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PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposal is for the demolition of an existing vacant and unsound one-story single-family dwelling and construction of a new three-story over basement structure with two dwelling units. Unit one is a single-level unit on the first floor with one-bedroom and two bathrooms with a total of 1,242 square feet. The second unit, which is located on the second and third floors, has two-bedrooms, two bathrooms, a private terrace and roof deck with a total of 2,276 square feet. Each unit will have one off-street parking space and one Class 1 bicycle parking space on the basement level. The Project is not seeking any exceptions or variances from the Zoning Code.

The project requires Conditional Use Authorization pursuant to Planning Code Section 317(d) to demolish a dwelling unit. This report includes findings for a Conditional Use Authorization in addition to the Demolition Criteria established in Planning Code Section 317.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXISTING CONDITIONS</th>
<th>PROPOSED CONDITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Of Units</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Of Bedrooms</td>
<td>0 + loft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Area</td>
<td>±400 Gross Floor Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

www.sfplanning.org
SITE DESCRIPTION AND PRESENT USE

The project site is located on the east side of Carolina Street, between 20th and 22nd Streets, Lot 031 in Assessor’s Block 4097 and is located within the RH-2 (Residential-House, Two-Family) Zoning District with a 40-X Height and Bulk District. The site is an approximately 2,500 square foot uphill sloping lot with 25 feet of frontage and a depth of 100 feet. On site is an existing approximately 400 gross floor area, one-story (with loft) single-family dwelling constructed circa 1907. Currently, the structure is vacant and there is no off-street parking for the property.

SURROUNDING PROPERTIES AND NEIGHBORHOOD

The subject property is located in the Showplace Square/Potrero Hill neighborhood and within District 10. Parcels within the immediate vicinity consist of residential single-, two- and three-family dwellings of varied design and construction dates. The block-face is characterized by two- to three-story buildings of mixed architectural style. The buildings on the block vary in density from single-family residences to small multi-unit buildings. The adjacent properties to the north and south are improved with two-story single-family dwellings constructed in 1931 and 1932, respectively, and the house to the east a three-story single-family home, constructed in 1906 and enlarged and extensively remodeled in 2014. On the west side of Carolina Street and along Southern Heights Avenue, the architectural style is also mixed and generally two- and three-story single- and multi-family dwellings. The surrounding properties are located in the RH-2 (Residential-House, Two-Family) Zoning District. The subject property is also within .25-miles of stops for the 10, 14X, 19, 48, 8, 8AX and 8BX MUNI transit lines.

REPLACEMENT STRUCTURE

The replacement structure will provide two dwelling-units with a two-car garage, and would rise to approximately 38 feet, 7 inches in height. The basement will contain a two-car garage and storage. The first floor contains the common front entry area for both units and Unit No. 1. The second and third floor contains Unit No. 2.

The Project proposes a rear yard of approximately 37 feet, which is based on the average of the two adjacent properties. The overall scale, design, and materials of the proposed replacement structure are compatible with the block-face and are complementary to the residential neighborhood character. The materials for the front façade are contemporary in style, with wood siding, stucco, stone and aluminum clad windows and doors.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The project is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) as a Class 1 and Class 3 categorical exemption.

HEARING NOTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>REQUIRED PERIOD</th>
<th>REQUIRED NOTICE DATE</th>
<th>ACTUAL NOTICE DATE</th>
<th>ACTUAL PERIOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classified News Ad</td>
<td>20 days</td>
<td>January 12, 2018</td>
<td>January 10, 2018</td>
<td>22 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PUBLIC COMMENT/COMMUNITY OUTREACH
As of January 24, 2018, the Department had received no comments.

ISSUES AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
- The project will demolish an existing vacant and unsound single-family dwelling with no bedrooms. The new construction will result in one net new unit, bringing the property to the maximum permitted density of two dwelling units with one- and two-bedrooms.
- The Project will demolish existing single-family dwelling that is not considered a historic resource.
- The Department has reviewed the soundness reports and concurs with the determination by the consultant that the existing building is unsound.

REQUIRED COMMISSION ACTION
In order for the Project to proceed, the Commission must grant Conditional Use Authorization to allow demolition of an existing single-family residence for the construction of two replacement dwelling units within the RH-2 Zoning District, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 317(d).

BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION
- The Project will remove an unsound vacant dwelling-unit.
- The Project will result in a net gain of one dwelling-unit.
- No tenants will be displaced as a result of this Project.
- Given the scale of the Project, there will be no significant impact on the existing capacity of the local street system or MUNI.
- The RH-2 Zoning District allows a maximum of two dwelling-units on this lot. This District is intended to accommodate a greater density than what currently exists on-site, and several of the surrounding properties reflect this ability to accommodate the maximum density. The Project is therefore an appropriate in-fill development.
- Although the structure is more than 50-years old, a review of the Historic Resource Evaluation resulted in a determination that the existing building is not a historic resource or landmark.
- The proposed Project meets all applicable requirements of the Planning Code.
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HEARING DATE: FEBRUARY 1, 2018

Case No.: 2017-001990CUA
Project Address: 863 Carolina Street
Zoning: RH-2 (Residential, House, Two-Family) Zoning District
40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 64097/031
Project Sponsor: Jeremy Paul
584 Castro Street #466
San Francisco, CA 94114
Staff Contact: Linda Ajello Hoagland – (415) 575-6823
linda.ajellohoagland@sfgov.org

ADOPTING FINDINGS RELATING TO THE APPROVAL OF CONDITIONAL USE AUTHORIZATION PURSUANT TO PLANNING CODE SECTIONS 303 AND 317(D) OF THE PLANNING CODE TO DEMOLISH A ONE-STORY SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE, AND CONSTRUCT A THREE-STORY OVER BASEMENT, TWO-FAMILY DWELLING WITHIN AN RH-2 (RESIDENTIAL-HOUSE, TWO-FAMILY) ZONING DISTRICT AND A 40-X HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICT, AND ADOPTING FINDINGS UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT.

PREAMBLE

On March 7, 2017, Jeremy Paul (Project Sponsor) filed an application with the Planning Department (hereinafter “Department”) for Conditional Use Authorization under Planning Code Sections 303 and 317 to demolish a single-story residential dwelling, and to construct a three-story over basement, two-family dwelling at 863 Carolina Street within an RH-2 (Residential, House, Two-Family) District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

On June 1, 2017, the Project was determined by the Department to be categorically exempt from environmental review under Case No. 2017-001990ENV. The Commission has reviewed and concurs with said determination.

On February 1, 2018, the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter “Commission”) conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting on Conditional Use Application No. 2017-001990CUA.
The Planning Department Commission Secretary is the custodian of records, located in the File for Case No. 2017-001990CUA, 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 authorizes the Conditional Use requested in Application No. 2017-001990CUA, subject to the conditions contained in “EXHIBIT A” of this motion, 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 proposal is for the demolition of an existing one-story single-family dwelling and construction of a new three-story over basement structure with two dwelling units. Unit one is a single-level unit on the first floor with one-bedroom and two bathrooms with a total of 1,242 square feet. The second unit, which is located on the second and third floors, has two bedrooms, two bathrooms, a private terrace and roof deck with a total of 2,276 square feet. Each unit will have one off-street parking space and one Class 1 bicycle parking space on the basement level.

3. **Site Description and Present Use.** The project site is located on the east side of Carolina Street, between 20th and 22nd Streets, Lot 031 in Assessor’s Block 4097 and is located within the RH-2 (Residential-House, Two-Family) Zoning District with a 40-X Height and Bulk designation. The site is an approximately 2,500 square foot uphill sloping lot with 25 feet of frontage and a depth of 100 feet. On site is an existing approximately 400 gross floor area, one-story (with loft) single-family dwelling constructed circa 1907. Currently, the structure is vacant and there is no off-street parking for the property.

4. **Surrounding Properties and Neighborhood.** The subject property is located in the Showplace Square/Potrero Hill neighborhood and within District 10. Parcels within the immediate vicinity consist of residential single-, two- and three-family dwellings of varied design and construction dates. The block-face is characterized by two- to three-story buildings of mixed architectural style. The buildings on the block vary in density from single-family residences to small multi-unit buildings. The adjacent properties to the north and south are improved with two-story single-family dwellings constructed in 1931 and 1932, respectively, and the house to the east a three-story single-family home, constructed in 1906 and enlarged and extensively remodeled in 2014. On the west side of Carolina Street and along Southern Heights Avenue, the architectural style is also mixed and generally two- and three-story single- and multi-family dwellings. The surrounding properties are located in the RH-2 (Residential-House, Two-Family) Zoning District.
The subject property is also within .25-miles of stops for the 10, 14X, 19, 48, 8, 8AX and 8BX MUNI transit lines.

5. **Public Comment.** The Department has received no formal comments regarding the proposal.

6. **Planning Code Compliance:**

A. **Residential Demolition – Section 317.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 317, Conditional Use Authorization is required for applications proposing to demolish a residential unit in an RH-2 Zoning District. The Code establishes criteria that the Planning Commission shall consider in the review of applications for residential demolition.

   *As the Project requires Conditional Use Authorization per the requirements of Section 317, the additional criteria specified under Section 317 have been incorporated as findings as part of this Motion; please see below.*

B. **Height.** Planning Code Section 260 requires that all structures be no taller than the height prescribed in the subject height and bulk district. The proposed Project is located in a 40-X Height and Bulk District, with a 40-foot height limit. Planning Code Section 261 further restricts height in RH-2 Districts to 30-feet at the front lot line, then at such setback, height shall increase at an angle of 45° toward the rear lot line until the prescribed 40-foot height limit is reached.

   *The project proposes a building that will be approximately 37 feet, 8 inches tall. The building height at the front lot line is approximately 28 feet tall. The third floor is set back 15 feet from the property line, and, therefore complies with the Planning Code and the Height and Bulk District.*

C. **Front Setback Requirement.** Planning Code Section 132 requires, in RH-2 Districts, a front setback that complies to legislated setbacks (if any) or a front back based on the average of adjacent properties (15 foot maximum).

   *The subject property does not have a legislated setback. The average front setback of the adjacent two buildings is zero; therefore, there is no required front setback. The project proposes no front setback, thus, the Project complies with Planning Code Section 132.*

D. **Rear Yard Requirement.** Planning Code Section 134 requires a minimum rear yard depth shall be equal to 45 percent of the total depth of the lot on which the building is situated, except to the extent that a reduction in this requirement is permitted by averaging of the adjacent rear building walls. When averaging, the minimum rear yard allowed is 25%, but in no case less than 15 feet, and shall be provided at the ground level. Permitted projections into the rear yard are also permitted per Planning Code Section 136, such as a two-story addition projecting up to 12 feet into the rear yard with 5 foot side setbacks on each side for the length of the projection.
The subject property is 100 feet deep; and the average rear yard depth of the adjacent neighbors is 37 feet, 1¼ inches; therefore, the rear yard requirement is 37 feet, 1¼ inches. The Project complies with the rear yard requirements.

E. Street Frontage Requirement. Planning Code Section 144 requires that off-street parking entrances be limited to one-third of the ground story width along the front lot line and no less than one-third be devoted to windows, entrances to dwelling units, landscaping and other architectural features that provide visual relief and interest for the street frontage.

The project complies with the street frontage requirement and provides the appropriately-sized entrance to the off-street parking.

F. Street Frontage, Parking and Loading Access Restrictions. Off-street parking shall meet the standards set forth in Planning Code Section 155 with respect to location, ingress/egress, arrangement, dimensions, etc.

Proposed off-street parking for two vehicles will be located wholly within the property, comply with access, arrangement and street frontage dimensional standards.

G. Usable Open Space. Planning Code Section 135 requires, in RH-2 Districts, usable open space that is accessible by each dwelling (125 square feet per unit if private, or 166 square if shared).

The Project provides access to the rear yard area for the lower level unit and access to a private roof deck for the upper level unit. The private open space areas for all units exceed the 125 square feet required; therefore, the Project provides code-complying open space for all dwelling units.

H. Off-Street Parking. Planning Code Section 151 requires one parking space for each dwelling unit.

As the Project provides two dwelling units, two automobile parking spaces are required. The Project proposes two off-street parking spaces and, therefore complies with Planning Code Section 151.

I. Bicycle Parking. Planning Code Section 155.2 requires at least one Class 1 bicycle parking space for each dwelling unit and one Class 2 space for every 20 dwelling units.

The project requires three Class 1 bicycle parking spaces and no Class 2 bicycle parking spaces. The Project proposes two Class 1 bicycle parking spaces, located in the garage.

J. Child Care Requirements for Residential Projects. Planning Code Section 414A requires that any residential development project that results in additional space in an existing residential unit of more than 800 gross square feet shall comply with the imposition of the Residential Child Care Impact Fee requirement.
The Project proposes new construction of a building that results in one net new dwelling. Therefore, the Project is subject to the Residential Child Care Impact Fee and must comply with the requirements outlined in Planning Code Section 414A.

K. Eastern Neighborhood Infrastructure Impact Fees. Planning Code Section 423 is applicable to any development project that results in the new residential use over 800 gross square feet.

The Project includes new residential development over 800 gross square feet. Excluding the square footage dedicated to the accessory parking spaces, this use is subject to Eastern Neighborhood Infrastructure Impact Fees, as outlined in Planning Code Section 423. These fees must be paid prior to the issuance of the building permit application.

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 surrounding neighborhood. The proposal would demolish an existing single-family dwelling that contains a loft and no private bedrooms and has approximately 400 square feet of floor area. The new building will contain one one-bedroom and two-bedroom dwelling units ranging in size from approximately 1,242 square feet and 2,276 square feet, respectively. The siting of the new building will be in conformity with the requirements of the Planning Code and consistent with the objectives of the Residential Design Guidelines.

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 includes a three-story massing along the street, with the fourth floor setback 15 feet from the front building wall, which is appropriate given the context of the surrounding neighborhood. The proposed building provides rear setbacks, all which help to sculpt the building to minimize impacts and remain compatible with the neighborhood’s two- to-three-story buildings.

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;

Planning Code requires one off-street parking space per dwelling unit. The garage provides the two required off-street parking spaces, in addition to the two Class 1 bicycle parking spaces.
iii. The safeguards afforded to prevent noxious or offensive emissions such as noise, glare, dust and odor;

As the Project is residential in nature, the proposed residential use is not considered 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 Project is residential and will be landscaped accordingly.

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 relevant requirements and standards of the Planning Code and 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 RH-2 District.

The proposed project is consistent with the stated purpose of the RH-2 Districts, which are characterized by one- and two-family houses that are finely scaled and usually do not exceed 25 feet in width and 40 feet in height. Additionally, the Project is in conformance with the Planning Code requirements for dwelling units in the RH-2 Zoning District.

8. Planning Code Section 317(d) requires the Planning Commission to establish criteria and procedures for determining the soundness of a structure proposed for demolition, where soundness is an economic measure of the feasibility of upgrading a residence that is deficient with respect to habitability and Housing Code requirements, due to its original construction. The soundness factor for a structure shall be the ratio of a construction upgrade to the replacement cost, expressed as a percent. A building is unsound if its soundness factor exceeds 50-percent. A residential building that is unsound may be approved for demolition.

In accordance with the Planning Commission’s Residential Demolition Policy, the Project Sponsor has submitted a soundness report, which demonstrates that the repair cost exceeds 50-percent of the replacement cost for each building proposed to be demolished. The costs include but are not limited to: collapsed footings, water intrusion due to inadequate flashing, and rebuilding the collapsed rear room and bathroom.

9. 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:

i. 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 open enforcement cases or notices of violation for the subject property.

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

The existing dwelling is vacant with past code-violations for an abandoned building; however, the building has since been registered with the Department of Building Inspection as a Vacant or Abandoned Building, pursuant to Ordinance 194-09. Additionally, the building is unsound due to original design deficiencies, per the soundness report prepared by Patrick Buscovich & Associates Structural Engineers, Inc. on January 6, 2017 and November 28, 2017.

iii. Whether the property is an "historical resource" under CEQA;

Although the existing structures are more than 50 years old, a review of the supplemental information resulted in a determination that neither structure is a historical resource.

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

Not applicable. The existing structures are not historical resources.

v. Whether the project converts rental housing to other forms of tenure or occupancy;

The Project does not convert rental housing to other forms of tenure or occupancy, as the existing building is a vacant single-family residence which has been vacant for over 15 years.

vi. Whether the project removes rental units subject to the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance or affordable housing;

The existing single-family dwelling is currently vacant. Although the single-family dwelling is technically subject to the Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance because it is a residential building constructed before 1979, the Planning Department cannot definitively determine which aspects of the Ordinance are applicable. The Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance includes provisions for eviction controls, price controls, and other controls, and it is the purview of the Rent Board to determine which specific controls apply to a building or property. The Rent Board has confirmed that there are no database records, or any documentation indicating an eviction neither history nor eviction notices filed at the Rent Board for 863 Carolina Street. The Department can confirm that there are no tenants currently living in the dwelling.

vii. Whether the project conserves existing housing to preserve cultural and economic neighborhood diversity;

Although the Project proposes the demolition of an existing unsound dwelling, the new construction project will result in an additional dwelling unit.

viii. Whether the project conserves neighborhood character to preserve neighborhood cultural and economic diversity;
The Project conserves neighborhood character with appropriate scale, design, and materials, and improves cultural and economic diversity by constructing two dwelling units that are consistent with the RH-2 Zoning District. The proposed residential development is characteristic of other existing residential buildings located along Carolina Street; one net new dwelling unit would be added to the City’s Housing Stock.

ix. Whether the project protects the relative affordability of existing housing;

The Project removes an older dwelling unit, which is generally considered more affordable than a more recently constructed unit; however, the existing dwelling is unsound. The project also adds one family-sized dwelling unit to the City’s Housing Stock.

x. 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 proposes less than ten units.

xi. Whether the project locates in-fill housing on appropriate sites in established neighborhoods;

The Project proposes in-fill housing with a total of two dwelling units which is consistent with the varying neighborhood density. The proposed residential development is characteristic of other existing residential buildings located along Carolina Street and in the surrounding neighborhood.

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

The Project proposes an opportunity for family-sized housing. A one-bedroom and a two-bedroom unit are proposed within the new two-unit building. Currently, the property only contains one unsound dwelling with no bedrooms.

xiii. Whether the project creates new supportive housing;

The Project does not create new supportive housing.

xiv. 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 buildings are consistent with the block-face and compliment the neighborhood character with a contemporary design. The proposed residential development is characteristic of other existing residential uses along Carolina Street and in the surrounding neighborhood.

xv. 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 two dwelling units.
xvi. Whether the project increases the number of on-site bedrooms.

*The existing unsound building does not contain any bedrooms. The Project proposes a total of three bedrooms between the two dwelling units.*

xvii. Whether or not the replacement project would maximize density on the subject lot; and

*The maximum density for the subject property is two units. The Project proposes the new construction of a two-unit building, increasing the existing site density and maximizing the density permitted in the RH-2 Zoning District.*

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

*The existing single-family dwelling is currently vacant. Although the single-family dwelling is technically subject to the Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance because it is a residential building constructed before 1979, the Planning Department cannot definitively determine which aspects of the Ordinance are applicable. The Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance includes provisions for eviction controls, price controls, and other controls, and it is the purview of the Rent Board to determine which specific controls apply to a building or property. The Rent Board has confirmed that there are no database records, nor any documentation indicating an eviction history nor eviction notices filed at the Rent Board for 863 Carolina Street. The Department can confirm that there are no tenants currently living in the dwelling.*

*Regarding unit size and count, the existing dwelling unit has approximately 400 square feet of habitable area and zero bedrooms. The proposed building contains two units; one with one bedroom and the second unit with two bedrooms. The new units provide more than the existing square footage and bedroom count.*

10. **General Plan Compliance.** The Project is, on balance, 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 2.1:**

Discourage the demolition of a sound existing housing, unless the demolition results in a net increase in affordable housing.
The project proposes to demolish an unsound structure containing one bathroom and zero bedrooms to construct two new dwelling units with one- and two-bedrooms and thereby contributes to the general housing stock of the city.

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 vacant and unsound dwelling, the new construction project will result in an increase in the density of the property and contributes one net new dwelling unit, a net addition of three bedrooms, to the existing housing stock.

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.

The project proposes to demolish a single-family residence with no bedrooms to construct two dwelling units with one- and two-bedroom. Additionally, the Project includes an elevator which will accommodate access for residents of varying lifestyles and needs.

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 respect 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 11.4
Continue to utilize zoning districts which conform to a generalized residential land use and density plan and the General Plan.

Policy 11.5
Ensure densities in established residential areas promote compatibility with prevailing neighborhood character.

The subject property is within an RH-2 (Residential, House, Two-Family) district which allows for higher residential density than what is existing. The Project proposes a total of two dwelling units with two off-street parking spaces on property located in a neighborhood consisting of single-family residences to small multi-unit buildings with off-street parking. Furthermore, the proposed new construction conforms to the Residential Design Guidelines and is appropriate in terms of material, scale, proportions and massing for the surrounding neighborhood.

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.

The Project proposes demolition of an existing unsound single-family building to construct a two-family with off-street parking. Similar to other existing structures on the block-face, the new building proposes garage access that is subordinate to the existing building façade. The structure, as viewed from the front façade, will continue the stepped pattern of building forms along the block-face with the top floor setback from the main building wall.

Policy 1.3:
Recognize that buildings, when seen together, produce a total effect that characterizes the city and its districts.

The proposed façade and massing are compatible with the existing neighborhood character and development pattern, particularly because the proposed building is of a similar massing, width and height to the existing structures in the neighborhood. A ground floor entry is appropriate given the ground floor entries of adjacent neighbors in the immediate area. The proposed façade and massing of the new building reflects the existing mixed architectural character, varying heights along the block face and will be in keeping with the neighborhood development pattern.
OBJECTIVE 2:
CONSERVATION OF RESOURCES WHICH PROVIDE A SENSE OF NATURE,
CONTINUITY WITH THE PAST, AND FREEDOM FROM OVERCROWDING.

Policy 2.6:
Respect the character of older development nearby in the design of new buildings.

The massing of the replacement buildings’ main front façades has been designed to be compatible with the prevailing street wall height, particularly the height and proportions of the adjacent buildings. Although interpreted in a contemporary architectural style, the proposed building proportions and exterior materials have been selected to be compatible with the adjacent buildings and the immediate neighborhood character.

11. 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 building does not contain commercial uses.

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

While the existing housing is proposed to be demolished, the replacement building would provide two dwelling units in a neighborhood made up of single-family residences to small multi-unit buildings of mixed architectural character.

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

The existing single-family dwelling is currently vacant and unsound. Although the single-family dwelling is technically subject to the Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance because it is a residential building constructed before 1979, the Planning Department cannot definitively determine which aspects of the Ordinance are applicable. The Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance includes provisions for eviction controls, price controls, and other controls, and it is the purview of the Rent Board to determine which specific controls apply to a building or property. The Rent Board has confirmed that there are no database records, nor any documentation indicating an eviction history nor eviction notices filed at the Rent Board for 863 Carolina Street. The Department can confirm that there are no tenants currently living in the dwelling.

D. That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking.
The Project would not have a significant adverse effect on automobile traffic congestion or create parking problems in the neighborhood. The project would enhance neighborhood parking by providing two off-street parking spaces, where none currently exist.

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 is a residential project in an RH-2 District; therefore the Project 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 structure 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.

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

The Project will have no negative impact on existing parks and open spaces. The height of the proposed structure is compatible with the established neighborhood development.

12. 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.

13. 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. 2017-001990CUA subject to the following conditions attached hereto as “EXHIBIT A” 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. *****. 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 February 1, 2018.

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES:

NAYS:

ABSENT:

ADOPTED: February 1, 2018
EXHIBIT A

AUTHORIZATION

This authorization is for a Conditional Use to allow the demolition of an existing one-story single-family residence and construction of a new three-story over basement structure with two dwelling units located at 863 Carolina Street, Block 4097, Lot 031, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 317 within the RH-2 District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District; in general conformance with plans, dated October 17, 2017, and stamped “EXHIBIT B” included in the docket for Case No. 2017-001990CUA and subject to conditions of approval reviewed and approved by the Commission on February 1, 2018 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 February 1, 2018 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](http://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](http://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](http://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](http://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](http://www.sf-planning.org)*

DESIGN

6. **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](http://www.sf-planning.org)*
7. **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.

**PARKING AND TRAFFIC**

8. **Bicycle Parking.** The Project shall provide no fewer than two Class 1 bicycle parking spaces as required by Planning Code Sections 155.1 and 155.2. For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org.

9. **Parking Requirement.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 151, the Project shall provide two independently accessible off-street parking spaces. For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org.

**PROVISIONS**

10. **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.

11. **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**

12. **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.

13. **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

19. **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](http://sfdpw.org).*

20. **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](http://www.sf-planning.org).*

21. **Garbage, Recycling and Composting Receptacles.** Garbage, recycling, and compost containers shall be kept within the premises and hidden from public view, and placed outside only when being serviced by the disposal company. Trash shall be contained and disposed of pursuant to garbage and recycling receptacles guidelines set forth by the Department of Public Works. *For information about compliance, contact the Bureau of Street Use and Mapping, Department of Public Works at 415-554-5810, [http://sfdpw.org](http://sfdpw.org).*
*The Sanborn Maps in San Francisco have not been updated since 1998, and this map may not accurately reflect existing conditions.*
Height and Bulk Map
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CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Address</th>
<th>Block/Lot(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>863 Carolina Street</td>
<td>4097/031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Permit No.</th>
<th>Plans Dated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-001990ENV</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/23/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☑️ Addition/A
Demolition
(requires HRER if over 45 years old)

☑️ New Construction
☐ Project Modification

Project description for Planning Department approval.

Demolish existing one-story single-family residence and construct a new four-story building containing two dwelling units, two vehicle parking spaces, and a roof deck.

STEP 1: EXEMPTION CLASS
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

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

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

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

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

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

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

Comments and Planner Signature (optional): Jean Poling

No archeological effects.

---

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

**TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPERTY IS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING: (refer to Parcel Information Map)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Category A: Known Historical Resource. GO TO STEP 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category B: Potential Historical Resource (over 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category C: Not a Historical Resource or Not Age Eligible (under 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### STEP 4: PROPOSED WORK CHECKLIST
**TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check all that apply to the project.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1. Change of use and new construction. Tenant improvements not included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 2. Regular maintenance or repair to correct or repair deterioration, decay, or damage to building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 3. Window replacement that meets the Department’s Window Replacement Standards. Does not include storefront window alterations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 4. Garage work. A new opening that meets the Guidelines for Adding Garages and Curb Cuts, and/or replacement of a garage door in an existing opening that meets the Residential Design Guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 5. Deck, terrace construction, or fences not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 6. Mechanical equipment installation that is not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 7. Dormer installation that meets the requirements for exemption from public notification under Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 3: Dormer Windows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Project Planner must check box below before proceeding.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check all that apply to the project.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 2. Interior alterations to publicly accessible spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 3. Window replacement of original/historic windows that are not “in-kind” but are consistent with existing historic character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 4. Façade/storefront alterations that do not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 5. Raising the building in a manner that does not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 6. Restoration based upon documented evidence of a building’s historic condition, such as historic photographs, plans, physical evidence, or similar buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 7. Addition(s), including mechanical equipment that are minimally visible from a public right-of-way and meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 8. Other work consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (specify or add comments):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

San Francisco Department of Planning

Revised: 4/11/10
9. Other work that would not materially impair a historic district (specify or add comments):

(Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator)

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

- Reclassify to Category A
- [ ] Reclassify to Category C
  a. Per HRER dated: Per PTR form dated 3/6/17 (attach HRER)
  b. Other (specify):

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

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

Comments (optional):

Preservation Planner Signature: Natalia Kwiatkowska

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

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

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

Planner Name: Signature:

Jean Poling

Digitally signed by Jean Poling
Date: 2017.06.01 11:05:47 -07'00'

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

In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, an appeal of an exemption determination can only be filed within 30 days of the project receiving the first approval action.
STEP 7: MODIFICATION OF A CEQA EXEMPT PROJECT
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

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

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Address (If different than front page)</th>
<th>Block/Lot(s) (If different than front page)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Previous Building Permit No.</th>
<th>New Building Permit No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans Dated</th>
<th>Previous Approval Action</th>
<th>New Approval Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Modified Project Description:

DETERMINATION IF PROJECT CONSTITUTES SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

Compared to the approved project, would the modified project:

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

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

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

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

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

DETERMINATION OF NO SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

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

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

Planner Name: | Signature or Stamp:
## SAN FRANCISCO
### PLANNING DEPARTMENT

**PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW FORM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preservation Team Meeting Date:</th>
<th>Date of Form Completion:</th>
<th>3/6/2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### PROJECT INFORMATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planner:</th>
<th>Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natalia Kwiatkowska</td>
<td>863 Carolina Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block/Lot:</th>
<th>Cross Streets:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4097/031</td>
<td>20th and 22nd Streets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEQA Category:</th>
<th>Art. 10/11:</th>
<th>BPA/Case No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2017-001990ENV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PURPOSE OF REVIEW:

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

### DATE OF PLANS UNDER REVIEW:

1/23/17

### PROJECT ISSUES:

- Is the subject Property an eligible historic resource?  
  - [ ] Yes  
  - [ ] No

- If so, are the proposed changes a significant impact?  
  - [ ] Yes  
  - [ ] No

### Additional Notes:


Proposed Project: Demolition of existing one-story building and new construction of a four-story, two-unit building with a roof deck.

### PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Historic District/Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Criterion 1 - Event: | [ ] Yes  
  - [ ] No |
| Criterion 2 - Persons: | [ ] Yes  
  - [ ] No |
| Criterion 3 - Architecture: | [ ] Yes  
  - [ ] No |
| Criterion 4 - Info. Potential: | [ ] Yes  
  - [ ] No |
| Period of Significance: | N/A  
  - [ ] Contributor  
  - [ ] Non-Contributor |

**RECEPTION:**

- **415.558.6378**
- **415.558.6409**

**Planning Information:**

- **415.558.6377**
### PRESERVATION TEAM COMMENTS:

According to the Historic Resource Evaluation prepared by Left Coast Architectural History (dated February 23, 2017), and information found in the Planning Department files, the subject property at 863 Carolina Street contains a one-and-a-half-story, wood-frame, single-family dwelling designed in the Vernacular style. The building was constructed circa 1907 (source: water tap records) by an unknown architect/builder. The house features wood shingle siding capped with a gable roof at front and a hip roof at rear portion. The original owner and occupant was Frank Priest, a laborer who lived in the house with his wife Catherine and four children. Known exterior alterations to the property include the addition of a sleeping porch at the front of the building in 1919. Additional visual observation and archival research suggests that he house appears to be a combination of two masses joined together: a front gable-roofed portion and a rear hip-roofed portion. The front portion may be the sleeping porch referred to in the 1919 permit. Additional visual inspection reveals the windows in the front gable end have been replaced with sliding aluminum-sash windows and the front entry steps have been altered.

No known historic events occurred at the subject property (Criterion 1). None of the owners or occupants have been identified as important to history (Criterion 2). The building is not architecturally distinct such that it would qualify individually for listing in the California Register under Criterion 3. The subject property is a nondescript example of a vernacular single-family residence.

The subject property is not located within the boundaries of any identified historic district. The subject building is located in the Portrero Hill neighborhood, and the surrounding area is composed primarily of one- to three-story single- and multi-family dwellings constructed between 1900 and 2004. A number of institutional buildings are also present in the area including the First Russian Molokan Christian Church, the SFSU Portrero Hill Head Start School, the Portrero Hill Neighborhood House, and the San Francisco Fire Department Station 37. The subject block exhibits a variety of architectural styles and does not contain a significant concentration of historically or aesthetically unified buildings.

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

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

[Signature]

3-20-2017

SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
Supplemental Information Form

Current Images:

*Primary facade from Carolina Street.*

*Primary facade, from front of lot.*
Disclaimer:
This report is a soundness study on the subject structure. The preparer of this report has prepared this report under generally recognized engineering principle. The preparer has no interest in this property or any other property of the owner nor is the preparer of this report doing any other work on this property or any other property owned by this owner.
Basis of Soundness Report

The soundness evaluation will be based upon the cost to repair and/or remediate applicable soundness criteria. These costs are based upon the house being vacant, which it is currently. The costs are prepared in conjunction with a licensed contractor and represent current construction costs. Not included in these costs are architectural and engineering fees. Permit fees are also included as well as 18% profit/overhead. This soundness cost is to be compared to a replacement cost. Not included in this replacement cost is the demolition cost of the existing structure. It is important to note that the soundness cost number using the 50% threshold do not include the following:

1. Deterioration due to intentional, willful negligence.
3. Remodeling not associated with required work.
4. Upgrade not associated with required work.

The official DCP Soundness Matrix Item number system will be used in this report. The complete DCP Soundness summary and Matrix is in Appendix A.

Planning Information

The lot has an area of 2,500 ft². The zoning is RH2, 40x Height. The DCP property information report is in Appendix C. The assessor shows the floor area as 640 ft². There is no original building permit on microfilm. The original Water Department application gave the floor area of the house as 400 SF. Approximate as-built floor area is 400 SF. A 1918 permit was issued for a front sleeping porch of 180 SF. This porch may not have been built and it is currently missing. For this report I will use the floor area of the house as 400 SF.

Building Description

The structure is a single-family house built in 1907. There is a missing 1918 additional of 180 ft² front porch. The building is a one story, wood framed. The first floor are the habitable rooms. The foundations are unreinforced concrete. Arear room of the house has collapsed (81 SF out of a total of 400 SF or 20%). This partial collapse requires replacement of the rear portion of the building. There is also termite/dryrot work in this rear room.

Summary of Deficiencies

DCP Matrix #1 – Permit Fee ($3,000)

DCP Matrix #5 – Flashing/Weather Proofing (See DCP Matrix #9)

Inadequate/missing flashing and weatherproofing has allowed water intrusion into the rear portion of the house. The rear room has collapse due to a lack of waterproofing. When this building was built in 1907 there was no Building Code for residential construction. The first Building Code for residential construction was the State Housing ACT (SHA) of 1912/Tenement, 1915/Home. The SHA require all exterior wall to be weather resistant, this would have required some type of building paper under the exterior wood siding (Sec. 101). The 1903 San Francisco Building Code did not specifically have Residential Code requirement. The SFBC 1903 did require all exterior walls to be damp proof (Sec. 15A). This section (Attached) would have required building paper.

DCP Matrix #8 Foundation ($9,000)

The existing footing at the collapsed rear room needs to be replaced. The footing were structurally improper for the rebuild. The building is settling down and the foundation are improper (unreinforced concrete for a rebuild. The perimeter of the rear room is 36 L.F. The cost is $250 L.F. x 36 L.F. or $9,000. The SFBC 1903 require structurally stable footing. These footing are not stable.
DCP Matrix #9 — Floor Hazard ($19,440)

The first-floor at the rear is collapsed. The cost to rebuild 81SF @ $240/SF = $19,440. This is due to DCP Matrix 5 missing building paper.

DCP Matrix #17 — Structural Pest (See DCP Matrix #9)

The termite cost to rebuild the collapsed rear room is given in Matrix #9. Termite damage is due to sub-standard construction (see DCP Matrix 5).

DCP Matrix #20 — Bathroom ($19,850)

Rebuild bathroom at collapse rear room. This collapse is due to DCP Matrix 5.

New Construction Cost

Based upon the as-built, the habitable area of the house is 400ft² and. Based upon DCP cost of $240/ft² to rebuild habitable floor:

\[(400/ft^2 \times 240/ft^2) = 96,000\]

50% Cost Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upgrade Cost</th>
<th>Replacement Cost</th>
<th>62% &gt; 50% unsound Building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$59,982</td>
<td>$96,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

Based upon Department of City Planning Guidelines and Engineering Principle's, the building is unsound.
The follow items will require work:

**Upgrade Cost Breakdown**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DCP 50% Matrix Item #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Mark up</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Permit fee 5% x $60K</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Flashing/weather proofing</td>
<td></td>
<td>See #9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rear room foundation 81 liner feet</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$1,620</td>
<td>$10,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rebuild rear room</td>
<td>$19,440</td>
<td>$3,499</td>
<td>$22,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Rebuild bathroom @ rear room</td>
<td>$19,850</td>
<td>$3,573</td>
<td>$23,423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal               | $51,290                                             | +$8,693|         | $59,920 |

18% Mark-up             | $8,692                                              |         |         |         |

Total                   | $59,982                                             |         |         |         |

Note:

Sincerely,

Patrick Buscovich
Structural Engineer

Copyright 2011

List Attachment:
Floor Plans
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ADJACENT BUILDING

NOTES:
1. 1907 400 SQ. FT.
2. 1912 180 SQ. FT. SLEEPING PORCH MISSING.

AREA = 96 SQ. FT.

MISSING SLEEPING PORCH

AREA = 320 SQ. FT.

863 CAROLINA STREET
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ADJACENT BUILDING

PROPERTY LINE
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## SOUNDNESS REPORT TEMPLATE

### DCP 50% Soundness Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix A
## Sample Soundness Report Template

**Project Address:** 863 Carolina

**Job Number:** 16.152

**Replacement Cost**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Space</th>
<th>Area (Square Feet)</th>
<th>Cost per Square Foot</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>occupied, finished spaces</td>
<td>400ft²</td>
<td>$240/ ft²</td>
<td>$96,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfinished space with flat ceiling &amp; &gt; 7'-6&quot; of headroom (e.g., basements, garages)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Replacement Cost Total:** $96,000

## WORK THAT COULD BE INCLUDED IN THE UPGRADE COST ESTIMATE FOR THE 50% THRESHOLD:
(Attach cost estimates from relevant consultants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items considered under 50% Threshold</th>
<th>Description of deficiencies (leave blank if not applicable)</th>
<th>Reference items in cost estimates (pest inspection reports, contractor estimates)</th>
<th>Photo ID that illustrates deficiencies</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Building Permit Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Providing room dimensions at a minimum of 70 sq. ft. for any habitable room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Providing at least one electrical outlet in each habitable room and 2 electrical outlets in each kitchen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Providing at least one switched electrical light in any room where there in running water.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Correcting lack of flashing or proper weather protection if not originally installed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See #9
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items considered under 50% Threshold</th>
<th>Description of deficiencies (leave blank if not applicable)</th>
<th>Reference items in cost estimates (pest inspection reports, contractor estimates)</th>
<th>Photo ID that illustrates deficiencies</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Installing adequate weather protection and ventilation to prevent dampness in habitable rooms if not originally constructed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Provision of garbage and rubbish storage and removal facilities if not originally constructed (storage in garage is permitted).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Eliminating structural hazards in foundation due to structural inadequacies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Eliminating structural hazards in flooring or floor supports, such as defective members, or flooring or supports of insufficient size to safely carry the imposed loads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$19,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Correcting vertical walls or partitions which lean or are buckled due to defective materials or which are insufficient in size to carry vertical loads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Eliminating structural hazards in ceilings, roots, or other horizontal members, such as sagging or splitting, due to defective materials, or insufficient size.</td>
<td>Eliminating structural hazards in ceilings, roots, or other horizontal members, such as sagging or splitting, due to defective materials, or insufficient size.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Eliminating structural hazards in fireplaces and chimneys, such as listing, bulging or settlement due to defective materials or due to insufficient size or strength.</td>
<td>Eliminating structural hazards in fireplaces and chimneys, such as listing, bulging or settlement due to defective materials or due to insufficient size or strength.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Upgrading electrical wiring which does not conform to the regulations in effect at the time of installation.</td>
<td>Upgrading electrical wiring which does not conform to the regulations in effect at the time of installation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Upgrading plumbing materials and fixtures that were not installed in accordance with regulations in effect at the time of installation.</td>
<td>Upgrading plumbing materials and fixtures that were not installed in accordance with regulations in effect at the time of installation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Providing exiting in accordance with the code in effect at the time of construction.</td>
<td>Providing exiting in accordance with the code in effect at the time of construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items considered under 50% Threshold</td>
<td>Description of deficiencies (leave blank if not applicable)</td>
<td>Reference items in cost estimates (pest inspection reports, contractor estimates)</td>
<td>Photo ID that illustrates deficiencies</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Correction of improper roof, surface or sub-surface drainage if not originally installed, if related to the building and not to landscape or yard areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Correction of structural pest infestation (termites, beetles, dry rot, etc.) to extent attributable to original construction deficiencies (e.g., insufficient earth-wood separation).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Repair of fire-resistant construction and fire protection systems if required at the time of construction, including plaster and sheet rock where fire separation is required, and smoke detectors, fire sprinklers, and fire alarms when required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Wood and metal decks, balconies, landings, guardrails, fire escapes and other exterior features free from hazardous dry rot, deterioration, decay or improper alteration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Repairs as needed to provide at least one properly operating water closet, and lavatory, and bathtub or shower.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$19,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Repair of a kitchen sink not operating properly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Provision of kitchen appliances, when provided by the owner, in good working condition, excluding minor damage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Repair if needed of water heater to provide a minimum temperature of 105° and a maximum of 102°, with at least 8 gallons of hot water storage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Provision of both hot and cold running water to plumbing fixtures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items considered under 50% Threshold</td>
<td>Description of deficiencies (leave blank if not applicable)</td>
<td>Reference items in cost estimates (pest inspection reports, contractor estimates)</td>
<td>Photo ID that illustrates deficiencies</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Repair to a sewage connection disposal system, if not working</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Repair heating facilities that allow the maintenance of a temperature of 70° in habitable rooms, if not working</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Repair ventilation equipment, such as bathroom fans, where operable windows are not provided, if not working</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Provision of operable windows in habitable rooms (certain exceptions apply)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Repair of electrical wiring if not maintained in a safe condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Repair of plumbing materials and fixtures if not maintained in good condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Elimination structural hazards in ceilings, roofs, or other horizontal members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Fireplace (See Item #12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Mold &amp; Mildew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Lead &amp; asbestos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Contractor's profit &amp; overhead, not to exceed 18% of construction subtotal. If unit costs used for repair items do not include profit &amp; overhead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

Replacement Cost: $96,000

50% Threshold Upgrade Cost: $48,000

Greater, unsound
863 Carolina St
San Francisco, CA 94107
Report for: 863 CAROLINA

General information related to properties at this location.

PARCELS (Block/Lot):
4097/031

PARCEL HISTORY:
None

ADDRESSES:
863 CAROLINA ST, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107

NEIGHBORHOOD:
Potrero Hill

CURRENT PLANNING TEAM:

http://50.17.237.182/PIM/?dept=planning
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Information</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Area:</td>
<td>640 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Area:</td>
<td>2,495 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Shape:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Frontage:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Depth:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Type:</td>
<td>Wood or steel frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Type:</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooms:</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedrooms:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathrooms:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basement:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner:</td>
<td>ROCKLIN DMITRY &amp; ALLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>699 36TH AVE APT 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAN FRANCISCO CA, 94121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Date:</td>
<td>9/22/2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zoning Report: 863 CAROLINA

Planning Department Zoning and other regulations.

**ZONING DISTRICTS:**

- **RH-2 - RESIDENTIAL- HOUSE, TWO FAMILY**

**HEIGHT & BULK DISTRICTS:**

- **40-X**

**SPECIAL USE DISTRICTS:**

- None

**SPECIAL SIGN DISTRICTS:**

- None

**LEGISLATIVE SETBACKS:**

- None

**COASTAL ZONE:**

- Not in the Coastal Zone

**PORT:**

- Not under Port Jurisdiction

**LIMITED AND NONCONFORMING USES:**

- None
ARTICLE 11 PRESERVATION DESIGNATION: None

NATIONAL REGISTER HISTORIC DISTRICTS: None

CALIFORNIA REGISTER HISTORIC DISTRICTS: None

HISTORIC RESOURCE EVALUATION RESPONSES: None

HISTORIC SURVEYS: None

HISTORIC CONTEXT STATEMENTS: None

LEGACY BUSINESS REGISTRY: None

ARCHITECTURE: Unknown

Planning Applications Report: 863 CAROLINA

Permits are required in San Francisco to operate a business or to perform construction activity. The Planning Department reviews most applications for these permits in order to ensure that the projects comply with the Planning Code. The 'Project' is the activity being proposed.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS: None

SHORT TERM RENTALS: None

Building Permits Report: 863 CAROLINA

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

BUILDING PERMITS: None

Miscellaneous Permits Reviewed By The Planning Dept Report: 863 CAROLINA

http://50.17.237.182/PIM/?dept=planning
BLOCK BOOK NOTIFICATIONS:

None

The Disclaimer: The City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) does not guarantee the accuracy, adequacy, completeness or usefulness of any information. CCSF provides this information on an 'as is' basis without warranty of any kind, including but not limited to warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose, and assumes no responsibility for anyone's use of the information.

Printed: 12/5/2016

http://propertymap.sfplanning.org/dept=planning
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Porch 10' x 18'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report of Residential Building Record (3R)
(Housing Code Section 351(a))

Beware: This report describes the current legal use of this property as compiled from records of City Departments. There has been no physical examination of the property itself. This record contains no history of any plumbing or electrical permits. The report makes no representation that the property is in compliance with the law. Any occupancy or use of the property other than that listed as authorized in this report may be illegal and subject to removal or abatement, and should be reviewed with the Planning Department and the Department of Building Inspection. Errors or omissions in this report shall not bind or stop the City from enforcing any and all building and zoning codes against the seller, buyer and any subsequent owner. The preparation or delivery of this report shall not impose any liability on the City for any errors or omissions contained in said report, nor shall the City bear any liability not otherwise imposed by law.

Address of Building: 863 CAROLINA ST
Block 4097 Lot 031

Other Addresses

1. Present authorized Occupancy or use: ONE FAMILY DWELLING
   A. Is this building classified as a residential condominium? Yes No ✓
   B. Does this building contain any Residential Hotel Guest Rooms as defined in Chap. 41, S.F. Admin. Code? Yes No ✓

2. Zoning district in which located: RH-2
   3. Building Code Occupancy Classification: R-3

4. Do Records of the Planning Department reveal an expiration date for any non-conforming use of this property? Yes No ✓
   If Yes, what date? The zoning for this property may have changed. Call Planning Department, (415) 558-6377, for the current status.

5. Building Construction Date (Completed Date): UNKNOWN
6. Original Occupancy or Use: UNKNOWN
7. Construction, conversion or alteration permits issued, if any:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application #</th>
<th>Permit #</th>
<th>Issue Date</th>
<th>Type of Work Done</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88411</td>
<td>88411</td>
<td>Sep 12, 1919</td>
<td>BUILD SLEEPING PORCH 10X18 ON FRONT OF BUILDING</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. A. Is there an active Franchise Tax Board Referral on file? Yes No ✓
   B. Is this property currently under abatement proceedings for code violations? Yes No ✓

9. Number of residential structures on property: 1

10. A. Has an energy inspection been completed? Yes No ✓
    B. If yes, has a proof of compliance been issued? Yes No ✓

11. A. Is the building in the Mandatory Earthquake Retrofit of Wood-Frame Building Program? Yes No ✓
    B. If yes, has the required upgrade work been completed? Yes No ✓

Date of Issuance: 15 SEP 2016
Date of Expiration: 15 SEP 2017
By: MAY YU
Report No: 201609091363

Patty Herrera, Manager
Records Management Division

This report is valid for one year only. The law requires that, prior to the consummation of the sale or exchange of this property, the seller must deliver this report to the buyer and the buyer must sign it.

(For Explanation of terminology, see attached)
APPLICATION

No. 83411

APPLICATION

OF

Miss. Priest

Owner

To make additions, alterations or repair to building

Location 363

Coraline Street

Estimated Cost $265.00

Filed SEP. 8, 1919

Referred to Inspector

For Report

SEP 12, 1919

Approved

Chief Building Inspector.
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

West side of Caroline street 75 feet north

of 227 1/2 or 163 Caroline St. lot 27 and 27 1/2 street

WRITE Plainly FULL DESCRIPTION OF WORK TO BE DONE

To build Sleeping Porch 10' x 18'
on Front of 203 Building.

Estimated cost of work, $ 263.25

Building to be used as

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

Name of Builder

Address

Address

Report — favorably

James McCurry
Inspector

Seal 11 1919

Owner

Address
The following Regulations have been duly adopted by resolution of the Board of Trustees of the Spring Valley Water Company, and are to be strictly observed by consumers of Spring Valley Water, and considered a part of this agreement:

1. In all cases of non-payment of the water rent within three days after the presentation of the bill, the supply will be cut off, and the water shall not again be let on, either for the present, or for any subsequent occupant, except upon the payment of the amount due, together with the sum of two dollars, 

2. In case of the non-payment of the water rent within the three days, the water will be cut off, and the water shall not be let on, either for the present, or for any subsequent occupant, except upon the condition before mentioned, the place that the rent is not paid, and may be let on again upon the condition before mentioned

3. No person or family supplied with Spring Valley Water shall be permitted to use the water for any other purpose than that excepted in the agreement, nor to supply water in any way to other persons or families.

4. Consumers shall prevent all unnecessary waste of water and shall make no concealment of the purposes for which it is used.

5. In all cases where water is to be supplied to several parties or tenants from one connection or tap, the Company contracts only with one of the several parties, and in case of default, the Company will cut off the connection.

6. In case of any of these regulations shall be violated, the supply of water will be discontinued and not resumed until all charges and expenses are satisfied.

7. The Company does not guarantee pressure.

8. All persons taking water shall keep the service pipes in good repair, at their own expense, and they will be held liable for all damages which may result from their failure to do so.

9. Street Sprinkling with Hose and Standing Irrigators will not be allowed under any circumstances.

10. The inspector or other properly authorized officer of the Company, shall be admitted at all reasonable hours to all parts of any premises supplied with water, to see that these regulations are observed.

No
Date of Supply,
APPLICATION AND AGREEMENT

I hereby agree to take water from the Spring Valley Water Company at the rate of
per month, payable monthly in advance, in U.S. Gold Coin.

San Francisco,

\[\text{Signature}\]

\[\text{Aug. 11, 07}\]

\[\text{Bill, \$374.41}\]

And I hereby covenant and agree that I will protect and save harmless the said corporation from all claims for damage occasioned by the bursting of any of the pipes used for the supply of water under this application.

\[\text{Signature}\]
Building Ordinances

City and County of
San Francisco

Adopted February 6th, 1903

County Engineer - Telephone South 565
City Clerk - Telephone South 15
City Architect - Telephone South 101

PRICE 25c.

If you want to know what is going on in the building business subscribe for

Daily Pacific Builder

The Pioneer: Building Daily
Delivered every business day
for one dollar per month.

1508 Market St Phone South 78
Always progressive and up to date.—
That's the motto of the Daily Pacific
Builder. The daily pointers in its columns
will convince you of this fact. Subscribe
now. 'Twill be the best investment you
ever made.—Tel. South 781 or address 1508
Market St. S. F.
PART I.

WOOD FRAME BUILDINGS.

(Further Sections Applicable to These Buildings Are in Part II.)

(Wood Frame Buildings)

Sec. 12. A wood frame building is a building or structure whose exterior walls, or a portion thereof, are constructed of wood. Buildings sheathed with boards and partially or entirely covered with four inches of brickwork shall be deemed frame buildings. Wood frames covered with metal shall be deemed to be wood structures.

No wood frame building, now erected within the fire limits shall be enlarged or built upon.

No wood frame building, now erected within the fire limits shall be repaired without a permit from the Board of Public Works.

(Height of Same.)

Sec. 13. Wood frame buildings shall be limited to a height of fifty (50) feet. All spires of churches and towers of breweries which are higher than fifty (50) feet, shall have such parts as are higher covered with fireproof materials.

(Walls.)

Sec. 14. The walls of wood frame buildings shall be constructed with studding, covered with weather boarding on the outside. No uncovered studding will be allowed against the wall of an adjoining building or structure.

(Brick or Stone Veneer.)

Sec. 15. The outer walls of wood frame buildings over one story in height, veneered with brick or stone, shall be at least eight (8) inches in thickness, including veneer and studding. No building shall be veneered with brick over three (3) stories in height. Veneered walls must be anchored every three (3) feet in height to the inside studding.

(Thickness of Foundation Walls for Frame Buildings.)

Sec. 16. Brick or concrete foundations for wood frame buildings, one and two stories in height, used as dwellings, must not be less than eight (8) inches thick, and not over four (4) feet high. When the foundations are more than four (4) feet high they must not be less than thirteen (13) inches thick.

Foundations for three-story wood frame buildings shall not be less than thirteen (13) inches thick, and for buildings over three stories, the foundation shall not be less than seventeen (17) inches thick.

When foundation walls of wood frame buildings are used for embankment or retaining wall, one, two and three-story buildings with basement shall have foundation or basement walls of brick or concrete not less than thirteen (13) inches thick, and not higher than eight (8) feet from top of top footing to bottom of first floor joists (first tier of joists).

If a deeper basement be desired the walls thereof shall be not less than seventeen (17) inches thick; the bottom or footing of said walls shall not be higher than ten (10) feet from top of top footing to under side of first story floor joists, and the footing shall have a spread of one-half (1/2) the thickness of the wall resting on it.

All buildings over four (4) stories in height shall have foundation or basement walls of brick or concrete not less than twenty-one (21) inches thick, and shall not be more than twelve (12) feet high from top of top footing to bottom of first story floor joists; footings shall have a spread of one-half (1/2) the thickness of the wall resting on it.

Where it is not allowable to have footings on the outside of a foundation or basement wall, the footings must extend far enough on the inside to make them the required width.

(Size of Studding for Exterior Walls.)

Sec. 17. For a building of two stories or less in height, except factories, mills or warehouses, the studding for the outside walls and bearing partitions shall not be less than 2x4 inches; for a building of three stories in height, the studding shall not be less than 3x4 inches, to the bottom of the upper floor joists, and 2x4 inches for the remaining height; for a building
17001. No portion of any apartment house or hotel shall be used as a machine shop, or a battery repair shop unless it meets the requirements of this chapter for a repair garage.

17002. No automobiles shall be stored in a space beneath a rear yard of an apartment house, except automobiles owned by the tenants or occupants of apartments within the building. (See design of fire-resistant separation in Appendix.)

Article 5. Ventilation

17080. Every garage in a building shall be provided with ventilation meeting the requirements of this article.

17080.1. A private storage garage with an opening into an apartment house or hotel shall be equipped with fixed louvered or screened openings or exhaust ventilation with exhaust openings located within six inches (6") of the floor. The clear area of the louvered openings or of the opening into the exhaust ducts shall be not less than sixty (60) square inches per car stored in such private storage garage. Under no circumstances shall a garage have any opening directly into a room used for sleeping purposes.

17080.2. A public storage garage or a repair garage shall be provided with mechanical exhaust ventilation sufficient to produce one complete change of air every 15 minutes. Such exhaust ventilation shall be taken from a point at or near the floor level.

* 17080.3. Any person in charge of a building or garage in which a mechanical exhaust system of ventilation is installed and used pursuant to this article, who fails, neglects, or refuses to operate and maintain the system in good order and repair so that the air in the garage for which it is provided is not completely changed within the specified interval is guilty of a misdemeanor.

17055. Each ventilation outlet shall lead directly to a free and unobstructed circulation of air; but shall not lead into any inner court.

17055.5. In a public storage garage or in a repair garage not exceeding an area of five thousand (5,000) square feet, the enforcement agency may authorize the omission of such ventilating equipment where in the agency's opinion, the building is supplied with unobstructed openings to the outer air which are sufficient to provide the necessary ventilation.

17085. The fan discharge from a mechanical exhaust system shall be taken to a point above the roof of the building or to the outer air at a point not less than 10 feet from any window in the building in which the garage is located, or in any adjoining building.

Chapter 23. Dormitories

17151. Every dormitory constructed, altered, or converted in any building shall meet the requirements of this chapter.

* 17152. No dormitory shall contain sleeping accommodations for more than 20 persons, nor shall any dormitory be so overcrowded as to be inconsistent with the requirements of this part for cubic air space in rooms used for sleeping purposes.

17153. A dormitory shall have a clear ceiling height of not less than eight feet, measured from the finished floor to the finished ceiling.

17154. In a dormitory having a clear ceiling height of less than 16 feet there shall be but one tier of beds.

In a dormitory having a clear ceiling height of 16 feet or more, measured between the finished floor and finished ceiling, there may be a double tier of beds, one tier above the other, if there is not less than:
(a) Three feet of clear vertical space between beds, or tiers of beds.
(b) Three feet of horizontal space between beds.
(c) One foot of clear space between the floor of the dormitory and the under side of the first tier of beds, if there is more than one tier.

17155. The frames of beds in every dormitory shall be made of steel, iron, or some other hard, smooth, incombustible, and nonabsorbent material.

17156. Windows opening onto a street, or a yard or court, of the dimensions specified in this part and located on the same lot, shall be installed in every dormitory. The window area shall not be less than one-eighth of the superficial floor area in a dormitory containing not more than one tier of beds, nor less than one-fourth the superficial floor area in a dormitory containing a double tier of beds.

* 17157. Every existing dormitory erected prior to August 17, 1923, shall meet the requirements of this part relating to the number of persons and cubic air space. If the housing department issues a certificate of occupancy for any dormitory erected prior to August 17, 1923, which is found by the department to be sanitary and fit for human occupancy, the certificate shall be issued as to the existing structural features and arrangement of the dormitory at the time the certificate is issued, and the dormitory may be used for human habitation.

Chapter 24. Building Construction Generally

Article 1. Details of Construction

17250. Every building shall be constructed in a safe and substantial manner.

17251. Every dwelling shall be so constructed as to provide shelter to the occupants against the elements and exclude dampness in inclement weather.

17252. The materials used in the construction of a building shall be of substantial and approved stock.
State Housing Act
Health and Safety Code, Division 13, Part 1

Earthquake Protection Law
Health and Safety Code, Division 13, Part 3

A Compendium of the California State Housing Act

1909

The first state law of significance to regulate housing in California was enacted by the Legislature on April 16, 1909, Statutes of California of 1909, page 948. It was entitled, "An act to regulate the building and occupancy of tenement houses in incorporated cities, and cities and counties, and to provide penalties for the violation thereof."

A tenement house was defined as, "any house or building, or portion thereof, occupied by the home or residence of three families or more living independently of each other, and doing their cooking upon the premises, or by more than two families upon any floor so living and cooking, but having a common right in the halls, stairways, yards, water-closets or privies or some or any of them."

For a first law, its 22 sections were comprehensive. Its enforcement was entrusted to city officials.

1910

An appellate court decision in 1910 confirmed that the State Tenement House Act provided minimum requirements which could be increased by city councils or boards of supervisors. It could not be relaxed. May v. Craig, 13 Cal. App. 388, 105, Pac. 842, 1910.

1911

In 1911 the act was repealed but replaced by another. The original law was supplemented by the addition of 29 new sections and practically all of the original sections were retained and clarified. It was approved April 10, 1911, Statutes of California of 1911, page 860.

1913

On August 19, 1913, the Supreme Court of the State of California upheld the constitutionality of the State Tenement House Act of 1911. The decision, as recorded in Reports of Cases Determined in the Supreme Court of the State of California, Volume 65, 1914, page 789 (Crim. No. 1795. In Bank—August 19, 1913), reads:

"In the Matter of the Application of Emma W. Stoltenberg, on Habeas Corpus.

"Tenement Houses—Act of 1911—Different Relations Affecting Existing Tenements and Those to be Built—Discrimination Justifiable—The Tenement House Act of 1911 (Stats. 1911, p. 860) which makes detailed provisions regulating the mode of construction and occupation of all tenement houses, is not rendered invalid on account of justifiable discrimination, merely because it establishes, in certain respects, different regulations for existing tenement houses from those made applicable to buildings to be erected.

"1D. Police Power—Regulation of Construction and Occupation of Buildings—The Legislature, in the exercise of the police power, has the right to regulate the manner of the construction and occupation of buildings and particularly tenement houses, to the end of safeguarding the health of their occupants, and lessening the fire hazard.

"1D. Classification of Subjects of Regulation—While constitutional provisions prohibit arbitrary discrimination in favor of or against selected individuals or groups, it is within the legislative power to classify subjects of regulation and to pass laws applicable to all of a class, provided that the classification so made be founded upon some reasonable, intrinsic basis of differentiation."
"ID. Validity of Classification—The question whether a classification of subjects for the exercise of the police power is proper is not to be determined upon any hard and fast rules but must be answered after a consideration of the particular subject of legislation.

"ID. Difference Between Existing Tenements and Those to Be Built—There is a substantial, inherent, logical difference between tenement houses already constructed and those to be built, and this difference is one that the Legislature might fairly make the basis of the different treatment that it has accorded to the two classes by such act.

(N.B.—It is of interest to note that the principles enunciated in the above cases were reaffirmed in an appellate court decision of 1945. 62 CA 2d, page 839).

This Tenement House Act was again repealed and re-enacted with amendments, including one making explicit the right and duty of city health departments to enforce its provisions. It was approved June 18, 1913, Statutes of California of 1913, page 787.

An act to regulate the building and occupancy of hotels and lodging houses in incorporated towns, incorporated cities, and cities and counties was approved on June 16, 1913, and became effective on August 10, 1913, Statutes of California of 1913, page 1429.

1915

Among the 1915 amendments were sections authorizing the Commission of Immigration and Housing to enforce all of the maintenance provisions of the laws within cities after the expiration of a 30-day notice of specific violations to the local enforcement agency. The amended law was approved May 29, 1915, Statutes of California of 1915, page 952.

1917

Within the eight months preceding the convening of the 1917 Legislature, the Commission of Immigration and Housing, through Paul Scharrenberg who was secretary, held four meetings in different parts of the State. Twelve cities named official delegates—some 30 in number—including supervisors, councilmen, city attorneys, health, housing, building and fire commissioners and inspectors. These were joined by semiofficial delegates representing architectural and engineering societies, city planning and housing associations, public welfare and civic clubs, realty boards and chambers of commerce, apartment house and hotel owners’ associations, labor and medical organizations, social workers and similar bodies.

As a result of these conferences three laws were evolved: covering tenement houses, hotels, and lodging houses respectively. These laws were introduced in the Legislature for the Commission of Immigration and Housing by Senators Benson and Burnett.

The previous Tenement House Act and the previous Hotel and Lodging House Act, which applied only to incorporated cities, were repealed and two new, revised, expanded laws, which were made applicable to all parts of the State of California, were adopted. They were entitled the "State Tenement House Act" and the "State Hotel and Lodging House Act." They were both approved on May 31, 1917, Statutes of California of 1917, page 1473 and page 1422.

The third was an entirely new law regulating the construction, reconstruction, moving, alteration, maintenance, use and occupancy of dwellings in incorporated cities. It was likewise approved on May 31, 1917, and went into effect on September 1, 1917, Statutes of California of 1917, page 1461.

There were 90 sections in the State Tenement House Act, 88 sections in the State Hotel and Lodging House Act and 35 sections in the State Dwelling House Act. City and county building and health departments were charged with enforcement of the laws and the Commission of Immigration and Housing was authorized to enforce the maintenance features in both incorporated and unincorporated areas following the termination of a 30-day notice citing specific violations to the local enforcement agency.

1921

In 1921 a housing law was passed but the people, by referendum, refused to uphold the statute as enacted by the Legislature. The Commission of Immigration and Housing was in favor of the referendum and one of the commissioners, by order of the commission, had written the argument therefor. Shortly thereafter it was considered advisable to call another series of meetings of housing experts throughout the State. The meetings were attended by the same type of people who were present at the 1916 meetings.

1922

The first of the above meetings was held in December, 1922. A special committee of 10 members was selected to draft a new State Housing Law.

1923

The committee held several conferences and prepared a draft which combined the three 1917 housing laws into one. This was submitted to all known interested persons. The committee reconvened for the purpose of considering amendments suggested by the various persons to whom the proposed law had been sent. Many of the suggestions were incorporated in the final draft.

This bill, with slight variations, after practically unanimous vote of the Legislature and the approval of the Governor became effective on August 7, 1923.

1925

The 1925 Legislature made 5 amendments to the act.

1929

The 1929 Legislature made 6 amendments to the act.

1937

The 1937 Legislature made 54 amendments to the act.

1939

The 1939 Legislature made 10 amendments to the act.

1941

The 1941 Legislature made 10 amendments to the act.

1943

The 1943 Legislature made 1 amendment to the act.
### Amendments to State Housing Act

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present section number</th>
<th>Original section number</th>
<th>Effective date</th>
<th>Amended date</th>
<th>Nature and extent of amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>The second sentence was added in 1951.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15001</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>The word “hotel” was inserted in 1923 and amended to omit it during the same legislative session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15002</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>The word “construction” was changed to “construction or building”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15003</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>The word “site” was inserted in 1923 and amended to omit it during the same legislative session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15004</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>The word “building” was substituted for “apartment house or hotel.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15004.1</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>The word “building” was substituted for “apartment house or hotel.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15005</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Added in 1951.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15006</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>The word “building” was substituted for “apartment house or hotel.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15007</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Added in 1951.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15008</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>The word “building” was substituted for “apartment house or hotel.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15009</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Added in 1951.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15010</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>The word “building” was substituted for “apartment house or hotel.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15011</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Added in 1951.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15012</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>The word “building” was substituted for “apartment house or hotel.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15013</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Added in 1951.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15014</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>The word “building” was substituted for “apartment house or hotel.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15015</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Added in 1951.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15016</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>The word “building” was substituted for “apartment house or hotel.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15016.1</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Added in 1951.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15017</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>The word “building” was substituted for “apartment house or hotel.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15018</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Added in 1951.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15019</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>The word “building” was substituted for “apartment house or hotel.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15020</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Added in 1951.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15021</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>The word “building” was substituted for “apartment house or hotel.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15022</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Added in 1951.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15023</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>The word “building” was substituted for “apartment house or hotel.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15024</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Added in 1951.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15025</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>The word “building” was substituted for “apartment house or hotel.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15026</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Added in 1951.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15027</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>The word “building” was substituted for “apartment house or hotel.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15028</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Added in 1951.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15029</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>The word “building” was substituted for “apartment house or hotel.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15030</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Added in 1951.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15031</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>The word “building” was substituted for “apartment house or hotel.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15031.5</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Added in 1951.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15032</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>The word “building” was substituted for “apartment house or hotel.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15033</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Added in 1951.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15034</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>The word “building” was substituted for “apartment house or hotel.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15035</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Added in 1951.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15036</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>The word “building” was substituted for “apartment house or hotel.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15037</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Added in 1951.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15151.1</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>The word “building” was substituted for “apartment house or hotel.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15151.2</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Added in 1951.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15151.3</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>The word “building” was substituted for “apartment house or hotel.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15152</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Added in 1951.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15153</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>The word “building” was substituted for “apartment house or hotel.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15153.2</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Added in 1951.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The amendments to the State Housing Act are charted on the following pages. To encourage and facilitate uniform enforcement of the law throughout the State, present section numbers, the original section numbers, the effective date of each section, the date of each amendment since 1923, the nature and extent of amendments, and retroactive sections of the act are indicated.

Present section numbers originated at the 1930 Session of the Legislature. The State Housing Act (Statutes of 1923, Chapter 386, page 781; Deering Act 6548) was codified in the Health and Safety Code (Statutes of 1939, Chapter 60, page 482). The rephrasing of many sections, for clarification only, are without change in legal effect.
Use of these plans and specifications shall be restricted to the original site for which they were prepared and shall constitute prima facie evidence of the acceptance of these restrictions.

863 CAROLINA STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107

BLOCK 4097 LOT 031  PROJECT NO. 2016.044

ROCKLIN RESIDENCE

02.28.2017

SITE PERMIT: 01.23.2017

PHOTOS

1. SUBJECT PROPERTY AND ADJACENT BLDG.
2. FRONT FACADE
3. FRONT FACADE DETAIL
4. AERIAL PHOTO
5. AERIAL FRONT PHOTO
6. AERIAL REAR PHOTO
7. WEST STRUCTURES
8. ACROSS THE STREET NEIGHBORS
Use of these plans and specifications shall be restricted to the original site for which they were prepared and no use thereof shall constitute prima facie evidence of the acceptance of these restrictions.
GENERAL FLOOR PLAN NOTES:

1. BATT INSULATION AT ALL OPEN EXTERIOR WALLS PER TITLE 24 REQUIREMENTS.
2. ACoustIc INSULATION AT ALL (N) INTERIOR WALLS AND FLOORS JOISTS WHERE ALL EXPOSED WALL AREAS, TYP.
3. NEW GLASS LOCATED IN HAZARDOUS LOCATIONS SHALL BE TEMPERED (T) OR SAFETY GLASS PER C.B.C. SECTION 2406.4 INCLUDING GLAZINGS IN DOORS, GLAZING IN NOTED EXPOSED PHASES OF SUDDEN DOOR ASSEMBLIES AND DOORS, AND GLAZINGS IN ALL UNFRAMED SWINGING DOORS. ADDITIONALLY WHERE THE BOTTOM EXPOSED EDGE OF THE GLAZING IS LESS THAN 60" ABOVE THE WALKING SURFACE.

KEY NOTES:

1. (N) 3/4" THK. RIFT / QUARTER SAWN WHITE OAK ENGINEERED WD. FLOORS, TYP., EXCEPT BATHS
2. (N) 20 MIN RATED DOOR ON SELF CLOSING HARDWARE.
3. (N) FIXTURES, CABINETS, APPLIANCES, ALL FINISHES TYP. IN ALL BATHS.
4. (N) FIXTURES, CABINETS, ALL FINISHES IN KITCHEN.
5. (N) 1 3/4" THK. SOLID CORE PTD. WD. DOORS, WITH (N) DOOR HARDWARE TYP. - SEE DOOR SCHEDULE
6. (N) 1/2" THK. STAR PHIRE TEMPERED SHOWER GLASS DOOR W/ CR LAURENCE "ANNEHEIM" SQUARE CORNER HINGE P.C. FINISH TYP. AT ALL SHOWER LOCATIONS
7. PROVIDE 1 HOUR RATED CONSTRUCTION AT CLOSET WALLS, CEILINGS, AND UNDERSIDE OF STAIRS TO PROTECT COMMON CORRIDOR

FLOOR PLAN LEGEND:

- PROPERTY LINE
- REGO SETBACK
- (E) ELEMENTS TO BE REMOVED
- (N) WALLS
- (N) 1 HOUR RATED WALL
- (N) SOLID 42" GUARDRAIL
- (N) FENCE

SAFD-II 81-CM-99-A.99 - 1/4" = 1'-0"

863 CAROLINA STREET
4097 / 033, 2-STORY STRUCTURE

871 CAROLINA STREET
4097 / 032, 2-STORY STRUCTURE

859 CAROLINA STREET
4097 / 032, 2-STORY STRUCTURE

BASEMENT PROPOSED FLOOR PLAN

863 CAROLINA STREET
4097 / 033, 2-STORY STRUCTURE

871 CAROLINA STREET
4097 / 032, 2-STORY STRUCTURE

859 CAROLINA STREET
4097 / 032, 2-STORY STRUCTURE
Use of these plans and specifications shall be restricted to the original site for which they were prepared and acceptance of these plans and specifications shall constitute prima facie evidence of the acceptance of these restrictions.

1/4" = 1'-0"

FIRST FLOOR PROPOSED FLOOR PLAN

863 CAROLINA STREET
4097 / 031, 4-STORY STRUCTURE

859 CAROLINA STREET
4097 / 032, 2-STORY STRUCTURE

871 CAROLINA STREET
4097 / 030, 2-STORY STRUCTURE

863 CAROLINA STREET

4097 / 031, 4-STORY STRUCTURE

FLOOR PLAN LEGEND:
- PROPERTY LINE
- REGO SETBACK
- (E) ELEMENTS TO BE REMOVED
- (N) WALLS
- (N) 1 HOUR RATED WALL
- (N) SOLID 42" GUARDRAIL
- (N) FENCE

859 CAROLINA STREET
4097 / 032, 2-STORY STRUCTURE
45% OF LOT DEPTH
YARD SETBACK
AVERAGE OF ADJACENT
BUILDING WALLS
PROPERTY LINE
PROPERTY LINE

859 CAROLINA STREET
4097 / 032, 2-STORY STRUCTURE
SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING

FIRST FLOOR F.C.
SECOND FLOOR F.F.
SECOND FLOOR F.C.
THIRD FLOOR F.F.
THIRD FLOOR F.C.
FOURTH FLOOR F.F.
BASEMENT FLOOR F.C.

8'-6"
9'-0"
9'-0"
8'-0"
7'-0"

EXISTING SOUTH EXTERIOR ELEVATION

PROPOSED SOUTH EXTERIOR ELEVATION

Use of these plans and specifications shall be restricted to the original site for which they were prepared and ... with these plans and specifications shall constitute prima facie evidence of the acceptance of these restrictions.