><div>+1480 SF</div><div>1480 SF</div></div><div><div>THIRD FLOOR</div><div>-</div><div>+937 SF</div><div>937 SF</div></div><div><div>TOTAL</div><div>1939 SF</div><div>+3588 SF</div><div>5528 SF</div></div><div><div>% INCREASE</div><div></div><div>185%</div><div></div></div></div> <div><div><div>BUILDING DEPTH</div><div>EXISTING</div><div>CHANGE</div><div>PROPOSED</div></div><div><div></div><div>60' - 2"</div><div>3' - 7"</div><div>63' - 9"</div></div></div> <div><div><div>USABLE AREAS</div><div>FLOOR AREA</div><div>USABLE OPEN SPACE</div><div>BEDROOMS</div><div>BATHS</div></div><div><div>UNIT 1</div><div>669</div><div>290</div><div>1</div><div>1</div></div><div><div>UNIT 2</div><div>1397</div><div>510</div><div>3</div><div>2</div></div><div><div>UNIT 3</div><div>730</div><div>121</div><div>2</div><div>1</div></div><div><div>UNIT 4</div><div>1628</div><div>546</div><div>3</div><div>3</div></div></div> <div><div><div>APPROVALS</div></div></div> <div><div><div><div>Make-Out Room</div><div>Walgreens</div><div>Velvet Cantina</div><div>United States Postal Service</div><div>792 Capp Street</div></div><div><div>22nd St</div><div>23rd St</div><div>24th St</div><div>25th St</div><div>26th St</div><div>27th St</div><div>28th St</div><div>29th St</div><div>30th St</div><div>31st St</div><div>32nd St</div><div>33rd St</div><div>34th St</div><div>35th St</div><div>36th St</div><div>37th St</div><div>38th St</div><div>39th St</div><div>40th St</div><div>41st St</div><div>42nd St</div><div>43rd St</div><div>44th St</div><div>45th St</div><div>46th St</div><div>47th St</div><div>48th St</div><div>49th St</div><div>50th St</div><div>51st St</div><div>52nd St</div><div>53rd St</div><div>54th St</div><div>55th St</div><div>56th St</div><div>57th St</div><div>58th St</div><div>59th St</div><div>60th St</div><div>61st St</div><div>62nd St</div><div>63rd St</div><div>64th St</div><div>65th St</div><div>66th St</div><div>67th St</div><div>68th St</div><div>69th St</div><div>70th St</div><div>71st St</div><div>72nd St</div><div>73rd St</div><div>74th St</div><div>75th St</div><div>76th St</div><div>77th St</div><div>78th St</div><div>79th St</div><div>80th St</div><div>81st St</div><div>82nd St</div><div>83rd St</div><div>84th St</div><div>85th St</div><div>86th St</div><div>87th St</div><div>88th St</div><div>89th St</div><div>90th St</div><div>91st St</div><div>92nd St</div><div>93rd St</div><div>94th St</div><div>95th St</div><div>96th St</div><div>97th St</div><div>98th St</div><div>99th St</div><div>100th St</div></div><div><div>1st St</div><div>2nd St</div><div>3rd St</div><div>4th St</div><div>5th St</div><div>6th St</div><div>7th St</div><div>8th St</div><div>9th St</div><div>10th St</div><div>11th St</div><div>12th St</div><div>13th St</div><div>14th St</div><div>15th St</div><div>16th St</div><div>17th St</div><div>18th St</div><div>19th St</div><div>20th St</div><div>21st St</div><div>22nd St</div><div>23rd St</div><div>24th St</div><div>25th St</div><div>26th St</div><div>27th St</div><div>28th St</div><div>29th St</div><div>30th St</div><div>31st St</div><div>32nd St</div><div>33rd St</div><div>34th St</div><div>35th St</div><div>36th St</div><div>37th St</div><div>38th St</div><div>39th St</div><div>40th St</div><div>41st St</div><div>42nd St</div><div>43rd St</div><div>44th St</div><div>45th St</div><div>46th St</div><div>47th St</div><div>48th St</div><div>49th St</div><div>50th St</div><div>51st St</div><div>52nd St</div><div>53rd St</div><div>54th St</div><div>55th St</div><div>56th St</div><div>57th St</div><div>58th St</div><div>59th St</div><div>60th St</div><div>61st St</div><div>62nd St</div><div>63rd St</div><div>64th St</div><div>65th St</div><div>66th St</div><div>67th St</div><div>68th St</div><div>69th St</div><div>70th St</div><div>71st St</div><div>72nd St</div><div>73rd St</div><div>74th St</div><div>75th St</div><div>76th St</div><div>77th St</div><div>78th St</div><div>79th St</div><div>80th St</div><div>81st St</div><div>82nd St</div><div>83rd St</div><div>84th St</div><div>85th St</div><div>86th St</div><div>87th St</div><div>88th St</div><div>89th St</div><div>90th St</div><div>91st St</div><div>92nd St</div><div>93rd St</div><div>94th St</div><div>95th St</div><div>96th St</div><div>97th St</div><div>98th St</div><div>99th St</div><div>100th St</div></div><div><div>1st St</div><div>2nd St</div><div>3rd St</div><div>4th St</div><div>5th St</div><div>6th St</div><div>7th St</div><div>8th St</div><div>9th St</div><div>10th St</div><div>11th St</div><div>12th St</div><div>13th St</div><div>14th St</div><div>15th St</div><div>16th St</div><div>17th St</div><div>18th St</div><div>19th St</div><div>20th St</div><div>21st St</div><div>22nd St</div><div>23rd St</div><div>24th St</div><div>25th St</div><div>26th St</div><div>27th St</div><div>28th St</div><div>29th St</div><div>30th St</div><div>31st St</div><div>32nd St</div><div>33rd St</div><div>34th St</div><div>35th St</div><div>36th St</div><div>37th St</div><div>38th St</div><div>39th St</div><div>40th St</div><div>41st St</div><div>42nd St</div><div>43rd St</div><div>44th St</div><div>45th St</div><div>46th St</div><div>47th St</div><div>48th St</div><div>49th St</div><div>50th St</div><div>51st St</div><div>52nd St</div><div>53rd St</div><div>54th St</div><div>55th St</div><div>56th St</div><div>57th St</div><div>58th St</div><div>59th St</div><div>60th St</div><div>61st St</div><div>62nd St</div><div>63rd St</div><div>64th St</div><div>65th St</div><div>66th St</div><div>67th St</div><div>68th St</div><div>69th St</div><div>70th St</div><div>71st St</div><div>72nd St</div><div>73rd St</div><div>74th St</div><div>75th St</div><div>76th St</div><div>77th St</div><div>78th St</div><div>79th St</div><div>80th St</div><div>81st St</div><div>82nd St</div><div>83rd St</div><div>84th St</div><div>85th St</div><div>86th St</div><div>87th St</div><div>88th St</div><div>89th St</div><div>90th St</div><div>91st St</div><div>92nd St</div><div>93rd St</div><div>94th St</div><div>95th St</div><div>96th St</div><div>97th St</div><div>98th St</div><div>99th St</div><div>100th St</div></div></div></div> <div><div><div>TITLE PAGE</div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div></div>
--



1 EXISTING SITE PLAN
3/16" = 1'-0"

WINDER
GIBSON
architects

interiors
planning
architecture

www.archsf.com

t. 415. 318.8634

1898 mission street
san francisco, ca 94103



792 CAPP ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110

CU REVISION

EXISTING SITE PLAN




A 1.00

DATE 04/13/18


SCALE 3/16" = 1'-0"

DRAWN HP, DV



DEMOLISH ENTIRE
EXISTING BUILDING
AND PREPARE FOR
NEW CONSTRUCTION

2 EXISTING 1ST FLOOR
1/4" = 1'-0"



1 EXISTING BASEMENT (GARAGE)
1/4" = 1'-0"

WINDER
GIBSON
architects

interiors
planning
architecture

www.archsf.com

t: 415. 318.8634

1898 mission street
san francisco, ca 94103



792 CAPP ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110

CU REVISION

EXISTING FLOOR PLANS




A 1.01

DATE 04/13/18

SCALE 1/4" = 1'-0"

DRAWN HP, DV



792 CAPP ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110

CU REVISION


EXISTING FRONT (EAST)
ELEVATION

A1.02

DATE 04/13/18

SCALE 1/4" = 1'-0"

DRAWN HP, DV



① EXISTING FRONT (EAST) ELEVATION
1/4" = 1'-0"



792 CAPP ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110

CU REVISION


EXISTING SIDE (SOUTH)
ELEVATION

A1.03

DATE 04/13/18

SCALE 1/4" = 1'-0"

DRAWN HP, DV



1 EXISTING SIDE (SOUTH) ELEVATION
1/4" = 1'-0"



792 CAPP ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110

CU REVISION


EXISTING REAR (WEST)
ELEVATION

A 1.04

DATE 04/13/18

SCALE 1/4" = 1'-0"

DRAWN HP, DV



① EXISTING REAR (WEST) ELEVATION
1/4" = 1'-0"




792 CAPP ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110

CU REVISION


EXISTING SIDE (NORTH)
ELEVATION

A 1.05

DATE	04/13/18
SCALE	1/4" = 1'-0"
DRAWN	HP, DV



1 EXISTING SIDE (NORTH) ELEVATION
1/4" = 1'-0"




792 CAPP ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110

CU REVISION

EXISTING LONGITUDINAL
SECTION


A 1.06

DATE	04/13/18
SCALE	1/4" = 1'-0"
DRAWN	HP, DV



① EXISTING LONGITUDINAL SECTION
1/4" = 1'-0"

SEE A0.51 FOR FLOOR BY FLOOR
BUILDING ENVELOPE DIMENSIONS



① PROPOSED SITE PLAN
3/16" = 1'-0"

WINDER
GIBSON
architects

interiors
planning
architecture

www.archsf.com

t: 415. 318.8634

1898 mission street
san francisco, ca 94103



792 CAPP ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110

CU REVISION

PROPOSED SITE PLAN



A	2.00
---	------

DATE	04/13/18	
------	----------	--

SCALE	3/16" = 1'-0"
-------	---------------

RAWN	HP, DV	
------	--------	--

6

FRONT YARD		
	AREA	%
PLANTING	98 SF	32%
PERMEABLE	103 SF	33%
IMPERMEABLE	107 SF	35%
TOTAL	308 SF	100%

WALL TYPES LEGEND	
	DEMOLISHED WALL
	NEW CONCRETE WALL / FOUNDATION WALL
	NEW WOOD STUD WALL

CONSTRUCTION SHEET LEGEND	
NOTE	DESCRIPTION
0.01	NEW CONCRETE FOUNDATION, S.S.D
0.02	NEW CONCRETE SLAB ON GRADE
0.03	NEW CONCRETE RETAINING WALL
0.04	NEW ENTRY STOOP
0.05	NEW CONCRETE PAVING LEADING TO FRONT ENTRANCE
0.06	NEW CONCRETE PAVERS
0.07	NEW UNPAVED AREA DEVOTED TO CLIMATE APPROPRIATE PLANTING - 100SF TOTAL, > 20% OF FRONT SETBACK AREA
0.08	NEW DRIVEWAY WITH 70% PERMEABLE INTERLOCKING CONCRETE PAVERS
0.09	NEW 4' - 0" HIGH FENCE
1.01	NEW CONCRETE STEPS ON GRADE, 12 TREAD DEPTH, 7" MAX RISER HEIGHT
1.03	NEW INTERIOR STAIR, MIN 11" TREAD DEPTH, MAX 7" RISE, WITH STEEL STRUCTURE, HARDWOOD TREADS AND RISERS, STEEL HANDRAILS ON BOTH SIDES, 36" HIGH, GUARDRAILS 42", MAX 4" OPENING.
1.04	NEW EXTERIOR STAIR, MIN 10.5" TR DEPTH, 7.75" RISE, WOOD TREADS, RISERS AND GUARDRAIL/HANDRAIL ON BOTH SIDES, 36" HIGH, MAX OPENING < 4"
1.05	NEW STEEL GUARDRAIL W/ TEMPERED GLASS PANELS, MIN 42" HIGH WITH MAX OPENING < 4"
1.06	NEW MIN 42" HIGH GUARDWALL

CONSTRUCTION SHEET LEGEND	
NOTE	DESCRIPTION
1.07	NEW STEEL GUARDRAIL W/ PICKETS, MIN 42" HIGH WITH MAX OPENING < 4"
1.08	NEW 2" HIGH PARAPET AT ROOF LEVEL
1.09	NEW FLAT ROOF OVER ROOFING MEMBRANE OVER PLYWOOD SHEATHING OVER WOOD FRAMING
1.10	NEW REAR DECK WITH TILES OVER MORTAT BED
1.11	NEW CORNICE ON PARAPET / GUARD WALL WITH 1x12 TRIM BOARD
1.12	NEW 1x18 TRIM BOARD
2.00	NEW INTERIOR DOOR, 20 MIN FIRE RATED
2.01	NEW INTERIOR DOOR, 20 MIN FIRE RATED WITH SLEF CLOSER
2.02	NEW EXTERIOR THERMALLY BROKEN ALUMINUM DOUBLE-GLAZED MULTIPANEL SLIDING DOOR UNIT
2.03	NEW EXTERIOR THERMALLY BROKEN ALUMINUM DOUBLE-GLAZED WINDOW
2.04	NEW EXTERIOR PAINTED WOOD DOOR WITH GLAZED TRANSOM
2.06	NEW EXTERIOR PAINTED WOOD DOOR
2.07	NEW GARAGE DOOR, UPWARD-ACTING, PAINTED WOOD WITH MIN 200SQ IN VENTILATION
3.00	NEW KITCHEN WITH CABINETS, COUNTERS, APPLIANCES AND FIXTURES
3.01	NEW BATHROOM WITH NEW FIXTURES AND FINISHES, TILE FLOOR AND VENTILATION
4.01	NEW HARDWOOD FLOORING

WINDER
GIBSON
architects

interiors
planning
architecture

www.archsf.com

t. 415. 318.8634

1898 mission street
san francisco, ca 94103

ARCHITECT
JOHN S. WINDER
No. C 13305
REN.
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

792 CAPP ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110


CU REVISION

PROPOSED BASEMENT FLOOR
PLAN






A 2.01

DATE	04/13/18
SCALE	1/4" = 1'-0"
DRAWN	HP, DV



1 PROPOSED BASEMENT FLOOR PLAN
1/4" = 1'-0"

WALL TYPES LEGEND

	DEMOLISHED WALL
	NEW CONCRETE WALL / FOUNDATION WALL
	NEW WOOD STUD WALL

CONSTRUCTION SHEET LEGEND

NOTE	DESCRIPTION
0.01	NEW CONCRETE FOUNDATION, S.S.D
0.02	NEW CONCRETE SLAB ON GRADE
0.03	NEW CONCRETE RETAINING WALL
0.04	NEW ENTRY STOOP
0.05	NEW CONCRETE PAVING LEADING TO FRONT ENTRANCE
0.06	NEW CONCRETE PAVERS
0.07	NEW UNPAVED AREA DEVOTED TO CLIMATE APPROPRIATE PLANTING - 100SF TOTAL, > 20% OF FRONT SETBACK AREA
0.08	NEW DRIVEWAY WITH 70% PERMEABLE INTERLOCKING CONCRETE PAVERS
0.09	NEW 4' - 0" HIGH FENCE
1.01	NEW CONCRETE STEPS ON GRADE, 12 TREAD DEPTH, 7" MAX RISER HEIGHT
1.03	NEW INTERIOR STAIR, MIN 11" TREAD DEPTH, MAX 7" RISE, WITH STEEL STRUCTURE, HARDWOOD TREADS AND RISERS, STEEL HANDRAILS ON BOTH SIDES, 36" HIGH, GUARDRAILS 42", MAX 4" OPENING.
1.04	NEW EXTERIOR STAIR, MIN 10.5" TR DEPTH, 7.75" RISE, WOOD TREADS, RISERS AND GUARDRAIL/HANDRAIL ON BOTH SIDES, 36" HIGH, MAX OPENING < 4"
1.05	NEW STEEL GUARDRAIL W/ TEMPERED GLASS PANELS, MIN 42" HIGH WITH MAX OPENING < 4"
1.06	NEW MIN 42" HIGH GUARDWALL

CONSTRUCTION SHEET LEGEND

NOTE	DESCRIPTION
1.07	NEW STEEL GUARDRAIL W/ PICKETS, MIN 42" HIGH WITH MAX OPENING < 4"
1.08	NEW 2" HIGH PARAPET AT ROOF LEVEL
1.09	NEW FLAT ROOF OVER ROOFING MEMBRANE OVER PLYWOOD SHEATHING OVER WOOD FRAMING
1.10	NEW REAR DECK WITH TILES OVER MORTAT BED
1.11	NEW CORNICE ON PARAPET / GUARD WALL WITH 1x12 TRIM BOARD
1.12	NEW 1x18 TRIM BOARD
2.00	NEW INTERIOR DOOR, 20 MIN FIRE RATED
2.01	NEW INTERIOR DOOR, 20 MIN FIRE RATED WITH SLEF CLOSER
2.02	NEW EXTERIOR THERMALLY BROKEN ALUMINUM DOUBLE-GLAZED MULTIPANEL SLIDING DOOR UNIT
2.03	NEW EXTERIOR THERMALLY BROKEN ALUMINUM DOUBLE-GLAZED WINDOW
2.04	NEW EXTERIOR PAINTED WOOD DOOR WITH GLAZED TRANSOM
2.06	NEW EXTERIOR PAINTED WOOD DOOR
2.07	NEW GARAGE DOOR, UPWARD-ACTING, PAINTED WOOD WITH MIN 200SQ IN VENTILATION
3.00	NEW KITCHEN WITH CABINETS, COUNTERS, APPLIANCES AND FIXTURES
3.01	NEW BATHROOM WITH NEW FIXTURES AND FINISHES, TILE FLOOR AND VENTILATION
4.01	NEW HARDWOOD FLOORING

WINDER
GIBSON
architects

interiors
planning
architecture

www.archsf.com

t. 415. 318.8634

1898 mission street
san francisco, ca 94103



792 CAPP ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110


CU REVISION

PROPOSED 1ST FLOOR PLAN



A 2.02

DATE	04/13/18
SCALE	1/4" = 1'-0"
DRAWN	HP, DV



1 PROPOSED 1ST FLOOR PLAN
1/4" = 1'-0"

WALL TYPES LEGEND	
	DEMOLISHED WALL
	NEW CONCRETE WALL / FOUNDATION WALL
	NEW WOOD STUD WALL

CONSTRUCTION SHEET LEGEND	
NOTE	DESCRIPTION
0.01	NEW CONCRETE FOUNDATION, S.S.D
0.02	NEW CONCRETE SLAB ON GRADE
0.03	NEW CONCRETE RETAINING WALL
0.04	NEW ENTRY STOOP
0.05	NEW CONCRETE PAVING LEADING TO FRONT ENTRANCE
0.06	NEW CONCRETE PAVERS
0.07	NEW UNPAVED AREA DEVOTED TO CLIMATE APPROPRIATE PLANTING - 100SF TOTAL, > 20% OF FRONT SETBACK AREA
0.08	NEW DRIVEWAY WITH 70% PERMEABLE INTERLOCKING CONCRETE PAVERS
0.09	NEW 4' - 0" HIGH FENCE
1.01	NEW CONCRETE STEPS ON GRADE, 12 TREAD DEPTH, 7" MAX RISER HEIGHT
1.03	NEW INTERIOR STAIR, MIN 11" TREAD DEPTH, MAX 7" RISE, WITH STEEL STRUCTURE, HARDWOOD TREADS AND RISERS, STEEL HANDRAILS ON BOTH SIDES, 36" HIGH, GUARDRAILS 42", MAX 4" OPENING.
1.04	NEW EXTERIOR STAIR, MIN 10.5" TR DEPTH, 7.75" RISE, WOOD TREADS, RISERS AND GUARDRAIL/HANDRAIL ON BOTH SIDES, 36" HIGH, MAX OPENING < 4"
1.05	NEW STEEL GUARDRAIL W/ TEMPERED GLASS PANELS, MIN 42" HIGH WITH MAX OPENING < 4"
1.06	NEW MIN 42" HIGH GUARDWALL

CONSTRUCTION SHEET LEGEND	
NOTE	DESCRIPTION
1.07	NEW STEEL GUARDRAIL W/ PICKETS, MIN 42" HIGH WITH MAX OPENING < 4"
1.08	NEW 2" HIGH PARAPET AT ROOF LEVEL
1.09	NEW FLAT ROOF OVER ROOFING MEMBRANE OVER PLYWOOD SHEATHING OVER WOOD FRAMING
1.10	NEW REAR DECK WITH TILES OVER MORTAT BED
1.11	NEW CORNICE ON PARAPET / GUARD WALL WITH 1x12 TRIM BOARD
1.12	NEW 1x18 TRIM BOARD
2.00	NEW INTERIOR DOOR, 20 MIN FIRE RATED
2.01	NEW INTERIOR DOOR, 20 MIN FIRE RATED WITH SLEF CLOSER
2.02	NEW EXTERIOR THERMALLY BROKEN ALUMINUM DOUBLE-GLAZED MULTIPANEL SLIDING DOOR UNIT
2.03	NEW EXTERIOR THERMALLY BROKEN ALUMINUM DOUBLE-GLAZED WINDOW
2.04	NEW EXTERIOR PAINTED WOOD DOOR WITH GLAZED TRANSOM
2.06	NEW EXTERIOR PAINTED WOOD DOOR
2.07	NEW GARAGE DOOR, UPWARD-ACTING, PAINTED WOOD WITH MIN 200SQ IN VENTILATION
3.00	NEW KITCHEN WITH CABINETS, COUNTERS, APPLIANCES AND FIXTURES
3.01	NEW BATHROOM WITH NEW FIXTURES AND FINISHES, TILE FLOOR AND VENTILATION
4.01	NEW HARDWOOD FLOORING

WINDER
GIBSON
architects


interiors
planning
architecture

www.archsf.com

t. 415. 318.8634

1898 mission street
san francisco, ca 94103

ARCHITECT
JOHN S. WINDER
No. C 13305
REN.
STATE OF CALIFORNIA



1 PROPOSED 2ND FLOOR PLAN
1/4" = 1'-0"

792 CAPP ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110

CU REVISION

PROPOSED 2ND FLOOR PLAN



A 2.03

DATE	04/13/18
SCALE	1/4" = 1'-0"
DRAWN	HP, DV

WALL TYPES LEGEND

- DEMOLISHED WALL
- NEW CONCRETE WALL / FOUNDATION WALL
- NEW WOOD STUD WALL

CONSTRUCTION SHEET LEGEND

NOTE	DESCRIPTION
0.01	NEW CONCRETE FOUNDATION, S.S.D
0.02	NEW CONCRETE SLAB ON GRADE
0.03	NEW CONCRETE RETAINING WALL
0.04	NEW ENTRY STOOP
0.05	NEW CONCRETE PAVING LEADING TO FRONT ENTRANCE
0.06	NEW CONCRETE PAVERS
0.07	NEW UNPAVED AREA DEVOTED TO CLIMATE APPROPRIATE PLANTING - 100SF TOTAL, > 20% OF FRONT SETBACK AREA
0.08	NEW DRIVEWAY WITH 70% PERMEABLE INTERLOCKING CONCRETE PAVERS
0.09	NEW 4' - 0" HIGH FENCE
1.01	NEW CONCRETE STEPS ON GRADE, 12 TREAD DEPTH, 7" MAX RISER HEIGHT
1.03	NEW INTERIOR STAIR, MIN 11" TREAD DEPTH, MAX 7" RISE, WITH STEEL STRUCTURE, HARDWOOD TREADS AND RISERS, STEEL HANDRAILS ON BOTH SIDES, 36" HIGH, GUARDRAILS 42", MAX 4" OPENING.
1.04	NEW EXTERIOR STAIR, MIN 10.5" TR DEPTH, 7.75" RISE, WOOD TREADS, RISERS AND GUARDRAIL/HANDRAIL ON BOTH SIDES, 36" HIGH, MAX OPENING < 4"
1.05	NEW STEEL GUARDRAIL W/ TEMPERED GLASS PANELS, MIN 42" HIGH WITH MAX OPENING < 4"
1.06	NEW MIN 42" HIGH GUARDWALL

CONSTRUCTION SHEET LEGEND

NOTE	DESCRIPTION
1.07	NEW STEEL GUARDRAIL W/ PICKETS, MIN 42" HIGH WITH MAX OPENING < 4"
1.08	NEW 2" HIGH PARAPET AT ROOF LEVEL
1.09	NEW FLAT ROOF OVER ROOFING MEMBRANE OVER PLYWOOD SHEATHING OVER WOOD FRAMING
1.10	NEW REAR DECK WITH TILES OVER MORTAT BED
1.11	NEW CORNICE ON PARAPET / GUARD WALL WITH 1x12 TRIM BOARD
1.12	NEW 1x18 TRIM BOARD
2.00	NEW INTERIOR DOOR, 20 MIN FIRE RATED
2.01	NEW INTERIOR DOOR, 20 MIN FIRE RATED WITH SLEF CLOSER
2.02	NEW EXTERIOR THERMALLY BROKEN ALUMINUM DOUBLE-GLAZED MULTIPANEL SLIDING DOOR UNIT
2.03	NEW EXTERIOR THERMALLY BROKEN ALUMINUM DOUBLE-GLAZED WINDOW
2.04	NEW EXTERIOR PAINTED WOOD DOOR WITH GLAZED TRANSOM
2.06	NEW EXTERIOR PAINTED WOOD DOOR
2.07	NEW GARAGE DOOR, UPWARD-ACTING, PAINTED WOOD WITH MIN 200SQ IN VENTILATION
3.00	NEW KITCHEN WITH CABINETS, COUNTERS, APPLIANCES AND FIXTURES
3.01	NEW BATHROOM WITH NEW FIXTURES AND FINISHES, TILE FLOOR AND VENTILATION
4.01	NEW HARDWOOD FLOORING


WINDER
GIBSON
architects

interiors
planning
architecture

www.archsf.com

t. 415. 318.8634

1898 mission street
san francisco, ca 94103



792 CAPP ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110

CU REVISION

PROPOSED 3RD FLOOR PLAN




A 2.04

DATE 04/13/18

SCALE 1/4" = 1'-0"

DRAWN HP, DV



1 PROPOSED 3RD FLOOR PLAN
1/4" = 1'-0"

CONSTRUCTION SHEET LEGEND	
NOTE	DESCRIPTION
0.01	NEW CONCRETE FOUNDATION, S.S.D
0.02	NEW CONCRETE SLAB ON GRADE
0.03	NEW CONCRETE RETAINING WALL
0.04	NEW ENTRY STOOP
0.05	NEW CONCRETE PAVING LEADING TO FRONT ENTRANCE
0.06	NEW CONCRETE PAVERS
0.07	NEW UNPAVED AREA DEVOTED TO CLIMATE APPROPRIATE PLANTING - 100SF TOTAL, > 20% OF FRONT SETBACK AREA
0.08	NEW DRIVEWAY WITH 70% PERMEABLE INTERLOCKING CONCRETE PAVERS
0.09	NEW 4' - 0" HIGH FENCE
1.01	NEW CONCRETE STEPS ON GRADE, 12 TREAD DEPTH, 7" MAX RISER HEIGHT
1.03	NEW INTERIOR STAIR, MIN 11" TREAD DEPTH, MAX 7" RISE, WITH STEEL STRUCTURE, HARDWOOD TREADS AND RISERS, STEEL HANDRAILS ON BOTH SIDES, 36" HIGH, GUARDRAILS 42", MAX 4" OPENING.
1.04	NEW EXTERIOR STAIR, MIN 10.5" TR DEPTH, 7.75" RISE, WOOD TREADS, RISERS AND GUARDRAIL/HANDRAIL ON BOTH SIDES, 36" HIGH, MAX OPENING < 4"
1.05	NEW STEEL GUARDRAIL W/ TEMPERED GLASS PANELS, MIN 42" HIGH WITH MAX OPENING < 4"
1.06	NEW MIN 42" HIGH GUARDWALL

CONSTRUCTION SHEET LEGEND	
NOTE	DESCRIPTION
1.07	NEW STEEL GUARDRAIL W/ PICKETS, MIN 42" HIGH WITH MAX OPENING < 4"
1.08	NEW 2" HIGH PARAPET AT ROOF LEVEL
1.09	NEW FLAT ROOF OVER ROOFING MEMBRANE OVER PLYWOOD SHEATHING OVER WOOD FRAMING
1.10	NEW REAR DECK WITH TILES OVER MORTAT BED
1.11	NEW CORNICE ON PARAPET / GUARD WALL WITH 1x12 TRIM BOARD
1.12	NEW 1x18 TRIM BOARD
2.00	NEW INTERIOR DOOR, 20 MIN FIRE RATED
2.01	NEW INTERIOR DOOR, 20 MIN FIRE RATED WITH SLEF CLOSER
2.02	NEW EXTERIOR THERMALLY BROKEN ALUMINUM DOUBLE-GLAZED MULTIPANEL SLIDING DOOR UNIT
2.03	NEW EXTERIOR THERMALLY BROKEN ALUMINUM DOUBLE-GLAZED WINDOW
2.04	NEW EXTERIOR PAINTED WOOD DOOR WITH GLAZED TRANSOM
2.06	NEW EXTERIOR PAINTED WOOD DOOR
2.07	NEW GARAGE DOOR, UPWARD-ACTING, PAINTED WOOD WITH MIN 200SQ IN VENTILATION
3.00	NEW KITCHEN WITH CABINETS, COUNTERS, APPLIANCES AND FIXTURES
3.01	NEW BATHROOM WITH NEW FIXTURES AND FINISHES, TILE FLOOR AND VENTILATION
4.01	NEW HARDWOOD FLOORING

WINDER
GIBSON
architects


interiors
planning
architecture

www.archsf.com

t. 415. 318.8634

1898 mission street
san francisco, ca 94103

ARCHITECT
JOHN S. WINDER
No. C 13305
REN.
STATE OF CALIFORNIA



1 PROPOSED ROOF PLAN
1/4" = 1'-0"

792 CAPP ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110



CU REVISION

PROPOSED ROOF PLAN



A 2.05

DATE	04/13/18
SCALE	1/4" = 1'-0"
DRAWN	HP, DV

WALL LEGEND	
	1x12 WOOD SIDING ON NEW EXTERIOR WALL
	1x4 WOOD SIDING ON NEW EXTERIOR WALL

CONSTRUCTION SHEET LEGEND	
NOTE	DESCRIPTION
0.01	NEW CONCRETE FOUNDATION, S.S.D
0.02	NEW CONCRETE SLAB ON GRADE
0.03	NEW CONCRETE RETAINING WALL
0.04	NEW ENTRY STOOP
0.05	NEW CONCRETE PAVING LEADING TO FRONT ENTRANCE
0.06	NEW CONCRETE PAVERS
0.07	NEW UNPAVED AREA DEVOTED TO CLIMATE APPROPRIATE PLANTING - 100SF TOTAL, > 20% OF FRONT SETBACK AREA
0.08	NEW DRIVEWAY WITH 70% PERMEABLE INTERLOCKING CONCRETE PAVERS
0.09	NEW 4' - 0" HIGH FENCE
1.01	NEW CONCRETE STEPS ON GRADE, 12 TREAD DEPTH, 7" MAX RISER HEIGHT
1.03	NEW INTERIOR STAIR, MIN 11" TREAD DEPTH, MAX 7" RISE, WITH STEEL STRUCTURE, HARDWOOD TREADS AND RISERS, STEEL HANDRAILS ON BOTH SIDES, 36" HIGH, GUARDRAILS 42", MAX 4" OPENING.
1.04	NEW EXTERIOR STAIR, MIN 10.5" TR DEPTH, 7.75" RISE, WOOD TREADS, RISERS AND GUARDRAIL/HANDRAIL ON BOTH SIDES, 36" HIGH, MAX OPENING < 4"
1.05	NEW STEEL GUARDRAIL W/ TEMPERED GLASS PANELS, MIN 42" HIGH WITH MAX OPENING < 4"
1.06	NEW MIN 42" HIGH GUARDWALL

CONSTRUCTION SHEET LEGEND	
NOTE	DESCRIPTION
1.07	NEW STEEL GUARDRAIL W/ PICKETS, MIN 42" HIGH WITH MAX OPENING < 4"
1.08	NEW 2" HIGH PARAPET AT ROOF LEVEL
1.09	NEW FLAT ROOF OVER ROOFING MEMBRANE OVER PLYWOOD SHEATHING OVER WOOD FRAMING
1.10	NEW REAR DECK WITH TILES OVER MORTAT BED
1.11	NEW CORNICE ON PARAPET / GUARD WALL WITH 1x12 TRIM BOARD
1.12	NEW 1x18 TRIM BOARD
2.00	NEW INTERIOR DOOR, 20 MIN FIRE RATED
2.01	NEW INTERIOR DOOR, 20 MIN FIRE RATED WITH SLEF CLOSER
2.02	NEW EXTERIOR THERMALLY BROKEN ALUMINUM DOUBLE-GLAZED MULTIPANEL SLIDING DOOR UNIT
2.03	NEW EXTERIOR THERMALLY BROKEN ALUMINUM DOUBLE-GLAZED WINDOW
2.04	NEW EXTERIOR PAINTED WOOD DOOR WITH GLAZED TRANSOM
2.06	NEW EXTERIOR PAINTED WOOD DOOR
2.07	NEW GARAGE DOOR, UPWARD-ACTING. PAINTED WOOD WITH MIN 200SQ IN VENTILATION
3.00	NEW KITCHEN WITH CABINETS, COUNTERS, APPLIANCES AND FIXTURES
3.01	NEW BATHROOM WITH NEW FIXTURES AND FINISHES, TILE FLOOR AND VENTILATION
4.01	NEW HARDWOOD FLOORING

WINDER
GIBSON
architects


interiors
planning
architecture

www.archsf.com

t. 415. 318.8634

1898 mission street
san francisco, ca 94103

LICENSED ARCHITECT
JOHN S. WINDER
No. C 13305
REN.
STATE OF CALIFORNIA



① PROPOSED FRONT (EAST) ELEVATION
1/4" = 1'-0"



792 CAPP ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110

CU REVISION

PROPOSED FRONT (EAST) ELEVATION	

A 3.00

DATE	04/13/18
SCALE	1/4" = 1'-0"
DRAWN	HP, DV

WALL LEGEND	
	1x12 WOOD SIDING ON NEW EXTERIOR WALL
	1x4 WOOD SIDING ON NEW EXTERIOR WALL

CONSTRUCTION SHEET LEGEND	
NOTE	DESCRIPTION
0.01	NEW CONCRETE FOUNDATION, S.S.D
0.02	NEW CONCRETE SLAB ON GRADE
0.03	NEW CONCRETE RETAINING WALL
0.04	NEW ENTRY STOOP
0.05	NEW CONCRETE PAVING LEADING TO FRONT ENTRANCE
0.06	NEW CONCRETE PAVERS
0.07	NEW UNPAVED AREA DEVOTED TO CLIMATE APPROPRIATE PLANTING - 100SF TOTAL, > 20% OF FRONT SETBACK AREA
0.08	NEW DRIVEWAY WITH 70% PERMEABLE INTERLOCKING CONCRETE PAVERS
0.09	NEW 4' - 0" HIGH FENCE
1.01	NEW CONCRETE STEPS ON GRADE, 12 TREAD DEPTH, 7" MAX RISER HEIGHT
1.03	NEW INTERIOR STAIR, MIN 11" TREAD DEPTH, MAX 7" RISE, WITH STEEL STRUCTURE, HARDWOOD TREADS AND RISERS, STEEL HANDRAILS ON BOTH SIDES, 36" HIGH, GUARDRAILS 42", MAX 4" OPENING.
1.04	NEW EXTERIOR STAIR, MIN 10.5" TR DEPTH, 7.75" RISE, WOOD TREADS, RISERS AND GUARDRAIL/HANDRAIL ON BOTH SIDES, 36" HIGH, MAX OPENING < 4"
1.05	NEW STEEL GUARDRAIL W/ TEMPERED GLASS PANELS, MIN 42" HIGH WITH MAX OPENING < 4"
1.06	NEW MIN 42" HIGH GUARDWALL

CONSTRUCTION SHEET LEGEND	
NOTE	DESCRIPTION
1.07	NEW STEEL GUARDRAIL W/ PICKETS, MIN 42" HIGH WITH MAX OPENING < 4"
1.08	NEW 2" HIGH PARAPET AT ROOF LEVEL
1.09	NEW FLAT ROOF OVER ROOFING MEMBRANE OVER PLYWOOD SHEATHING OVER WOOD FRAMING
1.10	NEW REAR DECK WITH TILES OVER MORTAT BED
1.11	NEW CORNICE ON PARAPET / GUARD WALL WITH 1x12 TRIM BOARD
1.12	NEW 1x18 TRIM BOARD
2.00	NEW INTERIOR DOOR, 20 MIN FIRE RATED
2.01	NEW INTERIOR DOOR, 20 MIN FIRE RATED WITH SLEF CLOSER
2.02	NEW EXTERIOR THERMALLY BROKEN ALUMINUM DOUBLE-GLAZED MULTIPANEL SLIDING DOOR UNIT
2.03	NEW EXTERIOR THERMALLY BROKEN ALUMINUM DOUBLE-GLAZED WINDOW
2.04	NEW EXTERIOR PAINTED WOOD DOOR WITH GLAZED TRANSOM
2.06	NEW EXTERIOR PAINTED WOOD DOOR
2.07	NEW GARAGE DOOR, UPWARD-ACTING, PAINTED WOOD WITH MIN 200SQ IN VENTILATION
3.00	NEW KITCHEN WITH CABINETS, COUNTERS, APPLIANCES AND FIXTURES
3.01	NEW BATHROOM WITH NEW FIXTURES AND FINISHES, TILE FLOOR AND VENTILATION
4.01	NEW HARDWOOD FLOORING

WINDER
GIBSON
architects


interiors
planning
architecture

www.archsf.com

t. 415. 318.8634

1898 mission street
san francisco, ca 94103

LICENSED ARCHITECT
JOHN S. WINDER
No. C 13305
REN.
STATE OF CALIFORNIA



1 PROPOSED SIDE (SOUTH) ELEVATION
1/4" = 1'-0"



792 CAPP ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110

CU REVISION

PROPOSED SIDE (SOUTH) ELEVATION	

A 3.01

DATE	04/13/18
SCALE	1/4" = 1'-0"
DRAWN	HP, DV

WALL LEGEND	
	1x12 WOOD SIDING ON NEW EXTERIOR WALL
	1x4 WOOD SIDING ON NEW EXTERIOR WALL

CONSTRUCTION SHEET LEGEND	
NOTE	DESCRIPTION
0.01	NEW CONCRETE FOUNDATION, S.S.D
0.02	NEW CONCRETE SLAB ON GRADE
0.03	NEW CONCRETE RETAINING WALL
0.04	NEW ENTRY STOOP
0.05	NEW CONCRETE PAVING LEADING TO FRONT ENTRANCE
0.06	NEW CONCRETE PAVERS
0.07	NEW UNPAVED AREA DEVOTED TO CLIMATE APPROPRIATE PLANTING - 100SF TOTAL, > 20% OF FRONT SETBACK AREA
0.08	NEW DRIVEWAY WITH 70% PERMEABLE INTERLOCKING CONCRETE PAVERS
0.09	NEW 4' - 0" HIGH FENCE
1.01	NEW CONCRETE STEPS ON GRADE, 12 TREAD DEPTH, 7" MAX RISER HEIGHT
1.03	NEW INTERIOR STAIR, MIN 11" TREAD DEPTH, MAX 7" RISE, WITH STEEL STRUCTURE, HARDWOOD TREADS AND RISERS, STEEL HANDRAILS ON BOTH SIDES, 36" HIGH, GUARDRAILS 42", MAX 4" OPENING.
1.04	NEW EXTERIOR STAIR, MIN 10.5" TR DEPTH, 7.75" RISE, WOOD TREADS, RISERS AND GUARDRAIL/HANDRAIL ON BOTH SIDES, 36" HIGH, MAX OPENING < 4"
1.05	NEW STEEL GUARDRAIL W/ TEMPERED GLASS PANELS, MIN 42" HIGH WITH MAX OPENING < 4"
1.06	NEW MIN 42" HIGH GUARDWALL

CONSTRUCTION SHEET LEGEND	
NOTE	DESCRIPTION
1.07	NEW STEEL GUARDRAIL W/ PICKETS, MIN 42" HIGH WITH MAX OPENING < 4"
1.08	NEW 2" HIGH PARAPET AT ROOF LEVEL
1.09	NEW FLAT ROOF OVER ROOFING MEMBRANE OVER PLYWOOD SHEATHING OVER WOOD FRAMING
1.10	NEW REAR DECK WITH TILES OVER MORTAT BED
1.11	NEW CORNICE ON PARAPET / GUARD WALL WITH 1x12 TRIM BOARD
1.12	NEW 1x18 TRIM BOARD
2.00	NEW INTERIOR DOOR, 20 MIN FIRE RATED
2.01	NEW INTERIOR DOOR, 20 MIN FIRE RATED WITH SLEF CLOSER
2.02	NEW EXTERIOR THERMALLY BROKEN ALUMINUM DOUBLE-GLAZED MULTIPANEL SLIDING DOOR UNIT
2.03	NEW EXTERIOR THERMALLY BROKEN ALUMINUM DOUBLE-GLAZED WINDOW
2.04	NEW EXTERIOR PAINTED WOOD DOOR WITH GLAZED TRANSOM
2.06	NEW EXTERIOR PAINTED WOOD DOOR
2.07	NEW GARAGE DOOR, UPWARD-ACTING, PAINTED WOOD WITH MIN 200SQ IN VENTILATION
3.00	NEW KITCHEN WITH CABINETS, COUNTERS, APPLIANCES AND FIXTURES
3.01	NEW BATHROOM WITH NEW FIXTURES AND FINISHES, TILE FLOOR AND VENTILATION
4.01	NEW HARDWOOD FLOORING

WINDER
GIBSON
architects


interiors
planning
architecture

www.archsf.com

t. 415. 318.8634

1898 mission street
san francisco, ca 94103

LICENSED ARCHITECT
JOHN S. WINDER
No. C 13305
REN.
STATE OF CALIFORNIA



1 PROPOSED REAR (WEST) ELEVATION
1/4" = 1'-0"

792 CAPP ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110

CU REVISION

PROPOSED REAR (WEST)
ELEVATION



DATE04/13/18

SCALE1/4" = 1'-0"

DRAWNHP, DV

A 3.02

1616

WALL LEGEND	
	1x12 WOOD SIDING ON NEW EXTERIOR WALL
	1x4 WOOD SIDING ON NEW EXTERIOR WALL

CONSTRUCTION SHEET LEGEND	
NOTE	DESCRIPTION
0.01	NEW CONCRETE FOUNDATION, S.S.D
0.02	NEW CONCRETE SLAB ON GRADE
0.03	NEW CONCRETE RETAINING WALL
0.04	NEW ENTRY STOOP
0.05	NEW CONCRETE PAVING LEADING TO FRONT ENTRANCE
0.06	NEW CONCRETE PAVERS
0.07	NEW UNPAVED AREA DEVOTED TO CLIMATE APPROPRIATE PLANTING - 100SF TOTAL, > 20% OF FRONT SETBACK AREA
0.08	NEW DRIVEWAY WITH 70% PERMEABLE INTERLOCKING CONCRETE PAVERS
0.09	NEW 4' - 0" HIGH FENCE
1.01	NEW CONCRETE STEPS ON GRADE, 12 TREAD DEPTH, 7" MAX RISER HEIGHT
1.03	NEW INTERIOR STAIR, MIN 11" TREAD DEPTH, MAX 7" RISE, WITH STEEL STRUCTURE, HARDWOOD TREADS AND RISERS, STEEL HANDRAILS ON BOTH SIDES, 36" HIGH, GUARDRAILS 42", MAX 4" OPENING.
1.04	NEW EXTERIOR STAIR, MIN 10.5" TR DEPTH, 7.75" RISE, WOOD TREADS, RISERS AND GUARDRAIL/HANDRAIL ON BOTH SIDES, 36" HIGH, MAX OPENING < 4"
1.05	NEW STEEL GUARDRAIL W/ TEMPERED GLASS PANELS, MIN 42" HIGH WITH MAX OPENING < 4"
1.06	NEW MIN 42" HIGH GUARDWALL

CONSTRUCTION SHEET LEGEND	
NOTE	DESCRIPTION
1.07	NEW STEEL GUARDRAIL W/ PICKETS, MIN 42" HIGH WITH MAX OPENING < 4"
1.08	NEW 2" HIGH PARAPET AT ROOF LEVEL
1.09	NEW FLAT ROOF OVER ROOFING MEMBRANE OVER PLYWOOD SHEATHING OVER WOOD FRAMING
1.10	NEW REAR DECK WITH TILES OVER MORTAT BED
1.11	NEW CORNICE ON PARAPET / GUARD WALL WITH 1x12 TRIM BOARD
1.12	NEW 1x18 TRIM BOARD
2.00	NEW INTERIOR DOOR, 20 MIN FIRE RATED
2.01	NEW INTERIOR DOOR, 20 MIN FIRE RATED WITH SLEF CLOSER
2.02	NEW EXTERIOR THERMALLY BROKEN ALUMINUM DOUBLE-GLAZED MULTIPANEL SLIDING DOOR UNIT
2.03	NEW EXTERIOR THERMALLY BROKEN ALUMINUM DOUBLE-GLAZED WINDOW
2.04	NEW EXTERIOR PAINTED WOOD DOOR WITH GLAZED TRANSOM
2.06	NEW EXTERIOR PAINTED WOOD DOOR
2.07	NEW GARAGE DOOR, UPWARD-ACTING, PAINTED WOOD WITH MIN 200SQ IN VENTILATION
3.00	NEW KITCHEN WITH CABINETS, COUNTERS, APPLIANCES AND FIXTURES
3.01	NEW BATHROOM WITH NEW FIXTURES AND FINISHES, TILE FLOOR AND VENTILATION
4.01	NEW HARDWOOD FLOORING

WINDER
GIBSON
architects

interiors
planning
architecture

www.archsf.com

t. 415. 318.8634

1898 mission street
san francisco, ca 94103


LICENSED ARCHITECT

JOSH S. WINDER

No. C 13305

REN.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA



1 PROPOSED SIDE (NORTH) ELEVATION
1/4" = 1'-0"

792 CAPP ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110

CU REVISION

PROPOSED SIDE (NORTH) ELEVATION	

A 3.03

DATE	04/13/18
SCALE	1/4" = 1'-0"
DRAWN	HP, DV

INSULATION SCHEDULE	
EXTERIOR WALLS	R-21 AT 2X6 WALLS, R-13 AT 2X4 WALLS BLOWN-IN BATTS HERS VERIFIED
INTERIOR WALLS	R-13 MIN 3.5" THICK STANDARD BATTS (FOR SOUND INSULATION ONLY)
UNDER SLAB	R-7 1.5" THICK RIGID FOAM INSULATION HERS VERIFIED
ROOFS	R-38 12" THICK SPRAY-IN CLOSED CELL FOAM HERS VERIFIED
INTERIOR FLOORS	R-19 MIN 5.5" THICK STANDARD BATTS (FOR SOUND INSULATION ONLY)
INTERIOR FLOORS OVER GARAGE	R-38 BLOWN-IN BATTS HERS VERIFIED

CONSTRUCTION SHEET LEGEND	
NOTE	DESCRIPTION
0.01	NEW CONCRETE FOUNDATION, S.S.D
0.02	NEW CONCRETE SLAB ON GRADE
0.03	NEW CONCRETE RETAINING WALL
0.04	NEW ENTRY STOOP
0.05	NEW CONCRETE PAVING LEADING TO FRONT ENTRANCE
0.06	NEW CONCRETE PAVERS
0.07	NEW UNPAVED AREA DEVOTED TO CLIMATE APPROPRIATE PLANTING - 100SF TOTAL, > 20% OF FRONT SETBACK AREA
0.08	NEW DRIVEWAY WITH 70% PERMEABLE INTERLOCKING CONCRETE PAVERS
0.09	NEW 4' - 0" HIGH FENCE
1.01	NEW CONCRETE STEPS ON GRADE, 12 TREAD DEPTH, 7" MAX RISER HEIGHT
1.03	NEW INTERIOR STAIR, MIN 11" TREAD DEPTH, MAX 7" RISE, WITH STEEL STRUCTURE, HARDWOOD TREADS AND RISERS, STEEL HANDRAILS ON BOTH SIDES, 36" HIGH, GUARDRAILS 42", MAX 4" OPENING.
1.04	NEW EXTERIOR STAIR, MIN 10.5" TR DEPTH, 7.75" RISE, WOOD TREADS, RISERS AND GUARDRAIL/HANDRAIL ON BOTH SIDES, 36" HIGH, MAX OPENING < 4"
1.05	NEW STEEL GUARDRAIL W/ TEMPERED GLASS PANELS, MIN 42" HIGH WITH MAX OPENING < 4"
1.06	NEW MIN 42" HIGH GUARDWALL

CONSTRUCTION SHEET LEGEND	
NOTE	DESCRIPTION
1.07	NEW STEEL GUARDRAIL W/ PICKETS, MIN 42" HIGH WITH MAX OPENING < 4"
1.08	NEW 2" HIGH PARAPET AT ROOF LEVEL
1.09	NEW FLAT ROOF OVER ROOFING MEMBRANE OVER PLYWOOD SHEATHING OVER WOOD FRAMING
1.10	NEW REAR DECK WITH TILES OVER MORTAT BED
1.11	NEW CORNICE ON PARAPET / GUARD WALL WITH 1x12 TRIM BOARD
1.12	NEW 1x18 TRIM BOARD
2.00	NEW INTERIOR DOOR, 20 MIN FIRE RATED
2.01	NEW INTERIOR DOOR, 20 MIN FIRE RATED WITH SLEF CLOSER
2.02	NEW EXTERIOR THERMALLY BROKEN ALUMINUM DOUBLE-GLAZED MULTIPANEL SLIDING DOOR UNIT
2.03	NEW EXTERIOR THERMALLY BROKEN ALUMINUM DOUBLE-GLAZED WINDOW
2.04	NEW EXTERIOR PAINTED WOOD DOOR WITH GLAZED TRANSOM
2.06	NEW EXTERIOR PAINTED WOOD DOOR
2.07	NEW GARAGE DOOR, UPWARD-ACTING. PAINTED WOOD WITH MIN 200SQ IN VENTILATION
3.00	NEW KITCHEN WITH CABINETS, COUNTERS, APPLIANCES AND FIXTURES
3.01	NEW BATHROOM WITH NEW FIXTURES AND FINISHES, TILE FLOOR AND VENTILATION
4.01	NEW HARDWOOD FLOORING

WINDER
GIBSON
architects


interiors
planning
architecture

www.archsf.com

t. 415. 318.8634

1898 mission street
san francisco, ca 94103

LICENSED ARCHITECT
JOHN S. WINDER
No. C 13305
REN.
STATE OF CALIFORNIA



1 PROPOSED LONGITUDINAL SECTION
1/4" = 1'-0"

792 CAPP ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110

CU REVISION	
PROPOSED LONGITUDINAL SECTION	

A 3.04	
DATE	04/13/18
SCALE	1/4" = 1'-0"
DRAWN	HP, DV

INSULATION SCHEDULE	
EXTERIOR WALLS	R-21 AT 2X6 WALLS, R-13 AT 2X4 WALLS BLOWN-IN BATTS HERS VERIFIED
INTERIOR WALLS	R-13 MIN 3.5" THICK STANDARD BATTS (FOR SOUND INSULATION ONLY)
UNDER SLAB	R-7 1.5" THICK RIGID FOAM INSULATION HERS VERIFIED
ROOFS	R-38 12" THICK SPRAY-IN CLOSED CELL FOAM HERS VERIFIED
INTERIOR FLOORS	R-19 MIN 5.5" THICK STANDARD BATTS (FOR SOUND INSULATION ONLY)
INTERIOR FLOORS OVER GARAGE	R-38 BLOWN-IN BATTS HERS VERIFIED

CONSTRUCTION SHEET LEGEND	
NOTE	DESCRIPTION
0.01	NEW CONCRETE FOUNDATION, S.S.D
0.02	NEW CONCRETE SLAB ON GRADE
0.03	NEW CONCRETE RETAINING WALL
0.04	NEW ENTRY STOOP
0.05	NEW CONCRETE PAVING LEADING TO FRONT ENTRANCE
0.06	NEW CONCRETE PAVERS
0.07	NEW UNPAVED AREA DEVOTED TO CLIMATE APPROPRIATE PLANTING - 100SF TOTAL, > 20% OF FRONT SETBACK AREA
0.08	NEW DRIVEWAY WITH 70% PERMEABLE INTERLOCKING CONCRETE PAVERS
0.09	NEW 4' - 0" HIGH FENCE
1.01	NEW CONCRETE STEPS ON GRADE, 12 TREAD DEPTH, 7" MAX RISER HEIGHT
1.03	NEW INTERIOR STAIR, MIN 11" TREAD DEPTH, MAX 7" RISE, WITH STEEL STRUCTURE, HARDWOOD TREADS AND RISERS, STEEL HANDRAILS ON BOTH SIDES, 36" HIGH, GUARDRAILS 42", MAX 4" OPENING.
1.04	NEW EXTERIOR STAIR, MIN 10.5" TR DEPTH, 7.75" RISE, WOOD TREADS, RISERS AND GUARDRAIL/HANDRAIL ON BOTH SIDES, 36" HIGH, MAX OPENING < 4"
1.05	NEW STEEL GUARDRAIL W/ TEMPERED GLASS PANELS, MIN 42" HIGH WITH MAX OPENING < 4"
1.06	NEW MIN 42" HIGH GUARDWALL

CONSTRUCTION SHEET LEGEND	
NOTE	DESCRIPTION
1.07	NEW STEEL GUARDRAIL W/ PICKETS, MIN 42" HIGH WITH MAX OPENING < 4"
1.08	NEW 2" HIGH PARAPET AT ROOF LEVEL
1.09	NEW FLAT ROOF OVER ROOFING MEMBRANE OVER PLYWOOD SHEATHING OVER WOOD FRAMING
1.10	NEW REAR DECK WITH TILES OVER MORTAT BED
1.11	NEW CORNICE ON PARAPET / GUARD WALL WITH 1x12 TRIM BOARD
1.12	NEW 1x18 TRIM BOARD
2.00	NEW INTERIOR DOOR, 20 MIN FIRE RATED
2.01	NEW INTERIOR DOOR, 20 MIN FIRE RATED WITH SLEF CLOSER
2.02	NEW EXTERIOR THERMALLY BROKEN ALUMINUM DOUBLE-GLAZED MULTIPANEL SLIDING DOOR UNIT
2.03	NEW EXTERIOR THERMALLY BROKEN ALUMINUM DOUBLE-GLAZED WINDOW
2.04	NEW EXTERIOR PAINTED WOOD DOOR WITH GLAZED TRANSOM
2.06	NEW EXTERIOR PAINTED WOOD DOOR
2.07	NEW GARAGE DOOR, UPWARD-ACTING. PAINTED WOOD WITH MIN 200SQ IN VENTILATION
3.00	NEW KITCHEN WITH CABINETS, COUNTERS, APPLIANCES AND FIXTURES
3.01	NEW BATHROOM WITH NEW FIXTURES AND FINISHES, TILE FLOOR AND VENTILATION
4.01	NEW HARDWOOD FLOORING

WINDER GIBSON architects


interiors
planning
architecture

www.archsf.com

t. 415. 318.8634

1898 mission street
san francisco, ca 94103

LICENSED ARCHITECT
JOHN S. WINDER
No. C 13305
REN.
STATE OF CALIFORNIA



1 PROPOSED TRANSVERSE SECTION
1/4" = 1'-0"

792 CAPP ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110

CU REVISION

PROPOSED TRANSVERSE SECTION	

A 3.06

DATE	04/13/18
SCALE	1/4" = 1'-0"
DRAWN	HP, DV


NEIGHBORING BUILDINGS GHOSTED



④ AXONOMETRIC VIEW - SOUTHWEST



② AXONOMETRIC VIEW - SOUTHEAST



③ AXONOMETRIC VIEW - NORTHWEST



① AXONOMETRIC VIEW - NORTHEAST

WINDER
GIBSON
architects

interiors
planning
architecture

www.archsf.com

t: 415. 318.8634

1898 mission street
san francisco, ca 94103



792 CAPP ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110

CU REVISION

3D AXONOMETRIC
REPRESENTATIONS

A 9.00

DATE 04/13/18

SCALE

DRAWN HP, DV



③ STREET VIEW - SOUTHEAST



② STREET VIEW - NORTHEAST



① STREET VIEW - FRONT

WINDER
GIBSON
architects

interiors
planning
architecture

www.archsf.com

t: 415. 318.8634

1898 mission street
san francisco, ca 94103



792 CAPP ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110

CU REVISION

VIEWS FROM STREET

A 9.01

DATE 04/13/18

SCALE

DRAWN HP, DV



② STREET VIEW - FORMER DESIGN



① STREET VIEW - CURRENT DESIGN

WINDER
GIBSON
architects

interiors
planning
architecture

www.archsf.com

t: 415. 318.8634

1898 mission street
san francisco, ca 94103



792 CAPP ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110

CU REVISION

PROJECT REPRESENTATIONS



A 9.02

DATE 04/13/18

SCALE

DRAWN HP, DV