Discretionary Review  
Abbreviated Analysis  
HEARING DATE: FEBRUARY 8, 2018

Date: February 1, 2018  
Case No.: 2017-010311DRP  
Project Address: 217 Montana Street  
Permit Application: 2017.08.07.4055  
Zoning: RH-1[Residential House, One-Family]  
40-X Height and Bulk District  
Block/Lot: 7069/042  
Project Sponsor: Kelly Zhou  
217 Montana Street  
San Francisco, CA 94112  
Staff Contact: Nancy Tran – (415) 575-9174  
nancy.h.tran@sfgov.org  
Recommendation: Do not take DR and approve as proposed

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposal is to construct horizontal and vertical additions at the rear of an existing two-story, single-family dwelling. The project includes interior renovation and additional habitable space at the ground floor. No changes are proposed to the front façade along Montana Street.

SITE DESCRIPTION AND PRESENT USE

The project site is on the south side of Montana Street, between Faxon and Capitol Avenues, Lot 042 in Assessor’s Block 7069 and is located within the RH-1 (Residential House, One-Family) Zoning District with a 40-X Height and Bulk designation. The approximately 3,125 square foot lot has 25 feet of frontage and a depth of 125 feet.

SURROUNDING PROPERTIES AND NEIGHBORHOOD

The project site is located in Ocean View, District 11 and within the RH-1 Zoning District. Ocean View Playground is within 600 feet and the closest non-RH-1 parcels are located approximately 1000 feet southwest of the subject property. Parcels within the immediate vicinity primarily consist of residential single-family dwellings of varied design and construction dates.

BUILDING PERMIT NOTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>REQUIRED PERIOD</th>
<th>NOTIFICATION DATES</th>
<th>DR FILE DATE</th>
<th>DR HEARING DATE</th>
<th>FILING TO HEARING TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>311 Notice</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>Nov 7, 2017 – Dec 7, 2017</td>
<td>Dec 4, 2017</td>
<td>Feb 8, 2018</td>
<td>66 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HEARING NOTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>REQUIRED PERIOD</th>
<th>REQUIRED NOTICE DATE</th>
<th>ACTUAL NOTICE DATE</th>
<th>ACTUAL PERIOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Posted Notice</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>January 29, 2018</td>
<td>January 29, 2018</td>
<td>10 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailed Notice</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>January 29, 2018</td>
<td>January 29, 2018</td>
<td>10 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PUBLIC COMMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>/opposed</th>
<th>NO POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent neighbor(s)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (DR Requestor)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other neighbors</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood groups</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Project Sponsor held a pre-application meeting and has reached out to neighbors who have expressed concern regarding the project.

DR REQUESTOR

Hai C Yuan, 219 Montana Street, San Francisco, CA 94112 (adjacent neighbor, west of subject property).

DR REQUESTOR’S CONCERNS AND PROPOSED ALTERNATIVES

See attached Discretionary Review Application, dated December 4, 2017.

PROJECT SPONSOR’S RESPONSE TO DR APPLICATION


ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

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

RESIDENTIAL DESIGN TEAM REVIEW

The Residential Design Advisory Team (RDAT) reviewed the project following the submittal of the Request for Discretionary Review and found that the proposed project is compatible with the standards of the Residential Design Guidelines (RDGs) and that the project does not present any exceptional or extraordinary circumstances.

Under the Commission’s pending DR Reform Legislation, this project would not be referred to the Commission as this project does not contain or create any exceptional or extraordinary circumstances.
RECOMMENDATION: Do not take DR and approve project as proposed

Attachments:
Block Book Map
Sanborn Map
Zoning Map
Aerial Photographs
Section 311 Notice & Plans
Categorical Exemption
DR Notice
DR Application
Response to DR Application dated January 9, 2018
Reduced Plans
Discretionary Review Hearing
Case Number 2017-010311DRP
217 Montana Street
The Sanborn Maps in San Francisco have not been updated since 1998, and this map may not accurately reflect existing conditions.

Sanborn Map*

Discretionary Review Hearing
Case Number 2017-010311DRP
217 Montana Street
Discretionary Review Hearing
Case Number 2017-010311DRP
217 Montana Street
## NOTICE OF BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION (SECTION 311)

On **August 7, 2017**, the Applicant named below filed Building Permit Application No. **2017.08.07.4055** with the City and County of San Francisco.

### PROJECT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Address</td>
<td>217 Montana Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Street(s)</td>
<td>Faxon &amp; Capitol Avenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block/Lot No.</td>
<td>7069/042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning District(s)</td>
<td>RH-1 / 40-X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record No.</td>
<td>2017-010311PRJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPLICANT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Kelly Zhou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>217 Montana Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, State</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA 94112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>(510) 318-0008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bk88sf@gmail.com">bk88sf@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

### PROJECT SCOPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>New Construction</th>
<th>Alteration</th>
<th>Front Addition</th>
<th>Rear Addition</th>
<th>Side Addition</th>
<th>Vertical Addition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of Use</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Rear Addition</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECT FEATURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Use</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback</td>
<td>6 feet</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Setbacks</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Depth</td>
<td>31 feet – 5 inches</td>
<td>71 feet – 6 inches (including stairs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard</td>
<td>87 feet – 7 inches</td>
<td>47 feet – 6 inches (to stairs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>18 feet 3 inches</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Stories</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Dwelling Units</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Parking Spaces</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposal is to construct a horizontal and vertical addition at the rear of an existing two-story, single-family dwelling. The project includes interior renovation and additional habitable space at the ground floor. No changes are proposed to the front façade along Montana Street. See attached plans.

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

---

For more information, please contact Planning Department staff:

- **Planner:** Nancy Tran
- **Telephone:** (415) 575-9174
- **E-mail:** nancy.h.tran@sfgov.org

**Notice Date:** 11/7/17  
**Expiration Date:** 12/7/17
GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT PROCEDURES

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

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

1. Request a meeting with the project Applicant to get more information and to explain the project's impact on you.
2. Contact the nonprofit organization Community Boards at (415) 920-3820, or online at [www.communityboards.org](http://www.communityboards.org) for a facilitated discussion in a safe and collaborative environment. Community Boards acts as a neutral third party and has, on many occasions, helped reach mutually agreeable solutions.
3. Where you have attempted, through the use of the above steps or other means, to address potential problems without success, please contact the planner listed on the front of this notice to discuss your concerns.

If, after exhausting the procedures outlined above, you still believe that exceptional and extraordinary circumstances exist, you have the option to request that the Planning Commission exercise its discretionary powers to review the project. These powers are reserved for use in exceptional and extraordinary circumstances for projects which generally conflict with the City's General Plan and the Priority Policies of the Planning Code; therefore the Commission exercises its discretion with utmost restraint. This procedure is called Discretionary Review. If you believe the project warrants Discretionary Review by the Planning Commission, **you must file a Discretionary Review application prior to the Expiration Date shown on the front of this notice.** Discretionary Review applications are available at the Planning Information Center (PIC), 1660 Mission Street, 1st Floor, or online at [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org). You must submit the application in person at the Planning Information Center (PIC) between 8:00am - 5:00pm Monday-Friday, with all required materials and a check payable to the Planning Department. To determine the fee for a Discretionary Review, please refer to the Planning Department Fee Schedule available at [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org). If the project includes multiple building permits, i.e. demolition and new construction, a **separate request for Discretionary Review must be submitted, with all required materials and fee, for each permit that you feel will have an impact on you.** Incomplete applications will not be accepted.

If no Discretionary Review Applications have been filed within the Notification Period, the Planning Department will approve the application and forward it to the Department of Building Inspection for its review.

BOARD OF APPEALS

An appeal of the Planning Commission’s decision on a Discretionary Review case may be made to the **Board of Appeals within 15 calendar days after the building permit is issued** (or denied) by the Department of Building Inspection. Appeals must be submitted in person at the Board’s office at 1650 Mission Street, 3rd Floor, Room 304. For further information about appeals to the Board of Appeals, including current fees, contact the Board of Appeals at (415) 575-6880.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

This project has undergone preliminary review pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). If, as part of this process, the Department’s Environmental Review Officer has deemed this project to be exempt from further environmental review, an exemption determination has been prepared and can be obtained through the Exemption Map, on-line, at [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org). An appeal of the decision **to exempt the proposed project from CEQA may be made to the Board of Supervisors within 30 calendar days** after the project approval action identified on the determination. The procedures for filing an appeal of an exemption determination are available from the Clerk of the Board at City Hall, Room 244, or by calling (415) 554-5184.

Under CEQA, in a later court challenge, a litigant may be limited to raising only those issues previously raised at a hearing on the project or in written correspondence delivered to the Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, Planning Department or other City board, commission or department at, or prior to, such hearing, or as part of the appeal hearing process on the CEQA decision.
EXISTING FRONT ELEVATION (NORTH)

NO ALTERATIONS TO FRONT FACADE OF SUBJECT BUILDING
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>217 MONTANA ST</td>
<td>7069/042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Permit No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>201708074055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Project description for Planning Department approval.**
Construct a horizontal and vertical addition at the rear of an existing two-story, single-family dwelling. The project includes interior renovation and additional habitable space at the ground floor. No changes are proposed to the front façade along Montana Street.

**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.; change of use 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.
- **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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality</strong></td>
<td>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 &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Air Pollution Exposure Zone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hazardous Materials</strong></td>
<td>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. <em>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</em> (refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; Maher layer).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation</strong></td>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archeological Resources</strong></td>
<td>Would the project result in soil disturbance/modification greater than two (2) feet below grade in an archeological sensitive area or eight (8) feet in a non-archeological sensitive area? (refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Archeological Sensitive Area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment</strong></td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Slope = or &gt; 20%</strong></td>
<td>Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Topography) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seismic: Landslide Zone</strong></td>
<td>Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Seismic Hazard Zones) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seismic: Liquefaction Zone</strong></td>
<td>Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Seismic Hazard Zones) If box is checked, a geotechnical report will likely be required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Comments and Planner Signature (optional):** Nancy Tran
### STEP 3: PROPERTY STATUS - HISTORIC RESOURCE
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

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

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Category A: Known Historical Resource. <strong>GO TO STEP 5.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Category B: Potential Historical Resource (over 45 years of age). <strong>GO TO STEP 4.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Category C: Not a Historical Resource or Not Age Eligible (under 45 years of age). <strong>GO TO STEP 6.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Check all that apply to the project.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1. <strong>Change of use and new construction.</strong> Tenant improvements not included.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>2. <strong>Regular maintenance or repair</strong> to correct or repair deterioration, decay, or damage to building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>3. <strong>Window replacement</strong> that meets the Department’s <strong>Window Replacement Standards</strong>. Does not include storefront window alterations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>4. <strong>Garage work.</strong> A new opening that meets the <strong>Guidelines for Adding Garages and Curb Cuts</strong>, and/or replacement of a garage door in an existing opening that meets the Residential Design Guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>5. <strong>Deck, terrace construction, or fences</strong> not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>6. <strong>Mechanical equipment installation</strong> that is not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>7. <strong>Dormer installation</strong> that meets the requirements for exemption from public notification under <strong>Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 3: Dormer Windows</strong>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>8. <strong>Addition(s)</strong> 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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Project is not listed. <strong>GO TO STEP 5.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Project <strong>does not conform</strong> to the scopes of work. <strong>GO TO STEP 5.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Project involves <strong>four or more</strong> work descriptions. <strong>GO TO STEP 5.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Project involves <strong>less than four</strong> work descriptions. <strong>GO TO STEP 6.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STEP 5: CEQA IMPACTS - ADVANCED HISTORICAL REVIEW
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

Check all that apply to the project.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1. Project involves a <strong>known historical resource (CEQA Category A)</strong> as determined by Step 3 and conforms entirely to proposed work checklist in Step 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>2. <strong>Interior alterations to publicly accessible spaces.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>3. <strong>Window replacement</strong> of original/historic windows that are not “in-kind” but are consistent with existing historic character.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>4. <strong>Façade/storefront alterations</strong> that do not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>5. <strong>Raising the building</strong> in a manner that does not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>6. <strong>Restoration</strong> based upon documented evidence of a building’s historic condition, such as historic photographs, plans, physical evidence, or similar buildings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
      - a. Per HRER dated
      - b. Other (specify):
    - Reclassify to Category C

    *(attach HRER)*

    **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:

---

**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:**

- Building Permit

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

**Signature:**

Nancy Tran 01/22/2018

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.
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

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>217 MONTANA ST</td>
<td>7069/042</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>2017-010311PRJ</td>
<td>201708074055</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>Building Permit</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: ___________________________
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Hearing Date: Thursday, February 8, 2018
Time: Not before 1:00 PM
Location: City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 400
Case Type: Discretionary Review
Hearing Body: Planning Commission

PROPERTY INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Address:</th>
<th>217 Montana Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross Street(s):</td>
<td>Faxon &amp; Capitol Aves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block /Lot No.:</td>
<td>7069/042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning District(s):</td>
<td>RH-1 / 40-X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Plan:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPLICATION INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.:</th>
<th>2017-010311DRP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit:</td>
<td>2017.08.07.4055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Kelly Zhou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>(510) 318-0008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jk88sf@gmail.com">jk88sf@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Request is for a Discretionary Review of Building Permit Application No. 2017.08.07.4055 proposing to construct a horizontal and vertical addition at the rear of an existing two-story, single-family dwelling. The project includes interior renovation and additional habitable space at the ground floor. No changes are proposed to the front facade along Montana Street.

A Planning Commission approval at the public hearing would constitute the Approval Action for the project for the purposes of CEQA, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section 31.04(h).

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

ARCHITECTURAL PLANS: If you are interested in viewing the plans for the proposed project please contact the planner listed below. The plans of the proposed project will also be available prior to the hearing through the Planning Commission agenda at: http://www.sf-planning.org

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

FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE CONTACT PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF:
Planner: Nancy Tran Telephone: (415) 575-9174 E-Mail: nancy.h.tran@sfgov.org
GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT PROCEDURES

HEARING INFORMATION

You are receiving this notice because you are either a property owner or resident that is adjacent to the proposed project or are an interested party on record with the Planning Department. You are not required to take any action. For more information regarding the proposed work, or to express concerns about the project, please contact the Applicant or Planner listed on this notice as soon as possible. Additionally, you may wish to discuss the project with your neighbors and/or neighborhood association as they may already be aware of the project.

Persons who are unable to attend the public hearing may submit written comments regarding this application to the Planner listed on the front of this notice, Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103, by 5:00 pm the day before the hearing. These comments will be made a part of the official public record and will be brought to the attention of the person or persons conducting the public hearing.

Comments that cannot be delivered by 5:00 pm the day before the hearing may be taken directly to the hearing at the location listed on the front of this notice. Comments received at 1650 Mission Street after the deadline will be placed in the project file, but may not be brought to the attention of the Planning Commission at the public hearing.

APPEAL INFORMATION

An appeal of the approval (or denial) of a building permit application by the Planning Commission may be made to the Board of Appeals within 15 calendar days after the building permit is issued (or denied) by the Director of the Department of Building Inspection. Appeals must be submitted in person at the Board's office at 1650 Mission Street, 3rd Floor, Room 304. For further information about appeals to the Board of Appeals, including current fees, contact the Board of Appeals at (415) 575-6880.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

This project has undergone preliminary review pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). If, as part of this process, the Department’s Environmental Review Officer has deemed this project to be exempt from further environmental review, an exemption determination has been prepared and can be obtained through the Exemption Map, on-line, at www.sfplanning.org. An appeal of the decision to exempt the proposed project from CEQA may be made to the Board of Supervisors within 30 calendar days after the project approval action identified on the determination. The procedures for filing an appeal of an exemption determination are available from the Clerk of the Board at City Hall, Room 244, or by calling (415) 554-5184.

Under CEQA, in a later court challenge, a litigant may be limited to raising only those issues previously raised at a hearing on the project or in written correspondence delivered to the Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, Planning Department or other City board, commission or department at, or prior to, such hearing, or as part of the appeal hearing process on the CEQA decision.
APPLICATION FOR
Discretionary Review

1. Owner/Applicant Information

DR APPLICANT'S NAME: HAIC YUAN

DR APPLICANT'S ADDRESS: 219 MONTANA STREET, SAN FRANCISCO ZIP CODE: 94112 TELEPHONE: (415) 586-4263

PROPERTY OWNER WHO IS DOING THE PROJECT ON WHICH YOU ARE REQUESTING DISCRETIONARY REVIEW NAME: JIAYI ZHOU

ADDRESS: 217 MONTANA STREET, SAN FRANCISCO ZIP CODE: 94112 TELEPHONE: (510) 318-0008

CONTACT FOR DR APPLICATION: JANE YUAN

ADDRESS: 219 MONTANA STREET, SAN FRANCISCO ZIP CODE: 94112 TELEPHONE: (415) 513-2070

EMAIL ADDRESS: yuanjane@hotmail.com

2. Location and Classification

STREET ADDRESS OF PROJECT: 217 MONTANA STREET, SAN FRANCISCO ZIP CODE: 94112

CROSS STREETS: FAXON & CAPITOL AVE.


3. Project Description

Please check all that apply
Change of Use ☐ Change of Hours ☐ New Construction ☐ Alterations ☑ Demolition ☐ Other ☐

Additions to Building: Rear ☐ Front ☐ Height ☐ Side Yard ☐ Residential

Present or Previous Use: Residential

Proposed Use: Residential

Building Permit Application No. 2017.08.07.A055 Date Filed: August 7, 2017
4. Actions Prior to a Discretionary Review Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Action</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you discussed this project with the permit applicant?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you discuss the project with the Planning Department permit review planner?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you participate in outside mediation on this case?</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

If you have discussed the project with the applicant, planning staff or gone through mediation, please summarize the result, including any changes there were made to the proposed project. We met with the project sponsor two times. The first time was in July 2017. That was the Pre-application meeting. The second time was in October 2017. Two changes were made to the proposed plan as the result of the two meetings: setback of 3'-2" of rear extension from the shared property line; and removal of 3' x 5' portion next to our deck. Please see Attachment #1 with highlight representing the changes made.
Discretionary Review Request

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

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

Please see the separate paper for our answer to this question.

2. The Residential Design Guidelines assume some impacts to be reasonable and expected as part of construction. Please explain how this project would cause unreasonable impacts. If you believe your property, the property of others or the neighborhood would be adversely affected, please state who would be affected, and how:

Please see the separate paper for our answer to this question.

3. What alternatives or changes to the proposed project, beyond the changes (if any) already made would respond to the exceptional and extraordinary circumstances and reduce the adverse effects noted above in question #1?

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

We understand that although the project meets the minimum standards of the Planning Code, the adverse impacts to our property and our daily lives are exceptional and extraordinary. Our property is abutting to the project property. Please see Attachment #2 which shows the two properties are abutting and we share the same property line. According to the “Notice of Building Permit Application” from the Planning Department, their existing building depth is 31 feet, but after the rear addition, their building depth will increase to 71 feet. This is more than double of what they have currently. Such large scale of rear addition casts shadow to our deck, blocks lights to our kitchen, blocks view to the neighborhood, and their 2nd floor window design imposes threats to our privacy. Please see Attachment #3 which shows the current layout of both properties from the rear view.

The “Rear Yard” section of the San Francisco Residential Design Guidelines states: “When expanding a building into the rear yard, the impact of that expansion on light and privacy for abutting structures must be considered”. And the Guideline to expanding building into the rear yard says: “GUIDELINE: Articulate the building to minimize impact on light and privacy to adjacent properties”.

2. The Residential Design Guidelines assume some impacts to be reasonable and expected as part of construction. Please explain how this project would cause unreasonable impacts. If you believe your property, the property of others or the neighborhood would be adversely affected, please state who would be affected, and how:

We understand that we should expect some impacts as part of their proposed rear addition plan, however given the large scale of their rear addition plan, the adverse impact on our property and our daily lives are unreasonable. Our main concerns are: Light, Privacy, and the "boxed-in" feeling.

Light: Their existing building height is 18'-9". Their building is taller than ours. Please see Attachment #4 which shows their building height comparing to ours. Their proposed rear addition plan retains the same height, and extend at that height 40 feet into the rear yard. Their building depth will increase from the current 31 feet to the proposed 71 feet. Their proposed rear building wall will be the same length as our rear deck wall, which means our entire deck will be under shadow. Given this height and depth of rear addition, it will significantly block the light to our kitchen. We currently get sunlight since morning time, but with their building extension, it casts shadow to our deck, our kitchen will become much darker, and we won't get sunlight until around 11am or noon time. This adverse impact to our lives is daily.

Privacy: Their current 2nd floor window design imposes threats to our privacy. Please see Attachment #5 which shows their window design. They have two windows directly facing our deck. Given that their building is taller than ours (around 10 feet above our deck/kitchen floor), our kitchen is easily seen from these two windows. We lose our privacy with this type of design.

Boxed-in Feeling: Their proposed design leaves 3'-2" space between their building/deck wall to our deck wall. Given the fact that their building is taller than ours (around 10 feet above our deck/kitchen floor), their proposed rear building wall goes all the way that aligns to our rear deck wall, we feel the 3'-2" space is not sufficient. This out-of-scale rear yard addition leaves the surrounding residents and us, their adjacent neighbor, feeling "boxed-in". The Residential Design Guideline does provide that "Even when permitted by the Planning Code, building expansions into the rear yard may not be appropriate if they are uncharacteristically deep or tall".
3. **What alternatives or changes to the proposed project, beyond the changes (if any) already made would respond to the exceptional and extraordinary circumstances and reduce the adverse effects noted above in question #1?**

We would greatly appreciate the project sponsor to consider the following modifications:

a. Remove the two windows on the 2nd floor which directly facing our deck/kitchen. According to the proposed design, there are a total of six windows on the 2nd floor for the Living Room and Dining Room, therefore we think this request is reasonable to make. Please see Attachment #6 where the two windows in concern are circled.

b. Setback additional 5’ x 3’-6” on the 2nd floor. This modification will help to ease the boxed-in feeling and provide lights to our kitchen. Please see Attachment #6 for the mark referring to this setback request.

c. Scale back on the depth of the rear addition (height if possible). Current proposed plan extends 40 feet into the rear yard, and the proposed rear building wall goes all the way to the same length as our rear deck wall. With this scale of extension, our entire deck will be under shadow, and when we look up, we will only see a huge tall building wall right next to us.
Applicant's Affidavit

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

Signature: ___________________________ Date: 12-4-17

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

Zhen Yuan (Jane)

Owner (Authorized Agent fill in one)
Discretionary Review Application Submittal Checklist

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

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

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

For Department Use Only
Application received by Planning Department:

By: Kurt Beth  Date: 12/11/12

DEC 04 2017
CITY & COUNTY OF OR
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
Project Information

Property Address: 217 Montana Street
Building Permit Application(s): 2017.0807.4055
Record Number: 2017-010311DRP

Project Sponsor

Name: Kelly Zhou
Email: jk88sf@gmail.com

Required Questions

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

Please see attached.

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

Please see attached.

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

Please see attached.
## Project Features

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units (only one kitchen per unit - additional kitchens count as additional units)</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Stories (all levels with habitable rooms)</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basement Levels (may include garage or windowless storage rooms)</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces (Off-Street)</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedrooms</td>
<td>Two</td>
<td>Five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>18'-9&quot;</td>
<td>18'-9&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Depth</td>
<td>31'-5&quot;</td>
<td>66'-5&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Value (monthly)</td>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Value</td>
<td>$845,000</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Signature: [Signature]

Printed Name: Kelly Zhou

Date: [Date]

☑ Property Owner

If you have any additional information that is not covered by this application, please feel free to attach additional sheets to this form.
RESPONSE TO DISCRETIONARY REVIEW (drp) – 217 Montana Street

Building Permit Application: 2017.0807.4055

Record Number 2017-010311DRP

Assigned Planner: Nancy Tran

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

   The proposed addition should be approved because it has been modified multiple times to accommodate the DR requester’s concern of light and to comply with the Residential Design Guideline per Planning Review Comments.

   With all of the modifications, our proposed rear addition is now 15' in width on the second floor.

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

Below is a summary of meetings and modifications made:

- **Pre-Application Meeting:** Only the DR requester’s family showed up. Discussions of their concerns on view & shadow issues are documented on Attachment 1 - Summary with DR requester’s initial under each concern and her own note which stated “Extension length-wise instead of width-wise.” Attachment 2 is the Original proposed plans presented during the meeting on 7/17/2017.

- **Redesign to Reduce Width per DR Requesters Pre-Application Meeting Notes:** Provide Setbacks of 3’-2” first story & 6’-8” second story. Building extension to match DR requester’s home, 219 Montana’s rear wall. (Attachment 3 - Building Permit Submittal set dated 8/15/2017)

- **Redesign to Reduce Width per Planning Comments:** Provide 3’-0” on second floor adjacent to 215 Montana (Attachment 4 - Revision#1 dated 9/27/2017)

- **10/5/2017 Follow-Up Meeting with DR Requester’s Family:** During the meeting, the parents requested that we further setback 5’x3’-2” area per story adjacent to their deck to align with the rear kitchen wall, they said if we promised to that, they would not mind windows facing their deck. And we also discussed that use of window covering will protect each other’s privacy. It was a pleasant meeting ending up with a compromise.

- **Revision per Follow-up Meeting:** Provided additional 5’ x 3’-2” setback per agreement. (Attachment 5 – Revision #2 dated 10/9/17)
3. If you are not willing to change the proposed project or pursue other alternatives, please state why you feel that your project would not have any adverse effect on the surrounding properties. Include an explanation of your needs for space or other personal requirements that prevent you from making the changes requested by the DR requester.

- We purchased this 700-square-foot home last year to raise our family here. The proposed addition is significantly below what is permitted by planning code.

- The DR requester’s primary concern is on the shadow impact towards their kitchen window. However, the impacts are not as described by the DR requester because their kitchen window and deck are south facing while our property is on their east side. The major shadow impacts are from the DR requester’s own window awnings, including the one right above their kitchen window.

- Our proposed addition is modest and we have provided multiple concession in setbacks resulting in an addition of only 15’ in width and with the same building depth as the DR requested. Their request for us to further cutback our addition is entirely unreasonable.

- As for privacy concerns, we are as concerned if not more so than the DR requester since the DR requester has full access view into our home from their deck. We would value an evenly lighted house and will have proper window coverings installed for each other’s protection.

- Attachment 6 are renderings of the before and after of our home addition along with the DR Requester’s. It clearly demonstrates that our proposed addition is more than appropriate in terms of size and scale.

Based on the above mentioned, we respectfully requested that the Planning Commission do not take DR and approve our project as modified multiple times. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely Yours,

[Signature]

Kelly Zhou, Owner 217 Montana

Attachment 1 - Summary with DR requester’s initial under each concern and her own note
Attachment 2 - the Original proposed plans presented during the meeting on 7/17/2017.
Attachment 3 - Building Permit Submittal set dated 8/15/2017
Attachment 4 - Revision#1 dated 9/27/2017
Attachment 5 – Revision #2 dated 10/9/17
Attachment 6 - Renderings of the before and after of our home addition
Summary of discussion from the Pre-Application Meeting

Meeting Date: July 17, 2017
Meeting Time: 5PM
Meeting Address: Mini & Lovie Ward Recreational Center Benches at North-West of Park Playground
Project Address: 217 Montana Street
Property Owner Name: Juyi Zhou
Project Sponsor/Representative: Juyi Zhou

Please summarize the questions/comments and your response from the Pre-Application meeting in the space below. Please state if/how the project has been modified in response to any concerns.

Question/Concern #1 by (name of concerned neighbor/neighborhood group): HAI REQUESTED THAT WE ARE BLOCKING THE VIEW & MAJORITY OF THE DECK. SHE ALSO SAID IT WILL PUT SHADOW ON THE DECK.
Project Sponsor Response: 

Question/Concern #2: HAI REQUESTING ABOUT BLOCKING LIGHT & REQUEST WHAT IS OUR MAXIMUM THAT WE CAN EXTEND FOR OUR PROJECT. THEY GAVE A NUMBER THAT WE EXTEND ONLY 12.5 FT FOR EXTENSION TO THEIR DECK PROFILE.
Project Sponsor Response: 

Question/Concern #3: THE LIGHT IS MORE CRITICAL THAN VIEW & VIEW IS THE SECOND consideration. Blocking our kitchen light is our major concern. Your extension of 24 feet is blocking 2/3 of our deck which blocks lights to our kitchen.
Project Sponsor Response: 

Question/Concern #4: HAI DISCUSSED THAT IF WE DO A 10' WIDTH DECK TO THE EXTENSION OF THEIR BUILDING DECK & EXTEND @ 215 MONTANA PROFILE FOR LIVING SPACE, THEY CAN ACCOMMODATE THAT. THEY CARE ABOUT LIGHT AND VIEW AS SIGNIFICANT. WE TRY TO WORK OUT A PLAN THAT CAN ACCOMMODATE BOTH FAMILIES. HUYU NEED A EXTENSION LENGTH-WISE INSTEAD OF WIDTH-WISE.
Project Sponsor Response: 
### Pre-Application Meeting Sign-in Sheet

**Meeting Date:** July 17, 2017  
**Meeting Time:** 6 PM  
**Meeting Address:** Hei & Lovie Ward Recreational Center Benches at North West of Park Playground  
**Project Address:** 219 Montana Street  
**Property Owner Name:** Jay Zhou  
**Project Sponsor/Representative:** Jay Zhou

Please print your name below, state your address and/or affiliation with a neighborhood group, and provide your phone number. Providing your name below does not represent support or opposition to the project; it is for documentation purposes only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE #</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
<th>SEND PLANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hai Yuan</td>
<td>219 Montana</td>
<td>415-513-2070</td>
<td><a href="mailto:yuanjane@hotmail.com">yuanjane@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Chan Gu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Zhen Yuan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
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PRE-APP DWG
07/17/17

EXISTING WALL TO REMAIN
EXISTING WALL TO BE REMOVED
STUCCO WALL TO REMAIN, TYP.

GROUND FLOOR 0'-0"  SECOND FLOOR 7'-9"  ROOF 18'-3"

G.S.M. SCUPPER W/ R.W.L. TO CITY SEWER, TYP.

NO ALTERATIONS TO FRONT FACADE OF SUBJECT BUILDING

INTEGRITY ALL-ULTREX WINDOWS BY "MARVIN" OR EQ., TYP.

1 PROPOSED FRONT ELEVATION
SCALE: 1/4"=1'-0"

2 PROPOSED REAR ELEVATION
SCALE: 1/4"=1'-0"
EXISTING RIGHT ELEVATION
SCALE: 1/8"=1'-0"

EXISTING LEFT ELEVATION
SCALE: 1/8"=1'-0"

PROPOSED RIGHT ELEVATION
SCALE: 1/8"=1'-0"

PROPOSED LEFT ELEVATION
SCALE: 1/8"=1'-0"
217 MONTANA ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94112
HORIZONTAL REAR
ADDITION - RESIDENTIAL
HORIZINTAL ADDITION
217 MONTANA STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94112

GENERAL NOTE
1. PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT THE DRAWINGS ARE PREPARED FOR THE PROJECT LISTED AND ARE LIMITED TO THE EXTENT AS REQUIRED FOR PRELIMINARY PURPOSES BY CITY AGENCIES HAVING JURISDICTION OVER THE PROJECT.
2. IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR TO DESIGN/BUILD (DESIGN AND INSTALL) ALL SYSTEMS AND ELEMENTS AS REQUIRED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE PROJECT, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, PLUMBING, MECHANICAL, FIRE SPRINKLER, ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS, AND ALL DETAILS FOR ROOFING, FLASHING, WATERPROOFING, AND SOUND PROOFING STANDARDS.
3. CONTRACTOR SHALL ADHERE TO ALL CODES, RULES, AND REGULATIONS GOVERNING CONSTRUCTION, BUILDING ACCESS AND THE USE OF FACILITIES AS SET FORTH BY LOCAL BUILDING DEPARTMENT AGENCY, AS WELL AS APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE, OR CITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT, COUNTY AND CITY ORDINANCES, AMENDMENTS AND RULINGS.
4. THE EXISTING CONDITIONS IN THE CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS ARE BASED ON DRAWINGS PROVIDED BY THE OWNER. CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS OF THE LOT, EASEMENT, SOIL CONDITIONS, ALL PROPOSED DIMENSIONS, INCLUDING EXCAVATION, UNDERGROUND, DRAINAGE AND UTILITY LINES AT SUBJECT PROPERTY, AS WELL AS AT ADJACENT PROPERTIES. ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THESE DOCUMENTS AND THE ACTUAL FIELD CONDITIONS SHALL BE BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE ARCHITECT/ENGINEER BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH ANY WORK.
6. CONTRACTOR MUST SUBMIT IN WRITING ANY REQUEST FOR MODIFICATIONS TO THE PLAN.
7. DO NOT SCALE DRAWINGS, WRITTEN DIMENSIONS GOVERN ALL PARTITION LOCATIONS, ALL DOOR AND OPENING LOCATIONS SHALL BE SHOWN ON FLOOR PLAN. IN CASE OF CONFLICT OR DISCREPANCY, NOTIFY THE ARCHITECT/ENGINEER.
8. ALL WORK SHALL BE DONE IN A FIRST CLASS WORKMANLIKE MANNER BY MECHANICS SKILLED IN THEIR RESPECTIVE TRADES.
10. THE ARCHITECT/ENGINEER SHALL NOT CONTROL OR CHARGE OF, AND SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR, CONSTRUCTION MEANS, TECHNIQUES, SEQUENCES OR PROCEDURES, FOR THE OMISSIONS OF THE CONTRACTOR OR SUBCONTRACTORS PERFORMING ANY OF THE WORK OR FOR THE FAILURE OF ANY OF THEM TO CARRY OUT THE WORK IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS.
11. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE STRICT CONTROL OF JOB EXECUTION. PREVENT DUST AND DREDGE FROM EMMANATING FROM CONSTRUCTION AREA BY CONSTRUCTION OF DUST BARRIERS AS MAY BE REQUIRED BY THE SCOPE OF WORK.
12. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL REMOVE FROM THE BUILDING ALL RUBBISH AND WASTE MATERIALS GENERATED OR BY SUBCONTRACTING IF REQUIRED. THE PREMISES SHALL BE LEFT IN A CLEAN AND ORDERLY MANNER.
13. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PATCH/TAP ALL FIRE PROOFING DAMAGE INCURRED DURING CONSTRUCTION BY FIREPROOFING ALL PENETRATIONS THROUGH RATED ASSEMBLIES.
14. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PAY FOR ALL NECESSARY PERMITS, FEES, MATERIALS, LABOR, TOOLS, AND EQUIPMENT FOR THE ENTIRE COMPLETION OF THE WORK INTENDED TO BE DESCRIBED.
15. ALL DRAWINGS, SPECIFICATIONS, AND INFORMATION FURNISHED HEREBY ARE AND SHALL REMAIN THE PROPERTY OF THE ARCHITECT/ENGINEER AND SHALL BE HELD CONFIDENTIAL, AND SHALL NOT BE RELEASED OR SUBMITTED TO ANY OTHER PARTY FOR USE OR TO OTHER TRADES FOR WHICH THEY HAVE NOT BEEN SO DESIGNED AND PREPARED. THE ARCHITECT/ENGINEER DRAWINGS, SPECIFICATIONS OR OTHER DOCUMENTS SHALL NOT BE USED BY THE OWNER OR OTHERS ON OTHER PROJECTS, FOR ADDITIONS TO THIS PROJECT OR FOR COMPLETION OF THIS PROJECT BY OTHERS, EXCEPT BY AGREEMENT IN WRITING, AND WITH APPROPRIATE COMPENSATION TO THE ARCHITECT/ENGINEER.
16. ANY DRAWINGS ISSUED WITHOUT THE APPROVAL STAMP, SIGNED AND DATED BY THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT SHALL BE CONSIDERED IN THE PRELIMINARY STAGE AND SHALL NOT BE CONSIDERED FOR CONSTRUCTION.

A0 - TITLE SHEET AND GENERAL NOTES
A0.1 - TITLE SHEET AND GENERAL NOTES
A0.2 - EXISTING PHOTOS AND FOOT ELEVATION
A0.3 - EXISTING AND PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR PLAN
A0.4 - EXISTING AND PROPOSED SECOND FLOOR PLAN
A0.5 - EXISTING AND PROPOSED ELEVATIONS
A0.6 - PROPOSED BUILDING SECTIONS
A0.7 - GREEN BUILDING SUBMITTAL

BUILDING INFO:
Inglewood - District 13
Project Type: ADU
Project Year: 1946

2016 California Building Code with Local Amendments
California Building Code
2016 California Plumbing Code
2016 California Electrical Code
2016 California Fire Code
2016 California Energy Code
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Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"
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EXISTING RIGHT ELEVATION (WEST)
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

EXISTING LEFT ELEVATION (EAST)
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

PROPOSED RIGHT ELEVATION (WEST)
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

PROPOSED LEFT ELEVATION (EAST)
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"
City and County of San Francisco Green Building Submittal: Residential Additions and Alterations

REQUIREMENTS

The following items are required for all additions and alterations to residential occupancy which increase conditioned area, area, or type of conditioned areas. Requirements apply in one areas and systems within the scope of addition and alteration, with the exception that "designing for occupant comfort" requirements for specific equipment are limited to the scope of addition or alteration. To determine if this is an appropriate project for a Green Building Submittal, please refer to the City of San Francisco's "Residential Additions and Alterations" section for details.

Construction and Demolition Debris: 10% of mixed debris must be transported to a registered hauler to a registered facility and be processed for recycling, in compliance with the San Francisco Construction & Demolition Debris Ordinance (San Francisco Building Code Chapter 13B and Environment Code Chapter 14).

Recycling by Occupants: Provide adequate space and equal access for storage, collection and loading of compostable, recyclable and stormwater materials - See Administrative Bulletin 08-5.

Water Efficient Irrigation: Projects that include a 1,000 square feet of new or modified landscape must comply with the San Francisco Water Efficient Irrigation Ordinance. (See www.mwrpolitics.com/landscape)

Smoke Alarms and Carbon Monoxide Detectors: Install smoke and carbon monoxide detectors in or adjacent to bedrooms, sleeping areas, or exit stairways of a building. SFO completes smoke alarm installation in smoke or carbon monoxide detectors on this page. (Calif. Code of 4903.3)

Smart Irrigation Controller: Automatically adjust irrigation based on water and soil moisture. Controllers must have either an integral or separate rain sensors that connect or communicate with the controller. (Calif. Code 4904.1)

Indoor Water Efficiency: Install water-efficient faucets and fixtures as summarized in 4903.1. Replace all non-compliant fixtures in project area (San Francisco Housing Code 192a).

Energy Efficiency: Comply with California Energy Code (Title 24, Part 2B).

Roof Drainage: Arrows pointing around pipes, electric cable conduits, or other openings in asphaltic plates at exterior walls shall be protected against the passage of moisture by closing with cement mortar, concrete mortar, or a similar material acceptable to the San Francisco Public Works (City of San Francisco Building Code 4406.1).

Resistance: Verify walls and floor framing shall be verified to not exceed .3% moisture content prior to installation. Materials with visible signs of moisture damage shall not be installed. (Calif. Code 4.059.3)

Paving materials: The materials to be used for the finish floor shall not exceed 1% moisture content. Random materials shall be inspected and tested to ensure compliance with the finish floor material. (Calif. Code 4.059.3)

Design and treated HVAC system: per ACCA Manual J and D (Calif. Code 4.060.2)

HVAC Insulation: HVAC systems must be tested and certified in the proper installation of HVAC systems, such as the state certified contractors program, public utility training program or certification as an insulation installer, or program acceptable to the Department of Building Inspection, California Building Code 4.061.3

EXCEPTIONS

WATER EFFICIENCY

WATER EFFICIENCY

All fixtures that are not compliant with the San Francisco Residential Water Conservation Ordinance that serve or are installed within the project area must be replaced with fixtures or things meeting the maximum flow rate and standards at left. For more information, see the OBF ordinance, "San Francisco’s Residential Energy and Water Conservation-Nonprescriptive" or "San Francisco's Residential Energy and Water Conservation Mandatory Requirements" in Section 4030.4.1 of the San Francisco Building Code 4.064.2

Existing NONCOMPLIANT PLUMBING FIXTURES

If a fixture equals or exceeds the table values, the fixture is non-compliant. If the fixture equals or exceeds the table values, the fixture is non-compliant.

Projects that increase total conditioned area by 350 square feet: The Green Building Compliance Professional Record for this project is:

Green Building Compliance Professional - Name and Contact Phone Number

Green Building Compliance Professional - Firm

Signatures for a professional testing and one of the above certificates is required. If the Licensed Professional - Green Building Compliance Specialist does not have an active commission, the signature shall be that of another person who will provide the same professional services as described above.