Executive Summary
Conditional Use / Residential Demolition
HEARING DATE: FEBRUARY 14, 2019

Date: February 7, 2019
Case No.: 2017-005279CUA
Project Address: 448 Valley Street
Zoning: RH-2 (Residential-House, Two-Family)
40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 6612/017
Project Sponsor: Shatara Architecture Inc.
Suheil Shatara
890 7th Street
San Francisco, CA 94107
Staff Contact: Jeff Horn – (415) 575-6925
jeffrey.horn@sfgov.org
Recommendation: Approval with Conditions

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The proposal is for the demolition of an existing two-story-over-garage, 1904 gross square foot single-family residence and to construct a new four-story, 4,450 gross square foot two-unit residential structure. The structure will provide two 3-bedroom units (Unit 1 is 1,209 square feet and Unit 2 is 1,945 square feet) and a 580 square foot two-vehicle garage within a Residential House - Two-Family (RH-2) Zoning District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

REQUIRED COMMISSION ACTION
In order for the Project to proceed, the Commission must grant a Conditional Use Authorization Conditional Use Authorization pursuant to Planning Code Section 303 and 317 for the demolition of a residential unit. Pursuant to Planning Code 317 (c), “where an application for a permit that would result in the loss of one or more Residential Units is required to obtain Conditional Use Authorization by other sections of this Code, the application for a replacement building or alteration permit shall also be subject to Conditional Use requirements.”

ISSUES AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- Preservation Review: The Property is not an “Historical Resource” under CEQA. The Departments Categorical Exemption Determination and PTR determined “No Historic Resource Present.” (See Case No. 2017-0052795ENV)
- **Public Comment.** Department received one letter in opposition to the demolition of the existing structure.

**BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION**

The Department finds that the Project is, on balance, consistent with the Objectives and Policies of the General Plan. Although the Project results in the demolition of an existing single family home, the replacement home will provide an increased number dwelling units and of bedrooms, suitable for families. The Department also finds the project to be necessary, desirable, and compatible with the surrounding neighborhood, and not to be detrimental to persons or adjacent properties in the vicinity.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Draft Motion – Conditional Use Authorization  
Exhibit A – Conditions of Approval  
Exhibit B – Plans and Renderings  
Exhibit C – Environmental Determination  
Exhibit D – Maps and Context Photos  
Exhibit E – Correspondences
ADOPTING FINDINGS RELATING TO THE APPROVAL OF CONDITIONAL USE AUTHORIZATION PURSUANT TO PLANNING CODE SECTIONS 303 AND 317 REQUIRING CONDITIONAL USE AUTHORIZATION FOR THE DEMOLITION OF AN EXISTING SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE.

PREAMBLE

On February 22, 2018, Suheil Shatara (Project Sponsor) filed an application with the Planning Department (hereinafter “Department”) for Conditional Use Authorization under Planning Code Sections 303 and 317 for the demolition of an 1,904 square foot, two-story single-family home and to permit a new 4,450 gross square foot, four-story two-family home (hereinafter “Project”), within an RH-2 (Residential, House, Two-Family) District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

On February 14, 2019, the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter “Commission”) conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting on Conditional Use Application No. 2017-005279CUA.

The project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) as a Class 3 categorical exemption under CEQA.
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. 2017-005279CUA, 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. Site Description and Present Use. The project site is on the north side of Valley Street, between Castro and Noe Streets; Lot 017 in Assessor’s Block 66612 and is located within the RH-2 (Residential House, Two-Family) Zoning District with a 40-X Height and Bulk designation. The 2,850 square foot upward sloping lot (from front and east side) has 25 feet of frontage and a depth of 114 feet. On site is an existing approximately 1,904 gross floor area, two-story-over-garage single-family dwelling that was constructed circa 1910.

3. Surrounding Properties and Neighborhood. The subject property is located on the south side of Noe Valley within Supervisor District 8. Parcels within the immediate vicinity consist of residential one- to three-story, single- and multi-family dwellings. The subject block face exhibits a great variety of architectural styles, scale and massing.

4. Project Description. The proposal is for demolition of an existing two-story-over-garage, 1904 gross square foot single-family residence and to construct a new four-story, 4,450 gross square foot two-unit residential structure. The structure will provide two 3-bedroom units (Unit 1 is 1,209 square feet and Unit 2 is 1,945 square feet) and a 580 square foot two-vehicle garage.

5. Public Comment/Community Outreach. To date, the Department has received one letter in opposition to the demolition of the existing structure.

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

A. 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 has a maximum height of 38 feet – 8 1/2 inches.

B. **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 project proposes the required maximum 15-foot setback.*

C. **Rear Yard Requirement.** Planning Code Section 134 requires, in RH-2 Districts, a rear yard measuring 45 percent of the total depth.

*The project proposes an approximately 49 foot – 9 inch rear yard setback through the averaging of the adjacent properties’ rear yards, the project also includes a 12-foot-deep obstruction permitted under Planning Code Section 136.*

D. **Residential Design Guidelines.** Per Planning Code Section 311, the construction of new residential buildings and alteration of existing residential buildings in R Districts shall be consistent with the design policies and guidelines of the General Plan and with the "Residential Design Guidelines."

*The Residential Design Team determined that the project complies with the Residential Design Guidelines and would not create exceptional or extraordinary circumstances.*

E. **Front Setback Landscaping and Permeability Requirements.** Planning Code Section 132 requires that the required front setback be at least 20% unpaved and devoted to plant material and at least 50% permeable to increase storm water infiltration.

*The project will provide landscape and permeability within required front setback to comply with Section 132 requirements.*

F. **Usable Open Space.** Planning Code Section 135 requires, in RH-2 Districts, usable open space that is accessible by each dwelling (125 Sq. Ft per unit if private, ~166 Sq. Ft. if shared).

*The project provides usable open space that exceeds the minimum private and shared amount required.*

G. **Parking.** Planning Code Section 151 requires one parking space for each dwelling unit.

*The project proposes two off-street parking spaces.*

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

*The Project requires two Class 1 bicycle parking spaces and no Class 2 bicycle parking spaces. The Project will provide two bicycle parking spaces.*
I. **Residential Demolition – Section 317**: Pursuant to Planning Code Section 317, Conditional Use Authorization is required for applications proposing to remove a residential unit. This Code Section establishes a checklist of criteria that delineate the relevant General Plan Policies and Objectives.

*As the project requires Conditional Use Authorization per the requirements of the Section 317, the additional criteria specified under Section 317 have been incorporated as findings a part of this Motion. See Item 8. “Additional Findings pursuant to Section 317” below.*

J. **Residential Density, Dwelling Units.** Per Planning Code Section 209.1, up to two units per lot are principally permitted in RH-2 Districts and up to one unit per 1,500 Sq. Ft. of lot area is allowed with Conditional Use Authorization.

*The project proposes demolition of the existing single-family residence and construction of two dwelling units on the 2,850 square foot parcel.*

K. **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 two new dwelling units. Therefore, the Project is subject to the Residential Child Care Impact Fee and must comply with the requirements outlined in Planning Code Section 414A.*

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 proposed massing allows for a higher density and better use of the site. It will provide two family-sized unit, three bedroom units on the lot, while maintaining ample rear yard open space. The project is designed to be in keeping with the existing development pattern and the neighborhood character.*

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 is designed to be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood; the replacement building is in similar in massing to the structures on the block. The Project results in a building size, shape, and height that is appropriate for the neighborhood context.

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 two off-street parking space per dwelling unit. Two vehicle spaces are proposed, where currently there is one space provided for the existing building.

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

The proposal is residential and will not yield noxious or offensive emissions.

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

The proposed project 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 all 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.

8. Additional Findings pursuant to Section 317 establishes criteria for the Planning Commission to consider when reviewing applications to demolish or convert Residential Buildings. 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 structure appears to be in decent condition.

iii. Whether the property is an “historic resource” under CEQA;
The Planning Department reviewed Historic Resource Determination Supplemental Information and provided a historic resource determination in a Preservation Team Review (PTR) Form. The review concluded that the subject property is not eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) individually or as a contributor to a historic district. Therefore, the existing structure is not a historic resource under CEQA.

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

Not applicable. The Planning Department determined that the existing structure is not a historic resource. Therefore, the removal of the structure would not result in a significant adverse impact on historic resources under CEQA.

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

Project does not convert rental housing to other forms of tenure or occupancy.

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

The single family home was not deed-restricted, tax-credit funded affordable housing. Although Planning Staff does not have the authority to make a determination on the rent control status of a property, it is to be assumed that the unit that was demolished was not subject to the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance.

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

Although the project proposes demolition of the two-bedroom single-family dwelling, there will be a net gain of one unit at the project site. The replacement structure proposed will include two units – both providing three bedrooms.

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

The replacement building will conserve neighborhood character with appropriate scale, design, and materials, and improve cultural and economic diversity by appropriately increasing the number of bedrooms. The project would increase the number of dwelling units, while providing a net gain of four bedrooms to the City’s housing stock.

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

The project does not protect the relative affordability of existing housing, as the project proposes demolition of the existing building, which is generally considered more affordable.
and construction of two new buildings. However, the existing unit is vacant and will be replaced with a unit of comparable size and improved interior layout.

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 has been designed to be in keeping with the scale and development pattern of the established neighborhood character.

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

The project proposes an opportunity for family-sized housing. Two three-bedroom single-family residence are proposed within the two-unit building.

xiii. Whether the Project creates new supportive housing;

The project does not create 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 building is consistent with the block-face and compliments the neighborhood character while preserving much of the existing architecture.

xv. Whether the Project increases the number of on-site Dwelling Units;

The Project will provide a net gain of one unit at the site. The proposed replacement structure is in keeping with the scale and mass of the immediately surrounding development.

xvi. Whether the Project increases the number of on-site bedrooms;

The project proposes two units – both containing three bedrooms – a total of four bedrooms more than the existing building.

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

The project proposes maximizes the density on the subject lot as the proposal includes two units on an RH-2 lot that is 2,850 square feet in size.
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 project proposes replacing the existing unit with two new Dwelling Units of a similar size. The proposal results in two family-sized.

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

**HOUSING ELEMENT**

**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 to construct two family-sized dwelling units.

**OBJECTIVE 11:**
SUPPORT AND RESPECT THE DIVERSE AND DISTINCT CHARACTER OF SAN FRANCISCO’S NEIGHBORHOODS.

Policy 11.1
Promote the construction and rehabilitation of well-designed housing that emphasizes beauty, flexibility, and innovative design, and respects existing neighborhood character.

Policy 11.2
Ensure implementation of accepted design standards in project approvals.

Policy 11.3
Ensure growth is accommodated without substantially and adversely impacting existing residential neighborhood character.

The proposed replacement buildings conform to the Residential Design Guidelines and, while contemporary architecture, are appropriate in terms of scale, proportions and massing for the surrounding neighborhood.

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.

**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.

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

*The proposed replacement building reflects the existing mixed architectural character and development pattern of the neighborhood, particularly by proposing a construction that respects the one- to three- story heights on the block face.*

**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 replacement building has been designed to be compatible with the neighborhood’s mixed massing, width and height. The proposed buildings reflect the pattern of the older development to have bay windows and vertically oriented projections and window form.*

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

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

   *The project is residential and has no impact on neighborhood-serving retail uses.*

B. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods.
While the existing housing is proposed to be demolished, the replacement building would provide two dwelling units in a neighborhood made up of one-, two- and three units of mixed architectural character.

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

While the affordability of the existing unit is not preserved since it is proposed to be demolished, the replacement building will provide two dwelling units that are well-designed and contain a total net gain of four additional bedrooms.

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 one currently exists.

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 proposal 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 project will significantly strengthen the existing building, bringing it up to current building and seismic codes.

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.

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

That based upon the Record, the submissions by the Applicant, the staff of the Department and other interested parties, the oral testimony presented to this Commission at the public hearings, and all other written materials submitted by all parties, the Commission hereby APPROVES Conditional Use Application No. 2017-005279CUA 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. XXXXX. The effective date of this Motion shall be the date of this Motion if not appealed (After the 30-day period has expired) OR the date of the decision of the Board of Supervisors if appealed to the Board of Supervisors. For further information, please contact the Board of Supervisors at (415) 554-5184, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94012.

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

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

I hereby certify that the Planning Commission ADOPTED the foregoing Motion on February 14, 2019.

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES:

NAYS:

ABSENT:

ADOPTED: February 14, 2019
EXHIBIT A

AUTHORIZATION

This authorization is for a conditional use to allow tantamount to demolition of an existing single-family residence and construction of two replacement dwelling units located at 448 Valley, Block 6612, Lot 017 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 February 6, 2019, and stamped “EXHIBIT B” included in the docket for Case No. 2017-005279CUA and subject to conditions of approval reviewed and approved by the Commission on February 14, 2019 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 14, 2019 under Motion No XXXXXX.

PRINTING OF CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL ON PLANS

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

SEVERABILITY

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

CHANGES AND MODIFICATIONS

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

PERFORMANCE

1. **Validity.** The authorization and right vested by virtue of this action is valid for three (3) years from the effective date of the Motion. The Department of Building Inspection shall have issued a Building Permit or Site Permit to construct the project and/or commence the approved use within this three-year period.
   
   *For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org*

2. **Expiration and Renewal.** Should a Building or Site Permit be sought after the three (3) year period has lapsed, the project sponsor must seek a renewal of this Authorization by filing an application for an amendment to the original Authorization or a new application for Authorization. Should the project sponsor decline to so file, and decline to withdraw the permit application, the Commission shall conduct a public hearing in order to consider the revocation of the Authorization. Should the Commission not revoke the Authorization following the closure of the public hearing, the Commission shall determine the extension of time for the continued validity of the Authorization.
   
   *For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org*

3. **Diligent pursuit.** Once a site or Building Permit has been issued, construction must commence within the timeframe required by the Department of Building Inspection and be continued diligently to completion. Failure to do so shall be grounds for the Commission to consider revoking the approval if more than three (3) years have passed since this Authorization was approved.
   
   *For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org*

4. **Extension.** All time limits in the preceding three paragraphs may be extended at the discretion of the Zoning Administrator where implementation of the project is delayed by a public agency, an appeal or a legal challenge and only by the length of time for which such public agency, appeal or challenge has caused delay.
   
   *For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org*

5. **Conformity with Current Law.** No application for Building Permit, Site Permit, or other entitlement shall be approved unless it complies with all applicable provisions of City Codes in effect at the time of such approval.
   
   *For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org*
DESIGN

6. **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*

7. **Landscaping.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 132, the Project Sponsor shall submit a site plan to the Planning Department prior to Planning approval of the building permit application indicating that 50% of the front setback areas shall be surfaced in permeable materials and further, that 20% of the front setback areas shall be landscaped with approved plant species. The size and specie of plant materials and the nature of the permeable surface shall be as approved by the Department of Public Works.
   
   *For information about compliance, contact the Case Planner, Planning Department at 415-558-6378, www.sf-planning.org*

8. **Bicycle Parking.** The Project shall provide no fewer than one Class 1 bicycle parking spaces as required by Planning Code Section 155.
   
   *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*

MONITORING

11. **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*

12. **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

13. **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 Bureau of Street Use and Mapping, Department of Public Works at 415-554-5810, http://sfdpw.org

14. **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

15. **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
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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>448 VALLEY ST</td>
<td>6612017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Permit No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-005279ENV</td>
<td>201704113693</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Addition/Alteration**
- **Demolition (requires HRE for Category B Building)**
- **New Construction**

Project description for Planning Department approval.
Demolition of an existing single-family home and the new construction of a two-family dwelling.

### STEP 1: EXEMPTION CLASS

*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.** Up to three new single-family residences or six 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.

- **Class 32 - In-Fill Development.** New Construction of seven or more units or additions greater than 10,000 sq. ft. and meets the conditions described below:
  - (a) The project is consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations.
  - (b) The proposed development occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than 5 acres substantially surrounded by urban uses.
  - (c) The project site has no value as habitat for endangered rare or threatened species.
  - (d) Approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.
  - (e) The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.

FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING USE ONLY

- **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, etc.)? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Air Pollution 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). |
| ☐ |
| **Transportation:** Does the project create six (6) or more net new parking spaces or residential units? Does the project have the potential to adversely affect transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle safety (hazards) or the adequacy of nearby transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities? |
| ☐ |
| **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 > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Archeological Sensitive Area) |
| ☐ |
| **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 > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography) |
| ☐ |
| **Slope = or > 20%:** Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography) *If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required.* |
| ☐ |
| **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 > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones) *If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required.* |
| ☐ |
| **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 > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones) *If box is checked, a geotechnical report will likely be required.* |
| ☐ |

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.

**Comments and Planner Signature (optional):** Laura Lynch

Archeo Review complete 2/5/2019, no effects

Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation prepared by Murray Engineers Inc. 9/2017. Updated memo addressing change in scope prepared by Murray Engineers Inc. 2/4/2019
STEP 3: PROPERTY STATUS - HISTORIC RESOURCE
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

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

- Category A: Known Historical Resource. GO TO STEP 5.
- Category B: Potential Historical Resource (over 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 4.
- Category C: Not a Historical Resource or Not Age Eligible (under 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 6.

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

Check all that apply to the project.

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

Note: Project Planner must check box below before proceeding.

- 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 PROJECT PLANNER

Check all that apply to the project.

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

8. **Other work consistent** with the *Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* (specify or add comments):

9. **Other work** that would not materially impair a historic district (specify or add comments):

   *(Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator)*

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

   - [ ] Reclassify to Category A
   - [ ] Reclassify to Category C
     - a. Per HRER dated 11/13/2018 *(attach HRER)*
     - b. Other *(specify)*: PTR Dated 11/13/2017

   **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):**
Since the time of original submission, the project description has changed from an addition to demolition and new construction. However, this change does not affect the historic recourse determination or the findings of the

**Preservation Planner Signature:** Jorgen Cleemann

**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. There are no unusual circumstances that would result in a reasonable possibility of a significant effect.

**Project Approval Action:**
**Commission Hearing**

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

**Signature:** Laura Lynch

02/06/2019

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.

Please note that other approval actions may be required for the project. Please contact the assigned planner for these approvals.
**PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW FORM**

**Preservation Team Meeting Date:** 10/24/2017  
**Date of Form Completion:** 11/13/2017

### PROJECT INFORMATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planner</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jørgen G. Cleemann</td>
<td>448 Valley Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block/Lot:</td>
<td>Cross Streets:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6612/017</td>
<td>Castro &amp; Noe 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>2017-005279ENV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PURPOSE OF REVIEW:

- CEQA
- Article 10/11
- Preliminary/PIC

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

- Alteration
- Demo/New Construction

### DATE OF PLANS UNDER REVIEW:

4/7/2017

### PROJECT ISSUES:

- ☒ Is the subject Property an eligible historic resource?

If so, are the proposed changes a significant impact?

Additional Notes:


Proposed Project: Horizontal and vertical addition to existing single family residence; interior alterations.

### PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Historic District/Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ A</td>
<td>☐ B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Property is individually eligible for inclusion in a California Register under one or more of the following Criteria:
  - Criterion 1 - Event: ☐ Yes ☐ No
  - Criterion 2 - Persons: ☐ Yes ☐ No
  - Criterion 3 - Architecture: ☐ Yes ☐ No
  - Criterion 4 - Info. Potential: ☐ Yes ☐ No

- Period of Significance: 

- Property is in an eligible California Register Historic District/Context under one or more of the following Criteria:
  - Criterion 1 - Event: ☐ Yes ☐ No
  - Criterion 2 - Persons: ☐ Yes ☐ No
  - Criterion 3 - Architecture: ☐ Yes ☐ No
  - Criterion 4 - Info. Potential: ☐ Yes ☐ No

- Period of Significance: 

- Contributor ☐ Non-Contributor
Complies with the Secretary's Standards/Art 10/Art 11:  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
CEQA Material Impairment to the individual historic resource:  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
CEQA Material Impairment to the historic district:  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Requires Design Revisions:  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Defer to Residential Design Team:  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

PRESERVATION TEAM COMMENTS:

According to the Historic Resource Evaluation (prepared 6/6/2017) and information found in the Planning Department files, the subject property at 448 Valley Street contains a two-story over-garage, wood-frame, stucco-clad, single-family residence constructed around 1907 and located in the Noe Valley neighborhood of San Francisco. The subject building's primary (south) street-facing facade features a terrazzo stair leading to a recessed off-center entry, flanked to the left (west) by a projecting faceted bay window. The gable-end second story cantilevers over the first story and contains a single centered window.

Notable design features include flying buttresses with arched openings extending into the side yards and, below the second-story window, a decorative crest. Recorded exterior alterations include window replacement and the addition of a skylight (1989). A 1923 photo shows the subject building clad in horizontal wood siding; the existing stucco cladding must have been installed subsequent to that date.

The subject building does not appear to be eligible for individual listing in the California Register under Criterion 1 (events), 2 (persons), 3 (architecture), or 4 (information potential). Although associated broadly with the development of Noe Valley, the subject building does not have a specific association with this or any other historical events to support a finding of significance under Criterion 1. None of the owners or occupants has been identified as sufficiently important to history to merit a finding of significance under Criterion 2. Architecturally, the subject building is an unremarkable example of an altered vernacular residence that is not significant under Criterion 3. (The John Anderson who signed the July 1907 water tap application does not appear to be identified master builder Jonathan Anderson; even if he were, the subject building would not be a notable example of the latter Anderson's work.) Finally, the subject building does not embody a rare construction type and therefore is not likely significant under Criterion 4 as it applies to buildings and structures. (The potential archeological significance of the site, as opposed to the building, is not addressed in this document.)

The subject building does not appear to be located in a historic district. The surrounding buildings were constructed in range of architectural styles over a protracted period of time and do not unify visually or thematically into a historic district.

Therefore the subject building is not eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources either individually or as a contributor to a historic district.

Signature of a Senior Preservation Planner / Preservation Coordinator:  

[Signature]

Date: 11/13/17

SAN FRANCISCO  
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
Figure 1. 448 Valley Street. Screenshot of 2017 Google Streetview.
Parcel Map

Conditional Use Authorization Hearing
Case Number 2017-005279CUA
448 Valley Street
*The Sanborn Maps in San Francisco have not been updated since 1998, and this map may not accurately reflect existing conditions.
Aerial Photo

SUBJECT PROPERTY

Conditional Use Authorization Hearing
Case Number 2017-005279CUA
448 Valley Street
January 31, 2019

San Francisco Planning Commission
Room 400
City Hall

Re: Case No. 2017-005279CUAVAR. 448 Valley Street (Hearing on February 14th)

Dear President Melgar, Vice President Koppel and Fellow Commissioners:

Here are my comments on this project since the standard is Necessary and Desirable and this is the 9th or 10th project in Noe Valley in the past four/five years that is seeking a CUA as a demo, although the original application was an alteration.

The existing house sold for $1.3 million in 2016 and from the web ad appears to be currently sound and livable but could be “upgraded” as well as have an ADU.*

According to the Sheet A0.0, proposed Unit 1 is 1,925 sq. ft. Proposed Unit 2 is 2,065 sq. ft. However the entire building is 4,500 sq. ft. This square footage mimics the Monster Home alterations. I know that the Commission does not like to determine the interior space, but this proposed layout does not seem efficient. The layout of these units is modeled after the Monster Home, where the kitchen space fundamentally dominates an entire floor. As you know this model has created very expensive homes which do not protect relative affordability. These layouts are missing what most traditional San Francisco flats have and that is a hallway. It is possible to design a three bedroom unit on one level. While the Commission rightly took DR on the project at 434 20th Avenue in the past few months and denied the project due to tenant issues, that proposed layout was efficient and the units were ample.

What will be the tenure of these units upon completion? The definition of RH-2 in the Planning Code is for a single family home or two units, one owner occupied and one available for rental. Would two condos preserve relative affordability?

The roof deck is too large. Actually there should be no roof deck as there are not any nearby and the roof deck makes the project less relatively affordable. The RET had a good idea when it proposed that the rear yard should be a shared space and that should be considered for this project. Also, the rear yard should maintain as much of the existing greenery as possible and not become a bunker.

The front of the building facing Valley Street does not meet the RDGs as it has too much glass and compared to the buildings on either side does not maintain the character of the neighborhood. The tree in front of 448 Valley should be preserved.

Thank you.
Georgia Schuttish
Noe Valley Resident

* Is there an official Appraisal of 448 Valley done within the past six months?