



DISCRETIONARY REVIEW ANALYSIS

HEARING DATE: January 14, 2021

Continued from January 7, 2021

| Record No.: | 2017-011977DRP-02 |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Project Address: | 3145-3147 Jackson Street |
| Permit Applications | : 2018.1010.2850 |
| Zoning: | RH-2 [Residential House, Two-Family] |
| | 40-X Height and Bulk District |
| Block/Lot: | 0983/017 |
| Project Sponsor: | Steve Geiszler |
| | Geiszler Architects |
| | 2155 Powell St. |
| | San Francisco, CA 94133 |
| Staff Contact: | David Winslow – (628) 652-7335 |
| | david.winslow@sfgov.org |
| Recommendation: | Do Not Take DR and Approve |

Project Description

The project proposes to construct a one-story vertical addition; a two-level below grade addition; a horizontal addition at the front of the home to create a three-car garage; a partial infill of existing lightwells, and decks added at the front and rear of a two-unit building. One of the two units will be enlarged 226% (6,904 gsf total).

Site Description and Present Use

The site is a 27'-8" wide x 128' deep lateral and steep up sloping lot with an existing 3-story, two-family home built in 1904 and is categorized as a 'A' –Historic Resource present.

Surrounding Properties and Neighborhood

The buildings on this block of Jackson Street have a consistent scale of 4-stories that have varying setbacks from the street and a range of architectural traditional styles and forms. The depth of the subject and immediately adjacent buildings create a small but well-defined mid-block open space.

Building Permit Notification

| Туре | Required Period | Notification Dates | DR File Date | DR Hearing Date | Filing to Hearing Date |
|------------|--------------------|---|--------------|-----------------|---------------------------|
| 311 Notice | 30 days | September 28, 2020 – October 28, 2020 | 10.28. 2020 | 1.14.2021 | 78 days |

Hearing Notification

| Туре | Required Period | Required Notice Date | Actual Notice Date | Actual Period |
|---------------|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------|
| Posted Notice | 20 days | December 18, 2020 | December 18, 2020 | 20 days |
| Mailed Notice | 20 days | December 18, 2020 | December 18, 2020 | 20 days |
| Online Notice | 20 days | December 18, 2020 | December 18, 2020 | 20 days |

Public Comment

| | Support | Opposed | No Position |
|--|---------|---------|-------------|
| Adjacent neighbor(s) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other neighbors on the block or directly across the street | 11 | 1 | 0 |
| Neighborhood groups | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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).

DR Requestors

DR requestor 1:

Ryan Patterson representing residents of the 3139-3141 Jackson Street Homeowners Association, the adjacent property to the east of the proposed project.



DR requestor 2:

Shapor Ansari of 3242 Washington Street the property to the south of the proposed project.

DR Requestor's Concerns and Proposed Alternatives

DR requestor 1:

Is concerned that the proposed project:

- 1. Does not comply with height requirement per Planning Code Section 260(a)(1)(C) due to improper basis of measurement;
- 2. Is a de facto unit merger per Code Section 317.
- 3. Does not comply with the Residential Design Guidelines:

"Articulate buildings to minimize impact on light and privacy";

"Design the scale of the building to be compatible with the height and depth of surrounding buildings." and;

"Design the height and depth of the building to be compatible with the existing building scale at the midblock open space".

4. Violates the required rear yard requirement with a portion of the fire wall.

Proposed alternatives:

- 1. Design the two units to avoid an unauthorized merger;
- 2. Remove the 4th floor and replace with a roof deck;
- 3. Eliminate the extensive excavation in the rear and;
- 4. Match the neighboring lightwell.

See attached Discretionary Review Application, dated October 28, 2020.

DR requestor 2:

Is concerned that:

- 1. The proposed excavation is extensive and the extent o which it may jeopardize adjacent structures has not been considered;
- 2. the proposed 4th story and roof deck does not comply with the Residential Design Guidelines to:

"Articulate buildings to minimize impact on light and privacy";

"Design the scale of the building to be compatible with the height and depth of surrounding buildings." and;

"Design the height and depth of the building to be compatible with the existing building scale at the mid-



block open space".

Proposed alternatives:

- 1. Limit the excavation and provide geotechnical analysis that demonstrates protection of adjacent retaining and foundation walls; recommendation to limit soil erosion; and provide an arborist report with measures to protect a mature birch tree.
- 2. Adjust window locations to minimize direct line of sight into homes.
- 3. Remove rear roof deck.
- 4. Incorporate translucent glass on upper level windows.

See attached Discretionary Review Application, dated October 28, 2020.

Project Sponsor's Response to DR Application

The project has been designed and modified to minimize impacts to neighbors and complies with the Planning Code, and the Residential Design Guidelines. The proposed design responds to and meets the growing need of the project sponsor. The DR requestors have not identified any exceptional or extraordinary circumstances.

See attached Response to Discretionary Review, dated January 6, 2021

Department Review

The Department's review of this confirmed that this meets the Residential Design Guidelines related to privacy, scale and access to mid-block open space.

Furthermore:

- 1. This project conforms to the height requirement and has been measured appropriately with respect to height measurement in Planning Code Section 260(a)(1)(C). The Deputy Zoning Administrator confirmed that the method used by the project sponsor to measure height on up sloping lots was done accurately: from the centerline of the building, from curb level and at every other cross-section of the building, at right angles to the centerline of the building at such points taken as the average of the existing ground elevations at either side of the building or building step at that cross-section.
- 2. The two units retain independent access and cooking facilities and are not considered to be a residential unit merger by the Code.
- 3. The 4th floor addition matches the east adjacent neighbors' lightwell with a lightwell that is 3'-0" deep and extends the entire length to provide adequate light and air to the adjacent properties.
- 4. Construction and safety issues related to excavation, soil composition and foundation design are not within the purview of the Planning Department to regulate. It is assumed that the appropriate engineering design



and review will follow Planning approvals, by the Department of Building Inspection. A geotechnical report has been conducted. (see attached).

- 5. The roof decks are sized, screened, and setback from adjacent properties enough to be deemed not to impose exceptional or extraordinary impacts or nuisance with respect to potential privacy or noise.
- 6. The location and size of windows are in keeping with the scale, size, and proportions of windows in the surrounding properties do not create an exceptional circumstance that impacts privacy.
- 7. However, as originally proposed and noticed in the 311 plan set, the addition of a parapet at the rear west property line to accommodate the stair acces to the proposed rear roof deck would require a variance since it extends into the last 25% of the lot and the minimum required rear yard. This has been modified since the DR was filed so as not to require a Variance, and is exhibited on drawings in the project sponsors' brief.

Recommendation: Do Not Take DR and Approve

Attachments:

Block Book Map Sanborn Map Zoning Map Aerial Photographs Context Photographs Section 311 Notice CEQA Determination DR Applications Response to DR Applications, dated January 6, 2021 Letters Geotechnical report Maher Waiver Reduced Plans, and 3-D renderings



Exhibits

Parcel Map



LYON

Sanborn Map*



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



Zoning Map







 $\mathbf{\mathbf{b}}$













Site Photo



SUBJECT PROPERTY





49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400 San Francisco, CA 94103 628.652.7600 www.sfplanning.org

NOTICE OF BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION (SECTION 311)

On **October 10, 2018**, Building Permit Application No. **2018.10.10.2850** was filed for work at the Project Address below.

Notice Date: 9/28/20 Expiration Date: 10/28/20

PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Address: Cross Streets: Block / Lot No.: Zoning District(s): Record No.: **3145-3147 Jackson Street** Lyon and Presidio Streets 0983 / 017 RH-2 / 40-X **2017-011977PRJ**

APPLICANT INFORMATION

| Applicant: | Steve Geiszler, Geiszler Architects |
|--------------|-------------------------------------|
| Address: | 2155 Powell Street |
| City, State: | San Francisco, CA 94133 |
| Telephone: | (415) 409-7000 |
| Email: | steve@geiszlerarchitects.com |

You are receiving this notice as an owner or occupant of property 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 that the Planning Commission review this application at a public hearing for Discretionary Review. Requests for a Discretionary Review hearing must be filed during the 30-day review period, prior to the close of business on the Expiration Date shown above, 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 | PROJECT FEATURES | Existing | Proposed |
|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Demolition | Building Use: | Residential | No Change |
| Change of Use | Front Setback: | 17.5 feet | 2 feet, 3 inches |
| Rear Addition | Side Setbacks: | None | No Change |
| New Construction | Building Depth: | 97 feet, 3 inches | 108 feet, 10 inches |
| ☑ Façade Alteration(s) | Rear Yard: | 16 feet, 11 inches | No Change |
| □ Side Addition | Building Height: | 30 feet | 40 feet |
| ☑ Alteration | Number of Stories: | 2-stories-over-basement | 4-stories-over-garage |
| Front Addition | Number of Dwelling Units | 2 | No Change |
| Vertical Addition | Number of Parking Spaces | 0 | 3 |

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project includes a one-story Vertical addition and two-level below grade addition to a two-unit building. Additionally, a horizontal addition at the front of the home to create a three-car garage; existing lightwells reduced, and decks added at the front and rear of the building. One of the two units will be enlarged 226% (6,904 gsf total).

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.

To view plans or related documents, visit sfplanning.org/notices and search the Project Address listed above.

For more information, please contact Planning Department staff: Planner: Elizabeth Gordon-Jonckheer Telephone: (628) 652-7365 Email: Elizabeth.Gordon-Jonckheer@sfgov.org

General Information About Procedures During COVID-19 Shelter-In-Place Order

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 specific questions about the proposed project, you should contact the planner listed on the front of this notice. If you have general questions about the Planning Department's review process, contact the Planning counter at the Permit Center via email at <u>pic@sfgov.org</u>.

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. Contact the project Applicant to get more information and to discuss the project's impact on you.
- Contact the nonprofit organization Community Boards at (415) 920-3820, or online at <u>www.communityboards.org</u> for a facilitated. 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 that 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 ("DR"). If you believe the project warrants Discretionary Review by the Planning Commission, **you must file a DR Application prior to the Expiration Date shown on the front of this notice**.

To file a DR Application, you must:

- Create an account or be an existing registered user through our Public Portal (<u>https://acaccsf.accela.com/ccsf/Default.aspx</u>).
- 2. Complete the Discretionary Review PDF application (<u>https://sfplanning.org/resource/drp-application</u>) and email the completed PDF application to

<u>CPC.Intake@sfgov.org</u>. You will receive follow-up instructions via email on how to post payment for the DR Applciation through our Public Portal.

To determine the fee for a Discretionary Review, please refer to the Planning Department Fee Schedule available at <u>www.sfplanning.org</u>. If the project includes multiple building permits, i.e. demolition and new construction, a 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. The Board of Appeals is accepting appeals via e-mail. For further information about appeals to the Board of Appeals, including current fees, contact the Board of Appeals at (628) 652-1150.

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 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 Board of Supervisors at bos.legislation@sfgov.org, 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.





SAN FRANCISCO **PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

| Project Address | | Block/Lot(s) | |
|--|--|----------------------|--|
| 3145-3147 Jackson Street | | 0983017 | |
| Case No. | | Permit No. | |
| 2017-011977ENV | | 201810102850 | |
| Addition/ Alteration | Demolition (requires HRE for Category B Building) | New Construction | |
| Project description for Planning Department approval | | | |

tion for Planning Department approval.

The project sponsor proposes the following improvements: one-story vertical addition; excavate for new garage and basement; demolish existing front masonry switch back stairs and replacement with new; reposition front porches and build new wood entry stairs; combine façade windows into one bay; new windows throughout; new deck and spiral staircase to third floor; and new penthouse and roof decks. The existing three-story, two-unit residential building is approximately 6,642 gross square feet in size with no off-street parking spaces. With the proposed project, the building would be four stories with one basement level and approximately 10,645 gross square feet in size. The project would add three off-street parking spaces. The project would require approximately 15 feet of excavation below existing ground surface, resulting in approximately 2,000 cubic yards of soil removal.

STEP 1: EXEMPTION CLASS

| The p Act (| project has been determined to be categorically exempt under the California Environmental Quality CEQA). |
|----------------|--|
| | 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

| | 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.)? (<i>refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Air Pollution Exposure Zone</i>) |
|------|---|
| | 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? Note that a categorical exemption shall not be issued for a project located on the Cortese List 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 involve a child care facility or school with 30 or more students, or a location 1,500 sq. ft. or greater? 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? If yes, archeo review is required (<i>refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Archeological Sensitive Area</i>) |
| | Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment: Does the project site involve a subdivision or lot line adjustment on a lot with a slope average of 20% or more? (<i>refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography</i>). If yes, Environmental Planning must issue the exemption. |
| | Slope = or > 25%: Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 500 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (<i>refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography</i>) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required and Environmental Planning must issue the exemption. |
| | Seismic: Landslide Zone: Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 500 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 and Environmental Planning must issue the exemption. |
| | Seismic: Liquefaction Zone: Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 500 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 and Environmental Planning must issue the exemption. |
| Com | ments and Planner Signature (optional): Don Lewis |
| PLE/ | ASE SEE ATTACHED |
| | |
| | |
| | |

STEP 3: PROPERTY STATUS - HISTORIC RESOURCE

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

| PROP | PROPERTY IS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING: (refer to Property 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 | 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 <i>Guidelines for Adding Garages and Curb Cuts</i> , and/or replacement of a garage door in an existing opening that meets the Residential Design Guidelines. | | |
| | 5. Deck, terrace construction, or fences not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way. | | |
| | 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 <i>Zoning</i> 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

| Chec | k 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 . (<i>Requires approval by Senior Preservation</i> <i>Planner/Preservation</i> | | | |
| | Reclassify to Category A Reclassify to Category C | | | |
| | a. Per HRER or PTR dated 08/14/2018 (attach HRER or PTR) | | | |
| | b. Other <i>(specify)</i> : Project would remove contributor to Presidio Heights eligible district. Project does not pose significant adverse impact. | | | |
| | Note: If ANY box in STEP 5 above is checked, a Preservation Planner MUST sign below. | | | |
| | 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 (<i>optional</i>): | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Preser | vation Planner Signature: Alexandra Kirby | | | |
| STE | STEP 6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION | | | |

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

| 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: | Signature: | | |
| Building Permit | Don Lewis | | |
| If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project. | 08/09/2020 | | |
| Once signed or stamped and dated, this document constitutes a categorical exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31of 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 approval action. Please note that other approval actions may be required for the project. Please contact the assigned planner for these approvals. | | | |

CEQA Impacts

The project sponsor enrolled in the Maher Program on 10/31/2017. On 11/20/2017, the health department granted a waiver from the requirements of Article 22A.

Planning department staff archeologist cleared the project with no effects on 7/7/2020.

A preliminary geotechnical report was prepared by Rollo & Ridley Geotechnical Engineers (dated 9/11/2017). The project's structural drawings would be reviewed by the building department, where it would be determined if further geotechnical review and technical reports are required.

The project would use typical construction equipment that would be regulated by Article 29 of the Police Code (section 2907, Construction Equipment). No impact pile driving or nighttime construction is required. Construction vibration would not be anticipated to affect adjacent buildings.

STEP 7: MODIFICATION OF A CEQA EXEMPT PROJECT

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

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

MODIFIED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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 b approve website with Ch days of | 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. In accordance with Chapter 31, Sec 31.08j of the San Francisco Administrative Code, an appeal of this determination can be filed within 10 days of posting of this determination. | | | |
| Plani | ner Name: | Date: | | |
| | | | | |



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Historic Resource Evaluation Response

| Date | August 8, 2018 |
|------------------|--|
| Case No.: | 2017-011977ENV |
| Project Address: | 3145-3147 Jackson Street |
| Zoning: | RH-2 (Residential – Two Family) |
| | 40-X |
| Block/Lot: | 0983/017 |
| Date of Review: | July 30, 2018, (Part I) |
| | August 8, 2018 (Part II) |
| Staff Contact: | Alexandra Kirby (Preservation Planner) |
| | (415) 575-9133 |
| | alexandra.kirby @sfgov.org |

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

Reception: 415.558.6378

Fax: 415.558.6409

Planning Information: **415.558.6377**

PART II: PROJECT EVALUATION

PRE-EXISTING HISTORIC RATING / SURVEY

Designed in 1909 by master architect John Davis Hatch and constructed by builder E.C. Bletch in a vernacular Classical Revival Style, the subject building at 3145-3147 Jackson Street is a two-family residence located on the south side of Jackson Street between Presidio Avenue and Lyon Street at the boundary of the Presidio Heights and Pacific Heights neighborhoods. The subject property is not currently listed in any local, state or national historical registries.

As stated in the Historic Resource Evaluation Response, Part I (dated July 30, 2018), the Department has determined that the subject property appears to be a contributor to the Presidio Heights eligible historic district, which is eligible for inclusion on the California Register under Criterion 3 (Architecture). The character-defining features of the district include:

- Large, frequently formal dwellings, typically two- to three-stories in height above a raised basement
- Frequent use of front and side setbacks with associated garden and/or site walls
- Overall superior level of architectural details and the use of high quality materials
- Gable and hip roof forms are most common
- Wood-sash windows (double-hung and casement) are most common
- Wood shingle, brick or stucco cladding materials are most common

Therefore, 3145 – 3147 Jackson Street is considered a "Category A.2 – Historical Resource" (Resources listed on adopted local registers, and properties that have been determined to appear or may become eligible, for the California Register) property for the purposes of the Planning Department's California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review procedures.

Proposed Project

Demolition

Alteration

Per Drawings Dated: July 20, 2018 by Geiszler Architects.

Project Description

The subject building is a two-story-over-basement wood-frame, two-family residence constructed circa 1909 in a vernacular Classical Revival Style. The building is rectangular in plan, clad with horizontal wood siding, featuring a pronounced cornice with an egg-and-dart entablature and dentil detailing and a flat roof.

The proposed scope of work includes:

- Excavation of a new garage at the front setback and basement level below the footprint of the building;
- Reorienting the entry stairs;
- Constructing a new 3-story bay at the primary façade; and
- Vertical addition of a penthouse set back 20' from the primary façade with roof decks.

Project Evaluation

If the property has been determined to be a historical resource in Part I, please check whether the proposed project would materially impair the resource and identify any modifications to the proposed project that may reduce or avoid impacts.

Subject Property/Historic Resource:

The project <u>will not</u> cause a significant adverse impact to the historic resource as proposed.

____ The project <u>will</u> cause a significant adverse impact to the historic resource as proposed.

California Register-eligible Historic District or Context:

The project <u>will not</u> cause a significant adverse impact to a California Register-eligible historic district or context as proposed.

The project <u>will</u> cause a significant adverse impact to a California Register-eligible historic district or context as proposed.

Staff finds that, on balance, the proposed work does not meet the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* ("Standards"). The following is an analysis of the proposed project per the applicable *Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation*:

Standard 1.

A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

The proposed project retains the existing use as a two-family residence; however, the proposed scope of work will significantly modify the massing and exterior appearance of the subject building. The characteristic design of the primary façade would be significantly altered by the removal of more than 65% of the primary façade for the new design. Nevertheless, the proposed design would not significantly

alter the distinctive features and spatial relationships of the Presidio Heights eligible historic district as the overall design and massing would be stylistically compatible with the surrounding eligible district.

Therefore, the proposed project complies with Rehabilitation Standard 1.

Standard 2.

The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

The proposed project would remove many of the character-defining features and the spatial relationships of the subject building including the design and decorative features of the primary façade and overall massing of the building.

Therefore, the proposed project does <u>not</u> comply with Rehabilitation Standard 2.

Standard 3.

Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

The proposed project will not introduce new features that pose a false sense of historicism. The proposed fenestration on the primary façade will clearly read as compatible yet contemporary in design and proportions. The proposed vertical addition will also read as a contemporary addition while being subordinate to the massing of the original structure with a setback of approximately 20'.

Therefore, the proposed project complies with Rehabilitation Standard 3.

Standard 5.

Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

The proposed project would remove nearly all distinctive features on the primary façade including the detailed windows and surrounds in addition to the street presence via the introduction of a new garage opening at the street level, removal of the brick switchback stairs, and modification of the primary entrances at either side of the building.

Therefore, the proposed project does <u>not</u> comply with Rehabilitation Standard 5.

Standard 9.

New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

The proposed project includes the redesign of the primary façade, with removal of over 65% of the historic fabric and introduction of a new three-story bay window. The proposed design of the new primary façade would be compatible with the surrounding context of the Presidio Heights eligible

Historic Resource Evaluation Response August 8, 2018

historic district and differentiated form the original features in scale and proportion while utilizing compatible materials such as horizontal wood siding and wood windows. The proposed vertical addition would be minimally visible from the public right of way and detailed with contemporary materials and finishes, distinguishing it from the original historic fabric of the property.

On balance, the proposed project does <u>not</u> comply with Rehabilitation Standard 9.

Standard 10.

New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

The proposed façade remodel will permanently alter the materials and proportions of the primary façade of the subject building, and the proposed vertical addition will alter the general massing and scale of the building. In the unlikely event that the additions were later removed, the historic features would need to be reconstructed in order to revert to its previous character.

Therefore, the proposed project does <u>not</u> comply with Rehabilitation Standard 10.

Summary

Overall, the Department finds that the project is not consistent with the *Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation*, which emphasizes retention of character-defining features and sensitive change that minimally impacts these features. As proposed, the project at 3145-3147 Jackson Street will remove a contributing property from the eligible Historic District; this loss has been found to not pose a significant adverse impact to the eligible district, as defined by CEQA.

The subject block face is composed of ten multi-family residences constructed between 1905 and 1922, featuring ornate historic detailing in varying styles. The proposed alterations will not impact the character of the eligible historic district despite the loss of the property's character defining features and massing. The subject property will relate to the surrounding character of the district through its compatible materials including wood siding and wood frame windows. The characteristic elements of the eligible district as a whole will be preserved despite the proposed changes to the subject property.

The loss of a single resource within the context of the eligible Historic District would not constitute a significant impact to the district as it is a small percentage of the overall district, which is roughly bounded by the Presidio on the north, Clay Street on the south, Presidio Avenue on the east and Arguello Boulevard on the west. As noted in the HRER Part I, the subject block appears to be a clear extension of this district with nine properties that reflect the character-defining features of the district. The loss of 3145 – 3147 Jackson as a contributor to this district would not render the subject block ineligible for inclusion in the district.

In order to meet the Standards, the proposed project should be revised as follows:

- Retain the existing design of the primary façade, including the decorative windows and surrounds.
- Retain both raised residential entrances and porticos.

PART II: SENIOR PRESERVATION PLANNER REVIEW

Signature: Allison Vanderslice, Principal Preservation Planner

Date: 6/14/2018

cc: Monica Huggins, Environmental Division/ Historic Resource Impact Review File

AK: G:\Preservation\3145 Jackson\3145 jackson_HRER_Part II.doc



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Historic Resource Evaluation Response

| Date | July 30, 2018 |
|------------------|---|
| Case No.: | 2017-011977ENV |
| Project Address: | 3145-3147 Jackson Street |
| Zoning: | RH-2 (Residential – Two Family) |
| | 40-X |
| Block/Lot: | 0983/017 |
| Staff Contact: | Alexandra Kirby, Preservation Planner |
| | (415) 575-9133 alexandra.kirby @sfgov.org |
| Date of Review: | March 6. 2018 |

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

Reception: 415.558.6378

Fax: **415.558.6409**

Planning Information: 415.558.6377

PART I: HISTORIC RESOURCE EVALUATION

Building and Property Description

The parcel is located on the south side of Jackson Street between Presidio Avenue and Lyon Street at the boundary of the Presidio Heights and Pacific Heights neighborhoods. The subject lot is located in an RH-2 (Residential – Housing, Two Family) Zoning District. The surrounding neighborhood consists predominantly of single-family homes and two-unit flats constructed between the 1890s and the 1920s, although there are a number of post-World War II residences in the immediate vicinity.

3145-47 Jackson Street was designed in 1909 by master architect John Davis Hatch and constructed by builder E.C. Bletch in a vernacular Classical Revival Style. The subject building is a two-story-overbasement wood-frame, two-family residence that features horizontal wood cladding, a pronounced cornice with an egg-and-dart entablature and dentil detailing and a flat roof. The building is elevated above the street level due to the topography of the site, with switchback stairs leading down to the street. The basement level features tripartite windows with security bars; the first level features a tripartite window with a central casement window that peaks at the center, capped with a central wood fanlight and keystone, simulating a Palladian window, braced with wood pilasters and a molded wood sill. The upper floor features a bay window supported by two floriated wood brackets. The windows are fixed with wood sashes.

At the west and east side façades, straight-run entry stairs lead to the residential entrances, both of which are set back from the front façade. Each entry stair features wood treads, a stepped wood railing and a terrazzo landing. Both entrances are sheltered by decorative porticos with detailed cornices and Doric column supports. The rear façade is approximately two and a half stories in height with a rear bay set to the east. The entire rear façade is clad in asbestos siding.

Pre-Existing Historic Rating / Survey

The subject property is not listed on any local, state or national registries, although it was surveyed in the 1976 Architectural Quality Survey, with a rating of "3". This suggests that the subject building is within

Historic Resource Evaluation Response July 30, 2018

the top ten percent of San Francisco's building stock for architectural significance. The building is considered a "Category B" property (Properties Requiring Further Consultation and Review) for the purposes of the Department's California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review procedures.

Neighborhood Context and Description

3145-47 Jackson Street is located at the northwest edge of the residential Pacific Heights neighborhood, a large area roughly bounded by Green Street on the north, California Street on the south, Presidio Avenue on the west, and Van Ness Avenue to the east. The property is adjacent to the Presidio Heights neighborhood, immediately south of the Presidio parklands, and the subject block more closely reflects the character of the Presidio Heights neighborhood. The area surrounding the subject property is primarily residential with a commercial corridor to the south on Sacramento Street. The subject block is characterized by three-story single-family residences or two- to three-family flats; one apartment complex is located at the southeast corner of the intersection at Jackson Street and Presidio Avenue. Construction dates for buildings located on the subject block range from circa 1904 to 1952, although the vast majority was constructed between 1902 and 1924. This is reflected in the architecture of the building stock, which includes examples of buildings designed with Queen Anne, Shingle, Classical Revival, Colonial Revival, Craftsman, Tudor Revival and French Provincial influences. The broader neighborhood contains many houses designed by prominent architects of the early 20th century, including Ernest Coxhead, Albert Farr, Julia Morgan, Bernard Maybeck, and Willis Polk. The level of architectural integrity in the area is high.

While there are no locally designated Article 10 Landmarks located within the subject blocks, there is a high concentration of properties that are listed on the 1976 DCP architectural survey and the 1968 Junior League survey, published as *Here Today*.

CEQA Historical Resource(s) Evaluation

Step A: Significance

Under CEQA section 21084.1, a property qualifies as a historic resource if it is "listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources." The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources or not included in a local register of historical resources, shall not preclude a lead agency from determining whether the resource may qualify as a historical resource under CEQA.

| Individual | Historic District/Context | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| Property is individually eligible for inclusion in a | Property is eligible for inclusion in a California | | |
| California Register under one or more of the | Register Historic District/Context under one or | | |
| following Criteria: | more of the following Criteria: | | |
| Criterion 1 - Event: \Box Yes \boxtimes NoCriterion 2 - Persons: \Box Yes \boxtimes NoCriterion 3 - Architecture: \Box Yes \boxtimes NoCriterion 4 - Info. Potential: \Box Yes \boxtimes No | Criterion 1 - Event:☐ Yes ⋈ NoCriterion 2 - Persons:☐ Yes ⋈ NoCriterion 3 - Architecture:⋈ Yes ⋈ NoCriterion 4 - Info. Potential:☐ Yes ⋈ No | | |
| Period of Significance: n/a | Period of Significance: 1890 - 1930 | | |

Historic Resource Evaluation Response July 30, 2018

CASE NO. 2017-011977ENV 3145-47 Jackson Street

Based on the Supplemental Information prepared by Page and Turnbull (dated May 22, 2017), information found in Planning Department files, and research conducted in the Presidio Heights neighborhood, Preservation staff finds that the subject building is not individually eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources, but does appear to contribute to the previously identified California Register-eligible Presidio Heights historic district, as does much of the subject block.

Criterion 1: Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.

For several decades following the Gold Rush, the area that today comprises Presidio Heights remained far removed from the more populous areas of the city. The most prominent early features of the area were several large cemeteries opened during the 1850s and 1860s. These included the Laurel Hill Cemetery, located south of California Street between Presidio and Parker avenues. By the early 1870s the cemeteries were served by two horse-drawn streetcar lines running out California and Post streets, both of which terminated at what is today Presidio Avenue. To the west, the primary transportation route in the area was the Point Lobos Road, today known as Geary Boulevard, which ran out to the Cliff House restaurant and hotel.

The primary catalyst for sustained development of Presidio Heights was the installation of new transportation lines, which reduced travel times between the western portion of the city and downtown. In 1879, the California Street Cable Railroad extended its operations west from Fillmore Street to Presidio Avenue, largely to access the cemeteries. Other important early lines included the Geary Street, Park and Ocean Railroad, first developed in 1880. This cable car line followed Geary Boulevard to Presidio Avenue, where connection was made to a steam-powered streetcar line that continued west on Geary Street before turning south on 1st Avenue (today Arguello Boulevard) to access Golden Gate Park.

One of the Richmond district's largest landowners, Adolph Sutro, also financed construction of the Ferries & Cliff House Railroad, completed in 1888. This was another combination cable car and steampowered operation that ran out California Street to Point Lobos. Within Presidio Heights, the turntable for the Ferries & Cliff House Railroad's cable cars was located on the north side of California Street between Locust and Laurel streets. During the early 1890s, the Market Street Railroad developed an additional cable car line running out Sacramento Street to 6th Avenue, with a car house located at the northwest corner of Sacramento Street and Presidio Avenue.

The installation of new streetcar lines was soon followed by street grading and other infrastructure improvements—as well as sustained residential development. By 1895, area residents had formed the Presidio Heights Club to lobby for improvements that included street paving and sidewalks. Sanborn maps published in 1899 indicate that the blocks north of California Street in Presidio Heights were typically five- to twenty-five percent built out, almost exclusively with one- or two-story single-family dwellings. Construction was much sparser adjacent to the Presidio, where some blocks remained almost wholly undeveloped.

Sanborn maps produced in 1905 indicate steady building activity, with the blocks between Sacramento and Washington streets ranging from approximately thirty- to ninety-percent built out. North of Washington Street, however, development remained sparse. During this period, wood frame construction was dominant, although a few scattered homes featured brick construction, or brick/stone veneers. Stylistically, many of these early buildings featured late-Queen Anne, Shingle (or First Bay Tradition), Craftsman/Arts and Crafts, and Colonial Revival style influences. Commercial development was rare, and almost wholly confined to the street frontages along California and Sacramento streets. A few institutional properties were also developed, including Hahnemann Hospital and Children's Hospital, both located near the intersection of Maple and California streets.

The neighborhood escaped severe damage during the 1906 Earthquake and Fire and soon attracted many new residents relocating from burned areas of the city. Numerous parcels were quickly subdivided, and the pace of development in Presidio Heights greatly intensified. Due in part to its proximity to public transportation, as well as its adjacency to the already upscale Pacific Heights neighborhood, Presidio Heights quickly earned a reputation as a decidedly fashionable neighborhood. This was enhanced by the creation of the nearby Presidio Terrace subdivision in 1906, which was designed as an exclusive enclave for some of the city's wealthiest residents.

A substantial number of the homes in Presidio Heights were architect-designed and constructed with a superior level of craftsmanship. Master architects known to have worked in both Presidio and Pacific Heights include Bakewell and Brown, Walter Bliss, Ernest Coxhead, Albert Farr, Hyman & Appleton, Edgar Mathews, Bernard Maybeck, Julia Morgan, and Willis Polk, among others. Finer residences typically included front and side setbacks, frequently with associated site/garden walls. In terms of massing and siting, post-earthquake residences continued many of the patterns established prior to 1906, although stylistic shifts are evident in the growing popularity of Classical Revival and Period Revival style ornamentation. Construction materials also shifted, with stucco cladding becoming much more prevalent from the 1910s onward.

Residential construction slowed somewhat during World War I, but resumed during the 1920s as San Francisco and the rest of the United States participated in a sustained building boom. A major force for this growth was the advent of the private automobile, which facilitated the development of areas further away from streetcar lines. The popularity of the private automobile also led to changes in residential design, with most new homes featuring driveways and integral garages. One of the most frequent alterations for older homes in Presidio Heights is the addition of a "snout" garage within the front setback, or an integral garage at the raised basement level. Many buildings of the 1920s also feature Spanish or Italian stylistic influences, frequently grouped under the Mediterranean Revival sobriquet.

Another result of the 1920s construction boom in Presidio Heights was the redevelopment of some of the area's oldest residences—frequently smaller dwellings constructed early in the neighborhood's development. By 1930, the neighborhood had been essentially built out—although a few larger parcels would subsequently be subdivided during the late 1930s, including clusters of late-1930s properties at the northwest corner of Spruce and Jackson Street, as well as the southwest corners of Presidio Avenue at Jackson Street and Washington Street. Intermittent redevelopment of individual parcels also continued through the middle of the century. During this period, prominent architects continued to design residences in Presidio Heights, including examples of high-style Modernism by Campbell & Wong, Gardner Dailey, Joseph Esherick, Erich Mendelsohn and William Wurster.

The first Sanborn fire insurance maps showing the subject block were produced in 1893 and indicate that it was then completely undeveloped. Nearby development was also extremely sparse, and few if any of the buildings shown on the 1893 map remain extant today. The turn of the century marked an important period of growth in the neighborhood, and by 1905 Sanborn maps show the subject block partially

developed, including the corner apartment complex at Jackson Street and Presidio Avenue. The 1913 Sanborn map indicates continued infill of the block—including construction of the subject building, as well as neighboring properties to the east. The footprint of the subject building does not appear to have changed since its construction.

Considered as a whole, 3145-47 Jackson Street does not appear to be associated with significant events such that it would be individually significant under Criterion 1. Its construction is associated with broader construction trends in Presidio Heights during the early 20th century, but it does not appear significant or noteworthy within this context. Likewise, it does not appear to be part of a potential historic district significant for historic events. While development of the subject block was largely concentrated between circa 1900 and 1925, it does not singularly demonstrate any specific or important association with development of the Presidio Heights neighborhood.

It is therefore determined that 3145-47 Jackson is not eligible for listing in the California Register individually or as a contributor to a potential historic district under Criterion 1. However, this finding does not preclude the identification of other individual buildings or potential historic districts in the Presidio Heights neighborhood as significant under this Criterion. Staff finds that the subject building is not individually eligible for inclusion on the California Register individually or as a contributor to a potential historic district under Criterion 1 (Events).

Criterion 2: Property is associated with the lives of persons important in our local, regional or national past.

3145-47 Jackson Street was originally owned by Charles J. Mund. Mund was a manager at the Arnstein-Simon Co., a wool milling and wholesale business. Mund resided at 1908 Steiner and presumably rented the two flats out; the tenants during his ownership are unknown. The property was sold in 1927 and changed hands frequently through the 1940's. In 1948, Max and Emma Lorenzini, a grocery clerk and his wife, purchased the property. Their daughter, Emma, became a dancer from the New York City Ballet and would later become a ballet instructor in San Francisco. The Lorenzini family owned the property until 2015.

None of the owners or occupants of either 3145 or 3147 Jackson Street appear to be of local regional or nation al significance. Therefore, the property does not appear to be eligible for individual listing on the California Register under criterion 2.

Criterion 3: Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values.

3145-47 Jackson Street was designed by architect and builder John Davis Hatch. Hatch was born in San Francisco in 1875 and earned his architectural license in 1900, becoming the third generation of architect in his family. Hatch is known for Spanish and Classical Revival style civic buildings, including Masonic temples in Oakland (1910), Vallejo (1918), and San Luis Obispo (1913). Several newspapers and journals mention Hatch's residential designs in San Francisco, including a number of apartment complexes and a two-unit building at 2973 Jackson Street with Mission revival detailing. Overall, Hatch does appear to be a master architect, and the subject building appears to stand out as an unusually ornate example of his smaller residential work. 3145-47 Jackson Street does not rise above Young's civic designs as a notable example of his work, nor is it exemplary of an architectural style, and therefore does not appear individually eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 3.

In conjunction with earlier Historic Resource Evaluation Responses prepared for the Presidio Heights neighborhood, Planning Department staff conducted reconnaissance efforts and neighborhood research to identify the boundaries and character-defining features of the district.¹ Based on these efforts, the most cohesive and intact concentration of architecturally significant properties is located along the northern edge of the neighborhood in an area roughly bounded by the Presidio on the north, the north side of Clay Street on the south, Presidio Avenue on the east and Arguello Boulevard on the west. This same area was identified in the Junior League survey published in 1968 as Here Today San Francisco's Architectural Heritage for containing "a remarkably large number of handsome houses. In this small area ... are a great many buildings that would be worthy of special mention were they in some other parts of the city." As noted previously, multiple properties on the subject block, as well as on adjacent blocks, were also noted in the 1976 Department of City Planning Architectural Survey.

Department staff requested that the subject block be surveyed by Page & Turnbull for consideration as an extension of the previously identified Presidio Heights District, as the block was located in the broader Pacific Heights neighborhood and had not been previously assessed. Staff concurs with the consultant findings that, while the subject block does not appear to adhere well enough to be eligible as a standalone district, it does appear to contribute more closely to the Presidio Heights eligible district due to the period and scale of construction. Groupings of buildings that appear eligible as contributors from the period of significance (1890 – 1930) include 3160, 3140, 3134 Jackson Street on the north face of the block and 3111, 3119, 3125, 3133, 3139, 3145-47, and 3159-61 Jackson Street on the south face. These properties do not appear to have been significantly altered and reflect the noted character-defining features of the previously identified eligible district.

The Presidio Heights eligible historic district is almost exclusively residential and primarily characterized by large, frequently formal, dwellings, typically two- to three-stories in height over a raised basement. The period of significance for the district is circa 1890 to 1930, although the vast majority of properties were constructed between 1905 and 1925. This is reflected in the architecture of the building stock, which includes a few scattered examples of late-Victorian (typically Queen Anne) architecture, but is most frequently characterized by Shingle (or First Bay Region), Arts & Crafts, Classical Revival, Colonial Revival, Tudor Revival, French Provincial and Mediterranean Revival design influences. Although a variety of cladding materials and rooflines are present, the district exhibits an overall cohesive and consistent pattern of massing and setbacks, as well as an overall superior level of architectural detailing and materials. Collectively, the district also embraces a significant concentration of residences designed by master architects in San Francisco.

Within the district boundaries, the largest cluster of non-contributing properties is located along the south side of Washington Street between Cherry and Maple streets. Most of the properties along the south side of Pacific Avenue between Spruce and Laurel streets are not included within the district boundaries owing to prior alterations and the presence of numerous properties constructed outside the period of significance. Similarly, the properties located along the south side of Clay Street east of Laurel Street to Presidio Avenue are not included within the district. Conversely, along select intersecting

¹ San Francisco Planning Department. Historic Resource Evaluation Response: 200 Locust Street. October 21, 2014.

streets, such as Arguello Boulevard, Maple, Spruce and Laurel streets, the district boundaries extend southward toward Sacramento Street.

It is therefore determined that 3145-47 Jackson Street is not individually eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 3, but does contribute to a California Register eligible historic district significant under Criterion 3.

Criterion 4: Property yields, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Based upon a review of information in the Departments records, the subject property is not significant under Criterion 4, which is typically associated with archaeological resources. Furthermore, the subject property is not likely significant under Criterion 4 since this significance criterion typically applies to rare construction types when involving the built environment. The subject building is not an example of a rare construction type. Assessment of archeological sensitivity is undertaken through the Department's Preliminary Archeological Review process and is outside the scope of this review.

Step B: Integrity

To be a resource for the purposes of CEQA, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the California Register of Historical Resources criteria, but it also must have integrity. Integrity is defined as "the authenticity of a property's historic identity, evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the property's period of significance." Historic integrity enables a property to illustrate significant aspects of its past. All seven qualities do not need to be present as long the overall sense of past time and place is evident.

| Location: | 🔀 Retains | Lacks | Setting: | 🔀 Retains | 🗌 Lacks |
|--------------|-------------|-------|------------|-----------|---------|
| Association: | 🔀 Retains | Lacks | Feeling: | 🔀 Retains | Lacks |
| Design: | 🔀 Retains | Lacks | Materials: | 🔀 Retains | Lacks |
| Workmanship | : 🔀 Retains | Lacks | | | |

The subject property retains integrity of location and association, as it has never been moved and remains a two-family dwelling. Overall, the property retains sufficient integrity of design and materials to convey association with its 1909 construction and contributes to the historic district.

Step C: Character Defining Features

If the subject property has been determined to have significance and retains integrity, please list the characterdefining features of the building(s) and/or property. A property must retain the essential physical features that enable it to convey its historic identity in order to avoid significant adverse impacts to the resource. These essential features are those that define both why a property is significant and when it was significant, and without which a property can no longer be identified as being associated with its significance.

The character defining features of 3145-47 Jackson Street include the following:

- Overall form and massing
- Flat roof with detailed cornice line
- Horizontal wood cladding and ornate wood detailing
- Tripartite wood-sash windows with detailed surrounds
- Recessed entry porches

Historic Resource Evaluation Response July 30, 2018

CASE NO. 2017-011977ENV 3145-47 Jackson Street

The general character-defining features of the potential Presidio Heights historic district include the following:

- Large, frequently formal dwellings, typically two- to three-stories in height above a raised basement
- Frequent use of front and side setbacks with associated garden and/or site walls
- Overall superior level of architectural details and the use of high quality materials
- Gable and hip roof forms are most common
- Wood-sash windows (double-hung and casement) are most common
- Wood shingle, brick or stucco cladding materials are most common

CEQA Historic Resource Determination

Historical Resource Present

Individually-eligible Resource

- Contributor to an eligible Historic District
 -] Non-contributor to an eligible Historic District

No Historical Resource Present

PART I: SENIOR PRESERVATION PLANNER REVIEW

Signature:

Date: 6/14/2018

Allison Vanderslice, Principal Preservation Planner

8




City and County of San Francisco DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Stephanie K. J. Cushing, MSPH, CHMM, REHS Environmental Health Director

WAIVER FROM SAN FRANCISCO HEALTH CODE ARTICLE 22A (MAHER ORDINANCE)

Compliance with Article 22A of the San Francisco Health Code is required for all sites that require a permit from the Department of Building Inspection, will move or excavate at least 50 cubic yards (38.23 m³) of soil and/or that have the potential to contain hazardous materials in soil and/or groundwater or are within the mapped Article 22A (Maher) area. Sites subject to Article 22A may be granted a waiver by the San Francisco Department of Public Health per Section A.4. of Article 22A which states, "The Director may waive the requirements imposed by this Article if the applicant demonstrates that the property has been continuously zoned as residential under the City Planning Code since 1921, has been in residential use since that time, and no evidence has been presented to create a reasonable belief that the soil and/or groundwater may contain hazardous substances. In these circumstances, the Director shall provide the applicant and the Director of Building Inspection with written notification that the requirements of this Article have been waived."

The following information and documents were submitted in support of the Waiver:

- Site history information and/or environmental/geotechnical documents
- Project plans and elevation Drawings AND excavation, trenching grading plans
- Current or former underground storage tank operation and removal documents, as applicable

PROPERTY/PROJECT INFORMATION

Address: <u>3145-3147 Jackson Street</u> Block/Lot: <u>0983/017</u> SMED No.: <u>1655</u>

Owner/Proponent name Emma Gibbons (emma@geiszlerarchitects.com)

Contact Name/ phone: (415) 409-7000

Proponent Address: 2155 PPOWELL STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94133

Current Site Use: Single Family Resident Proposed Site Use: Single Family Resident

If residential use only, approximate year residential only use began: 1909

COMMENTS:

The San Francisco Department of Public Health has determined that:

The project Property has been continuously zoned as residential since at least 1921 AND the available information does not indicate potential or known the soil and/or groundwater contamination by contain hazardous substances or materials. AND The site use will remain as residential or a less sensitive land use.

- □ Less than 50 Cubic Yards of soil will be disturbed by the proposed project AND the available information does not indicate potential or known the soil and/or groundwater contamination by contain hazardous substances or materials.
- A former underground storage tank removed from the residential site or nearby residential site, does not present a significant health or environmental risk to the project property based on the information available from publically available state databases and SF DPH files.

SFDPH Recommendations:

- Site Soils are known to, or may, contain fill material. Fill material associated with the 1906 Earthquake and Fire or other fill materials in San Francisco may contain elevated lead concentrations among other potential contaminants. SF DPH recommends that excavated fill soils be segregated, stored on plastic sheeting and chemically analyzed for contaminants prior to soil reuse or as required by the disposal facility prior to disposal. The analyses considered may include the analytes listed in the Maher Ordinance, which include: Metals, volatile and semi volatile organic compounds, cyanide and petroleum hydrocarbons. Any remaining soils with elevated contaminants should be capped by the building, hardscape or at least one foot of clean soil over a visual physical barrier such as expanded plastic geogrid, or similar material.
- Construction activities should follow a work health and safety plan and dust control measures.

San Francisco Department of Public Health GRANTS A WAIVER FROM THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE SF HEALTH CODE ARTICLE 22A FOR THE SPECIFIED PROJECT ONLY BASED ON THE SITE CRITERIA AND CHARACTERISTICS LISTED ABOVE. Should you have any questions please contact the San Francisco Department of Public Health, Site Assessment and Mitigation Program (DPH SAM) at (415) 252-3800.

Atmann Kg Cu

Stephanie K. J. Cushing, MSPH, CHMM, REHS Director of Environmental Health San Francisco Department of Public Health Date: November 20, 2017

cc: Jeanie Poling, Environmental Planner jeanie.poling@sfgov.org

> Daniel Lowery, Deputy Director of Inspection Services Daniel.Lowery@sfgov.org



GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION 3145-3147 JACKSON STREET San Francisco, California

Seal Rock Capital LLC San Francisco, California

> September 11, 2017 Project No. 1520.1



September 11, 2017 Project No. 1520.1

Seal Rock Capital LLC c/o Michael Blair 3147 Jackson Street San Francisco, California 94115

Subject: Geotechnical Investigation 3145-3147 Jackson Street San Francisco, California

Dear Mr. Blair:

Our geotechnical investigation report for the proposed below grade additions to your property at 3145-3147 Jackson Street in San Francisco, California is attached. The services described in the report are outlined in our proposal dated March 20, 2017 and professional services agreement executed on May 24, 2017. This cover letter omits detailed findings and conclusions; therefore, anyone relying on the report should read it in its entirety. Our conclusions and recommendations apply only to the project described in the report. Additional copies of this report have been distributed as indicated on the last page of this report.

The property is in the Pacific Heights neighborhood on the south side of Jackson Street between Presidio Avenue and Lyon Street. The site has plan dimensions of approximately 28 feet by 128 feet and is occupied by a circa 1904, two-story, two-unit building over a partial basement/crawl space. The lowest level (crawl space) is roughly 12 feet above the adjacent Jackson Street sidewalk grade. Furthermore, the rear yard is approximately 15 feet above the Jackson Street sidewalk.

We understand current plans include expanding and excavating out the storage/crawl space level over the building footprint to create loft mezzanine level. In addition, plans are to excavate at the sidewalk level to create a full footprint garage level with storage. On the upper two levels, extensive renovations are planned including the addition of a fifth floor penthouse and rooftop terrace. The focus of our investigation was to determine the properties of the underlying soil and bedrock to determine the most appropriate foundation and shoring system as necessary (in conjunction with the structural and/or shoring engineer). An excavation on the order of 12 to 15 is anticipated for the below grade additions and a new foundation will be constructed. In addition, shoring or a sequenced construction will be required along the east, south and west sides of the excavation and the foundations of adjacent properties on the east and west sides may require underpinning support.

On the basis of our observations in the test pits, we judge the site is underlain by approximately 1 to 2-1/2 feet of fill and possible fill consisting of medium dense sand with clay and very stiff to hard clay with sand. The fill is underlain by residual bedrock consisting of very stiff to hard sandy clay with shale fragments to depths of approximately 2 to 2.5

Seal Rock Capital LLC September 11, 2017 Page 2



feet below the adjacent site grades. The residual bedrock is underlain by Franciscan Complex bedrock consisting of shale and sandstone at depths of several feet below the residual bedrock. Groundwater was not encountered during our investigation. We judge groundwater may seep along the soil/residual bedrock contact and within fractures of the bedrock. Seasonal fluctuations are likely.

On the basis of our field investigation and engineering analysis, and consultation with the design team, we understand an excavation on the order of 12- to 15- feet is anticipated to create a full footprint garage level with storage at the Jackson Street sidewalk grade. We judge competent Franciscan Complex bedrock should be exposed at the proposed base of excavation and the new foundations may consist of either a reinforced concrete footings (grid) or a thickened edge mat. Detailed design recommendations for foundations and other geotechnical design criteria are contained within this report.

The recommendations contained in the report are based on limited subsurface exploration. Consequently, variations between expected and actual soil conditions may be found in localized areas during construction. We should, therefore, be engaged to observe the installation of foundations and earthwork, during which time, we may make changes in our recommendations if deemed necessary.

We appreciate the opportunity of being of service to you on this project and look forward to working with you during construction.

Best regards, ROLLO & RIDLEY, INC.

Frank J. Rollo, P.E., G.E. Principal

1520.1.rpt





GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION 3145-3147 JACKSON STREET San Francisco, California

Seal Rock Capital LLC San Francisco, California

> September 11, 2017 Project No. 1520.1



TABLE OF CONTENTS

| 1.0 | INTRODUCTION1 |
|----------------|---|
| 2.0 | SCOPE OF SERVICES2 |
| 3.0 | FIELD INVESTIGATION |
| 4.0 | REGIONAL GEOLOGY AND SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS |
| 5.0 | SEISMICITY AND SEISMIC HAZARDS |
| 6.0 | DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS |
| 7.0 | RECOMMENDATIONS117.1Site Preparation, Grading and Drainage117.2Foundations127.3Slabs on Grade147.4Basement Walls and Retaining Walls167.5Slope Cuts187.6Shoring and Underpinning197.7Exterior Hardscape207.8Excavation Monitoring21 |
| 8.0 | ADDITIONAL GEOTECHNICAL SERVICES 22 |
| 9.0 | LIMITATIONS22 |
| REFER FIGUR | NCES |
| APPEN | DIX A –Logs of Test Pits and Classification Charts |
| DISTR | BUTION |



LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure 1 | Site Location Map |
|----------|---|
| Figure 2 | Site Plan |
| Figure 3 | Map of Regional Geology |
| Figure 4 | Map of Major Faults and Earthquake Epicenters in the San Francisco Bay Area |
| Figure 5 | Map of Seismic Hazard Zones |

APPENDIX A

| Figure A-1 | Log of Test Pit, TP-1 |
|------------|-----------------------|
| Figure A-2 | Log of Test Pit, TP-2 |
| Figure A-3 | Log of Test Pit, TP-3 |
| Figure A-4 | Classification Chart |



GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION 3145-3147 Jackson Street San Francisco, California

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of the geotechnical investigation performed by Rollo & Ridley, Inc. for the proposed below grade additions to your property at 3145-3147 Jackson Street in San Francisco, California.

The property is in the Pacific Heights neighborhood on the south side of Jackson Street between Presidio Avenue and Lyon Street, as shown on the Site Location Map, Figure 1. The site has plan dimensions of approximately 28 feet by 128 feet and is occupied by a circa 1904, two-story, two-unit building over a partial basement/crawl space. The lowest level (crawl space) is roughly 12 feet above the adjacent Jackson Street sidewalk grade. Furthermore, the rear yard is approximately 15 feet above the Jackson Street sidewalk. The property is bound by single family homes on the east and west.

The services described in this report were performed in accordance with our proposal dated March 20, 2017 and professional services agreement executed on May 24, 2017. Conclusions and recommendations presented herein are based on: 1) discussions and correspondence with Matthew Blair and your architect, Steve Geiszler of Geiszler Architects, 2) a review of preliminary architectural drawings by Geiszler Architects dated August 2017 and our previous investigations performed in the vicinity of the site, 3) the results of our on-site field investigation and engineering analysis performed for the proposed below grade additions and 4) our experience and knowledge of the subsurface conditions from other projects in the vicinity of the property.

We understand current plans include expanding and excavating out the storage/crawl space level over the building footprint to create loft mezzanine level. In addition, plans are to excavate at the sidewalk level to create a full footprint garage level with storage. On the upper two levels, extensive renovation is planned including the addition of a fifth floor penthouse and rooftop terrace. The focus of our investigation was to determine the



properties of the underlying soil and bedrock to determine (in conjunction with the structural and/or shoring engineer) the most appropriate foundation and shoring system as necessary. An excavation on the order of 12 to 15 is anticipated for the below grade additions and a new foundation will be constructed. In addition, shoring or a sequenced construction will be required along the east, south and west sides of the excavation and the adjacent properties on the east and west sides may require underpinning support.

The approximate footprint of the property and the proposed garage level expansion and other additions are shown on the Site Plan, Figure 2.

2.0 SCOPE OF SERVICES

Our scope of services was outlined in our proposal dated March 20, 2017. These services consisted of reviewing previously performed geotechnical investigations in the vicinity of the site, performing engineering analyses, and developing conclusions and recommendations regarding:

- the most appropriate foundation type for the structure
- design criteria for the recommended foundation type
- estimates of foundation settlement
- basement/retaining wall design criteria
- evaluation of the site geology and geologic hazards
- site seismicity and seismic hazards
- California Building Code site soil type and seismic factors
- utility trench excavation and backfill criteria
- construction considerations



During the course of our investigation, we have consulted members of the design team. Information was transmitted to the team as it became available.

3.0 FIELD INVESTIGATION

Prior to commencing our field investigation, we reviewed the results of previous geotechnical investigations performed in the vicinity of the site.

On May 24, 2017, as part of our on-site field investigation, we logged three test pits located as follows:

- TP-1 outside the northern side of the residence, adjacent to Jackson Street sidewalk.
- TP-2 inside the crawl space/basement on the northern half of the residence, approximately 12 feet above the Jackson Street sidewalk grade.
- TP-3 inside the crawl space on the southern half of the residence, approximately 15 feet above the Jackson Street sidewalk grade.

The locations of the test pits are shown on the Site Plan, Figure 2.

The test pits are presented in Appendix A as Figures A-1 through A-3, and were excavated to expose the existing soil conditions below the adjacent site grades. The soil exposed in the test pits were classified according to the classification chart presented in Appendix A as Figure A-4.

4.0 REGIONAL GEOLOGY AND SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS

The site is within the Coast Range geomorphic province that is characterized by northwesttrending valleys and ridges. Folds and faults that resulted from the collision of the Pacific (Farallon) and North American plates and subsequent strike-slip faulting along the San Andreas Fault Zone control the geology. Bedrock underlying the general region is primarily of the Franciscan Complex.



The Franciscan Complex is a disrupted assemblage of large and small inclusions of various hard rock types embedded in a fine-grained matrix of intensely sheared and crushed rock material. Inclusions of coherent rocks in the mélange matrix may range in size from an inch to several miles. Sandstone and shale are the most abundant inclusion type, with lesser amounts of greywacke, conglomerate, serpentinite, calcium-silicate rock, schist, greenstone and chert.

As shown on the Map of Regional Geology, Figure 3, the site is located in an area mapped as Franciscan Complex sedimentary rocks of the Cretaceous epoch; which is consistent with our observations.

TP-1, located outside the northern side of the residence, adjacent to Jackson Street sidewalk, exposed a 3-inch thick concrete slab resting on approximately one foot of medium dense, brown sand with clay fill. The sandy fill is underlain by residual bedrock consisting of very stiff to hard, light brown to yellow brown sandy clay with shale fragments to the maximum depth explored of approximately 2 feet.

TP-2, located inside the crawl space/basement on the northern half of the residence, is approximately 14 feet higher than the Jackson Street sidewalk grade. It exposed approximately a 2-inch thick concrete slab resting on approximately 2.5 feet of very stiff to hard, greenish brown to light brown clay with sand.

TP-3, located inside the crawl space on the southern half of the residence, is approximately 15 feet higher than the Jackson Street sidewalk grade. It exposed approximately a 2-inch thick of rat slab resting on approximately 1 to 1-1/2 feet of medium dense, light brown to brown sand with clay fill. The fill is underlain by residual bedrock consisting of very stiff to hard, light brown to yellow brown sandy clay with shale to the maximum depth explored of approximately 2.5 feet.

We judge Franciscan Complex bedrock consisting of shale and sandstone should be within a few feet below the residual bedrock encountered in test pits. The sandstone with shale interbeds bedrock varies from crushed to intensely fractured, has low to moderate hardness, is friable to weak and is deeply to moderately weathered. It should be noted that



the bedrock typically becomes less fractured, harder, stronger and less weathered with depth.

No groundwater was encountered in the test pit excavations. However, surface water infiltration (seepage from rain or landscaping irrigation) most likely travels in near-surface fill and with the top fractures of the residual bedrock and bedrock; seasonally fluctuations are likely. The non-seasonal, permanent groundwater table likely exists deep below the site within fractures of the Franciscan Complex bedrock; however it is not uncommon for springs to be present near the ground surface where water is seeping out of fractures in the bedrock.

5.0 SEISMICITY AND SEISMIC HAZARDS

5.1 Regional Seismicity and Faulting

The major active faults in the area are the San Andreas, Hayward and Calaveras Faults. These and other active faults of the region are shown on Figure 4. For each of the active faults within 65 kilometers (km) of the site, the distance from the site and the mean characteristic Moment magnitude¹ [2007 Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities (WGCEP) (2007) and Cao et al. (2003)] are summarized in Table 1.

¹ Moment magnitude is an energy-based scale and provides a physically meaningful measure of the size of a faulting event. Moment magnitude is directly related to average slip and fault rupture area.



| | TABI | .E 1 | |
|----------|--------|------|------------|
| Regional | Faults | and | Seismicity |

| Fault Segment | Approximate Distance from Site (km) | Direction from Site | Maximum Magnitude |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------|----------------------|
| San Andreas - 1906 Rupture | 10 | West | 7.90 |
| San Andreas - Peninsula | 10 | West | 7.15 |
| San Andreas- North Coast South | 11 | West | 7.45 |
| Northern San Gregorio | 15 | West | 7.23 |
| Total San Gregorio | 15 | West | 7.44 |
| North Hayward | 19 | Northeast | 6.49 |
| Total Hayward | 19 | Northeast | 6.91 |
| Total Hayward-Rodgers Creek | 19 | Northeast | 7.26 |
| South Hayward | 21 | East | 6.67 |
| Rodgers Creek | 33 | North | 6.98 |
| Mt Diablo - MTD | 37 | East | 6.65 |
| Point Reyes | 38 | West | 6.80 |
| Total Calaveras | 39 | East | 6.93 |
| Concord/Green Valley | 41 | East | 6.71 |
| Monte Vista-Shannon | 43 | Southeast | 6.80 |
| West Napa | 45 | Northeast | 6.50 |
| Greenville | 55 | East | 6.94 |
| Hayward - South East Extension | 61 | Southeast | 6.40 |
| Great Valley 6 | 64 | East | 6.70 |

Figure 4 also shows the earthquake epicenters for events with magnitude greater than 5.0 from January 1800 through August 2014. Since 1800, four major earthquakes have been recorded on the San Andreas Fault. In 1836, an earthquake with an estimated Moment magnitude, M_w, of about 6.25 occurred east of Monterey Bay on the San Andreas Fault (Toppozada and Borchardt 1998). In 1838, an earthquake occurred with an estimated M_w of about 7.5. The San Francisco Earthquake of 1906 caused the most significant damage in the history of the Bay Area in terms of loss of lives and property damage. This earthquake created a surface rupture along the San Andreas Fault from Shelter Cove to San Juan Bautista approximately 470 km in length. It had a M_w of about 7.9, and was felt 560 km



away in Oregon, Nevada, and Los Angeles. The most recent earthquakes to affect the Bay Area were the Loma Prieta Earthquake of October 17, 1989, in the Santa Cruz Mountains with a M_w of 6.9, approximately 98 km from the site and the South Napa Earthquake of August 24, 2014 with a M_w of 6.0 (preliminary report), approximately 49 km from the site.

In 1868 an earthquake with an estimated M_w of 7.0 occurred on the southern segment (between San Leandro and Fremont) of the Hayward Fault. In 1861, an earthquake of unknown magnitude (probably a M_w of about 6.5) was reported on the Calaveras Fault. The most recent significant earthquake on the Calaveras Fault was the 1984 Morgan Hill earthquake ($M_w = 6.2$).

The 2007 WGCEP at the U.S. Geologic Survey (USGS) predicted a 63 percent probability of a magnitude 6.7 or greater earthquake occurring in the San Francisco Bay Area in 30 years (beginning in 2001). More specific estimates of the probabilities for different faults in the Bay Area are presented in Table 2.

| Fault | Probability (percent) |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Hayward-Rodgers Creek | 31 |
| N. San Andreas | 21 |
| Calaveras | 7 |
| San Gregorio | 6 |
| Concord-Green Valley | 3 |
| Greenville | 3 |
| Mount Diablo Thrust | 1 |

TABLE 2WGCEP (2007) Estimates of 30-Year Probabilityof a Magnitude 6.7 or Greater Earthquake

5.2 Seismic Hazards

During a major earthquake on a segment of one of the nearby faults, strong to very strong shaking is expected to occur at the project site. Very strong shaking during an earthquake



can result in ground failure such as that associated with fault rupture, soil liquefaction², lateral spreading³, and differential compaction⁴. We used the results of our field investigation as well as those by others in the vicinity to evaluate the potential of these phenomena occurring at the project site.

5.2.1 Fault Rupture

Historically, ground surface ruptures closely follow the trace of geologically young faults. The site is not within an Earthquake Fault Zone, as defined by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act and no known active or potentially active faults exist on the site. Therefore, we conclude the risk of fault offset at the site from a known active fault is low. In a seismically active area, the remote possibility exists for future faulting in areas where no faults previously existed; however, we conclude the risk of fault rupture (surface faulting) from an unknown fault and consequent secondary ground failure is low.

5.2.2 Liquefaction, Lateral Spreading, Differential Compaction and Earthquake Induced Landsliding

We used the results of the on-site test pits to evaluate the potential for liquefaction, lateral spreading, and settlement from differential compaction. As presented on Figure 5, Map of Seismic Hazard Zones, the site does not fall within an area of San Francisco where known liquefaction has occurred. No groundwater was observed at the site during our field investigation and any groundwater is expected within fractures of the bedrock which is sufficiently strong to resist the potential for liquefaction. Therefore, we conclude the potential for liquefaction-induced settlement and lateral spreading at the project site is nil.

In addition, strong ground shaking can cause unsaturated sand above the groundwater table to densify and settle (referred to as differential compaction). The proposed

² Liquefaction is a transformation of soil from a solid to a liquefied state during which saturated soil temporarily loses strength resulting from the buildup of excess pore water pressure, especially during earthquake-induced cyclic loading. Soil susceptible to liquefaction includes loose to medium dense sand and gravel, low-plasticity silt, and some low-plasticity clay deposits.

³ Lateral spreading is a phenomenon in which surficial soil displaces along a shear zone that has formed within an underlying liquefied layer. Upon reaching mobilization, the surficial blocks are transported downslope or in the direction of a free face by earthquake and gravitational forces.



foundations will be founded in bedrock, therefore, we judge the potential for differential compaction once the new garage and lowered basement level are constructed, is nil.

We did not observe any surficial evidence of historical landsliding or find any published maps indicating historical landsliding on-site (Figure 5); therefore, we conclude the potential for earthquake induced landsliding within the footprint of the proposed improvements is low.

6.0 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of our field investigation, laboratory testing and engineering analyses, we conclude the geotechnical conditions at the site are suitable for the proposed upgrades and additions.

The primary geotechnical issues for this project are:

- foundation support
- excavatability of the bedrock with depth
- basement/retaining wall design

These and other considerations are addressed in the remainder of this section and in our recommendations detailed in Section 7.0.

6.1 Foundation Type

We understand current plans include expanding and excavating out the storage/crawl space level over the building footprint to create loft mezzanine level. In addition, plans are to excavate at the sidewalk level to create a full footprint garage level with storage. On the upper two levels, extensive renovation is planned including a penthouse addition and rooftop terrace. An excavation on the order of 12- to 15- is anticipated across the footprint of the existing residence.

⁴ Differential compaction is a phenomenon in which non-saturated, cohesionless soil is compacted by earthquake vibrations, causing differential settlement.



On the basis of our onsite field investigation, we judge Franciscan Complex bedrock consisting of shale and sandstone will be exposed at the proposed base of excavation. We therefore conclude the new foundation may consist of either reinforced concrete footings (grid) or a thickened edge mat. A properly constructed shallow foundation system bearing on Franciscan Complex bedrock consisting of shale and sandstone with normally spaced columns should experience less than ½ inch of total and differential settlement.

6.2 Excavation and Construction Considerations

The near surface soil to be excavated consists mainly of sandy clays and clay with sands which can be excavated with conventional earth-moving equipment such as loaders and backhoes. The residual bedrock and rock underlying the surficial deposits are expected to gain competency, strength and hardness with depth. Heavier equipment will be required to excavate the rock. Hydraulic hoe-rams and jack hammers will create vibrations that may be felt by surrounding neighbors. If vibrations are too intense, damage to surrounding improvements may occur. The contractor should limit vibrations to an acceptable level.

Whether a material can be ripped or has to be broken with hydraulic/pneumatic equipment depends upon the contractor's equipment, effort and willingness to subject the equipment to wear. Therefore, we recommend that the excavation contractor who has performed projects in the neighborhood with similar bedrock conditions and visit the site to arrive at his/her own conclusions on the bedrock's excavation rippability.

During construction, the subgrade of excavations should be kept moist at all times and not allowed to dry.

If shoring towers will be used to support the structure above grade during excavation and foundation construction, they will extend into bedrock. The contractor should anticipate hard and slow digging (jack-hammering) to achieve the necessary depth (usually two feet below the proposed lowest excavation depth, as specified by the shoring engineer) when hand excavating the shoring tower piers into bedrock.



7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations for site preparation, grading and drainage, foundations, slabs on grade, basement and retaining walls, slope cuts, shoring and underpinning, exterior hardscape, excavation monitoring and seismic design are presented in this section of the report.

7.1 Site Preparation, Grading and Drainage

Prior to construction, the areas of the site to be improved should be cleared of vegetation and soil containing greater than four percent organic materials by dry weight of soil. Stripped materials should be removed from the site or stockpiled for later use in landscaped areas, if approved by the architect.

If fill is required, it should consist of on-site or imported soil that is free of organic matter, non-corrosive, non-hazardous, contains no rocks or lumps larger than three inches in greatest dimension, has a liquid limit less than 40 and plasticity index (PI) less than 15, and is approved by the geotechnical engineer. We anticipate that most of the on-site soil will meet the fill requirements. In addition, if bedrock is used as fill it will be to be broken down in gravel fragments (less than 3-inch in greatest dimension). Fill should be placed in lifts not exceeding eight inches in loose thickness, moisture-conditioned to above optimum moisture content, and compacted to at least 90 percent relative compaction⁵. If imported or existing clean sand or gravel is used as backfill, however, it should be compacted to at least 95 percent relative compaction.

In areas that will receive vehicular traffic, the upper eight inches of the subgrade should be compacted to at least 95 percent relative compaction to achieve a firm, unyielding subgrade. The soil subgrade should be kept moist until it is covered by aggregate base. Aggregate base should be compacted to at least 95 percent relative compaction.

The geotechnical engineer should approve all sources of imported engineered fill at least three days before use at the site. The grading subcontractor should provide analytical test

⁵ Relative compaction refers to the in-place dry density of soil expressed as a percentage of the maximum dry density of the same material, as determined by the latest ASTM D1557 laboratory compaction procedure.



results or other suitable environmental documentation indicating the imported fill is free of hazardous materials at least three days before use at the site. If this data is not available, up to two weeks should be allowed to perform analytical testing on the proposed import material. If the on-site material is to be exported, analytical testing of the soil may be required by the party or parties receiving the soil.

Backfill for utility trenches and other excavations is also considered fill, and it should be compacted according to the recommendations provided above. Jetting of trench backfill is not permitted.

Drainage control design should include provisions for positive surface gradients so that surface runoff is not permitted to pond, particularly adjacent to structures, or on hardscape, driveways, roadways or pavements. Surface runoff should be directed away from foundations to an acceptable City outlet or a slope dissipation system designed by the project civil engineer. In addition, all roofs should have gutters and downspouts that are connected to the city sewer and/or dissipater, as appropriate. Curbs, gutters (or concretelined v-ditches) and area drains should capture surface water before it reaches any slopes. Inlets of any pipes should be designed against clogging and for minimum maintenance. Inlets should be periodically inspected and cleaned, as necessary. We should review the drainage plan for the site developed by the project civil engineer prior to plans being submitted for permit.

7.2 Foundations

A shallow foundation consisting of a grid of inter-connected footings or a reinforced thickened-edge concrete mat extending into Franciscan Complex bedrock may be designed for an allowable bearing pressure of 8,000 pounds per square foot (psf) for dead plus live loads, with a one-third increase for wind and/or seismic loads.

The bottom of the footings or mat should be embedded at least 18 inches below the lowest adjacent slab and extend a minimum of six inches into bedrock. Interconnected footings should be at least 24 inches wide. If a thickened edge mat is used, the perimeter (edge) of



the mat and any locations where columns are proposed should be at least 18 inches thick and 36 inches wide (tapered at a 1:1, horizontal to vertical or flatter).

Resistance to lateral forces can be obtained from passive pressure against the sides of foundation elements. We recommend using a uniform pressure of 2,000 pounds per square foot (psf) if the footings or mat are poured directly against the residual bedrock or Franciscan Complex bedrock (no formwork) to calculate passive resistance when the footing is confined by a slab. If formwork is used and engineered fill is placed and compacted against the sides of the foundation, passive resistance may be calculated using an equivalent fluid weight of 300 pounds per cubic feet (pcf). Frictional resistance should be calculated using a base friction coefficient of 0.40 (if the concrete is poured directly onto the subgrade). If waterproofing is placed between the bedrock and the mat, this value should be reduced to 0.20 (or the value provided by the waterproofing manufacturer). These values include a safety factor of about 1.5 and can be used in combination without reduction.

If elastic analyses are used, we recommend the foundation be analyzed using a modulus of subgrade reaction ranging from 110 to 220 pounds per cubic inch (pci) with a design value of 160 pci for the static and dynamic load case. No reduction or scaling is required. The range of values is representative of the anticipated settlement under the building loads (with static loading being the lower part of the range and seismic loading being the higher). We recommend the analysis include the ranges in moduli and their effects on the reinforcing in the foundations as well as in checking the forces anticipated in the columns (up through the building) during a seismic event with the lower values used for foundation design and the higher for column design.

The footings or mat excavations should be free of standing water, debris, loose or soft material prior to placing concrete. In addition, mat subgrade should be kept in a moist condition until the concrete is poured. We should check the excavations prior to placement of reinforcing steel to confirm the exposed subgrade is suitable to support the design bearing pressures. If loose, overly-saturated, soft or undesirable soil is encountered in the excavations, it should be removed and the over-excavation(s) backfilled with lean or structural concrete.



7.3 Slabs on Grade

Even though the new garage floor slab should be above the groundwater table, water and water vapor may occasionally be present within the subgrade bedrock (especially where buried springs may exist). If water vapor transmission through the slab is undesirable, the slab should be waterproofed or underlain by a capillary moisture break and vapor retarder. Waterproofing and vapor retarders are not equivalent systems. Waterproofing is designed to stop virtually all moisture transmission, while a vapor retarder can only reduce the amount and rate of moisture migration. The remainder of this section provides our recommendations for a capillary moisture break and vapor retarder system.

Where water vapor transmission through the floor slab is undesirable (e.g., where floor covering will be placed), a capillary moisture break and a water vapor retarder (15-mil Stego Wrap © or equivalent) may be installed beneath the floor.

A capillary moisture break consists of at least four inches of clean, free-draining gravel or crushed rock. If groundwater is present during construction, the thickness of the gravel should be increased to a minimum of 12 inches and a grid of perforated PVC pipes added to drain the water away from the bottom of the slab. It would be appropriate for the vapor retarder to meet the requirements for Class C vapor retarders stated in ASTM E1745-97 and for the vapor retarder to be placed in accordance with the requirements of ASTM E1643-98. These requirements include overlapping seams by six inches, taping seams, and sealing penetrations in the vapor retarder. The vapor retarder may be covered with two inches of sand to aid in curing the concrete and to protect the vapor retarder during slab construction. Design parameters for the gravel/crushed rock and sand are presented in Table 3.



| Sieve Size | Percentage Passing Sieve | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Gravel or Crushed Rock | | |
| 1 inch | 90 - 100 | |
| 3/4 inch | 30 - 100 | |
| 1/2 inch | 5 – 25 | |
| 3/8 inch | 0 - 6 | |
| | Sand | |
| No. 4 | 100 | |
| No. 200 | 0 – 5 | |

TABLE 3Gradation Requirements for Capillary Moisture Break

If the sand overlying the membrane is not dry at the time concrete is placed, excess water trapped in the sand could eventually be transmitted as vapor through the slab. If rain is forecast prior to pouring the slab, the sand may be covered with plastic sheeting to avoid wetting. If the sand becomes wet, the placement of concrete should be avoided until the sand has been dried or replaced.

Concrete mixes with high water/cement (w/c) ratios result in excess water in the concrete, which increases the cure time and results in excessive vapor transmission through the slab. Therefore, we judge that one design parameter for the floor slab concrete be that it have a low w/c ratio - less than 0.50. If approved by the project structural engineer, the sand can be eliminated and the concrete can be placed directly over the vapor retarder, provided the w/c ratio of the concrete does not exceed 0.45 and water is not added in the field. If necessary, workability may be increased by adding plasticizers.

Before the floor covering is placed, the contractor may check that the concrete surface and the moisture emission levels (if emission testing is required) meet the manufacturer's requirements.



7.4 Basement Walls and Retaining Walls

Basement walls and retaining walls should be designed to resist lateral earth pressures and surcharges. Restrained walls (such as below grade basement walls) should be designed for at-rest soil pressures, while unrestrained walls (such as landscaping retaining walls), which are free to rotate at the top may be designed for active pressures.

Basement walls include all below grade walls associated with the structure. Basement walls should be designed to resist lateral pressures created by the soil, bedrock and adjacent surcharges. In addition, because the site is in a seismically active area, all below grade walls should be designed to resist pressures associated with seismic forces. New research on basement wall pressures has been recently published. A comprehensive research project was undertaken at the University of California, Berkeley. This research reached two important conclusions. These are: (1) the seismic increment increases with depth and can be reasonably approximated by an equivalent fluid pressure (triangular distribution) and (2) the seismic increment occurs under the active condition. Using the procedure outlined in the SEAOC 2010 Convention Proceedings for Seismic Earth Pressures on Deep Building Basements, we recommend the following pressures presented in Table 4 be used in design for permanent basement walls with level backfill.

| Loading Condition | Restrained Walls |
|----------------------|--|
| Static | At-rest pressures corresponding to an equivalent fluid weight of 50 pounds per cubic foot (pcf) |
| Dynamic | Greater of either at-rest condition (50 pcf) or active (35 pcf) plus a seismic pressure increment of 20 pcf (equivalent fluid weight, triangular distribution) |

TABLE 4 Design Pressures - Basement Walls

Where traffic loads are expected within 10 feet of the walls, an additional design load of 100 psf should be applied to the upper ten feet of the wall.



The lateral earth pressures given for drained conditions assume the walls are properly backdrained to prevent the buildup of hydrostatic pressure. One acceptable method for backdraining the walls is to place a prefabricated drainage panel against the back side of the walls. The drainage panel should extend down to a four-inch-diameter perforated PVC collector pipe at the base of the walls. The pipe should be surrounded on all sides by at least four inches of Caltrans Class 2 permeable material (see Caltrans Standard Specifications Section 68-1.025) or clean ³/₄-inch drainrock wrapped in filter fabric (Mirafi 140N or equivalent). A thicker drainage paneling (such as Hydroduct® Coil 600 or equivalent) may be used in lieu of a PVC pipe surrounded by gravel. We should check the manufacturer's specifications regarding the proposed prefabricated drainage panel material to verify it is appropriate for its intended use. The collector pipes should drain to a suitable discharge location (sump).

Dampness and discoloration on the walls should be expected due to natural percolation of rain water, irrigation or other water introduced behind the walls. If this is not acceptable, the walls should be waterproofed. The waterproofing should be installed directly behind the wall (sandwiched between the wall and drainage paneling). Final waterproofing recommendations should be determined by the project waterproofing consultant and/or architect.

If proposed, site landscaping retaining walls can be designed to rotate (using active pressures) or be restrained (using at-rest pressures). If the walls are designed to rotate, they should be designed to resist an active equivalent fluid weight of 40 pounds per cubic foot (pcf). It should be noted that retaining walls designed to rotate, will move outward near the top of the wall over time (over several years), causing minor concrete cracking to the wall and ground settlement of the retained soil near the top of the wall. Alternatively, walls can be designed to be restrained to limit top deflection by applying at-rest pressures presented in Table 4. Foundations for retaining walls should be designed using the criteria outlined in Section 7.2.

If the design team indentifies any surcharges (from adjacent structures), we can assist the design team to develop the appropriate surcharge loading conditions.



The lateral earth pressure given assumes the walls are properly backdrained to prevent the buildup of hydrostatic pressure. The backdrains may consist of prefabricated drainage panels (Miradrain 6000 or equivalent) placed against the back of the wall. The drainage panels should extend down to a collector pipe consisting of four-inch-diameter, perforated PVC pipe surrounded on all sides by at least four inches of Caltrans Class 2 permeable material or 3/4-inch drain rock wrapped in filter fabric (Mirafi 140N or equivalent). A thicker drainage paneling (such as Hydroduct® Coil 600 or equivalent) may be used in lieu of a PVC pipe surrounded by gravel. The collector pipes should drain to a suitable discharge location.

Another acceptable alternative is to backdrain the wall with crushed rock material at least one foot wide extending down to the base of the wall. A perforated PVC pipe should be placed at the bottom of the drain to collect water and transmit it to a suitable discharge point. The pipe and crushed rock should be surrounded by filter fabric. The top of the gravel should be capped with at least 18 inches of clayey soil or a concrete v-ditch sloping to a discharge point.

Alternatively, weep holes at the base of the wall could be used to drain water collected in the drainage paneling and/or crushed rock from the back of the wall. Weep holes should be spaced no greater than 4 feet apart and be a minimum of 3 inches in diameter. The back of the weep hole should be covered with filter fabric to prevent retained soil from being transported through the weep holes. Weep holes continue to drain after rainfall stops. If hardscape is planned below the walls, it should be noted that it may remain wet. The design team and owner should discuss the appropriateness of weep holes and introducing water onto flatwork below the walls.

7.5 Slope Cuts

Excavations deeper than four feet should be shored or sloped for safety in accordance with CAL-OSHA standards. Temporary slope cuts made during construction in bedrock should be no steeper than 3/4 to 1 (horizontal to vertical) and not greater than 15 feet in height which roughly corresponds to a Type A soil as defined by the OSHA Technical Manual. However, if a sequenced construction is performed, vertical cuts may be used in stable bedrock. Once the structural and shoring system is determined, we should review the proposed means and



methods for construction and observe initial excavations so we can confirm conditions and make any modifications as necessary. Temporary sloped excavations in fill should not be steeper than 1:1.

If permanent slope cuts are planned for landscaping, they should be no steeper than 2-1/2 to 1 and not greater than 3 feet in height, unless approved by the geotechnical engineer.

All slope cuts (temporary and permanent) should start at least 3 feet away from property lines, unless shown on the structural and/or shoring plans. In addition, the geotechnical engineer should review the shoring, grading and/or landscaping plans to evaluate the safety of the proposed slope cuts and whether they impact any of the neighboring properties.

7.6 Shoring and Underpinning

Current plans call for the excavation of up to approximately 12 to 15 feet below the existing crawl space and storage on the approximately entire footprint of the existing residence, the existing foundation will be demolished and removed. Because of property line constraints (limited space) and on the basis of our experience on similar projects, we judge a combination of shoring towers and a sequenced foundation construction be implemented. Typically this system is designed by the project structural engineer in conjunction with a licensed shoring engineer hired by the general contractor prior to the start of construction.

Typically, underpinning consists of hand-dug piers installed in a sequenced manner as to limit potential settlement to the structure. If installed, piers should be designed to resist atrest soil pressure caused by the soil against the underpinning. An equivalent fluid pressure of 50 pcf should be applied against the pier. This pressure assumes the piers are equally spaced and are spanned by timber lagging. Lateral earth pressures may be resisted by passive resistance against the embedded portion of the pier. Bearing capacity and passive resistance of the piers may be calculated using values given in the foundations section of this letter. Pier should extend a minimum of 18-inches below the depth of the proposed adjacent foundations. The approach pits should be backfilled prior to commencing adjacent or next sequence pier holes. The approach pits should be filled with compacted soil or lean concrete. The excavation depth at the site should be left at least one foot above the bottom



of the perimeter footing until all of the underpinning piers have been installed and the building loads transferred into the pier by jacking and/or dry-packing is complete. The advantage of underpinning is that once installed, the new foundations can be excavated and poured at one time, whereas sequenced foundation installation results in multiple concrete pours, doweling or lapping of steel reinforcing.

If the design team decides to build the new foundations in a sequenced manner (to avoid the installation of underpinning), the length of new foundation segments is limited by the distance the existing foundation can span without support. On similar projects, the length of the foundation segments is roughly 5 to 8 feet as determined by the structural engineer based on the strength (amount of reinforcing and concrete strength) of the existing foundation. Each segment of new foundation should be doweled to the existing structure and adjacent completed segments before the next sequenced segment is excavated.

7.7 Exterior Hardscape

To mitigate the effects of potentially disturbed near-surface soil and organic matter typically found in near-surface soil, exterior hardscape, including sidewalks, patios, concrete pavers, and other concrete flatwork should be underlain by at least 12 inches of compacted soil unless the exposed subgrade consists of bedrock. To achieve the 12 inches, the existing soil should be stripped to a depth of at least 6 inches, the subgrade scarified and recompacted, and the stripped soil replaced as compacted fill. If the surficial soil does not meet the requirements for fill, approved imported fill (e.g. aggregate baserock) should be used in lieu of the native soil for the upper 6 inches as outlined in Section 7.1.

7.8 Excavation Monitoring

We recommend a monitoring program be established to evaluate the effects of the construction on the adjacent improvements and surrounding ground. A licensed surveyor should monitor ground movements and the movements of adjacent structures and improvements (both vertical and horizontal) during construction activities. We recommend installing survey points on the adjacent buildings, retaining walls, streets and any important improvements that are within 20 feet of the site. Survey points should be read regularly



and the results should be submitted to us in a timely manner for review. For estimating purposes, assume that the points will be read as follows:

- Prior to any work at the site
- On a weekly basis until the completion of the foundation
- Monthly basis until the completion of basement walls and supporting floor slabs

In addition, a thorough photographic survey and crack survey of the adjacent neighboring structures, retaining walls, driveway retaining walls and any other improvements should be performed prior to beginning construction and after construction has been completed. The baseline data may become critical if any disputes arise with the adjacent neighbors.

During excavation, the project geotechnical engineer should be on-site to evaluate the soil conditions so modifications in the shoring system can be made in a timely manner, if necessary. It is the responsibility of the owner and/or general contractor to notify the project geotechnical engineer of the shoring installation schedule so observations can be made in a timely manner.

7.9 Seismic Design

The San Francisco Bay Area is a seismically active region and the structure is likely to experience periodic minor earthquakes and possibly a major earthquake (Richter magnitude greater than 7) on one of the nearby active faults. Therefore, at a minimum, the seismic design should be in accordance with the provisions of 2013 California Building Code (CBC) including the following:

- Risk Targeted Maximum Considered Earthquake (MCE_R) S_s and S_1 of 1.500g and 0.674g, respectively.
- Site Class B
- Site Coefficients; F_a=1.0, F_v=1.0



- Risk Targeted Maximum Considered Earthquake (MCE_R) spectral response acceleration parameters at short periods, S_{MS}, and at one-second period, S_{M1}, of 1.500g and 0.674, respectively.
- Design Earthquake (DE) spectral response acceleration parameters at short period, S_{DS}, and at one-second period, S_{D1}, of 1.000g and 0.449g, respectively.

8.0 ADDITIONAL GEOTECHNICAL SERVICES

We should review the final shoring/underpinning and foundation plans and specifications to check that they are in general conformance with the intent of our recommendations. During construction, we should observe the foundation excavations, subgrade preparation and the placement and compaction of fill. We will, in turn, compare actual to anticipated soil conditions, and check the contractor's work conforms to the geotechnical aspects of the plans and specifications.

9.0 LIMITATIONS

The conclusions and recommendations presented in this report result from limited engineering studies based on our interpretation of the existing geotechnical conditions and available subsurface data. Actual subsurface conditions may vary. If any variations or unforeseen conditions are encountered during construction, or if the proposed construction will differ from that which is described in this report, Rollo & Ridley, Inc. should be notified so that supplemental recommendations can be made.

Our firm has prepared this report for the exclusive use of our client and their representatives on this project in substantial accordance with the generally accepted geotechnical engineering practice as it exists in the site area at the time of our study. No warranty is expressed or implied. The recommendations provided in this report are based on the assumption that an adequate program of tests and observations will be conducted by our firm during the construction phase in order to evaluate compliance with our recommendations. If we are not retained for these services, the client must assume Rollo & Ridley's responsibility for potential claims that may arise during or after construction.



REFERENCES

California Division of Mines and Geology (1996). "Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Assessment for the State of California." DMG Open-File Report 96-08.

Cao, T., Bryant, W. A., Rowshandel, B., Branum D. and Wills, C. J. (2003). "The Revised 2002 California Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Maps"

California Building Code (2013).

Lienkaemper, J. J. (1992). "Map of Recently Active Traces of the Hayward Fault, Alameda and Contra Costa counties, California." Miscellaneous Field Studies Map MF-2196.

Schlocker, J. (1974). "Geology of the San Francisco North Quadrangle, California."

Sitar, N. et al. (2010). "Seismic Earth Pressures on Deep Building Basements." SEAOC 2010 Convention Proceedings.

Toppozada, T. R. and Borchardt G. (1998). "Re-Evaluation of the 1836 "Hayward Fault" and the 1838 San Andreas Fault earthquakes." *Bulletin of Seismological Society of America*, 88(1), 140-159.

Townley, S. D. and Allen, M. W. (1939). "Descriptive Catalog of Earthquakes of the Pacific Coast of the United States 1769 to 1928." *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*, 29(1).

U.S. Geological Survey (2014), "Preliminary Earthquake Report (nc72282711)", Menlo Park, California, U.C. Berkeley Seismological Laboratory, Berkeley, California. August 24, 2014.

Wesnousky, S. G. (1986). "Earthquakes, Quaternary Faults, and Seismic Hazards in California." *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 91(1312).

Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities (WGCEP) (2007). "The Uniform California Earthquake Rupture Forecast, Version 2." Open File Report 2007-1437.



FIGURES












APPENDIX A

Logs of Test Pits and Classification Charts







| UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM | | | |
|---|--|---------|--|
| Major Divisions | | Symbols | Typical Names |
| ained Soils of soil > no. 200 size | Gravels (More than half of coarse fraction > no. 4 sieve size) | GW | Well-graded gravels or gravel-sand mixtures, little or no fines |
| | | GP | Poorly-graded gravels or gravel-sand mixtures, little or no fines |
| | | GM | Silty gravels, gravel-sand-silt mixtures |
| | | GC | Clayey gravels, gravel-sand-clay mixtures |
| -Gra half sieve | Sands (More than half of coarse fraction < no. 4 sieve size) | SW | Well-graded sands or gravelly sands, little or no fines |
| arse han | | SP | Poorly-graded sands or gravelly sands, little or no fines |
| CO: Dre th | | SM | Silty sands, sand-silt mixtures |
| ů, | | SC | Clayey sands, sand-clay mixtures |
| e lio | Silts and Clays LL = < 50 | ML | Inorganic silts and clayey silts of low plasticity, sandy silts, gravelly silts |
| of s size | | CL | Inorganic clays of low to medium plasticity, gravelly clays, sandy clays, lean clays |
| half sieve | | OL | Organic silts and organic silt-clays of low plasticity |
| Grai | Silts and Clays LL = > 50 | МН | Inorganic silts of high plasticity |
| Fine -((more t < no. 2 | | СН | Inorganic clays of high plasticity, fat clays |
| | | ОН | Organic silts and clays of high plasticity |
| Highly Organic Soils | | PT | Peat and other highly organic soils |

| | GRAIN SIZE CHA | ART | | Comple token with Coverse & Llenwood colit herrol complex with a | |
|---|---|--|------|---|--|
| | Range of Gr | ain Sizes | | 3.0-inch outside diameter and a 2.43-inch inside diameter. Darker | |
| Classification | U.S. Standard Sieve Size | Grain Size in Millimeters | | area indicates soil recovered | |
| Boulders | Above 12" | Above 305 | 1 🖾 | | |
| Cobbles | 12" to 3" | 305 to 76.2 | | Undisturbed sample taken with thin-walled tube | |
| Gravel coarse fine | 3" to No. 4 3" to 3/4" 3/4" to No. 4 | 76.2 to 4.76 76.2 to 19.1 19.1 to 4.76 | | Disturbed sample | |
| Sand coarse medium | No. 4 to No. 200 No. 4 to No. 10 No. 10 to No. 40 | 4.76 to 0.075 4.76 to 2.00 2.00 to 0.420 | 0 | Sampling attempted with no recovery | |
| fine | No. 40 to No. 200 | 0.420 to 0.075 | | Core sample | |
| Silt and Clay | Below No. 200 | Below 0.075 | | | |
| | | | • | Analytical laboratory sample | |
| ✓ Unstabilized groundwater level ✓ Stabilized groundwater level | | | | Sample taken with Direct Push sampler | |
| | | | | Sonic | |
| | | | SAMP | LER TYPE | |
| C Core bar | rrel | | | PT Pitcher tube sampler using 3.0-inch outside diameter, | |

- California split-barrel sampler with 2.5-inch outside
- diameter and a 1.93-inch inside diameter
- D&M Dames & Moore piston sampler using 2.5-inch outside diameter, thin-walled tube
- O Osterberg piston sampler using 3.0-inch outside diameter, thin-walled Shelby tube
- PT Pitcher tube sampler using 3.0-inch outside diameter, thin-walled Shelby tube

SAMPLE DESIGNATIONS/SYMBOLS

- S&H Sprague & Henwood split-barrel sampler with a 3.0-inch outside diameter and a 2.43-inch inside diameter
- SPT Standard Penetration Test (SPT) split-barrel sampler with a 2.0-inch outside diameter and a 1.5-inch inside diameter
- ST Shelby Tube (3.0-inch outside diameter, thin-walled tube) advanced with hydraulic pressure



CA

CLASSIFICATION CHART 3145-3147 JACKSON STREET

San Francisco, California

| | A | -4 |
|---------|-----|----------|
| FIGURE | | |
| DATE | (| 05/29/17 |
| PROJECT | No. | 1520.1 |



DISTRIBUTION

- PDF Copy: Seal Rock Capital LLC c/o Michael Blair 3147 Jackson Street San Francisco, California 94115
- PDF Copy: Steve Geiszler Geiszler Architects 2155 Powell Street San Francisco, California 94133



DISCRETIONARY REVIEW PUBLIC (DRP) APPLICATION PACKET

Pursuant to Planning Code Section 311, the Planning Commission may exercise its power of Discretionary Review over a building permit application.

For questions, you can call the Planning counter at 628.652.7300 or email <u>pic@sfgov.org</u> where planners are able to assist you.

Please read the Discretionary Review Informational Packet carefully before the application form is completed.

WHAT TO SUBMIT:

□ Two (2) complete applications signed.

- □ A Letter of Authorization from the DR requestor giving you permission to communicate with the Planning Department on their behalf, if applicable.
- □ Photographs or plans that illustrate your concerns.
- □ Related covenants or deed restrictions (if any).
- □ A digital copy (CD or USB drive) of the above materials (optional).
- Payment via check, money order or debit/credit for the total fee amount for this application. (See_ <u>Fee Schedule</u>).

HOW TO SUBMIT:

To file your Discretionary Review Public application, please email the completed application to cpc.intake@sfgov.org.

Español: Si desea ayuda sobre cómo llenar esta solicitud en español, por favor llame al 628.652.7550. Tenga en cuenta que el Departamento de Planificación requerirá al menos un día hábil para responder.

中文:如果您希望獲得使用中文填寫這份申請表的幫助,請致電628.652.7550。請注意,規劃部門需要至少 一個工作日來回應。

Filipino: Kung gusto mo ng tulong sa pagkumpleto ng application na ito sa Filipino, paki tawagan ang 628.652.7550. Paki tandaan na mangangailangan ang Planning Department ng hindi kukulangin sa isang araw na pantrabaho para makasagot.

2017-011977PRJ



DISCRETIONARY REVIEW PUBLIC (DRP) APPLICATION

Discretionary Review Requestor's Information

| Address: | Telephone: (413) 930-8100 | | | | |
|----------|---|---------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Addross | 235 Montgomery Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94104 | Email Address: ryan@zfplaw.com | | | |
| Name: | 3139-3141 Jackson Street HOA, c/o Ryan J. Patterson, J | Zacks, Freedman & Patterson, PC | | | |

Name: Michael Blair

Company/Organization: Seal Rock Capital, LLC

3147 Jackson Street San Francisco, CA, 94115 Address: Telephone:

Property Information and Related Applications

Project Address: 3145-3147 Jackson Street

Block/Lot(s): 0983/017

Building Permit Application No(s): 2018.10.10.2850

ACTIONS PRIOR TO A DISCRETIONARY REVIEW REQUEST

| PRIOR ACTION | YES | NO |
|---|-----|----|
| Have you discussed this project with the permit applicant? | | |
| Did you discuss the project with the Planning Department permit review planner? | | |
| Did you participate in outside mediation on this case? (including Community Boards) | | |

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 that were made to the proposed project.

No changes have been made as a result of discussions with the project sponsors.

DISCRETIONARY REVIEW REQUEST

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

1. What are the reasons for requesting Discretionary Review? The project meets the standards of the Planning Code and the Residential Design Guidelines. 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.

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 unreasonably affected, please state who would be affected, and how.

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?

DISCRETIONARY REVIEW REQUESTOR'S AFFIDAVIT

Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:

a) The undersigned is the DR requestor or their authorized representation.

Signature

Name (Printed)

Relationship to Requestor (i.e. Attorney, Architect, etc.) Phone

Email

For Department Use Only Application received by Planning Department:

By: _

Date: _

1. What are the reasons for requesting Discretionary Review? The project meets the standards of the Planning Code and the Residential Design Guidelines. 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 cite specific sections of the Residential Design Guidelines.

The proposed project violates the Planning Code and Residential Design Guidelines in several respects:

A. The project violates the height measurement rule in § 260(a)(1)(C).

The 311 plans state that the project will be 36'-9" within a 40-X height limit. However, the project violates § 260(a)(1)(C) by measuring from an artificially inflated baseline grade. The grade has been altered significantly with terracing – by several feet – above the adjacent lots to the east and south. This creates an artificial "ground zero" for the purpose of height calculation. The DR Requestors have repeatedly requested a topographic survey to determine the true natural grade, and the Project Sponsors have yet to produce one. The project bases its height calculation on an artificial rear terrace rather than natural grade.

B. The project is a de-facto unit merger in violation of § 317.

The project appears to accomplish a de facto unit merger in violation of SFPC §317. In its current iteration, the lower unit is sandwiched between the basement level and the second story of the upper unit. A staircase connecting the basement to the upper floors passes *through* the lower unit and previously included a door into the lower unit. (A prior version of the plans included a grand stair from the upper unit that dead-ended at the lower unit.)

Sheet A2.1, diagram 1 (Level 1 - Unit 3145) includes a note "CONNECTION CLOSED OFF," but there is no existing connection. (See sheet A2.1.) This note likely pinpoints the location where a connection between the units *will be created* by opening a doorway to the stair landing. And even if the project sponsors do not open an unpermitted doorway between the units, the project includes an elevator which will connect the two units.

The kitchen in the lower unit is also implausibly small while the laundry and wine cellar (!) are implausibly large. (See A2.1) These factors indicate and enable an unpermitted merger of the units – in violation of § 317.

C. The project does not "articulate the building to minimize impacts on light and privacy to adjacent properties."

The project violates the Residential Design Guideline requiring that it "articulate the building to minimize impacts on light and privacy to adjacent properties." (RDG pp. 16-17.) The neighboring building at 3139-3141 Jackson features a lightwell on its west side which is 6'-3" wide and three

stories tall. This essential lightwell provides light and air to bedrooms, kitchens, and dining rooms for both units. The existing subject property does not feature a matching lightwell along its east side, and this already limits the amount of light entering the neighboring lightwell. The Project proposes to exacerbate this condition with a vertical addition that does not match the lightwell to the east and which will further block the afternoon sun.

D. The project is not "compatible with the height and depth of surrounding buildings."

The Residential Design Guidelines require: "Design the scale of the building to be compatible with the height and depth of surrounding buildings." (RDG p. 23.) The proposed Project is almost 18' taller than its western neighbor – <u>nearly double its height</u>. It is about 10' taller than its eastern neighbor. (The project drawings misleadingly use a decorative parapet on 3139/3141 Jackson as its existing height.) It is 8' taller than the building at 3133 Jackson, which is uphill. It is even 4' taller than the building at 3161 Jackson. By all reasonable standards, the Project breaks the established height pattern of the block.

E. The project is not "compatible with the existing building scale at the mid-block open space."

The Residential Design Guidelines require: "Design the height and depth of the building to be compatible with the existing building scale at the mid-block open space." (RDG p. 25.) While the Project does not seem at first to encroach horizontally on the mid-block open space, this is misleading. The Project proposes to excavate the entirety of its rear yard to a depth of 7' and construct concrete retaining walls on its east, west and south borders. The root systems of established trees on neighboring properties will be destroyed.

In addition to the Project's violation of SFPC 260(a)(1)(C), it also proposes to sink the rear yard by 7' and create a new rear wall which is almost 44' tall when measured from the new grade in the rear yard. This will create a tower-and-moat effect impacting neighboring properties' enjoyment of the mid-block open space.

F. The project includes an unpermitted rear-yard obstruction in violation of §§ 134 & 136.

The project proposes a new firewall for a south-facing deck at the new third floor. A note on sheet A2.1, diagram 2 states "(E) FULL HEIGHT FIREWALL *NOTE - WITHIN (E) BUILDING ENVELOPE." However, the firewall is <u>not</u> within the existing envelope; it is a *new* structure being built above a nonconforming portion in the rear yard. (See sheet A3.1.) The proposed firewall is an obstruction in the required rear yard, and it is not allowed by §§ 134 or 136.

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 unreasonably affected, please state who would be affected, and how.

As discussed above, the project violates multiple Code sections and Residential Design Guidelines. As a result, its impacts go well beyond the normal impacts of a code-compliant project. It will deny reasonable access to light and air for 3141 Jackson Street and 3139 Jackson, degrade the common mid-block open space, and remove a housing unit without conditional use authorization.

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?

As a starting point, the proposed project should comply with the rules. Specifically:

- i. The two units should be designed to avoid an unauthorized merger.
- ii. The penthouse should be deleted and replaced with a roof deck.
- iii. The rear yard should not be excavated into a pit (destroying the mid-block trees and creating a tower effect at the rear).
- iv. The neighboring lightwell should be matched.

In particular, the proposed penthouse imposes severe impacts *without a corresponding benefit to the project*. It is square-footage without a purpose. The penthouse comprises a "front lounge" and dining room. But, the unit already includes two additional lounge areas, a living room, a dining room, and an eat-in kitchen on the third floor. Deleting the penthouse would reduce the project's resale value (making the housing more affordable) but would have no discernable impact on the project's *intrinsic* value as graciously appointed housing.

Google Maps 3145 Jackson St



Imagery ©2020 Google, Map data ©2020 , Map data ©2020 $\,$ 20 ft $_$

October 26, 2020

The 3139-3141 Jackson Street HOA hereby authorizes the attorneys of Zacks, Freedman & Patterson, PC to file a request for Discretionary Review of BPA No. 2018.10.10.2850/Case No. 2017-011977PRJ (3145-3147 Jackson Street) on its behalf.

Signed,

3139-3141 JACKSON STREET HOA

DocuSigned by: تتله

By: Tony Origlio Its: Member

DocuSigned by: 7 K Vanderbilt

By: Kip Vanderbilt Its: Member

DocuSigned by: TU II, P.Mugle

By: Tully Murphy Its: Member

DocuSigned by: m

By: Mark Murphy Its: Member



49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400 San Francisco, CA 94103 www.sfplanning.org

DISCRETIONARY REVIEW PUBLIC (DRP)

Pursuant to Planning Code Section 311, the Planning Commission may exercise its power of Discretionary Review over a building permit application.

For questions, you can call the Planning counter at 628.652.7300 or email <u>pic@sfgov.org</u> where planners are able to assist you.

Please read the Discretionary Review Informational Packet carefully before the application form is completed.

WHAT TO SUBMIT:

☑ Two (2) complete applications signed.

- A Letter of Authorization from the DR requestor giving you permission to communicate with the Planning Department on their behalf, if applicable.
- Photographs or plans that illustrate your concerns.
- □ Related covenants or deed restrictions (if any).
- □ A digital copy (CD or USB drive) of the above materials (optional).
- Payment via check, money order or debit/credit for the total fee amount for this application. (See<u>Fee Schedule</u>).

HOW TO SUBMIT:

To file your Discretionary Review Public application, please email the completed application to <u>cpc.intake@sfgov.org</u>.

Español: Si desea ayuda sobre cómo llenar esta solicitud en español, por favor llame al 628.652.7550. Tenga en cuenta que el Departamento de Planificación requerirá al menos un día hábil para responder.

中文:如果您希望獲得使用中文填寫這份申請表的幫助,請致電628.652.7550。請注意,規劃部門需要至少 一個工作日來回應。

Filipino: Kung gusto mo ng tulong sa pagkumpleto ng application na ito sa Filipino, paki tawagan ang 628.652.7550. Paki tandaan na mangangailangan ang Planning Department ng hindi kukulangin sa isang araw na pantrabaho para makasagot.

2017-011977PRJ



DISCRETIONARY REVIEW PUBLIC (DRP)

Discretionary Review Requestor's Information

Name: 35 Belgrave LLC, Shapoor Ansari Trustee

3242 Washington Street

Address:

Email Address: lavander69@gmail.com

Telephone: (415) 310-7282

Information on the Owner of the Property Being Developed

Name: Blair residence, applicant Steve Geiszler

Company/Organization:

2155 Powell Street

Email Address: steve@geiszlerarchitects.com

Telephone: (415) 409-7000

Property Information and Related Applications

Project Address:

Block/Lot(s):

Address:

Building Permit Application No(s):

ACTIONS PRIOR TO A DISCRETIONARY REVIEW REQUEST

| PRIOR ACTION | YES | NO |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| Have you discussed this project with the permit applicant? | 1 | |
| Did you discuss the project with the Planning Department permit review planner? | \checkmark | |
| Did you participate in outside mediation on this case? (including Community Boards) | | \checkmark |
| 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, the result, including any changes that were made to the proposed project. | please sum | ımarize |
| Please see attached | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

PAGE 2 | PLANNING APPLICATION - DISCRETIONARY REVIEW PUBLIC

V. 08.28.2020 SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

DISCRETIONARY REVIEW REQUEST

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

1. What are the reasons for requesting Discretionary Review? The project meets the standards of the Planning Code and the Residential Design Guidelines. 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.

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 unreasonably affected, please state who would be affected, and how.

Please see attached

Please see attached

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 attached

DISCRETIONARY REVIEW REQUESTOR'S AFFIDAVIT

Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:

a) The undersigned is the DR requestor or their authorized representation.

Signature

Shapoor Ansari

Name (Printed)

lavander69@gmail.com

Email

Relationship to Requestor (i.e. Attorney, Architect, etc.) Phone

4153107282

For Department Use Only Application received by Planning Department:

By: ___

PAGE 4 | PLANNING APPLICATION - DISCRETIONARY REVIEW PUBLIC

V. 08.28.2020 SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Date:

Actions Prior to A DR Request

Changes Made Prior to the Project as a Result of Mediation

I purchased this home (lot 9 which shares its southern border with lot 17) in February 2019 and the 311 notice was the first time I heard there would be construction with the neighbor directly behind me. Through my daughter, Maria, we made direct email contacts and multiple phone attempts with the number provided on the permit application/311 notice to the only point of contact: Steve Geiszler, Architect. To this day, no one has ever answered that phone number and there is no voicemail. Multiple emails and offers to meet with the architect were met with evasive and dismissive responses. Finally, on October 22 afternoon, 6 days prior to the expiration of the 311 notice, the owner, Michael Blair, responded to one of the emails sent to the architect and a phone call that same day was arranged by my daughter, Maria (representing me) with Carol Chichester (lot 10), and Michael Blair.

This is the report from Maria, my daughter based on her notes. In that phone meeting (October 22), Michael Blair said that he had not done a sun study, an arborist report, or an official land survey because "it was not required". He had done a partial land survey but it was done to inform the architectural design and he said there was no "formal report" available to review when asked. The geotech evaluation was focused on design and construction elements but did not address the impact on nearby properties. All of these studies had been requested by multiple neighbors including the neighbor Carol, who was on the call, at the preplanning meeting. We asked about the retaining wall and he said he was unaware that my property even had a retaining wall until the day prior and he was unaware that there were any concerns about mature trees. He said he would like plans for a "shared retaining wall" with both of us, but had never discussed this previously with either of us. He said a wall was already on the approved permit plans, but we had not seen one. When asked to show where on the submitted plans there is a retaining wall, he said he'd get back to us. He subsequently sent us a drawing that was not in the 311 notice that included a new retaining wall of unclear height at the rear of his property. Please recall that concerns about plans for the retaining wall were initially raised 2 years ago by Carol in person and in writing and remain unaddressed. On the call, Michaell said he'd be happy to consider an arborist evaluation now and a formal land survey, but they would not be ready right away. He then said he would not do a sun study unless we agreed not to file a DR, which had not even been mentioned or brought up.

When asked why he had not met with the neighbors in the last two years, he said he's been very busy. When asked why he did not notify or meet with the new owner of 3242 Washington of this plan that involves major construction, 15 feet excavation and doubling their square

3145-47 Jackson

footage and a planned shared retaining wall, he said, he felt the southside neighbors in general were really not as affected by this project as the other neighbors. He did agree that it was an oversight.

In summary, the permit applicant has (per his own report), spent three years making the approved plans and the last time he received feedback was 2 years ago. He has made only one substantial change (per his own report that he could recall) to the project as a result of a preplanning meeting which was an 18 inch setback of the penthouse. There has been no sun study, no arborist report, no formal land survey, no geotechnical evaluation of the south part of the applicant's property, and no collaboration on the retaining wall regarding our shared rear yards. There has been no apparent effort in the last two years despite prior feedback to to address these concerns on the part of the applicant.

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 standards of the Planning Code and the Residential Design Guidelines. 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.

Excavation concerns: There currently is only a partial basement present at the 3145-47 property. The plan is for excavation of 12-15 feet with a full footprint level garage (housing 3 cars in the drawing with capacity for 5 cars as shown on original plans, storage, gym, lift, and sauna/spa) and an additional loft/mezzanine below ground. This will require a new foundation at the residence. A preliminary geotech report done for architectural guidance states the work will require 12-15 feet of excavation but does not indicate impact on south side neighbors where we have retaining walls in place. My home and our neighbors are >120 years old and soil erosion and risk to the foundation could significantly impact the safety and stability of the landscape around our homes which are on a slope. There is a new retaining wall proposed in the rear yard setback. These may damage the roots of surrounding mature trees. The geotech report does not address these concerns. Excavation of this magnitude and building of a new retaining wall of unknown height, may affect the stability of our retaining wall in our sloped yard.

The next two items below are concerns that vary from the residential design guidelines: *Site Design (section III) with regards to the rear yard "light" and "privacy" as well as Building Scale and Form (section IV) regarding "mid block open space".*

Privacy concerns: This would be a 5 story structure which would include a penthouse level and two additional roof decks (one in front and one in the rear) which exceed the roofline of the existing structures and nearby structures. The rear roof deck would give visibility right into our backyard and rear facing windows of our homes on the southside and therefore into our interior living spaces.

Light concerns: The additional height would impact afternoon sun and affect the midblock lighting that is characteristic of the neighborhood. It would be the tallest structure in our line of sight and out of proportion to the other homes.

3145-47 Jackson St

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 unreasonably affected, please state who would be affected, and how.

The project impacts adjacent buildings in the neighborhood due to roofline, light, privacy and neighborhood character. Specifically it would impact both properties at 3242 and 3248 Washington St. The change in height affects the lighting of the open space in the rear yard, which will affect all the surrounding homes. The height of the new structure will create a "boxed in" feeling to the midblock open space and is substantially out of proportion to other structures in the adjacent area. The full footprint basement is not typical of most homes in the area with 1-2 car garage capacity, rather than 5 car capacity. The 5th floor penthouse is flanked by two roof decks. The rear roof deck has a spiral staircase and fire wall which encroach on the rear yard setback and requires a variance. The last 10 feet of an averaged rear yard is limited to 30 feet in height but the drawing shows a higher elevation.

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?

Excavation: Reduce degree of excavation to a partial footprint garage only in keeping with garages in the rest of the neighborhood and to minimize impact of excavation on nearby foundations. Have a geotechnical engineer provide specific recommendations to prevent soil erosion, impact to our existing retaining walls on the rear of both southern properties (lot 9 and 10) and protect mature birch trees as a result of this project. Provide direct soil engineering oversight and monitoring of the construction to minimize impact to our homes. We request a certified arborist report with measures to protect the mature trees and landscaping for the rear yards on a slope.

Privacy: Adjust window configuration on top level to minimize line of sight into our homes. Remove the rear roof deck which is in the rear of the property with a firepit/BBQ. There is a front roofdeck already with a hot tub, water feature, and firepit. This will help with privacy concerns of adjacent neighbors. The spiral staircase height would require a variance and should be lowered or removed.

Light: Remove rear roof deck to create more open space. Incorporate translucent glass or glazing on upper level windows. Provide a sun or shadow study to help guide a new design that will optimize lighting in the midblock open space.

3145-47 Jackson St

ATTACHED PHOTOS for DISCRETIONARY REVIEW



Photo 1

View from Shapoor Ansari residence 3242 Washington Street with loss of privacy concerns given that current vegetation shields yard from northern neighbor's view but that will be lost with the addition of another story. Risk also includes risk to these mature birch trees due to soil erosion, root damage. Photo demonstrates risk to privacy if another story is added with rear roof deck.

3145-47 Jackson



Photo 2

View from 3242 Washington Street

An additional story would go way above current vegetation and any of the surrounding homes and substantially negatively impact midblock open space.



Photo 3

View from 3242 Washington. An additional story here would create a significant loss of privacy into the windows of the southern neighbors given the height and exposure

October 24, 2020

RE: Project application: 2017-011977PRJ

Dear Ms Elizabeth Gordon Jonckheer,

I am the trustee of 35 Bélgrave LLC and owner of 3242 Washington Street. I am submitting a discretionary review regarding the proposed project at 3145-3147 Jackson Street.

My daughter, Maria Ansari has permission to communicate with the Planning Department on my behalf and her contact information was provided in my application (phone/email).

Thank you.

Sincerely,

usa.

Shapoor Ansari, trustee of 35 Belgrave LLC 3242 Washington Street San Francisco, California



DNM Architecture 1A Gate 5 Road Sausalito, CA 94965

T: (415) 348-8910 E: info@dnmarchitecture.com

Laura Ajello, Planner Northwest Team, Current Planning Division San Francisco Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

May 27, 2020

Dear Laura,

I am working with the neighbors at 3139-3141 Jackson (the "Neighbor Property") to help them understand the proposed plans for 3145 Jackson (the "Project) and articulate their concerns. We have reviewed the drawings labeled "Rev#5 – FEB 20 2020", and we feel that there are many significant issues which remain unaddressed. Below is a summary of concerns that we have identified based on the most recent plans submitted.

- The height limit indicated in the elevations is based on the applicant's claim of the [E] grade. This
 claim has not been established in fact or document. There are numerous grade changes and retaining
 walls surrounding the property that complicate establishment of grade at the property line per SFPC
 261. The adjacent properties on the East and South sides of the subject property are both much
 lower. Since applicant's vertical addition approaches the maximum 40' height limit, we request that
 the Department requires the applicant to provide a topographic survey by a licensed surveyor to
 establish the accurate existing grade and building height.
- 2. The location of the rear spiral stair is still within the 5' setback area that was required in your previous comments.
- 3. The spiral stair requires a new fire wall extending to 42" above the current roof. This new wall is in the rear yard setback and requires a variance.
- 4. Although not a Planning Code issue, the stair itself will not meet CBC requirements as a legal second exit from the top story. The applicants propose in their exiting plan the occupants leave the building to descend the stairs, and then <u>re-enter</u> the burning building to continue to the exit.
- 5. Several of the bedrooms will not provide CBC required rescue windows to qualify as bedrooms, and the applicant has cynically renamed some rooms to get around this condition. Like the exiting issue above, why approve a project at the Planning stage knowing it will not pass at the building permit stage?
- 6. The demolition plans and elevations do not indicate the true extent of the demolition and should be revised and recalculated. For example, they claim that a partial height wall in the current basement can be retained as a full height wall when the floor below is excavated away. It is not possible, and the walls to be removed should be correctly labeled.
- 7. A fireplace is indicated along the north wall of the 3rd story, and there is no plausible route for it to be vented without being too close to openings on the rear of 4th floor facades.
- 8. While the original curved staircase was removed, this plan can easily and clearly be merged into a single unit via the second staircase and the elevator, and we believe the applicant is planning a defacto unit merger
- 9. The garage is still oversized per your earlier comments. Showing three cars in a five car garage does not make it one.
- 10. The neighbors at 3139-3141 have an approximately 7' deep lightwell on their west side that provides significant light for their bedrooms, kitchen, and dining rooms. The proposed vertical addition and partial lightwell infill at the proposed elevator will significantly reduce light into these major windows.



DNM ARCHITECTURE 1A Gate 5 Road Sausalito, CA 94965 T: (415) 348-8910 E: info@dnmarchitecture.com

We request the vertical addition is held back on the east side at least to match the depth of the neighboring lightwell.

- 11. The applicants propose significant retaining walls at the property lines in the rear yard setback on the East, South and West sides. In addition to issues with shoring neighboring properties, these will clearly damage the roots of surrounding trees and diminish the mid-block open space. We request that a certified arborist report with measures to protect neighboring trees be provided, and all proposed protection measures be included the project approval.
- 12. They indicate the front parapet as 3'-9" above the lowest point of the roof as a means to minimize the impact of the vertical addition. The parapet is closer to 32" above the lowest point of their roof, however, and these drawings should be corrected.
- 13. The square footage summary on A0.1, proposed GFA on A0.5, and the fire exiting calculations on A0.6 are inaccurate and out of date. Planning cannot evaluate the project's compliance with erroneous information.
- 14. Finally, the applicants propose a 16' cut and more than 2000 c.y. of excavation. The excavation extends to the rear property line. It will require underpinning of neighbors (to which they will never agree) or massive sheet steel shoring. To date, we have seen no report from Environmental Planning regarding this undertaking. Has a geotechnical report been submitted and is environmental review underway?

We hope that highlighting these issues will assist the Planning Department as it reviews the Project. Please let us know if you have any queries or need any further information from us.

Sincerely,

) //NA

David Marlatt, AIA DNM Architecture Inc.

Canby Cohen 12 East Terrace Tiburon, California 94920

Elizabeth Gordon-Jonckheer, Planner Northwest Team, Current Planning Division San Francisco Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

Elizabeth.Gordon-Jonckheer@sfgov.org

Re: Objection to the proposed Plans for 3145 Jackson Street

October 20, 2020

Dear Elizabeth,

I was born at 3248 Washington Street San Francisco and not only did I grow up there, I lived there many years as an adult choosing to have to two babies there. It was a beautiful, light-filled, tranquil place to raise two babies.

I am concerned the construction proposed at 3145 Jackson (the "Project) will ruin the beauty and tranquility of the neighborhood. The project sponsors are proposing an ambitious horizontal and vertical addition (from 4300 sq ft to almost 10,000 sq ft.). The Project raises significant concerns for the neighbors of the Project, including impacts on light and air, privacy, and compromise of the mid-block open space. Below is a summary of concerns that we have identified based on the most recent plans submitted.

First, the Project proposes a significant excavation work (16 feet down and removal of at least 2000 cubic yards) to expand the lower floor and build new retaining walls. The new walls will be located in the required rear yard setback on the east, south and west sides of the property.

In addition to shoring up issues, the new retaining walls will damage or destroy the roots of surrounding trees and diminish the mid-block open space. We request that the Zoning Administrator require a certified arborist report with measures to protect neighboring trees, and these measures be included as a condition of project approval. Furthermore, we request there be no damage to the rear retaining wall, and that a soil engineer determine any drainage issues in connection with the Project as a condition of project approval.

Second, the Project encroaches into the required rear yard setback, in violation of §§ 134 and 136 of the Planning Code. The existing building already extends beyond both adjacent neighboring buildings and does not provide the required rear yard setback. The Project proposes to exacerbate this issue – the rear deck, spiral staircase, and a large portion of the new "back lounge" extend into the required rear yard area, beyond the point allowed by

averaging the adjacent buildings. (Planning Code, § 136(c).) Moreover, if, as here, a project sponsor uses averaging to extend into the required rear yard, the last 10' of the building's depth is limited to 30' in height. (Planning Code, § 136(c)(1).) The Project proposes a height of 43'-4" at the new rear wall. The excessive size of the rear addition will block light to the neighboring properties and create serious privacy impacts.

Third, the topography of this site has been dramatically changed (but not the entire block). The measurements currently being used are likely from fill, and native grade may be significantly lower than current grade. Therefore, we request that a geotechnical engineer investigate the present soil conditions at the site and determine where native grade is, as opposed to the altered grade. We believe a geotechnical engineer can also determine how far the grade at the front has been altered. The question of where the height of the proposed building should be measured from has not yet been determined.

Fourth, the proposed changes to the property are unlike/not in keeping with the character of the buildings in the neighborhood and/or in compliance with Historic Resources Category A in that they significantly and materially change the footprint of the building (by more than doubling the sq. ft., adding a penthouse + penthouse deck, changing existing windows to floor-ceiling windows, adding decks and adding an outdoor spiral staircase). The property is categorized as a Historic Resources A building and this has been completely glossed over. The proposed Project destroys the look and feel of this categorization.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions. Canby Cohen Canderies@yahoo.com

ZACKS, FREEDMAN & PATTERSON

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

235 Montgomery Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, California 94104 Telephone (415) 956-8100 Facsimile (415) 288-9755 www.zfplaw.com

January 7, 2020

VIA E-MAIL

President Joel Koppel San Francisco Planning Commission 49 South Van Ness Ave, Suite 1400 San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: 3145-3147 Jackson Street – Case No. 2017-011977DRP DR Requestors' Submission

Dear President Koppel and Commissioners:

Our office represents DR Requestors 3139-3141 Jackson Street HOA (Tony Origlio and Kip Vanderbilt of 3139 Jackson Street and Tully and Mark Murphy of 3141 Jackson Street), the adjacent neighbors to the project's east. These neighbors respectfully request modifications to the project in order to preserve a reasonable amount of light to their homes.

The proposed project violates the Planning Code and Residential Design Guidelines, and it would impose exceptional and extraordinary impacts on the adjacent neighbors, including:

- 1. The project exceeds the height limit because it was measured from an inflated artificial grade (fill dirt behind a retaining wall), rather than the natural grade.
- 2. The new rear staircase and firewall encroach into the rear-yard setback area without a variance.
- 3. The project would severely shadow the adjacent residential units.

1. <u>The Project Exceeds the Height Limit</u>

The project exceeds the 40-foot height limit because the Project Sponsors base their elevation calculations on artificially raised grade. SFPC section 260(a)(1)(C) states, "The ground elevations used shall be either existing elevations or the elevations resulting from new grading operations encompassing an entire block." "Existing elevations" must mean natural grade, not artificially raised fill dirt added by the Project Sponsors or their predecessors. Otherwise, project sponsors could build as tall as they like, so long as they pile dirt up around the building before measuring.

San Francisco Planning Commission January 7, 2020 Page 2

This code provision cannot allow a project sponsor to build a retaining wall and add 10 feet of fill dirt, then one week later propose a project based on the additional height; likewise if a month or a year or 20 years passed. The passage of time or sale of the property cannot give a project sponsor the right to measure from artificially raised grade. "Existing" grade cannot simply mean existing on the date of the permit application; it must mean natural grade. Otherwise, adjacent neighbors would be wrongfully disadvantaged.

Planning Department precedent requires measuring from natural grade, not artificially raised grade. For example, the Department recently required the DR Requestors' architect to measure height from natural grade for his project at 81 Uranus Street. (See Exhibit 5.) As this exhibit shows, the Department rejected the original starting point of measurement (raised grade) based on definitions and methodologies for establishing *natural* grade.

Applying previous precedent and the code's plain meaning, evidence shows that the project site has been built up above natural grade. According to the project's geotechnical report, the project rests on at least 1 to 2.5 feet of artificial fill dirt. (See Exhibit 7.) By measuring from this higher starting point, the Project Sponsors claim part of the building is below grade, when in reality that space should be factored into the project's above-grade height calculation.

The DR Requestors commissioned two recent surveys of the property and the surrounding block, which generated 19 elevation measurements. (Exhibit 4.) Using these measurements, their architect generated a terrain study defining the natural grade. When measured from the proper grade, the project exceeds the permissible 40-foot height by 18 inches. (See Exhibit 1.)

San Francisco Planning Commission January 7, 2020 Page 3



2. <u>The Rear Stairwell and Firewall Require a Variance</u>

The stairwell and firewall at the rear of the project require a variance because they increase an existing nonconformity in a non-complying portion of the structure. The existing building encroaches nearly 18 feet into the required rear-yard setback area. (See Sheet A1.0.)



San Francisco Planning Commission January 7, 2020 Page 4

While SFPC § 188 allows for some modification of non-complying structures, a change cannot result in any new or increased discrepancy with the code. The project proposes to remove part of the encroaching structure and build a new firewall and a spiral staircase in the same are. (See Exhibit 2.)



This new construction in the year yard is both a new discrepancy, in that it is wholly distinct from the previous discrepancy, *and* an increased discrepancy because the staircase and firewall exceed the height of the previous non-conformity. These new encroachments cannot be approved without a variance, and no variance has been requested.

3. The Project Would Deprive Neighbors of an Extraordinary Amount of Sunlight

This project would also have drastic impacts on natural lighting at the neighboring property. A generally accepted unit of measurement for the amount of light a residential unit
receives is known as the Daylight Factor, with the minimum standard set at a Daylight Factor of 2.0%.¹

A light study at the DR Requestors' property shows that the upper unit (3139 Jackson Street) has a daylight factor of 2.27%, just over the 2.0% minimum. The project would reduce the unit's Daylight Factor to a subpar 1.83%. (See exhibit 3.)



The upper unit would also lose multiple hours of sunlight each day, year-round, as a result of the increased height. (Exhibit 3.)

¹ See: <u>https://www.velux.com/what-we-do/research-and-knowledge/deic-basic-book/daylight/daylight-requirements-in-building-codes</u>



The lower unit at the DR Requestors' property (3147 Jackson Street) already has a deficient daylight factor of 0.29 percent. (Exhibit 3.) If the project goes forward as proposed, that unit would lose nearly 20% of its already meager light supply, with a remaining daylight factor of just 0.24%. (Exhibit 3.)





In other words, the project would take a neighbor's dwelling unit that barely meets guidelines for acceptable natural light and force it below that threshold, and the unit upstairs would lose an unacceptable portion of what little light it currently receives. (See Exhibit 6.)

Conclusion

The project's negative impacts are primarily caused by the proposed penthouse. The penthouse does not meet code, and it is unnecessary for a high-quality home. It consists of a lounge, dining room, powder room, and wine closet. (See Sheet A2.4.) The penthouse serves no essential housing functions and contains no bedrooms. Other portions of the unit already include a lounge, living room, and family room; a dining room and eat-in kitchen; a gym and sauna; a wine cellar; and a yoga/meditation studio. This means the penthouse is duplicative (or triplicative or quadruplicative) of spaces already provided elsewhere in the project.

We note that the project's second unit appears to be designed for a future, unauthorized merger: it is sandwiched between two floors of the primary unit, and a stairway passes through the second unit's floor; a doorway need only be opened at the second-floor stair landing. Even if a doorway is not opened, the proposed elevator accomplishes this merger already. And given that the second unit's kitchen is implausibly small (smaller than its wine cellar!) and the laundry room is implausibly large, the Project Sponsors' intent is clear.

Does the project really need <u>five</u> living rooms, <u>three</u> dining areas, and <u>two</u> wine cellars, while severely blocking light to neighbors' already shaded homes? The penthouse should be removed.

Very truly yours,

ZACKS, FREEDMAN & PATTERSON, PC

Ryan J. Patterson

TERRAIN STUDY



A01 TERRAIN TOPOGRAPHY FROM SURVEYED POINTS



AO2 TERRAIN TOPOGRAPHY PROJECTED 40 FEET



AO3 TERRAIN TOPOGRAPHY PROJECTED 40 FEET









A04

AUGUST / APRIL 21st | ADDITIONAL SHADING @ WEST LIGHTWELL 03:30 PM [PDT]



BO3

SEPTEMBER / MARCH 21ST | ADDITIONAL SHADING @ WEST LIGHTWELL 03:00 PM [PDT]



C01

DECEMBER 21st | ADDITIONAL SHADING @ WEST LIGHTWELL

01:00 PM [PST]





DAYLIGHT FACTOR | SECOND FLOOR EXISTING CONDITIONS

[RECOMMENDED DAYLIGHT FACTOR FOR KITCHEN = 2.0%]







DAYLIGHT FACTOR | SECOND FLOOR PROPOSED CONDITIONS

[RECOMMENDED DAYLIGHT FACTOR FOR KITCHEN = 2.0%]

AVERAGE DF = 0.24%

DECEMBER 17TH 2020



[RECOMMENDED DAYLIGHT FACTOR FOR KITCHEN = 2.0%]





DAYLIGHT FACTOR | THIRD FLOOR Proposed conditions

[RECOMMENDED DAYLIGHT FACTOR FOR KITCHEN = 2.0%]

Analysis Grid DAYLIGHT FACTOR PROPOSED YVID Regis 201-100 30P



DECEMBER 17TH 2020



| • | | | |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|--|
| | \times 0.00 | $\times 0.00$ | |
| | • | | |
| $\times 0.00$ | | \times 0.00 | |



| | PROPERTY BOUNDARY LIN |
|-----|-----------------------|
| Р | PAVEMENT |
| DI | DRAINAGE INLET |
| тс | TOP OF CURB |
| FL | FLOW LINE |
| LIP | LIP OF GUTTER |
| HCR | HANDICAP RAMP |
| AP | ANGLE POINT |
| WM | WATER METER |
| WV | WATER VALVE |
| FF | FINISH FLOOR |
| G | GROUND |
| BK | BACK |
| R | ROOF |
| RP | ROOF PEAK |













3139-3142 JACKSON STREET

SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY

CALIFORNIA

JAMES E. DIGGINS R.C.E. 27818 RENEWAL DATE: 03/31/20

| # | REVISIONS | DATE | DeBolt Civil Engineering 811 San Ramon Valley Boulevard Danville, California 94526 | Date: 4/03/2018 Scale: 1" = 10 By: IED / kl |
|---|-----------|------|--|--|
| | | | Tel: 925/837-3780 Fax: 925/837-4378 | JED / kl Job No.: 18132 |

| From: | David Marlatt | | |
|--------------|---|--|--|
| To: | Ryan Patterson | | |
| Cc: | Kip Vanderbilt; Tony Origlio; Brett Schweinberg; Tully Murphy | | |
| Subject: | 81 Uranus | | |
| Date: | Monday, December 28, 2020 3:45:51 PM | | |
| Attachments: | image.png | | |
| | 9-19-2019 Submittal.pdf | | |
| | 20.1008 81 URANUS TERRACE - SITE SECTION FOR SFPLANNING.pdf | | |

Hi Ryan,

DNM Architecture designed a remodel/addition at 81 Uranus Terrace, comprised of a horizontal addition and decks in the rear yard, including a small swim spa, The site slopes downward from Uranus towards Mars St,, and there is an approximately 8'-6" tall retaining wall at the rear property line:



Our original site permit submittal assumed that the grade on our property was measured from the top of the wall at the rear line to Uranus Terrace at the front line



We were proposing new decks in the rear yards and using SFPC 136 to establish the allowable deck heights on a downslope lot



After reviewing our design with Zoning Administrator Corey Teague, staff planner Katy Cambell informed us on June 22, 2020, that we could **not** use the top of the retaining wall to establish the grade at the rear line, but must establish the "natural" grade prior to the evident artificial terracing.

On Mon, Jun 22, 2020 at 7:21 PM Campbell, Cathleen (CPC) <<u>cathleen.campbell@sfgov.org</u>> wrote: Hi Julie and David, I will set up a Video conference meeting through Microsoft Teams. Please suggest a date and time. We will discuss next steps at this meeting.

I was able to speak with the Zoning Administrator.

The obstructions into the rear yard require additional information. The requirements are based on the natural grade. It appears existing rear yard has been terraced. The onus

is on the project sponsor to provide evidenced otherwise. The Zoning Administrator has requested

additional information to determine the variance triggers for the pop-out, decks, stairs, and additional

terracing with the required rear yard. A cantilevered deck is not permitted beyond a 136(c)(25) popout

and requires a rear yard Variance.

Katy Cathleen Campbell, Planner

Southwest Team, Current Planning Division San Francisco Planning Department

1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103 Direct: 415.575.8732 | <u>www.sfplanning.org</u>

San Francisco Property Information Map

As a result of this directive, we took measurements of the grades surrounding our parcel to come to some reasonable average which could be deemed the natural grade. The grade at the rear property line was lowered about 4'



Attached are also PDFs of the relevant site sections submitted to SF Planning in 2019 and revised in October 2020.

Thanks,









GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION 3145-3147 JACKSON STREET San Francisco, California

Seal Rock Capital LLC San Francisco, California

> September 11, 2017 Project No. 1520.1

REUBEN, JUNIUS & ROSE, LLP

Justin A. Zucker jzucker@reubenlaw.com

January 6, 2021

Delivered Via Email

President Joel Koppel San Francisco Planning Commission 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400 San Francisco, CA 94103 c/o David Winslow david.winslow@sfgov.org

Re: 3145-3147 Jackson Street – Building Permit Application No. 2018.10.10.2850 Planning Dept. Case No.: 2017-011977DRP & DRP-2 Hearing Date: January 14, 2021 Our File No.: 11636.01

Dear President Koppel and Commissioners:

Our office represents Seal Rock Capital LLC, owner and sponsor ("**Project Sponsor**") of the project at 3145-3147 Jackson Street, Assessor's Block 0983, Lot 017 (the "**Property**"). The Property is improved with a two-unit building in an RH-2 (Residential-House, Two Family) Zoning District. Project Sponsor proposes renovation of the Property's two existing units with excavation for a garage and basement and vertical penthouse addition, resulting in a 4-story over basement building (the "**Project**"). Revised Project plans are enclosed as <u>Exhibit A</u>. We respectfully request the Planning Commission approve the Project as revised.

The two Discretionary Review ("**DR**") requesters own property adjacent to Property, with one owning the property immediately to the east of the Property ("**Eastern DR Requester**") and the other owning the property immediately south of the Property ("**Southern DR Requester**"; collectively, the "**DR Requesters**"). The DR Requesters opposition to the Project is based on claims of code issues pertaining to building height, an obstruction in the rear yard, and an unauthorized residential merger, as well as fears pertaining to loss of privacy, sun, light and air, and trees. The believed code issues have been clarified and the fears have been addressed by the Project Sponsor at a Planning Department staff facilitated mediation. The revised Project has been reviewed by Planning Department staff and found to be code compliant. Staff recommends taking DR and approving the Project as revised. For these reasons, we submit that no exceptional or extraordinary circumstances have been established that would justify not approving this Project as revised.

San Francisco Office

One Bush Street, Suite 600, San Francisco, CA 94104 tel: 415-567-9000 | fax: 415-399-9480 Oakland Office 492 9th Street, Suite 200, Oakland, CA 94607 tel: 510-527-5589
President Joel Koppel San Francisco Planning Commission January 6, 2021 Page **2** of **7**

A. PROJECT SITE AND PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Property is an approximate 3,570 square foot mid-block lot on the southern side of Jackson Street between Presidio Avenue and Lyon Street. The Property slopes both front to back and side to side.

The Property is at the boundaries of the Presidio Heights and Pacific Heights neighborhoods, with the subject block more closely reflecting the character of the Presidio Heights neighborhood. The Property is within the California Register-eligible Presidio Heights historic district, which has a character defining feature of large, frequently formal dwellings.

The Project calls for renovation of the two existing units at the Property to two formal dwellings, increasing the building's gross floor area from 6,642 square feet to 10,645 square feet. To do such, the Project calls for excavation of the Project site to add a garage and basement and a penthouse vertical addition with roof decks. The existing front, rear, and side setbacks will be maintained, and but for the penthouse addition, the building's envelope will not be expanded.

The Project as revised is an attractive, appropriate, and neighborhood-compatible renovation of the existing two-family home and has gained the support of eleven neighbors in proximity to the Property.

B. RESPONSES TO DR REQUESTERS' CONCERNS

The DR Requesters have raised six concerns about the Project. As elaborated below, those six concerns are unsubstantiated and there are no exceptional or extraordinary circumstances warranting discretionary review.

1. Building Height is Code Compliant

The Property is in a 40-X height and bulk districts. While the building's proposed height will be increased by the penthouse, it will conform with the Planning Code's height requirements. Planning Code Section 260 sets forth the means for calculating a building's height when the lot upon which it is situated slopes as is the case with the Property. Specifically, subdivision (a)(1)(C) of Section 260 holds the point at which the measurement is to be taken from is:

Where the lot slopes upward from a street at the centerline of the building or building step, such point shall be taken at curb level for purposes of measuring the height of the closest part of the building within 10 feet of the property line of such street; at every other cross-section of the building, at right angles to the centerline of the building or building step, *such point shall be taken as the average of the ground elevations at either side of the building or building step at that cross-section. The ground elevations used shall be either existing elevations* or the elevations resulting from new

Z:\Shared\R&A\1163601\DR\3145-47 Jackson - PC Ltr. Brief (2021.01.05).docx

President Joel Koppel San Francisco Planning Commission January 6, 2021 Page **3** of **7**

grading operations encompassing an entire block. Elevations beneath the building shall be taken by projecting a straight line between ground elevations at the exterior walls at either side of the entire building in the same plane. (Planning Code, Section 260(a)(1)(C), emphasis added.)

A land survey of the Property has been conducted (attached as <u>**Exhibit B**</u>). The land survey determined that the Project's averaging height calculations are accurate and code compliant. As indicated on 311 Plans Sheet A3.0 (*see* <u>**Exhibit A**</u> Sheets A3.0 and A3.1), the height is below the height limit.

In addition, the Residential Design Guidelines state if "a new floor is being added to an existing building, it may be necessary to modify the building height or depth to maintain the existing scale at the street." (Residential Design Guidelines, p. 24.) Respecting the guidelines, the proposed penthouse is pulled back an additional 2'-1" from the 20' front yard setback and an additional 10' from the lot averaging rear yard setback. These significant setbacks maintain the existing scale of the proposed building from the public right of way, and there is no exceptional or extraordinary circumstance with respect to the height of the proposed Project.

2. No Obstruction in Rear Yard

Project Sponsor acknowledges that there is a minor addition above the existing firewall that would require a variance. The Property has an existing firewall at the rear as noted in the 311 Plans Sheet A2.1, diagram 3. (*See* Exhibit A Sheets A2.1) The height of the existing firewall is non-conforming and grandfathered from the need for a variance. Project Sponsor has revised the Project moving the location of the spiral staircase to the other side of the third-floor rear deck. Moving the spiral staircase removes the need for increasing the firewall on the eastern façade. Without the minor addition above the existing non-conforming firewall, the Project is codecompliant and does not require a variance.

3. There is no Residential Merger – Two Unit Renovation Project

The Project calls for maintaining the two existing units and does not aim to merge the two units in violation of Planning Code Section 317. The Eastern DR Requester's claim that "a connection between the two units will be created by opening a doorway to the stair landing" is not accurate. (Eastern DR Requester's Attachment, p. 1.)

As shown in the existing plans, there is a stairwell connecting both units and the basement. (See <u>Exhibit A</u> Sheet A2.0.) The Project was first submitted over three years ago in September 2017. When initially submitted, the Project included a communicable opening between Unit 3145 and Unit 3147 because at that time it was permissible to maintain it. In the intervening years since initial submission, code requirements have changed. A communicable opening is no longer permitted. In light of the code revision, Project Sponsor modified the plans to remove the communicable opening. (See <u>Exhibit A</u> Sheet A2.1, diagram 1.)

Z:\Shared\R&A\1163601\DR\3145-47 Jackson - PC Ltr. Brief (2021.01.05).docx

President Joel Koppel San Francisco Planning Commission January 6, 2021 Page **4** of **7**

While there is an elevator servicing all floors, "the elevator shall have individually keycoded access to each dwelling unit." (*See* <u>Exhibit A</u> Sheet A2.1, diagram 2.)

The Eastern DR Requester's claim that the Project is a de-facto merger is an unfounded conspiracy theory that should be disregarded.

4. Construction will not Impact Trees on Adjacent Properties

The DR Requesters claim that the Project will adversely impact trees that are adjacent to the Property due to excavation called for by the Project. While it is true that earth movement could impact a tree in some instances, the earth movement called for by the Project will not impact adjacent trees as determined by a certified arborist.

Roy C. Leggitt, III a Certified Arborist with the International Society of Arboriculture and member of the American Society of Consulting Arborists with over 30 years of experience rendering professional services in the field of horticulture and arboriculture provided Arborist Reports for trees on the adjacent properties. (Arborist Reports attached as <u>Exhibit C</u>.) Mr. Leggitt recommends that the excavation and retaining wall construction proceed without limitations.

Mr. Leggitt found the Property is 3' lower than the western adjacent property at 3157 Jackson Street where there is a tree. Because the tree on 3157 Jackson Street is at a different grade and "is within its own soil area with the roots separated from the [Project] construction, there will be no impact to the root system." (*Id.*) In addition, Mr. Leggitt found the trees on the Southern DR Requester's property to be set back far enough from the proposed retaining wall and excavation that the "trees will not experience any losses to larger or structural roots" and any fine root losses along the side near the excavation "will be negligible and should not harm tree health" because they are replaced annually. (*Id.*) Accordingly, the DR Requesters' concerns pertaining to impacts to trees are unfounded.

5. No Exceptional or Extraordinary Impacts to Sun, Light, and Air

Project Sponsor has strived to design a Project respecting of the existing surrounding buildings. The DR Requesters claim that the Project will adversely impact sun, light and air. That, however, is not the case. The Residential Design Guidelines acknowledge that "some reduction of light to neighboring buildings can be expected with a building expansion." (Residential Design Guidelines, p. 16.)

The Southern DR Requester claims that the Project's "additional height would impact afternoon sun and affect the midblock lighting." (Southern DR Requester Attachment, p. 3.) The Southern DR Requester's position is perplexing given that the sun passes across the horizon from the south. With the Property being to the north of the Southern DR Requester's property and the midblock, the Project's vertical addition cannot block any sun and light coming from the south.

Z:\Shared\R&A\1163601\DR\3145-47 Jackson - PC Ltr. Brief (2021.01.05).docx

President Joel Koppel San Francisco Planning Commission January 6, 2021 Page **5** of **7**

The Eastern DR Requester claims that the Project will impact light and air received from that property's western lightwell, i.e., on the Property's eastern property line. That is not wholly accurate. The existing building at the Property has two lightwells on its eastern property line, a northern one 4'-2" wide and 7'-6" deep and a southern one 6'-11.5" wide and 3'-6" deep. (See **Exhibit A** Sheet A2.0, diagram 1). The Property's northern lightwell reciprocates the Eastern DR Requester's in full. However, the Property's southern lightwell does not and approximately 40% of it is obstructed by the Eastern DR Requester's building. The Project proposes adjusting the two existing lightwells such that they both reciprocate the Eastern DR Requester's lightwell increasing light and air that reaches down the lightwells to the Eastern DR Requester's building. (See **Exhibit** <u>A</u> A2.1, diagram 2). Contrary to the Eastern DR Requester's assertion, at the proposed penthouse level a 3' side setback is provided for the entirety of the width of the Eastern DR Requester's lightwell, allowing ample light and air reach down their lightwell. (See **Exhibit A** Sheet A2.1, diagram 4).

There simply are not impacts to sun, light, and air that are exceptional and extraordinary warranting the Planning Commission to take DR.

6. Privacy Respected Through Incorporation of Setbacks and Screening

The DR Requesters' claims pertaining to impacts on privacy are without merit. As a preliminary matter, the Eastern DR Requester's assertion that the Residential Design Guidelines require "[the project] 'articulate the building to minimize impacts on light and privacy to adjacent owners" is misplaced. (Eastern DR Requester Attachment, p. 1.) While the Residential Design Guidelines do include a guideline to articulate, that guideline is for projects "expanding a building into the rear yard." (Residential Design Guidelines, p. 16.) As mentioned above, the Project does not call for expansion of the building into the rear yard and this guideline is not applicable.

Further, as indicated in the Residential Design Guidelines, "[a]s with light, some loss of privacy to existing neighboring buildings can be expected with a building expansion." (Residential Design Guidelines, p. 17.) The Eastern DR Requester's claim that the Project violates the Residential Design Guidelines pertaining to privacy is not correct. The Residential Design Guidelines identify privacy impacts as those to "neighboring interior living spaces." (*Id.*) In this case, the penthouse vertical addition and roof decks do not impact the privacy of the Eastern DR Requester's property because they do not create a vantage into the interior living spaces of the Eastern DR Requester's property. The penthouse vertical addition has no windows on the eastern façade that could provide a view into the Eastern DR Requester's property. (*See* Exhibit A Sheet A3.1.) In addition, the windows on the Project's eastern façade below the penthouse already exist and two existing windows in northern lightwell are proposed to be removed. (*Id.*) As such, the Project increases the privacy of the rooms on the Eastern DR Requester's property benefiting from that northern lightwell.

Notwithstanding the Eastern DR Requester's roof deck – not an interior living space – being outside the scope of the Residential Design Guidelines, Project Sponsor has incorporated elements recommended by the Residential Design Guidelines to address privacy impacts to it. The

Z:\Shared\R&A\1163601\DR\3145-47 Jackson - PC Ltr. Brief (2021.01.05).docx

President Joel Koppel San Francisco Planning Commission January 6, 2021 Page **6** of **7**

Project has incorporated landscaping and privacy screens into the rear roof deck, increasing the privacy to the Eastern DR Requester's roof deck.

The Southern DR Requester claims that the penthouse vertical addition would give visibility into their back yard and rear facing windows. However, there would be a significant distance between the penthouse and the Southern DR Requester's property with several young birch (Betula pendula) trees in between the two properties. The birch trees currently provide screening up to the existing top floor of the Property. (*See* Southern DR Requesters Photo 3; attached as **Exhibit D**.) The existing birch trees are young. (*See* **Exhibit C**.) Those trees will age and grow over time. Betula pendula trees mature to a height of approximately 40-50' at a growth rate of 3' per year. (https://selectree.calpoly.edu/tree-detail/betula-pendula, last visited January 5, 2020.) With the penthouse having a ceiling height of 9', in three years' time the existing birch trees will increase in height providing screening between the Property and the Southern DR Requester. Consequently, there are no exceptional or extraordinary privacy impacts to the DR Requesters.

C. CONCLUSION

We submit that no exceptional or extraordinary circumstances have been identified by the DR Requesters justifying the Planning Commission's denial of this Project. The Project is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood's pattern and density. Project Sponsor proposes a Project that will revitalize a two-family home to suit the programmatic needs of a modern family. The Project renovates the existing two units at the Property with desirable floor area and bedroom count. For these reasons, we respectfully request the Planning Commission take the DR request and approve the Project as revised. Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to presenting this Project to you on January 14, 2021.

Very truly yours,

REUBEN, JUNIUS & ROSE, LLP

Justin Jucher

Justin A. Zucker

Enclosures: Exhibit A – Revised Plans Exhibit B –Land Survey Exhibit C - Arborist Reports Exhibit D – Southern DR Requester's Photo 3

cc:

Kathrin Moore, Vice President Deland Chan, Commissioner Sue Diamond, Commissioner

Z:\Shared\R&A\1163601\DR\3145-47 Jackson - PC Ltr. Brief (2021.01.05).docx

President Joel Koppel San Francisco Planning Commission January 6, 2021 Page 7 of 7

> Frank S. Fung, Commissioner Theresa Imperial, Commissioner Rachael Tanner, Commissioner Matt & Michael Blair (*via email only*) Steve Geiszler (*via email only*)

EXHIBIT A



| | | REVISION: 01/06/2021 | REV1 |
|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| | | | |
| , | | EISZLER CHITECTS | PH 415.409.7000 geiszlerarchitects.com |
| Ţ | | A G | 2155 POWELL ST. SF CA 94133 |
| 1 A1.0 | EXISTING SITE PLAN | NOT FO Construc | R Tion |
| . | | | |
| | | RESIDENCE | I ST, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94115 11 JULY 2020 |
| 7'-0" REAR LINE RETA | | BLAIR | 3145-3147 JACKSUN 3 |
| | | SITE PLAN DRAWN BY: CHECKED: | EB/EG SG |
| 1 A1.1 | PROPOSED SITE PLAN | ISSUE: 311 07- | 15-2020 |
| | | A1.(| с |







| REVISION: 01/06/2021 | REV1 |
|---|---|
| EISZLER CHITECTS | PH 415.409.7000 geiszlerarchitects.com |
| A G A | 2155 POWELL ST. SF CA 94133 |
| NOT FOR Construct | ? FION |
| BLAIR RESIDENCE | |
| EXISTING FLOOR PLANS DRAWN BY: E CHECKED: ISSUE: 311 07-1 | EB/EG SG 5-2020 |
| A2.0 |) |









EXHIBIT B



<u>NOTES</u>

- 1. EASEMENTS AND/OR RIGHTS OF WAY ARE SHOWN HEREON. OTHER EASEMENTS AND/OR RIGHTS OF WAY OF RECORD, IF ANY, ARE NOT SHOWN HEREON.
- 2. DATE OF FIELD SURVEY: OCTOBER 30, 2020 AS TO THE BOUNDARY AND TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY.
- 3. THE UTILITIES SHOWN HEREON ARE BY SURFACE OBSERVATION AND RECORD INFORMATION ONLY AND NO WARRANTY IS GIVEN HEREIN AS TO THEIR EXACT LOCATION. IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE DEVELOPER AND/OR CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY THE EXACT LOCATION OF THE UTILITIES WITH THE APPROPRIATE UTILITY COMPANY OR AGENCY.
- 4. UTILITY JURISDICTIONS / PROVIDERS ARE AS FOLLOWS: STORM DRAINS: CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO SANITARY SEWER: CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO WATER: CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ELECTRICITY: PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC CO. NATURAL GAS: PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC CO.

BASIS OF SURVEY

FOUND MONUMENTS ON JACKSON STREET BETWEEN PRESIDIO AVE & LYON STREET AS SHOWN ON MONUMENT MAPS NO. 42 & 35 ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY SURVEYOR.

RECORD REFERENCES

1. MONUMENT MAP NO. 42 ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY & COUNTY SURVEYOR. 2. MONUMENT MAP NO. 35 ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY & COUNTY SURVEYOR.

BENCHMARK

BM11418, BEING A SET CCSF STANDARD 1/2" DOMED STAINLESS STEEL ANCHOR SCREW WITH WASHER STAMPED "CCSF CONTROL", LOCATED AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF JACKSON STREET AND PRESIDIO AVENUE, IN THE SIDEWALK AT THE SOUTHEASTERLY RETURN OF JACKSON STREET AND PRESIDIO AVENUE BETWEEN TWO HANDICAP RAMPS, 6.4' NORTHWESTERLY FROM THE NORTHWESTERLY CORNER OF 1.0' HIGH PLANTER AT #104 PRESIDIO AVENUE, 7.4' SOUTHEASTERLY FROM CENTER/CENTER CATCH BASIN, 10.2' NORTHEASTERLY FROM CENTER/CENTER MUNI GUY POLE/POWER POLE/STOP SIGN POLE, 11.7' SOUTHWESTERLY FROM CENTER/CENTER STREET LIGHT/MUNI GUY/POWER POLE ON JACKSON STREET. ELEVATION = 323.963 FEET, SAN FRANCISCO VERTICAL DATUM OF 2013 (SFVD13).

SURVEYOR'S STATEMENT

THIS SURVEY WAS DONE BY ME OR UNDER MY DIRECTION IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE LAND SURVEYORS ACT IN NOVEMBER 2020.

JACQUELINE LUK P.L.S. 8934 FOR LUK & ASSOCIATES, INC. DATE NOVEMBER 19, 2020



F: \Jobs\FILE2020\20210A10\TOPOBDRY-20210A10.dwg





| LEGEND |
|---------------|
| |

| <u>SYMBOLS</u> | DESCRIPTION |
|----------------|-----------------------------|
| | BOUNDARY – SUBJECT PROPERTY |
| | RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE |
| | ADJOINER LOT LINE |
| APN | ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER |
| DOC. NO. | DOCUMENT NUMBER |
| S.F. | SQUARE FEET |
| (266.81') | RECORD DISTANCE |
| R/W | RIGHT OF WAY |
| | BUILDING LINE |
| WM | WATER METER |
| SSCO | SANITARY SEWER CLEANOUT |
| | ASPHALT CONCRETE PAVEMENT |
| GR | GAS RISER |
| TWFLL | |
| C/CONC | CONCRETE |
| AD | AREA DRAIN |
| GRD | GROUND |
| ER | ELECTRIC RISER |
| THRSH | THRESHOLD |
| TEL | TELEPHONE BOX |
| PGE | PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC |
| THRSH | THRESHOLD |
| IHRSH | IHRESHOLD |
| X 52.09 | TOP OF CURB ELEVATION |
| X 51.99 | FLOW LINE ELEVATION |
| BSW X E1 95 | BACK OF SIDEWALK ELEVATION |
| . 21.20 | |
| X 51.95 | LIP OF GUTTER |

TOPOGRAPHIC & BOUNDARY SURVEY

3145 JACKSON STREET CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA DECEMBER 2020 PREPARED BY LUK AND ASSOCIATES CIVIL ENGINEER – LAND PLANNERS – LAND SURVEYORS 738 ALFRED NOBEL DRIVE HERCULES, CALIFORNIA 94547 (510) 724–3388

EXHIBIT C

Consulting Arborists

3109 Sacramento Street San Francisco, CA 94115

Member, American Society of Consulting Arborists Certified Arborists, Tree Risk Assessment Qualified

email Roy@treemanagementexperts.com

cell 415.606.3610

Matt Blair 3145 Jackson St. San Francisco, CA 94115

RE: 3157 Jackson St.

Date: 12/8/2020

ARBORIST REPORT

Assignment

- Provide a site visit to inspect the red flowering gum tree on the neighbor's property.
- Evaluate tree health and cultivation issues.
- Consider retaining wall replacement (construction) and the potential impacts on the tree.
- Provide an Arborist Report of findings and recommendations.

Findings

The neighbor's yard to the west at 3157 Jackson Street shares a property line with the Blair property. The Blair yard is about 3 feet lower, and the neighbor's yard is supported by a retaining wall on their property. Work planned for the Blair property includes removal and replacement of the retaining wall along their south boundary.

The neighbors landscape has a red flowering gum (*Corymbia ficifolia*) located in the southeast corner of their lot, confined by retaining walls on the south and east sides. The tree is about 16 inches diameter and is in poor health with several dead branches, undersized and yellowing leaves, and a sparse canopy.

Because this tree is within its own soil area with the roots separated from the Blair construction, there will be no impact to the root system.

Recommendations

I recommend that this tree be considered for removal due to the confined root system and poor health.

I recommend that the retaining wall construction proceed without limitations.



Consulting Arborists

3109 Sacramento Street San Francisco, CA 94115

Member, American Society of Consulting Arborists Certified Arborists, Tree Risk Assessment Qualified



email Roy@treemanagementexperts.com cell 415.606.3610

Assumptions and Limiting Conditions

- 1. Any legal description provided to the consultant is assumed to be correct. Title and ownership of all property considered are assumed to be good and marketable. No responsibility is assumed for matters legal in character. Any and all property is appraised or evaluated as though free and clear, under responsible ownership and competent management.
- 2. It is assumed that any property is not in violation of any applicable codes, ordinances, statutes or other governmental regulations.
- 3. Care has been taken to obtain all information from reliable sources. All data has been verified insofar as possible. The consultant can neither guarantee nor be responsible for the accuracy of information provided by others.
- 4. Various diagrams, sketches and photographs in this report are intended as visual aids and are not to scale, unless specifically stated as such on the drawing. These communication tools in no way substitute for nor should be construed as surveys, architectural or engineering drawings.
- 5. Loss or alteration of any part of this report invalidates the entire report.
- 6. Possession of this report or a copy thereof does not imply right of publication or use for any purpose by any other than the person to whom it is addressed, without the prior written or verbal consent of the consultant.
- 7. This report is confidential and to be distributed only to the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. Any or all of the contents of this report may be conveyed to another party only with the express prior written or verbal consent of the consultant. Such limitations apply to the original report, a copy, facsimile, scanned image or digital version thereof.
- 8. This report represents the opinion of the consultant. In no way is the consultant's fee contingent upon a stipulated result, the occurrence of a subsequent event, nor upon any finding to be reported.
- 9. The consultant shall not be required to give testimony or to attend court by reason of this report unless subsequent contractual arrangements are made, including payment of an additional fee for such services as described in the fee schedule, an agreement or a contract.
- 10. Information contained in this report reflects observations made only to those items described and only reflects the condition of those items at the time of the site visit. Furthermore, the inspection is limited to visual examination of items and elements at the site, unless expressly stated otherwise. There is no expressed or implied warranty or guarantee that problems or deficiencies of the plants or property inspected may not arise in the future.

Disclosure Statement

Arborists are tree specialists who use their education, knowledge, training, and experience to examine trees, recommend measures to enhance the beauty and health of trees, and attempt to reduce the risk of living near trees. Clients may choose to accept or disregard the recommendations of the arborist, or to seek additional advice.

Arborists cannot detect every condition that could possibly lead to the structural failure of a tree. Trees are living organisms that fail in ways we do not fully understand. Conditions are often hidden within trees and below ground. Arborists cannot guarantee that a tree will be healthy or safe under all circumstances, or for a specified period of time. Likewise, remedial treatments, like any medicine, cannot be guaranteed.

Consulting Arborists

3109 Sacramento Street San Francisco, CA 94115

Member, American Society of Consulting Arborists Certified Arborists, Tree Risk Assessment Qualified



email Roy@treemanagementexperts.com cell 415.606.3610

Treatment, pruning, and removal of trees may involve considerations beyond the scope of the arborist's services such as property boundaries, property ownership, site lines, disputes between neighbors, and other issues. An arborist cannot take such considerations into account unless complete and accurate information is disclosed to the arborist. An arborist should then be expected to reasonably rely upon the completeness and accuracy of the information provided.

Trees can be managed, but they cannot be controlled. To live near trees is to accept some degree of risk. The only way to eliminate all risk associated with trees is to eliminate the trees.

Certification of Performance

I, Roy C. Leggitt, III, Certify:

- That we have inspected the trees and/or property evaluated in this report. We have stated findings accurately, insofar as the limitations of the Assignment and within the extent and context identified by this report;
- That we have no current or prospective interest in the vegetation or any real estate that is the subject of this report, and have no personal interest or bias with respect to the parties involved;
- That the analysis, opinions and conclusions stated herein are original and are based on current scientific procedures and facts and according to commonly accepted arboricultural practices;
- That no significant professional assistance was provided, except as indicated by the inclusion of another professional report within this report;
- That compensation is not contingent upon the reporting of a predetermined conclusion that favors the cause of the client or any other party.

I am a member in good standing of the American Society of Consulting Arborists and a member and Certified Arborist with the International Society of Arboriculture.

I have attained professional training in all areas of knowledge asserted through this report by completion of a Bachelor of Science degree in Plant Science, by routinely attending pertinent professional conferences and by reading current research from professional journals, books and other media.

I have rendered professional services in a full-time capacity in the field of horticulture and arboriculture for more than 30 years.

٨

| Signed: | Roy C. Leggit , the | |
|---------|-----------------------------|--|
| | Certified Arborist WE-0564A | |

Consulting Arborists

3109 Sacramento Street San Francisco, CA 94115

Member, American Society of Consulting Arborists Certified Arborists, Tree Risk Assessment Qualified

email Roy@treemanagementexperts.com

cell 415.606.3610

Matt Blair 3145 Jackson St. San Francisco, CA 94115

RE: 3242 Washington St.

Date: 12/8/2020

ARBORIST REPORT

Assignment

- Provide a site visit to inspect the birch trees on the neighbor's property.
- Evaluate tree health and cultivation issues.
- Consider retaining wall replacement (construction) and the potential impacts on the trees.
- Provide an Arborist Report of findings and recommendations.

Findings

The neighbor's yard to the south at 3242 Washington Street shares a property line with the Blair property by about 12 feet. The Blair yard is about 4 feet higher and is supported by a retaining wall on the Blair property. Work planned for the Blair property includes removal and replacement of the retaining wall.

The neighbors landscape has an upper garden terrace with several birch trees (*Betula pendula*), shrubs and lawn. Three of the birch trees are near the retaining wall and impacts from construction are a concern to the neighbor.

These trees are young mature trees, meaning that they are not very old but have mature form. The trunk diameter measurements in inches, distances from the retaining wall, tree health, and cultivation issues are as follows:

| Tree # | Diameter(s) | Distance to wall | Health | Cultivation issues |
|--------|---------------|------------------|--------|--------------------|
| 1 | 6.3, 3.7, 2.3 | 53" | Fair | Drought stressed |
| 2 | 4.4 | 10'8" | Fair | Drought stressed |
| 3 | 6.4 | 58" | Fair | Drought stressed |

Tree 1 has 3 diameters, and each of these represents a separate tree, but they have been planted in one hole and are growing with a form as one tree multi-trunked tree.

Root systems develop primarily within the topsoil, normally to a depth of 2 feet or less. Roots provide several important functions including mechanical support, water absorption, nutrient uptake and storage of excess carbohydrates in the form of starch. Preserving roots is necessary to have a healthy tree.



Consulting Arborists

3109 Sacramento Street San Francisco, CA 94115 Member, American Society of Consulting Arborists Certified Arborists, Tree Risk Assessment Qualified



email Roy@treemanagementexperts.com cell 415.606.3610

The part of the root system closest to the trunk is the most critical since it is those roots that are holding up the tree and each of these larger roots supports a large network of finer roots. Should larger roots be damaged, decay can cause long-term problems and shorten the life of the tree. These roots occur within 3 to 5 times the trunk diameter as a radius. For instance, tree 3 is 6.4 inches diameter, so these larger or structural roots would typically extend out to a radius of not more than 32 inches.

The part of the root system further out absorbs water and nutrients. The absorbing roots are so fine that we often refer to them as hair roots. These roots are replaced annually, and are typically abundant and more numerous than what the tree needs. Should these fine roots be damaged they will be easily replaced, and with supplemental irrigation the remaining undamaged roots can supply plenty of water and nutrients. Fine roots occur within 10 times the trunk diameter as a radius, and are concentrated further out. For our example with tree 3, expect these roots to extend to a radius of about 64 inches.

These trees will not experience any losses to larger or structural roots. Trees 1 and 3 will likely experience some fine root losses along one side, but this will be negligible and should not harm tree health.

Birch trees require summer irrigation, and the irrigation has been turned off this summer. The trees are in fair condition as opposed to good condition for this reason. It is also important to irrigate the trees to offset water stress from root losses.

Recommendations

I recommend that the birch trees be regularly irrigated.

I recommend that the retaining wall construction proceed without limitations.

Consulting Arborists

3109 Sacramento Street San Francisco, CA 94115

Member, American Society of Consulting Arborists Certified Arborists, Tree Risk Assessment Qualified



email Roy@treemanagementexperts.com cell 415.606.3610

Assumptions and Limiting Conditions

- 1. Any legal description provided to the consultant is assumed to be correct. Title and ownership of all property considered are assumed to be good and marketable. No responsibility is assumed for matters legal in character. Any and all property is appraised or evaluated as though free and clear, under responsible ownership and competent management.
- 2. It is assumed that any property is not in violation of any applicable codes, ordinances, statutes or other governmental regulations.
- 3. Care has been taken to obtain all information from reliable sources. All data has been verified insofar as possible. The consultant can neither guarantee nor be responsible for the accuracy of information provided by others.
- 4. Various diagrams, sketches and photographs in this report are intended as visual aids and are not to scale, unless specifically stated as such on the drawing. These communication tools in no way substitute for nor should be construed as surveys, architectural or engineering drawings.
- 5. Loss or alteration of any part of this report invalidates the entire report.
- 6. Possession of this report or a copy thereof does not imply right of publication or use for any purpose by any other than the person to whom it is addressed, without the prior written or verbal consent of the consultant.
- 7. This report is confidential and to be distributed only to the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. Any or all of the contents of this report may be conveyed to another party only with the express prior written or verbal consent of the consultant. Such limitations apply to the original report, a copy, facsimile, scanned image or digital version thereof.
- 8. This report represents the opinion of the consultant. In no way is the consultant's fee contingent upon a stipulated result, the occurrence of a subsequent event, nor upon any finding to be reported.
- 9. The consultant shall not be required to give testimony or to attend court by reason of this report unless subsequent contractual arrangements are made, including payment of an additional fee for such services as described in the fee schedule, an agreement or a contract.
- 10. Information contained in this report reflects observations made only to those items described and only reflects the condition of those items at the time of the site visit. Furthermore, the inspection is limited to visual examination of items and elements at the site, unless expressly stated otherwise. There is no expressed or implied warranty or guarantee that problems or deficiencies of the plants or property inspected may not arise in the future.

Disclosure Statement

Arborists are tree specialists who use their education, knowledge, training, and experience to examine trees, recommend measures to enhance the beauty and health of trees, and attempt to reduce the risk of living near trees. Clients may choose to accept or disregard the recommendations of the arborist, or to seek additional advice.

Arborists cannot detect every condition that could possibly lead to the structural failure of a tree. Trees are living organisms that fail in ways we do not fully understand. Conditions are often hidden within trees and below ground. Arborists cannot guarantee that a tree will be healthy or safe under all circumstances, or for a specified period of time. Likewise, remedial treatments, like any medicine, cannot be guaranteed.

Consulting Arborists

3109 Sacramento Street San Francisco, CA 94115

Member, American Society of Consulting Arborists Certified Arborists, Tree Risk Assessment Qualified



email Rov@treemanagementexperts.com cell 415.606.3610

Treatment, pruning, and removal of trees may involve considerations beyond the scope of the arborist's services such as property boundaries, property ownership, site lines, disputes between neighbors, and other issues. An arborist cannot take such considerations into account unless complete and accurate information is disclosed to the arborist. An arborist should then be expected to reasonably rely upon the completeness and accuracy of the information provided.

Trees can be managed, but they cannot be controlled. To live near trees is to accept some degree of risk. The only way to eliminate all risk associated with trees is to eliminate the trees.

Certification of Performance

I, Roy C. Leggitt, III, Certify:

Date:

- That we have inspected the trees and/or property evaluated in this report. We have stated findings accurately, insofar as the limitations of the Assignment and within the extent and context identified by this report;
- That we have no current or prospective interest in the vegetation or any real estate that is the subject of this report, and have no personal interest or bias with respect to the parties involved;
- That the analysis, opinions and conclusions stated herein are original and are based on current • scientific procedures and facts and according to commonly accepted arboricultural practices;
- That no significant professional assistance was provided, except as indicated by the inclusion of another professional report within this report;
- That compensation is not contingent upon the reporting of a predetermined conclusion that favors the cause of the client or any other party.

I am a member in good standing of the American Society of Consulting Arborists and a member and Certified Arborist with the International Society of Arboriculture.

I have attained professional training in all areas of knowledge asserted through this report by completion of a Bachelor of Science degree in Plant Science, by routinely attending pertinent professional conferences and by reading current research from professional journals, books and other media.

I have rendered professional services in a full-time capacity in the field of horticulture and arboriculture for more than 30 years.

٨

| Signed: | Roy C. Leggit , the |
|---------|-----------------------------|
| | Certified Arborist WE-0564A |
| Date: | 12/8/2020 |

EXHIBIT D



Photo 3

View from 3242 Washington. An additional story here would create a significant loss of privacy into the windows of the southern neighbors given the height and exposure

| From: | Matt B <mjblair22@gmail.com></mjblair22@gmail.com> |
|----------|--|
| Sent: | Tuesday, January 5, 2021 7:42 PM |
| То: | Justin A. Zucker |
| Cc: | Michael Blair; Bill Blatchley; Steve Geiszler |
| Subject: | Fwd: Renovation at 3145 & 3147 Jackson St. |

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Matt B <mjblair22@gmail.com>
Date: December 15, 2020 at 2:46:07 PM PST
To: Susan DaSilva <smdsusana@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Renovation at 3145 & 3147 Jackson St.

Susan and Tom, Thanks so much for the support. Matt

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 15, 2020, at 2:42 PM, Susan DaSilva <smdsusana@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Mr. Winslow and Planning Department,

We hope this email finds you well. We write to support the Blair Family and their renovation at 3145 & 3147 Jackson Street as it enhances the block and neighborhood. We believe it will be a great addition and the existing structure is in desperate need for remodel. We believe it will benefit the Blair Family and our neighborhood to allow them to move forward with updating their home.

We hope, as supportive neighbors, that their project is approved and that they can move forward with their proposed plans. Thank you for your time and consideration.

All the best, Susan and Tom Roberts 3199 Jackson Street

| From: | Michael Blair <mblair2@gmail.com></mblair2@gmail.com> |
|----------|---|
| Sent: | Tuesday, January 5, 2021 7:14 PM |
| То: | Justin A. Zucker; Bill Blatchley; Matt Blair; Steve Geiszler |
| Subject: | Fwd: Proposed plans for the Blair homes at 3145-3147 Jackson Street |

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Michael 415-613-5953 Please excuse typos from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Marcia Herman <memherman@sbcglobal.net>
Date: December 8, 2020 at 9:48:09 AM PST
To: david.winslow@sfgov.org
Subject: Proposed plans for the Blair homes at 3145-3147 Jackson Street

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a close neighbor of the Blairs and am in complete support of the Blair's proposed plans for 3145-3147 Jackson Street. They have put a lot of thought and work into developing this project and they have kept the neighbor's informed about it throughout this process. This renovated building would not only be an asset to the neighborhood it would increase the property values of the surrounding properties.

I want the San Francisco Planning Department to know that I believe these plans should be approved and that doing so will be a benefit for the whole neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Marcia Herman 3125 Jackson Street SF, CA, 94115

(415) 518-7414

From:Michael Blair <mblair2@gmail.com>Sent:Tuesday, January 5, 2021 7:05 PMTo:Justin A. Zucker; Bill Blatchley; Matt Blair; Steve GeiszlerSubject:Fwd: Plans for 3145 & 3147 Jackson Street

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Michael 415-613-5953 Please excuse typos from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Terra Sollman <terra.sollman@gmail.com> Date: December 7, 2020 at 4:40:37 PM PST To: david.winslow@sfgov.org Subject: Plans for 3145 & 3147 Jackson Street

Dear David Winslow:

I'm reaching out as a neighbor of the Michael Blair and Matt Blair families who reside at 3145 & 3147 Jackson Street. It is my understanding they will be undergoing a design review in the near future. As a friend and neighbor, I felt compelled to write to inform you of my full support of their current proposed plans. They have gone above and beyond to keep our neighborhood informed of their proposed plans and been approachable to answer questions, etc. I'm excited for them and believe everyone deserves the opportunity to update their home, as well as improve our overall Jackson Street block by making these improvements.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of my feedback.

Warm Regards and Happy Holidays,

Terra Sollman 3120 Jackson St San Francisco, CA 94115

From:Michael Blair <mblair2@gmail.com>Sent:Tuesday, January 5, 2021 7:51 PMTo:Justin A. Zucker; Bill Blatchley; Matt Blair; Steve GeiszlerSubject:Fwd: Planning Dept email

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Michael 415-613-5953 Please excuse typos from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Steve Aber <steve@aberteam.com> Date: January 5, 2021 at 7:33:43 PM PST To: Michael Blair <mblair2@gmail.com> Subject: Fwd: Planning Dept email

------ Forwarded message ------From: **Steve Aber** <<u>steve@aberteam.com</u>> Date: Fri, Dec 4, 2020 at 2:59 PM Subject: Fwd: Planning Dept email To: Winslow, David (CPC) <<u>david.winslow@sfgov.org</u>>

Steve and Eva Aber 3157 Jackson Street San Francisco, Ca 94115

Dear David Winslow,

My name is Steve Aber and I live directly next door(west neighbor) to the Blair Families. Over the last 3 years we have been coordinating construction plans with the Blair's in preparation for their remodel. I am writing to inform you of my support for the proposed plans that Michael Blair and Matt Blair have set forth for their family home at 3145 and 3147 Jackson St. They informed me of their initial plans a few years back when they invited neighbors over to their home to share the plans with us all. I know it has been 3 years since and many revisions made later. I think they have waited long enough and deserve to move forward with the plans they have in place.

Thanks for considering my words,

..... Regards, Steve Aber 650-207-5723 www.aberadvisors.com

From:Michael Blair <mblair2@gmail.com>Sent:Tuesday, January 5, 2021 7:06 PMTo:Justin A. Zucker; Bill Blatchley; Matt Blair; Steve GeiszlerSubject:Fwd: Design Review 3145 & 3147 Jackson Street, San Francisco

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Michael 415-613-5953 Please excuse typos from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: erich sollman <erich.sollman@gmail.com>
Date: December 7, 2020 at 2:15:39 PM PST
To: david.winslow@sfgov.org
Subject: Design Review 3145 & 3147 Jackson Street, San Francisco

Erich Sollman 3120 Jackson Street San Francisco, Ca 94115

Dear David Winslow,

We understand the Michael Blair and Matt Blair families, who reside at 3145 & 3147 Jackson Street, will be undergoing design review in the near future. As a friend and neighboring homeowner, I felt compelled to inform you of my full support of their current proposed plans. They have been communicative and transparent with us and our fellow neighbors of said plans since the inception. Further, I respect and appreciate how they have proactively accommodated neighbor feedback by making revisions to their plans on their own accord, when it was not required of them. We are excited for them and look forward to seeing their updated home(s) take form. If you have any questions feel free to reach out.

Many Thanks,

Erich Sollman



From:Michael Blair <mblair2@gmail.com>Sent:Tuesday, January 5, 2021 7:03 PMTo:Justin A. Zucker; Bill Blatchley; Matt Blair; Steve GeiszlerSubject:Fwd: Blair residence

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Michael 415-613-5953 Please excuse typos from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Susan Britton <sgbritton@gmail.com> Date: December 3, 2020 at 6:50:40 AM PST To: david.winslow@sfgov.org Subject: Blair residence

Susie and Sam Britton <u>3150 Jackson St</u>. <u>San Francisco, CA 94115</u>

To whom this may concern,

We are the Britton Family and we live across the street from Matthew and Michael Blair - 3145/3147 Jackson St. We are in full support of their proposed plans. We understand they are being taken to design review and we wanted to write to let you know, as their neighbor, that we are in favor of their design plans for their homes. It's been a long time coming, We hope the plans for their home get approved as is. It will be a great update for our neighborhood.

Many thanks,

Susie and Sam Britton

From:Michael Blair <mblair2@gmail.com>Sent:Tuesday, January 5, 2021 7:08 PMTo:Justin A. Zucker; Bill Blatchley; Matt Blair; Steve GeiszlerSubject:Fwd: 3145-3147 Jackson Street Project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Michael 415-613-5953 Please excuse typos from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Afshin Mohebbi <afshin.mohebbi@sbcglobal.net>
Date: December 14, 2020 at 12:11:37 PM PST
To: david.winslow@sfgov.org, elizabeth.gordon-jonckheer@sfgov.org
Subject: 3145-3147 Jackson Street Project

Mr. David Winslow Ms. Elizabeth Gordon-Jonckheer

David and Elizabeth:

Hello, I'm Afshin Mohebbi and my family lives across the street from the families of Michael and Matt Blair at 3145 and <u>3147 Jackson Street</u>. I received the Notice of Building Permit Application (Section 311) for their project, and would like to register our family's support for it.

The Blairs have been our neighbors for some time in good standing, and we look forward to having them for many more years in their new expanded home.

If you'd like any further information please let me know.

Afshin Mohebbi <u>3134 Jackson St</u> <u>SF, CA94115</u> Mobile: (303) 506-4639

| From: | Michael Blair <mblair2@gmail.com></mblair2@gmail.com> |
|--------------|---|
| Sent: | Tuesday, January 5, 2021 7:06 PM |
| То: | Justin A. Zucker; Bill Blatchley; Matt Blair; Steve Geiszler |
| Subject: | Fwd: 3145-3147 Jackson Street- Letter regarding remodel building permit #2018.1010.2850 - |
| - | Discretionary Review by the Planning Commission |
| Attachments: | 3145-3147 Jackson St Blair Residence Remodel - Letter to David Winslow for Discretionary Review |
| | by Planning Dept Dec. 21, 2020 .pdf |

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Michael 415-613-5953 Please excuse typos from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Abraham Yang <abrahamyang@msn.com> Date: December 21, 2020 at 6:00:33 PM PST To: david.winslow@sfgov.org Subject: 3145-3147 Jackson Street- Letter regarding remodel building permit #2018.1010.2850 -Discretionary Review by the Planning Commission

Hello David!

Attaching a letter commenting on the remodel proposal for 3145-3147 Jackson St by the Blairs. Thanks, and if you have any questions or comments, please feel free to reach out to me.

Best wishes for the New Year and keep safe and stay well!

Abe Yang (415) 308-8284

From:Michael Blair <mblair2@gmail.com>Sent:Tuesday, January 5, 2021 7:07 PMTo:Justin A. Zucker; Bill Blatchley; Matt Blair; Steve GeiszlerSubject:Fwd: 3145/3147 Jackson Street Renovations - The Blair Families

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Michael 415-613-5953 Please excuse typos from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Michael Blair <mblair2@gmail.com>
Date: December 11, 2020 at 1:47:24 PM PST
To: Bill Blatchley <echopalm@yahoo.com>, Matt Blair <mjblair22@gmail.com>, Steve Geiszler <steve@geiszlerarchitects.com>, Thomas Tunny <ttunny@reubenlaw.com>
Subject: Fwd: 3145/3147 Jackson Street Renovations - The Blair Families

Michael 415-613-5953 Please excuse typos from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Harris, Mark" <Mark.E.Harris@morganstanley.com>
Date: December 11, 2020 at 1:40:21 PM PST
To: mblair2@gmail.com
Subject: FW: 3145/3147 Jackson Street Renovations - The Blair Families

Mike,

FYI

Mark E. Harris First Vice President – Financial Advisor The Harris Group at Morgan Stanley

Morgan Stanley Wealth Management 555 California Street, 35th Floor San Francisco, Ca. 94104 415-984-6762 direct

mark.e.harris@morganstanley.com

From: Harris, Mark (Wealth Management Field)
Sent: Friday, December 11, 2020 1:39 PM
To: 'david.winslow@sfgov.org' <david.winslow@sfgov.org>
Subject: 3145/3147 Jackson Street Renovations - The Blair Families

Dear Mr. Winslow,

This is a quick note to let you and the SF Planning Dept. know I am in support of the proposed plans for 3145/3147 Jackson Street, the improvements will be a welcome addition to the neighborhood.

The Blair families has been upfront about their proposed plans, has supplied me with any documentation I've asked for and has welcomed my interest and questions.

We certainly hope their plans will be approved.

All the best,

Mark E. Harris 3140 Jackson Steet San Francisco, CA 94115

415-984-6762 direct

mark.e.harris@morganstanley.com

You may have certain rights regarding the information that Morgan Stanley collects about you. Please see our Privacy Pledge https://www.morganstanley.com/privacy-pledge for more information about your rights.

To view Morgan Stanley's Client Relationship Summary and other important disclosures about our accounts and services, please visit <u>www.morganstanley.com/disclosures/account-disclosures</u>

If you would like to unsubscribe from marketing e-mails from Morgan Stanley Wealth Management, you may do so <u>here</u>. Please note, you will still receive service e-mails from Morgan Stanley Wealth Management.
Justin A. Zucker

From:Michael Blair <mblair2@gmail.com>Sent:Tuesday, January 5, 2021 7:02 PMTo:Justin A. Zucker; Bill Blatchley; Matt Blair; Steve GeiszlerSubject:Fwd: 3145 and 3147 Jackson design review

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Michael 415-613-5953 Please excuse typos from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: scarampi@sbcglobal.net
Date: December 5, 2020 at 6:05:18 PM PST
To: Michael Blair <mblair2@gmail.com>
Subject: FW: 3145 and 3147 Jackson design review

FYI.

Good luck,

D/S

From: scarampi@sbcglobal.net <scarampi@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Saturday, December 5, 2020 6:03 PM
To: 'david.winslow@sfgov.org' <david.winslow@sfgov.org>
Subject: 3145 and 3147 Jackson design review

Planning Department,

We have been informed that the Blair residence will be going through design review regarding the proposed plans for their respective homes at 3145 and 3147 Jackson Street. We are writing to inform you, as their neighbors, that we are in favor of their plans to update their property from its long-neglected condition. The upgrades they have presented will greatly improve their home and significantly beautify the block in which we all live. We strongly support their plans and urge the Department to grant them an ok to move forward as they propose.

Respectfully,

Dianne Weaver and Sebastiano Scarampi 3127 Jackson St San Francisco, Ca 94115

Justin A. Zucker

From:Michael Blair <mblair2@gmail.com>Sent:Tuesday, January 5, 2021 7:06 PMTo:Justin A. Zucker; Bill Blatchley; Matt Blair; Steve GeiszlerSubject:Fwd: 3145 - 3147 Jackson Street Plans

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Michael 415-613-5953 Please excuse typos from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Marta Giachino <martagiach@gmail.com> Date: December 15, 2020 at 2:39:42 PM PST To: david.winslow@sfgov.org Subject: 3145 - 3147 Jackson Street Plans

Hi David,

I had a chance to review the plans for 3145-3147 Jackson Street and think they are a wonderful addition to our block. I encourage you to approve them as they stand.

Happy Holidays, Marta



| | | REVISION: |
|--------------------|--------------------|---|
| EXISTING SITE PLAN | | Image: Second State Sta |
| | | BLAIR RESIDENCE 3145-3147 JACKSON ST, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94115 311 JULY 2020 |
| PROPOSED SITE PLAN | | SITE PLAN DRAWN BY: EB/EG CHECKED: SG ISSUE: 311 07-15-2020 |
| | EXISTING SITE PLAN | EXISTING SITE PLAN |







| REVISION: | | |
|---|---|--|
| | | |
| EISZLER CHITECTS | PH 415.409.7000 geiszlerarchitects.com | |
| A A A A A A A A | 2155 POWELL ST. SF CA 94133 | |
| NOT FOR Construction | | |
| BLAIR RESIDENCE EXISTING FLOOR PLANS | 311.111 V 2020 | |
| DRAWN BY: E CHECKED: ISSUE: 311 07-1 | EB/EG SG 5-2020 | |
| A2.0 |) | |









