Memo to the Planning Commission

HEARING DATE: JULY 26, 2018
Continued from the February 22, 2018, April 19, 2018, and May 24, 2018 Hearings

Date: July 19, 2018
Case No.: 2017-014841CUA
Project Address: 655 Alvarado Street
Zoning: RH-2 (Residential-House, Two-Family)
40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 2803/028C
Project Sponsor: John Kevlin
Reuben, Junius & Rose, LLP
One Bush Street, Suite 600
San Francisco, CA 94104
Staff Contact: Jeff Horn – (415) 575-6925
jeffrey.horn@sfgov.org
Recommendation: Approval with Modifications and Conditions

BACKGROUND

On May 16, 2018, the Building Inspection Commission (BIC) held a hearing on the property at 214 States Street, and heard a presentation from the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) and testimony from the Project Sponsors and neighbors.

Documents have been submitted by the adjacent neighbor at 651 Alvarado Street, who is in opposition to the project.

Prior to the February 22, 2018 hearing, the Project Sponsor submitted revised plans that proposed a two-unit building per the modification request of the Planning Department, but access was provided through a common door and entryway. The Department supports a two unit building that provides to separate entrances with direct access to the street.

Attachments:
BIC Hearing Minutes from May 16, 2018
DBI’s Supporting Documents for the May 16, 2018 BIC Hearing
Project Sponsor’s Support Documents for the May 16, 2018 BIC Hearing
651 Alvarado Streets Documents in opposition.
MINUTES

The regular meeting of the Building Inspection Commission was called to order at 10:03 a.m.

1. Call to Order and Roll Call – Roll call was taken and a quorum was certified.

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:
  Angus McCarthy, President
  Debra Walker, Vice-President
  Kevin Clinch, Commissioner, Excused
  Frank Lee, Commissioner
  John Konstin, Commissioner
  Sam Moss, Commissioner
  James Warshell, Commissioner
  Sonya Harris, Secretary
  Shirley Wong, Assistant Secretary

D.B.I. REPRESENTATIVES:
  Tom Hui, Director
  Ron Tom, Assistant Director
  Edward Sweeney, Deputy Director, Inspection Services
  Daniel Lowrey, Deputy Director, Permit Services
  Taras Madison, Chief Financial Officer
  William Strawn, Legislative and Public Affairs Manager
  Lily Madjus, Communications Director

CITY ATTORNEY REPRESENTATIVE
  Robb Kapla, Deputy City Attorney

2. President’s Announcements.

President McCarthy made the following announcements.

- Welcome to our new Commissioner, Sam Moss, Executive Director of Mission Housing. Originally from Fresno, then moved East for a number of years and to San Francisco in 2008. He joined Mission Housing in December 2011 as an Asset Manager, then was promoted to Director of Asset Management, and became Executive Director in September 2013. Oversees the administration of all Mission Housing assets, programs and services. Since 2012, their staff has grown from 8 people to 25 people; and Mission Housing now
Dan Lowrey, Deputy Director, said currently they can put an address restriction on the job so that when it moves from department to department (Plan Review and Building) it can reviewed properly, and it does get scrutinized closely.

8. Discussion regarding permit history and investigation of potential violations at 655 Alvarado Street.

Patrick O’Riordan, Chief Building Inspector, gave a presentation regarding 655 Alvarado Street. He addressed the following items:

- **Project Overview**
  - Form 3 alteration site permit issued September 2016
  - 3 additional permits issued from Feb-Nov 2017
  - 5 complaints filed between Aug-Apr 2018
  - 3 active NOVs
  - 7 permits suspended at the request of Planning
  - Work Stopped

- **Plan Review Issues**
  - The Site permit PA# 200912113061 was filed in December of 2009
  - Planning review commenced in December of 2009 and was completed in September 2016
  - The structural addendum was filed in October 2016 and was issued in November 2016
  - The site permit drawings didn't include demolition calculations
  - From February to November 7 additional permits were issued

- **Site Inspection Findings**
  - Multiple site visits have occurred at the site since the first complaint was filed in August 2017.
  - 3 Notices of Violation were issued based on site observation for undermining of neighboring structure, exceeding the scope of the permit and to document the suspension of the permits.
  - The building adjacent to the east property line was issued a Notice of Violation for the unsafe condition created by the excavation.
  - Remediation work was necessary after permit suspensions to mitigate hazard because of the excavation.
  - The project is being monitored regularly by inspectors

- **Current Status**
  - Site reconnaissance is 11/1/17
  - Follow up site reconnaissance is 3/5/18

- **Plan Review**
  - Shows the Scope of Work and Building Information
  - Document submittals, and site permit AB-032
  - Discusses addendum structural, hindsight, and recommendations

- **Next Steps**
  - Will be scheduled for Planning Commission Hearing subsequent to this hearing.
  - Post Planning approval DBI will review based on submittal documents.
After permit issuance a start of work inspection will be scheduled to review approved permit documents based on current site conditions. The site will be monitored on an ongoing basis to ensure compliance with all DBI requirements.

Zac Maddry, Architect of Record for the Project Sponsors, said he was involved in this project since July 2016. The following points were made:

- The project sponsors submitted two building permits, and two architectural permits which complied with Section 317.
- He showed a picture of the project on the overhead projector, and said that significant portions of the side wall were to stay.
- The structural system/weight does not bear on the side walls.
- The project sponsors were up front about the areas of demolition on the plan and additional demolition.

Mr. Patrick Davis, General Contractor for this project, said that he represented Thomas Brooks and stated the following:

- They realized there were errors in proper notification of the removal.
- The additional removal consisted of the two blind walls on each side of the property 6 inches from the neighbor.
- The walls were removed due to structural integrity of the wall, intended to be replaced with like walls.
- DBI Inspectors did not indicate non-compliance during their inspections.
- Permits were suspended in Oct 2017 stating excessive demolition.
- Inspectors cited a violation after a complaint was made, not during the inspection.

Secretary Harris called for public comment.

Mary Ferretti-Breiding, neighbor residing at 651 Alvarado Street, displayed a plan of area gained by the demolition. She requested that the BIC impose a reduction in project size equivalent to the amount gained, including property line and addition to the parapet. The owners kept neighbors out of the loop from the very beginning, and they were not notified of the neighborhood pre-application meeting. She and her brother were given plans that showed areas unexcavated. Her property fence was removed without notification, and Jonathan Kaplan told neighbors that he gave her money for this project, which was not true.

Jerry Dratler, SF resident, provided 2 handouts to the BIC. He said this is a code enforcement problem, and DBI should enforce this. – There is a failure to enforce the Building Code. If DBI enforced properly, the owner would be limited to replacing the structure with a home of the same size. If DBI properly classified these homes as demolitions, there would not be this problem.

Ozzie Rohm, Noe Neighborhood Council, said this project is different from 214 States Street because with this project you can clearly see there is nothing left of this building. This is clearly a demolition that was not permitted. If principal portions of the building are removed two-thirds, it is a demolition. Ms. Rohm said that she would like to ask the BIC and the Planning Commission to reduce the footprint of this structure.
Georgia Schuttish, resident, said this is a demolition as only 8-10% of the structure remains. There was an over the counter permit to expand the building which caused further demolition. They damaged their neighbor’s house with their excavation. This is a complicated project and looks to be a demolition.

Rebuttal from the Department – Mr. O’Riordan said the addendum would have the same permit application number, so it is one permit. A subsequent permit was filed in 2017 which spoke of excavating in the basement, which permit displayed a good rendering of the project, but this permit was not reviewed by the Planning Department. It addressed many Planning issues, but was not submitted to the Planning Department as it should have been.

Rebuttal from Project Sponsor – Mr. Maddry said there seemed to be some misunderstanding regarding the language of Code Section 317. They worked to comply with Code Section 317, which allowed 100% removal of the floor and horizontal systems as long as you maintained 50% of the walls. It is not the architect’s job to indicate what is existing and what is to remain; their drawings show mandatory structural features required for the building for support itself. He said their drawings show compliance to Code Section 317. There is no perceived mis-coordination of the drawings. It is also not the job of the structural engineer to indicate which portions are to be kept and which are to be removed, as long as the design is compatible with both.

Rebuttal from Project Sponsor – Mr. Patrick Davis said they removed the walls after evidence of dry rot and fire damage on the east side. He said they should have asked for permission before removing the walls.

Commissioner’s & Staff Question & Answer Discussion:

President McCarthy asked if this was a completely different building structurally and architecturally. What was DBI’s understanding with regards to the removal of the walls?

Mr. O’Riordan said the property line walls were to remain, but the walls were removed. If this happens, the project sponsor should call the inspector out there prior to the removal of the walls and ask for an issuance of a correction notice so they could go back to DBI to get the necessary permit to document their removal.

Commissioner Warstell said he understood how the everyday person would look at the building and see a complete demolition, he asked why it was important to preserve the non-structural walls on the sides rather than say this is a demolition intended for a new building, and everything would be new.

Mr. Maddry said they modified the drawings as necessary, but his goal was to be as candid as possible. Through the site permit process there was an additional wall that he displayed removed for proper review. He said he served at the request of his client and they determine whether something is an alteration or demolition. He said it is his job to create structures that will stand for a long time and are Code compliant and fit within the Code requirements.

President McCarthy asked who submitted to Planning.
Mr. Maddry said John Holy & Associates, a different architect, submitted to Planning. His company modified some window sizing requests. They intentionally maintained elements of the condition of the approval for the final site application. They were not changing the project.

Commissioner Lee asked regarding the structural design, if there was any discussion with the structural engineer to not touch the existing walls.

Mr. Maddry said the side walls provided sheer value, and the structural details have plywood indicated on the interior.

Amy Lee, Consultant for the owner, said the owner originally stopped the Planning process due to finances and another 311 notice was sent out in 2016. This is not a case of serial permitting, they were clear in what they were and were not doing in the removal of the walls. The architect at that time was not familiar with the process with the correction notice. Everyone working on the job intended to do the right thing, but there was a mishap with the side walls and not obtaining the correction notice.

Commissioner Lee said this project demonstrates why there needs to be a clear definition for demolition. He said he would leave it to the task force to determine whether the Code upgrades in regards to removal and replacement will be considered demolition as well.

Mr. Cyril Yu said engineers would provide the minimum requirements. The system conformed to Code. DBI proposes a site permit to indicate what is to remain or to be removed. DBI is attempting to incorporate a demolition sheet.

President McCarthy said he heard from the owner that they did not exceed the 50% demolition, and the neighborhood groups are saying the façade is gone. He asked for highlights from DBI indicating what happened on the plans, what was removed and what should stay, and to do it in a color code. Anything to that level from the owners would be appreciated as well.

Mr. O’Riordan said DBI could provide those drawings, the site permit and addendum set, and revision from March 2017 in basement.

President McCarthy asked about the NOV that was issued to the property next door.

Mr. O’Riordan said that 661 Alvarado had cracks and some distress on the building, so the Inspector required an engineer’s report, and that a permit be filed for corrections needed. They are currently reviewing the reports and will do site inspections.

President McCarthy asked for a DBI completed report, so they could calendar a date for discussion and close out the report.

9. Discussion on Accela permit and project tracking system.

Shawn Bulen, IS Project Manager, gave an update on the Accela permit and project tracking system and discussed the following items:
BIC Regular Meeting
of
May 16, 2018

Agenda Item 8
655 Alvarado Street
Project Overview: 655 Alvarado Street

- Form 3 alteration site permit application issued for PA # 200912113061 on September 29, 2016.
- Addendum for structural issued November 30, 2016.
- 3 additional permits issued from February – November 2017.
- 4 Revision permits issued March – August 2017.
- 5 complaints filed between August 2017 and April 2018.
- 3 active Notices of Violation (Referred to Enforcement March 2018).
- 7 permits suspended at the request of Planning.
- Work stopped (except hazard mitigation).
Plan Review Issues: 655 Alvarado Street

- The Site permit PA # 200912113061 was filed in December of 2009.
- Planning review commenced in December of 2009 and was completed in September 2016.
- The structural addendum was filed in October 2016 and was issued in November 2016.
- The site permit drawings didn’t include demolition calculations.
- From February to November 7 additional permits were issued.
Site Inspection Findings: 655 Alvarado Street

- Multiple site visits have occurred at the site since the first complaint was filed in August 2017.
- 3 Notices of Violation were issued based on site observation for undermining of neighboring structure, exceeding the scope of the permit and to document the suspension of the permits.
- The building adjacent to the east property line was issued a Notice of Violation for the unsafe condition created by the excavation.
- Remediation work was necessary after permit suspensions to mitigate hazard because of the excavation.
- The project is being monitored regularly by inspectors.
SITE RECONNAISSANCE: NOV. 01, 2017

BLDG PERMIT #: 2017-1103-3047

FOLLOW-UP SITE RECONNAISSANCE:

FEB. 01, 2018 / MARCH 05, 2018

CONFIRM ALL CONSTRUCTION LIMITED TO TEMPORARY SHORING AND FOUNDATION / RETAINING WALL TO MITIGATE SHORING AND FOUNDATION / RETAINING WALL SYSTEM HAZARD TO SITE AND ADJOINING NEIGHBOR BUILDING

Current Status: 655 Alvarado Street
**Plan Review: 655 Alvarado Street**

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

- 3 LEVELS OF HORIZONTAL EXTENSION:
  - (E) BASEMENT
  - (E) 1<sup>ST</sup> FLOOR
  - (E) 2<sup>ND</sup> FLOOR
- 1 (N) BASEMENT BELOW
- 1 (N) VERTICAL ADDITION ABOVE

**BUILDING INFORMATION:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>V-B</td>
<td>V-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF STORIES</td>
<td>2+BASEMENT</td>
<td>4+BASEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCUPANCY CLASS</td>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>R-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USE</td>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>SFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF DWELLING</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRINKLER SYSTEM</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NFPA 13R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plan Review: 655 Alvarado Street

DOCUMENT SUBMITTALS:
- SITE PERMIT
- ADDENDUMS
- EXCAVATION SHORING

SITE PERMIT: AB-032

ASSURE NO MAJOR FACTORS THAT WOULD PRECLUDE DETAILED DESIGN OF A BUILDING CODE COMPLYING STRUCTURE WITH THE PROPOSED BUILDING ENVELOPE

MAJOR LIFE-SAFETY COMPLIANCE:
- BUILDING INFORMATION
- ALLOWABLE HEIGHT, STORY AND AREA
- FIRE PROTECTION
- MEANS OF EGRESS

(E) FRONT  (N) FRONT  (E) REAR  (N) REAR
Plan Review: 655 Alvarado Street

ADDENDUM: STRUCTURAL

STRUCTURAL DESIGN CRITERIA:
- GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING REPORT
- STRUCTURAL ENGINEER CALCULATIONS
- CBC 2016
- SFBC 2016
- ASCE / SCI 7-16
- ACI 318-14
- NDSWC-2015
- AISC 341-10
- IAPMO / ESR

GRAVITY COMPONENT
- DEAD LOADS
- LIVE ROOF LOADS
- LIVE FLOOR LOADS
- SOIL LOADS
- WIND LOADS
- EARTHQUAKE LOADS

LATERAL COMPONENT
- STRUCTURAL REVIEW: AXIAL / SHEAR / BENDING / DEFLECTION
- RETAINING WALL
- ROOF FRAMING
- FLOOR FRAMING
- WALL FRAMING
- PLYWOOD DIAPHRAGM
- PLYWOOD SHEAR WALLS
- ANCHOR TIE-DOWNS
- STEEL MOMENT FRAMES
- SHEAR TRANSFER
- SHEAR COLLECTORS

LOAD COMBINATIONS:
- LRFD: 7 COMBINATIONS
  - 1.4D
  - 1.2D + 1.6L(H) + 0.5L
  - 1.2D + 1.0Lr + 1.9H + (0.5L OR 0.5W)
  - 1.2D + 1.0W + 1.0L + 1.6H
  - 1.2D + 1.0E + 1.5L + 1.6H
  - 0.9D + 1.0W + 1.0H
  - 0.9D + 1.0E + 1.6H

- ASD: 7 COMBINATIONS
  - D
  - D + H + L
  - D + H + 0.75L
  - D + H + 0.75L + 0.75L
  - D + H + 0.75L(0.6W) + 0.75L
  - D + H + 0.75L(0.7E) + 0.75L

ADDITIONAL STRUCTURAL COMPONENT
- FOUNDATION
- RETAINING WALL
- ROOF FRAMING
- FLOOR FRAMING
- WALL FRAMING
- PLYWOOD DIAPHRAGM
- PLYWOOD SHEAR WALLS
- ANCHOR TIE-DOWNS
- STEEL MOMENT FRAMES
- SHEAR TRANSFER
- SHEAR COLLECTORS

STRUCTURAL SYSTEM
- SITE GRADE
- GRAVITY
- LATERAL
- FOUNDATION
- RETAINING WALL

CONNECTIONS: EACH STRUCTURAL ELEMENT SHALL PROVIDE A DIRECT AND POSITIVE CONNECTION TO ANOTHER AND THE STRUCTURAL SYSTEM OF THE BUILDING SHALL COMPRISE OF STRUCTURAL ELEMENTS WHICH PROVIDE A DIRECT LOAD PATH.

MATERIAL SPECIFICATIONS
- LUMBER / ROUGH CARPENTRY: DF #1 / DF #2
- FASTENERS: GALV. / S.S.
- WALL SHEATHING: APA RATED
- CONCRETE / SHOTCRETE: Fc / AGGREGATE
- REINFORCING STEEL: GRADE: 40 / 60
- STEEL: A992 / A36 / A500
- WELDS: 70 KSI ELECTRODES
- BOLTS / ANCHORS: A325 / F1554
- EPOXY: IAPMO / ESR

ADDENDUM #___ SITE PERMIT ADDENDUM FOR CONSTRUCTION OF: ___
Plan Review: 655 Alvarado Street

HINDSIGHT:
- EXTREMELY INVOLVED STRUCTURAL UNDERTAKING

TEMPORARY SHORING
- HAND-DUG UNDERPINING PERS
- DRILL PIERS (AS CONTRACTOR'S OPTION)
- INTERNAL BRACING
- TIEBACK ROCK ANCHORS
- WOOD LAGGING

BUILDING STRUCTURE
- CONCRETE MAT SLAB
- CONCRETE SLAB ON GRADE
- CONCRETE GRADE BEAMS
- SHOTCRETE RETAINING WALLS
- PLYWOOD DIAPHRAGMS
- PLYWOOD SHEARWALLS
- SIMPSON STRONG WALLS
- STEEL MOMENT FRAMES
- WOOD FRAMING
- STEEL FRAMING

1ST ADDENDUM FOR REVIEW OF STRUCTURAL INTEGRITY, SEISMIC SAFETY, AND BUILDING PERFORMANCE

- COORDINATION OVERSIGHT

EXISTING TO REMAIN AND NEW CONSTRUCTION
- SITE PERMIT TO ADDENDUM
- ARCHITECTURAL AND STRUCTURAL DESIGN PROFESSIONAL AND CONTRACTOR

RECOMMENDATIONS:

CURRENT:
- PROCESS STRUCTURAL ADDENDUMS FOR PERMANENT STRUCTURAL DIRECTLY AFTER SITE PERMIT

PROPOSE:
- DEDICATED DEMOLITION SHEETS WITH FLOOR PLAN INDICATING EXISTING WALLS TO REMAIN AND EXISTING WALLS TO BE TO BE REQUIRED ON SITE PERMIT

- ADMEND AB-032: SITE PERMIT PROCESSING TO INCLUDE REVIEW AND INCLUSION OF DEMOLITION SHEETS

- TEMPORARY SHORING PLANS AND CALCULATIONS BY DESIGN PROFESSIONAL FOR EXISTING WALLS TO REMAIN IN SUBSTANTIAL ALTERATIONS TO BE THE IMMEDIATE ADDENDUM AFTER SITE PERMIT

- STRUCTURAL ADDENDUM FOR PERMANENT BUILDING STRUCTURE TO DIFFERENTIATE VIA LEGEND BETWEEN NEW AND EXISTING WALLS TO REMAIN

DILEMMA:
- CODE COMPLIANT WEATHER PROTECTION
- CODE COMPLIANT FIRE PROTECTION
- CODE COMPLIANT STRUCTURAL SYSTEM

DBI: FIRE PROTECTION, STRUCTURAL & SEISMIC INTEGRITY AND BUILDING PERFORMANCE WHICH CONTRIBUTES TO THE LIFE SAFETY & HABITABILITY OF THE OCCUPANTS TAKES PRECEDENCE
Next Steps

- Will be scheduled for Planning Commission Hearing subsequent to this hearing.
- Post Planning approval DBI will review based on submittal documents.
- After permit issuance a start of work inspection will be scheduled to review approved permit documents based on current site conditions.
- The site will be monitored on an ongoing basis to ensure compliance with all DBI requirements.
QUESTION & ANSWER

Thank you!

- Patrick O’Riordan, Chief Building Inspector
- Joseph Duffy, Senior Building Inspector
- Cyril Yu, Engineer
Permit Sequence Narrative

Permit Application # 2009-1211-3061

Project Description: The proposed project is to construct a three-level horizontal rear extension, a one level front horizontal extension and a one-story vertical extension. The proposed rear extension involves adding a rear horizontal extension at the existing first floor and basement levels and creating a new second basement level under the proposed basement extension. The rear horizontal extension at the first floor will be setback from the east property line by five feet.

Revisions to permit application #2009.1211.3061 including: Increase in size of the basement by approximately 200 S.F. (and associated update to T24 compliance report). Modifications to the window and door.

DMARCstudio Project Initiation: 07.22.2016

Site Permit Intake: 08.22.2016
Site Permit Approval: 09.29.2016

Structural Addendum Intake: 10.17.2016
15'-3" x 32'-9" (500 sq.ft - approx 14%) portion of wall added to scope of removal

Permit Application # 2017-0316-1580

Project Description: Revisions to permit application #2009.1211.3061 including: Increase in size of the basement by approximately 200 S.F. (and associated update to T24 compliance report). Modifications to the window and door manufacturer (U and SHGC values) and minor modifications to window size and operation (and associated update to T24 compliance report). Minor modifications to the thermal envelope and mechanical equipment sizing (and associated update to the T24 compliance report). All work under this permit shown in clouds.

Revision Permit Submittal (Arch and Struct): 03.16.2017
Revision Permit Approval: 05.04.2017
Permit Application # 2017-0519-7112

Project Description: Shoring Permit as required by Addendum 1 (200912113061 S2, R1). The shoring was reviewed and approved by DBI personnel. It clearly shows the intent of the shoring required to construct the new foundation walls to be installed at GL A&D, and GL 4. If any previous confusion existed regarding the parameters of the new foundation walls and the extent of the excavation, this permit was clear.

Sec. 317. Loss of Residential and Unauthorized Units Through Demolition, Merger and Conversion.

(b) Definitions.

(9) “Removal” shall mean, with reference to a wall, roof or floor structure, its dismantling, its relocation or its alteration of the exterior function by construction of a new building element exterior to it. Where a portion of the exterior wall is removed, any remaining wall with the height less than the Building Code requirement for legal head room shall be considered demolished. Where exterior elements of the building are removed and replaced for repair or maintenance, in like materials, with no increase in the extent of the element or volume of the building, such replacement shall not be considered Removal for the purposes of this section.

Portions of blind walls removed per Sec. 317 were fire damaged and had dry rot. There were also pre-existing foundation damage:
ABBREVIATED APPROVED DOCUMENTS DEMONSTRATING COMPLIANCE WITH SEC. 317

DOCUMENTS DEMONSTRATING APPROVED ABBREVIATED PROPOSED

655 ALVAREDO STREET RESIDENCE

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111
EXISTING TO REMAIN:
NORTH: 327
SOUTH: 0
EAST: 594
WEST: 971
TOTAL: 1,892 (56%)

TO BE REMOVED:
NORTH: 137
SOUTH: 733
EAST: 513
WEST: 132
TOTAL: 1,515 (44%)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENERAL CONDITIONS**

- All work must be completed by the specified date.
- Any deviations from the approved plans must be reported immediately.
- Safety precautions must be strictly followed.

**ABBREVIATIONS**

- B&M: Building & Mechanical
- E&C: Electrical & Communications
- L&M: Landscape & Maintenance

**SAN FRANCISCO, CA**

55 ALTA VIA

- Address for correspondence
- Contact information for project management

**DMARCstudio**

- Design and construction management services provider
- 415-555-1234
- info@dmarcstudio.com
WALL TO REMAIN
WALL AREAS REMOVED DUE TO FIELD CONDITIONS (DRY ROT, FIRE DAMAGE)

WALL AREAS PERMITTED TO REMAIN

WALL AREAS PERMITTED TO REMAIN

WALL AREAS REMOVED DUE TO FIELD CONDITIONS (DRY ROT, FIRE DAMAGE)
WALL AREAS REMOVED DUE TO FIELD CONDITIONS (DRY ROT OR FIRE DAMAGE)
WALL AREAS PERMITTED TO REMAIN

AREA ADDED IN APPLICATION 2017-0316-1580

WALL AREAS PERMITTED TO REMAIN
FOUNDATION REPLACEMENT

594 ft²

513 ft²

14'-9"
AREA ADDED IN APPLICATION 2017-0316-1580

WALL AREAS REMOVED DUE TO FIELD CONDITIONS (DRY ROT / FIRE DAMAGE)

WALL AREAS PERMITTED TO REMAIN

WALL AREAS PERMITTED TO BE REMOVED

FOUNDATION REPLACEMENT

30 ft OR FIRE DAMAGE (DRY ROT / FIRE DAMAGE)
Good Morning Commissioners

May 16, 2018

My name is Mary Ferretti-Breidingger.

I own 651 alvarado St.,

This graphic indicates the amount gained by 655’s Violation of Code 3307.1, and 3 over the counter permits taken out within a 3 month span, while the planning department thought the building was still there.

I am requesting the Building Department give heavy consideration for my request to protect my air light and privacy and to impose a reduction in project size equivalent to or greater to the amount gained by the violation. I am requesting at set back off my propertyline and the elimination of the top floor and parapet.

655 owner, Jonathan Kaplan, action,s have demonstrated his wishes to keep me out of the loop from the very beginning.

Here are a few examples of deceptions:

In November 2009. My brother and I were never notified of a neighborhood pre-application meeting. At the meeting, when my neighbor, John Flynn, asked why brother John and I were not there, he was told we were ok with the project and we were going to do the same. That was not true.

The 311 Notice states the cross st as Beaver / castro, that was not true, that location is a mile away.

September 2011, At the DR Hearing the architect was not present to answer any questions, making the plans very vague.

August 2015, my brother and I attended a neighborhood pre application meeting. We were given a set of architectural drawings. Beleving they were the same plans as introduced at the 2011 DR Hearing, which showed “unexcavated”, that proved to be untrue.

We were told the project would take 9 months to complete, that proved to be untrue it took over a year to complete the foundation and retaining walls.

September 2016 Plans were approved, 3 months later the building was gone without a demolition permit.

March 2017, they violated Building Code 3307.1, excavating adjacent to my building without notifying me and compromising my foundation. I’ve been told it would take 3 months to repair my foundation.

August 2017 My propertyline fence was removed without me or my tenant's knowledge. At present, leaving a gap, and creating a safety hazard.

Also in August, 2017 the constuction site superintendent told my team Mr. Kaplan did not did not went the adjacent properties to benefit from his construction.

At the planning hearing Judith Thompson said she removed the eastern propertyline wall due to a fire. This is not true. The fire occurred prior to the 1989 major remodel when the wall was installed.

I recently learned that Jonathan Kaplan told my neighbor and others that I requested $100K from him. He also told Judith thompson I received money from him. This is not true. I have never requested or received any money from Jonathan Kaplan or anyone affiliated with 655 Alvarado St.

I am aware that building in SF is not an easy process but this abuse for the process makes it a nightmare for everyone involved.

I’d like this nightmare to be over. I am not benefitting from any of this. At this point my main focus is to protect my air light and privacy.

Thank you for your time.
AMOUNT GAINED BY THE VIOLATION OF BUILDING CODE 3307.1
CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE 832
**Proposed East Elevation**

- **Blue**: Remove 4th (Top) Level
- **Green**: Set Back Off the Property Line
- **Red**: Amount Gained
PROTECT LIGHT, AIR AND PRIVACY

- REMOVE PROPOSED ROOF AND PARAPET LEVELS
- SET BACK PROPOSED 2ND AND 3RD LEVELS OFF THE PROPERTY LINE
Executive Summary
Conditional Use / Residential Demolition
HEARING DATE: FEBRUARY 22, 2018

Date: February 15, 2018
Case No.: 2017-014841CUA
Project Address: 655 Alvarado Street
Zoning: RH-2 (Residential-House, Two-Family) 40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 2803/028C
Project Sponsor: John Kevlin
Reuben, Junius & Rose LLP
One Bush Street, Suite 60
San Francisco, CA 94104
Staff Contact: Jeff Horn – (415) 575-6925
Jeffrey.Horn@sfgov.org
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PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The project proposes to legalize the tantamount to demolition of an existing 2,737 gross square foot, two-story-over-basement single-family home and the permit an expanded 5,096 gross square foot, three-story-over-two-basement-levels single-family home within a Residential House - Two-Family (RH-2) Zoning District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

The project requires Conditional Use Authorization pursuant to Planning Code Section 303 and 317 for the de facto demolition of a residential unit. Pursuant to Planning Code 317 (c), “where an application for a permit that would result in the loss of one or more Residential Units is required to obtain Conditional Use Authorization by other sections of this Code, the application for a replacement building or alteration permit shall also be subject to Conditional Use requirements.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXISTING CONDITIONS</th>
<th>PROPOSED CONDITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Of Existing Units</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Of Bedrooms</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Area</td>
<td>± 2,737 Sq. Ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SITE DESCRIPTION AND PRESENT USE

The property at 655 Alvarado Street is located midblock between Diamond and Castro Streets within the Noe Valley neighborhood. The subject property is 114 feet in depth and slopes downward (in excess of 20%) from the Alvarado Street frontage. The subject property is developed with an almost completely demolished two-story single-family dwelling of approximately 2,737 square feet, built in 1925. Large amounts of excavation have occurred at the site and new foundations and retaining walls for the proposed project have been constructed. The parcel totals approximately 2,850 square feet in size and is in a RH-2 (Residential House, Two-Family) Zoning District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

In December 2009, the Project Sponsor submitted a Building Permit Application (2009.12.11.3061) to construct a two-story over basement-level horizontal rear extension, and add a new third story with a setback of 15 feet. The project was publically noticed in December 2010 and in January 2011, the adjacent neighbor to the east, 651 Alvarado Street, filed a Discretionary Review of the Building Permit. The Planning Commission conducted a Discretionary Review Hearing on September 8, 2011 and the Commission did not take Discretionary Review and approved the project but also “urged the Project Sponsor to have dialog with the DR Requestor and concerned neighbors on outstanding issues.” (Attached DRA -0225). The Project Sponsor did not move forward with Planning approval of the Site Permit at this time.

On July 11, 2015, the Project Sponsor contacted the Planning Department to resume processing of the Building Permit Application. Due to the three (3) gap in time since the Planning Commission’s decision, the Zoning Administrator determined the project would need complete a new Section 311 public notification. The Sponsor decided to increase the scope of the project, including reducing the proposed third floor’s front setback to less than 15 feet, which resulted in the need for a Historic Resource Determination (2015-008472ENV). The revised project was publically noticed in January 2016 and the Building Permit was Issued by the Department of Building Inspection in September 2016. In March 2017, the property was issued a Building Permit (201703161580) to increase the floor area of the basement level (through additional excavation) by 200 square feet.

In August of 2017, after construction of the Project began, a violation was issued by DBI (Complaint No. 201799932) stating that construction and excavation work had undermined the adjacent building’s foundation (651 Alvarado Street). Upon review of the project plans, it was determined by Planning that the total amount of horizontal and vertical building elements removed on the existing structure had exceeded the totals described and permitted on the Project’s approved permits and plans and the percentages allowed with Planning Code Section 317, therefore several violations were issued by DBI (Complaint No. 201701001, 201709991, 201710531 and 201837511) for work being done beyond the scope of permit, and all permits were Suspended. On October 2, 2017, a Planning Enforcement case was opened for demolition of a structure without Approval per Planning Code Section 317. (2017-012680ENF).

SURROUNDING PROPERTIES AND NEIGHBORHOOD

The site is in the RH-2 Zoning District, which permits the development of one- and two-dwelling unit structures. The neighborhood is characterized as a mix of one- and two-family houses that are two- to three-stories in height and larger multi-family structures that are three- to four-stories in height. The
structure is designed to be compatible in height and façade design with the character of the block face. The architecture is varied mixed-character along Alvarado Street.

REPLACEMENT STRUCTURE

The demolished one-family residence will be replaced by a one-family residence that proposes to be three-stories in height at the block-face. The structure would be a 5,096 square-foot one-family dwelling, constructed within the lot’s buildable area, to a depth up to the required rear 45% setback line. However, a 12'-deep two-story pop out (permitted obstruction per Planning Code Section 136), with 5-foot setbacks from both property lines will encroach into the required rear yard. The structure reaches a height of 5-stories at the rear building, but the floors at the rear are terraced and step downwards to follow the downward slope of the lot. The proposed design, proportions and materials are consistent with the existing structures on the block.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The Department has determined that the proposed project is exempt from environmental review, pursuant to CEQA Guideline Sections 15301(e)(2).

HEARING NOTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>REQUIRED PERIOD</th>
<th>REQUIRED NOTICE DATE</th>
<th>ACTUAL NOTICE DATE</th>
<th>ACTUAL PERIOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classified News Ad</td>
<td>20 days</td>
<td>February 2, 2018</td>
<td>February 2, 2018</td>
<td>20 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posted Notice</td>
<td>20 days</td>
<td>February 2, 2018</td>
<td>February 2, 2018</td>
<td>20 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailed Notice</td>
<td>20 days</td>
<td>February 2, 2018</td>
<td>February 2, 2018</td>
<td>20 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PUBLIC COMMENT

As of February 15, 2018, the Department received one packages of materials in opposition to the project from the adjacent neighbor at 651 Alvarado Street.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>OPPOSED</th>
<th>NO POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent neighbor(s)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other neighbors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ISSUES AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- Department of Building Inspection (DBI) has reviewed this project and determined it is not an “Unlawful Demolition” per City Administrative Code Section 103A.3.1, Demolition without a Permit. Because the property has an issues permit, DBI considers the Violations to be categorized as “Work Exceeding Scope of Permit.”
STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the project incorporate a second unit into the proposed building volume to maximize the density allowed with the RH-2 Zoning District.

REQUIRED COMMISSION ACTION

In order for the project to proceed, the Commission must grant Conditional Use Authorization and approve the project with modifications to legalize the tantamount to demolition of an single-family residence and to create a five-story, 2-unit building within an RH-2 (Residential-House, Two Family), pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 317.

BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- The Project will result in no net loss of dwelling-units on the property.
- The project is owner-occupied. No tenants will be displaced as a result of this Project.
- The Project, with modifications, will increase number of bedrooms on the property.
- Given the scale of the project, there will be no significant impact on the existing capacity of the local street system or MUNI.
- The Project, with modifications, will increase number of units on the property from one (1) to two (2), the maximum density allowed in the RH-2 Zoning District.
- The RH-2 Zoning District allows a maximum of two dwelling-units on this lot. This surrounding neighborhood is a mix of single and multi-family homes; therefore, the density and scale of the development is in-keeping with the neighborhood pattern.
- Although the structure was more than 50-years old, a Historic Resource Evaluation resulted in a determination that the existing buildings are not historic resources.
- The project is residential and has no impact on neighborhood-serving retail uses.
- The proposed project meets all applicable requirements of the Planning Code

RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Modifications and Conditions

Attachments:
1. Draft Motion
2. Block Book Map
3. Sanborn Map
4. Zoning Map
5. Aerial Photographs
6. Context Photos
7. Residential Demolition Application
8. Prop M findings
9. Neighbor Submitted Materials
10. Environmental Evaluation / Historic Resources Information
11. 2010 311 Notice and Plans
12. Discretionary Review Action Memo-0225
13. 2015 311 Notice and Plans
14. Reduced Plans
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ADOPTING FINDINGS RELATING TO THE APPROVAL OF CONDITIONAL USE AUTHORIZATION PURSUANT TO PLANNING CODE SECTIONS 303 AND 317 REQUIRING CONDITIONAL USE AUTHORIZATION FOR THE LEGALIZATION OF TANTAMOUNT TO DEMOLITION OF AN EXISTING SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE.

PREAMBLE

On November 17, 2017, John Kevlin (Project Sponsor) filed an application with the Planning Department (hereinafter “Department”) for a Conditional Use Authorization under Planning Code Sections 303 and 317 to legalize the demolition of an existing 2,737 gross square foot, two-story-over-basement single-family home and the permit a new 5,096 gross square foot, three-story-over-two-basement-levels single-family home. (hereinafter “Project”), within an RH-2 (Residential, House, Two-Family) District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

On February 22, 2018, the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter “Commission”) conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting on Conditional Use Application No. 2017-014841CUA.

On December 14, 2015, the Project was determined by the Department to be categorically exempt from environmental review under Case No. 2015-008472ENV.
The Commission has heard and considered the testimony presented to it at the public hearing and has further considered written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of the applicant, Department staff, and other interested parties.

MOVED, that the Commission hereby authorizes the Conditional Use requested in Application No. 2017-014841CUA, subject to the conditions contained in “EXHIBIT A” of this motion, based on the following findings:

FINDINGS

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

1. The above recitals are accurate and constitute findings of this Commission.

2. Site Description and Present Use. The property at 655 Alvarado Street is located midblock between Diamond and Castro Streets within the Noe Valley neighborhood. The subject property is 114 feet in depth and slopes downward (in excess of 20%) from the Alvarado Street frontage. The subject property is developed with an almost completely demolished two-story single-family dwelling of approximately 2,737 square feet built in 1925. Large amounts of excavation has occurred at the site and the new foundations and retaining walls for the proposed project have been constructed. The parcel total approximately 2,850 square feet in size and is in a RH-2 (Residential House, Two-Family) Zoning District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

3. Surrounding Properties and Neighborhood. The use and size of the proposed Project is compatible with the immediate neighborhood. The site is in the RH-2 Zoning District, which permits the development of two dwelling units on the lot. The neighborhood is developed with a mix of one- and two-family houses that are two- to three-stories in height and larger multi-family structures that are three- to four-stories in height. The Project, with modifications, would include the legalization of tantamount to demolition of the existing one-family home and approve its replacement with a two-family home. The structure is designed to be compatible in height and façade design with the character of the block face. The architecture is varied mixed-character along Alvarado Street.

4. Project Description. The project proposes to legalize tantamount to demolition of on an of an existing 2,737 gross square foot, two-story-over-basement single-family home and the permit an expanded 5,096 gross square foot, three-story-over-two-basement-levels single-family home within a Residential House - Two-Family (RH-2) Zoning District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

Staff recommends that the project be modified to include a second unit. This may result in design changes to ensure both units meet minimum code requirements for usable open space, exposure and all other Code Sections.
5. **Public Comment/Community Outreach.** As of February 22, 2018, the Department received one packages of materials in opposition to the project from the adjacent neighbor at 651 Alvarado Street.

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

   A. **Residential Demolition – Section 317:** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 317, Conditional Use Authorization is required for applications proposing to remove one or more residential units. This Code Section establishes a checklist of criteria that delineate the relevant General Plan Policies and Objectives.

      As the project requires Conditional Use Authorization per the requirements of the Section 317, the additional criteria specified under Section 317 for residential demolition and merger have been incorporated as findings a part of this Motion. See Item 7, “Additional Findings pursuant to Section 317,” below.

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

      The Project proposes an approximately 51-foot and 4-inch-deep rear yard for the replacement structure on the 114-foot deep lot. The project also proposes a 12-foot deep obstruction permitted under Planning Code Section 136. The rear yard, excluding the obstruction is equal to 45 percent of the lot depth.

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

      The Project proposes an additional floor and total height of 30 feet, 3 inches. The height at the front of the building is 18 feet, 5 ¾ inches.

   D. **Open Space.** Planning Code Section 135 requires the project to provide 125 square feet of useable open space per unit if privately accessible (including minimum dimensions), and 166 square feet of useable open space per unit if commonly accessible (including minimum dimensions).

      The project provides a rear yard equal to the required 45% and two roof decks at the rear. The modified project is required to provide at least 125 square feet of private open space per unit or 166 square feet if common open space per unit per Section 209.1.

   E. **Parking.** Planning Code Section 151 requires one parking space for each dwelling unit.
The Project proposes a new garage with a parking space for the existing dwelling unit. The modified project would need to provide two (2) vehicle parking spaces. As stated in Planning Code Section 150(e), off-street parking spaces may be reduced and replaced by bicycle parking spaces based on standards provided in Section 155.1(d).

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

The project provides space for one (1) Class 1 bicycle parking space. The modified project would be required to provide two (2) Class 1 bicycle parking spaces and no Class 2 bicycle parking spaces.

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

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

The use and size of the proposed Project is compatible with the immediate neighborhood. The site is in the RH-2 Zoning District, which permits the development of two dwelling units on the lot. The neighborhood is developed with a mix of one- and two-family houses that are two- to three-stories in height and larger multi-family structures that are three- to four-stories in height. The Project, with modifications, would include the legalization of tantamount to demolition of the existing one-family home and approve its replacement with a two-family home. The structure is designed to be compatible in height and façade design with the character of the block face.

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

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

The Project is designed to be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood; the replacement building is three stories in height at the street face and similar in massing. At the rear the building is 5-stories in height, but terraced to follow the contours of the descending slope of the subject property. The replacement buildings would maintain a 45% rear yard, thus contributing to the mid-block open space and preserving the amount of open space on the site.

ii. The accessibility and traffic patterns for persons and vehicles, the type and volume of such traffic, and the adequacy of proposed off-street parking and loading;
Planning Code requires one off-street parking space per dwelling unit. The Project proposes to retain the existing garage with a parking space for one dwelling unit. The modified project would need to provide two (2) vehicle parking spaces. As stated in Planning Code Section 150(e) off-street parking spaces may be reduced and replaced by bicycle parking spaces based on standards provided in Section 155.1(d).

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

The Project is residential in nature, which is a use that typically is not considered to have the potential to produce noxious or offensive emissions.

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

The Project proposes landscape in the front setback and generally maintains the existing configuration of open space on the site. The driveways and garage doors have been minimized in width and are visually subordinate to the pedestrian entries to the residences.

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

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

D. That the use as proposed would provide development that is in conformity with the purpose of the applicable RH-2 District.

The proposed Project is consistent with the stated purpose of the RH-2 Districts to provide one-family and two-family houses. The Project creates two one-family houses on a single lot.

8. Additional Findings pursuant to Section 317 establishes criteria for the Planning Commission to consider when reviewing applications to demolish residential buildings and to merge dwelling units.

a. Residential Demolition Criteria. On balance, the Project complies with said criteria in that:

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

A review of the Department of Building Inspection and the Planning Department databases showed that the property is not free of serious, continuous code violations. In August of 2017, after construction of the Project began, a violation was issued by DBI (Complaint No. 201799932) stating that construction and excavation work undermined the adjacent building’s foundation (651 Alvarado Street). Upon review of the project plans, it was determined that the total amount of horizontal and vertical building elements removed that
had occurred on the existing structure exceeded the totals described and permitted on the Project’s approved permits and plans, therefore several violations were issued by DBI (Complaint No. 201710001, 201709991, 201710531 and 201837511) for work being done beyond the scope of permit and all permits were Suspended. On October 2, 2017 a Planning Enforcement case was opened for demolition of a structure without Approval per Planning Code Section 317. (2017-012680ENF).

Approval of this Conditional Use would allow the Violations and Enforcement Case to be abated.

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

The structure appeared to have been in decent condition, with no deficiencies documented prior to the demolition.

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

Although the existing structures are more than 50 years old, a review of the supplemental information resulted in a determination that the property is not a historical resource.

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

The structure is not historical resource.

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

The existing single-family building was owner occupied and not subject to the Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance. There are no restrictions on whether the two new one-family units will be rental or ownership.

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

The project would remove no rent controlled units.

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

Although the Project proposes to legalize the tantamount to demolition of a single-family building, the number of units would increase at the project site with modifications per staff recommendations. The Project, with modifications, could provide two dwelling units of comparable size to the existing single-family home.
viii. Whether the Project conserves neighborhood character to preserve neighborhood
cultural and economic diversity;

The project, with modifications, would be consistent with the density and development
pattern as it would provide a two-family building on a single lot in a neighborhood that is a
mix of one- and two-family buildings. The Project would increase the existing number of
dwelling units, and the two units would serve a variety of household sizes and needs.

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

The Project does not protect the relative affordability of existing housing, as the Project
proposes to legalize the tantamount to demolition and the alteration and enlargement of the
existing single-family home, which is generally considered be less affordable. However, if two
units are provided per Staff’s recommendation, each would individually maintain
affordability relative to the original building.

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

The Project is not subject to the provisions of Planning Code Section 415, as the Project
proposes less than ten units.

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

The Noe Valley neighborhood is an established residential neighborhood. The Project has been
designed to be in-keeping with the scale and development pattern of the established
neighborhood character.

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

The project, with modifications, would create a new unit. Although no proposed design has
been submitted or reviewed by staff, the two equitable units would be of comparable size to the
existing structures square footage.

xiii. Whether the Project creates new supportive housing;

The Project does not create supportive housing.

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

The overall scale, design, and materials of the proposed buildings are consistent with the
block-face on Alvarado Street, respectively, and compliment the neighborhood character with
a contextual design.
xv. Whether the Project increases the number of on-site dwelling units;

The Project, with modifications, would increase the number of on-site units to two (2).

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

The structure proposes three bedrooms, the same amount as the original structure.

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

The Project, with modifications per Staff’s recommendation would provide two (2) units on the subject lot, which maximizes the principally permitted density allowed within the RH-2 District.

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

The existing building being replaced is not subject to the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance because it is a single-family residence, constructed in 1925. Two units within the proposed 5,098 square foot building could provide units comparable to the original 2,737 square foot home.

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

**HOUSING ELEMENT**

**OBJECTIVE 2:**
RETAIN EXISTING HOUSING UNITS, AND PROMOTE SAFETY AND MAINTENANCE STANDARDS, WITHOUT JEOPARDIZING AFFORDABILITY.

Policy 2.1:
Discourage the demolition of sound existing housing, unless the demolition results in a net increase in affordable housing.

The existing building (prior to construction activities) appeared to be structurally sound, but has been almost completely demolished. Newer units tend to be less affordable than older units of similar size. The Project, with modifications, does more to protect the relative affordability of existing housing, if two units are provided per Staff’s recommendation, each would individually maintain an affordability similar to the natural affordability of the original building.

**OBJECTIVE 3**
PROTECT THE AFFORDABILITY OF THE EXISTING HOUSING STOCK, ESPECIALLY RENTAL UNITS.

Policy 3.1:
Preserve rental units, especially rent controlled units, to meet the City’s affordable housing needs.

Policy 3.4:
Preserve “naturally affordable” housing types, such as smaller and older ownership units.

The Project, with modifications, does protect the relative affordability of existing housing. The Project proposes the tantamount to demolition and the alteration and enlargement of the existing single-family home, which is generally considered be less affordable. However, if two units are provided per Staff’s recommendation, each would individually maintain an affordability similar to the natural affordability of the original building.

URBAN DESIGN

OBJECTIVE 1:
EMPHASIS OF THE CHARACTERISTIC PATTERN WHICH GIVES TO THE CITY AND ITS NEIGHBORHOODS AN IMAGE, A SENSE OF PURPOSE, AND A MEANS OF ORIENTATION.

Policy 1.2:
Recognize, protect and reinforce the existing street pattern, especially as it is related to topography.

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

The proposed replacement buildings reflect the existing neighborhood character and development pattern, by proposing buildings of similar mass, width and height as the existing adjacent structures along the block-face on Alvarado Street.

OBJECTIVE 2:
CONSERVATION OF RESOURCES WHICH PROVIDE A SENSE OF NATURE, CONTINUITY WITH THE PAST, AND FREEDOM FROM OVERCROWDING.

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

The massing of the proposed alteration has been designed to be compatible with the prevailing proportions of the adjacent buildings and the original structure.
10. **Planning Code Section 101.1(b)** establishes eight priority-planning policies and requires review of permits for consistency with said policies. On balance, the Project complies with said policies in that:

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

   *Existing neighborhood-serving retail uses would not be displaced or otherwise adversely affected by the proposal, as the existing buildings do not contain commercial uses/spaces. Ownership of neighborhood-serving retail businesses would not be affected by the Project, and the Project maintains the existing number of dwelling units on the site, which will preserve the customer base for local retail businesses.*

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

   *The tantamount demolition of the existing one-unit building, and the alteration and addition to create a much larger single-family residence when two comparatively sized units could be accommodated, would not conserve the neighborhood character and would not protect existing housing, which could jeopardize the economic diversity of the neighborhood.*

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

   *The former, older dwelling or two more modestly sized newer units would generally be considered to be more naturally affordable when compared with an expanded single-family dwelling-unit.*

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

   *The Project would not impede MUNI transit service of significantly affect automobile traffic congestion or create parking problems in the neighborhood. The modified project would provide one vehicle and two bicycle parking spaces, consistent with the parking standards for the RH-2 Zoning District.*

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

   *The Project Site is located in an RH-2 District and is a residential development; therefore, the Project would not affect industrial or service sector uses or related employment opportunities. Ownership of industrial or service sector businesses would not be affected by the Project.*

F. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.
The replacement structure would be built in compliance with San Francisco’s current Building Code Standards and would meet all earthquake safety requirements.

G. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved.

The Project Site does not contain Landmark or historic buildings.

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

The Project will not negatively impact any existing parks and open spaces because the proposed structure does not exceed the 40-foot height limit, and maintains the open rear yard space across the street from the park. The Project is not subject to the requirements of Planning Code Section 295 – Height Restrictions on Structures Shadowing Property under the Jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission. The Project would not adversely affect impact any existing parks and open spaces, nor their access to sunlight and vistas.

11. The Project is consistent with and would promote the general and specific purposes of the Code provided under Section 101.1(b) in that, as designed, the Project would contribute to the character and stability of the neighborhood and would constitute a beneficial development.

12. The Commission hereby finds that approval of the Conditional Use Authorization as modified would promote the health, safety and welfare of the City.
DECISION

That based upon the Record, the submissions by the Applicant, the staff of the Department and other interested parties, the oral testimony presented to this Commission at the public hearings, and all other written materials submitted by all parties, the Commission hereby APPROVES Conditional Use Application No. 2017-014841CUA subject to the following conditions attached hereto as “EXHIBIT A” which is incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth.

APPEAL AND EFFECTIVE DATE OF MOTION: Any aggrieved person may appeal this Conditional Use Authorization to the Board of Supervisors within thirty (30) days after the date of this Motion No. 17820. The effective date of this Motion shall be the date of this Motion if not appealed (After the 30-day period has expired) OR the date of the decision of the Board of Supervisors if appealed to the Board of Supervisors. For further information, please contact the Board of Supervisors at (415) 554-5184, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94012.

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

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

I hereby certify that the Planning Commission ADOPTED the foregoing Motion on February 22, 2018.

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES:

NAYS:

ABSENT:

ADOPTED:
EXHIBIT A

AUTHORIZATION

This authorization is for a conditional use to tantamount to demolish and add an addition and alteration and second unit to the subject building located at 655 Alvarado Street, Block 2803 and Lot 028C, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 317 within the RH-2 (Residential-House, Two Family) District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District; in general conformance with plans, dated November 16, 2017, and stamped “EXHIBIT B” included in the docket for Case No. 2017-014841CUA and subject to conditions of approval reviewed and approved by the Commission on February 22, 2018 under Motion No XXXXXX. This authorization and the conditions contained herein run with the property and not with a particular Project Sponsor, business, or operator.

RECORDATION OF CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Prior to the issuance of the building permit or commencement of use for the Project the Zoning Administrator shall approve and order the recordation of a Notice in the Official Records of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco for the subject property. This Notice shall state that the project is subject to the conditions of approval contained herein and reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission on February 22, 2018 under Motion No. XXXXXX.

PRINTING OF CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL ON PLANS

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

SEVERABILITY

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

CHANGES AND MODIFICATIONS

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

PERFORMANCE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6. Landscaping. Pursuant to Planning Code Section 132, the Project Sponsor shall submit a site plan to the Planning Department prior to Planning approval of the building permit application indicating that 50% of the front setback areas shall be surfaced in permeable materials and further, that 20% of the front setback areas shall be landscaped with approved plant species. The size and specie of plant materials and the nature of the permeable surface shall be as approved by the Department of Public Works.

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

7. Bicycle Parking. The Project shall provide no fewer than 2 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces as required by Planning Code Sections 155.1 and 155.5.

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

PROVISIONS

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

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

MONITORING

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

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

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

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

OPERATION
11. **Sidewalk Maintenance.** The Project Sponsor shall maintain the main entrance to the building and all sidewalks abutting the subject property in a clean and sanitary condition in compliance with the Department of Public Works Streets and Sidewalk Maintenance Standards. *For information about compliance, contact Bureau of Street Use and Mapping, Department of Public Works, 415-695-2017, [http://sfdpw.org/](http://sfdpw.org/).*

12. **Garbage, composting and recycling storage.** Space for the collection and storage of garbage, composting, and recycling shall be provided within enclosed areas on the property and clearly labeled and illustrated on the architectural addenda. Space for the collection and storage of recyclable and compostable materials that meets the size, location, accessibility and other standards specified by the San Francisco Recycling Program shall be provided at the ground level of the buildings. *For information about compliance, contact the Case Planner, Planning Department at 415-558-6378, [www.sf-planning.org](http://www.sf-planning.org).*
The Sanborn Maps in San Francisco have not been updated since 1998, and this map may not accurately reflect existing conditions.
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APPLICATION FOR
Conditional Use Authorization

1. Owner/Applicant Information

PROPERTY OWNER’S NAME: Jonathan Kaplan & Marci Glazer

PROPERTY OWNER’S ADDRESS: 655 Alvarado Street
San Francisco, CA 94114

APPLICATION’S NAME: John Kevlin

APPLICATION’S ADDRESS: Reuben, Junius & Rose, LLP
One Bush Street, Suite 600
San Francisco, CA 94104

CONTACT FOR PROJECT INFORMATION: Same as Above

ADDRESS: 

TELEPHONE: (415) 567-9000

EMAIL: jkevlin@reubenlaw.com

COMMUNITY LIAISON FOR PROJECT (PLEASE REPORT CHANGES TO THE ZONING ADMINISTRATOR):

ADDRESS: 

TELEPHONE: 

EMAIL: 

2. Location and Classification

STREET ADDRESS OF PROJECT: 655 Alvarado Street
ZIP CODE: 94114

CROSS STREETS: Diamond & Castro Streets

ASSESSORS BLOCK/LOT: 2803 / 028C
LOT DIMENSIONS: 114 X 25
LOT AREA (SQ FT): 2,850
ZONING DISTRICT: RH-2
HEIGHT/BULK DISTRICT: 40-X
3. Project Description

( Please check all that apply )

- Change of Use
- Change of Hours
- New Construction
- Alterations
- Demolition
- Other  Please clarify:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDITIONS TO BUILDING</th>
<th>PRESENT OR PREVIOUS USE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Rear</td>
<td>□ 3 story single family home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Front</td>
<td>□ 3 story above grade, 2 story below grade single family home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Height</td>
<td>□ PROPOSED USE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Side Yard</td>
<td>□ MULTIPLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRESENT USE:

BUILDING APPLICATION PERMIT NO.:  
DATE FILED:  

4. Project Summary Table

If you are not sure of the eventual size of the project, provide the maximum estimates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT FEATURES</th>
<th>EXISTING USES:</th>
<th>EXISTING USES TO BE RETAINED:</th>
<th>NET NEW CONSTRUCTION AND/OR ADDITION:</th>
<th>PROJECT TOTALS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Rooms</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loading Spaces</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Buildings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height of Building(s)</td>
<td>19'2.5&quot;</td>
<td>19'2.5&quot;</td>
<td>14'4&quot;</td>
<td>33'6.5&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Stories</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 story above grade, 1 story below grade</td>
<td>3 above grade, 2 below grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Spaces</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GROSS SQUARE FOOTAGE (GSF)

| Residential      | 2277            | 2277                          | 2359                                 | 4636           |
| Retail           | 0              | 0                             | 0                                    | 0              |
| Office           | 0              | 0                             | 0                                    | 0              |
| Industrial/PDR   | 0              | 0                             | 0                                    | 0              |
| Parking          | 460             | 460                           | 0                                    | 460            |
| Other (Specify Use) | 0             | 0                             | 0                                    | 0              |
| TOTAL GSF        | 2737            | 2737                          | 2359                                 | 5096           |

Please describe any additional project features that are not included in this table:

( Attach a separate sheet if more space is needed )
5. Action(s) Requested (Include Planning Code Section which authorizes action)

Dwelling unit demolition approval pursuant to Section 317 and conditional use authorization pursuant to Section 303 is necessary because the demolition threshold was surpassed during construction.

---

Conditional Use Findings

Pursuant to Planning Code Section 303(c), before approving a conditional use authorization, the Planning Commission needs to find that the facts presented are such to establish the findings stated below. In the space below and on separate paper, if necessary, please present facts sufficient to establish each finding.

1. That the proposed use or feature, at the size and intensity contemplated and at the proposed location, will provide a development that is necessary or desirable for, and compatible with, the neighborhood or the community; and

2. That such use or feature as proposed will not be detrimental to the health, safety, convenience or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity, or injurious to property, improvements or potential development in the vicinity, with respect to aspects including but not limited to the following:
   (a) The nature of the proposed site, including its size and shape, and the proposed size, shape and arrangement of structures;
   (b) The accessibility and traffic patterns for persons and vehicles, the type and volume of such traffic, and the adequacy of proposed off-street parking and loading;
   (c) The safeguards afforded to prevent noxious or offensive emissions such as noise, glare, dust and odor;
   (d) Treatment given, as appropriate, to such aspects as landscaping, screening, open spaces, parking and loading areas, service areas, lighting and signs; and

3. That such use or feature as proposed will comply with the applicable provisions of this Code and will not adversely affect the Master Plan.

See attachment.
Priority General Plan Policies Findings

Proposition M was adopted by the voters on November 4, 1986. It requires that the City shall find that proposed projects and demolitions are consistent with eight priority policies set forth in Section 101.1 of the City Planning Code. These eight policies are listed below. Please state how the project is consistent or inconsistent with each policy. Each statement should refer to specific circumstances or conditions applicable to the property. Each policy must have a response. IF A GIVEN POLICY DOES NOT APPLY TO YOUR PROJECT, EXPLAIN WHY IT DOES NOT.

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

See attachment.

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

See attachment.

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

See attachment.

4. That commuter traffic not impede Muni transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

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

See attachment.

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

See attachment.

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved; and

See attachment.

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

See attachment.
Estimated Construction Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF APPLICATION:</th>
<th>Conditional Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCCUPANCY CLASSIFICATION:</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING TYPE:</td>
<td>V-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GROSS SQUARE FEET OF CONSTRUCTION:</td>
<td>2359 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BY PROPOSED USES:</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COST:</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTIMATE PREPARED BY:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEE ESTABLISHED:</td>
<td>$6,475.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applicant’s Affidavit

Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:

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

Signature: [Signature] Date: 11/16/17

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

John Kevlin

Owner [ ] Authorized Agent [ ]
Application Submittal Checklist

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICATION MATERIALS</th>
<th>CHECKLIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application, with all blanks completed</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-foot radius map, if applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address labels (original), if applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address labels (copy of the above), if applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Plan</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Plan</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 303 Requirements</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop. M Findings</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic photographs (if possible), and current photographs</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check payable to Planning Dept.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Application signed by owner or agent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter of authorization for agent</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Section Plan, Detail drawings (i.e. windows, door entries, trim), Specifications (for cleaning, repair, etc.) and/or Product cut sheets for new elements (i.e. windows, doors)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:

☐ Required Material. Write "N/A" if you believe the item is not applicable. (e.g. letter of authorization is not required if application is signed by property owner.)

☒ Typically would not apply. Nevertheless, in a specific case, staff may require the item.

☐ Two sets of original labels and one copy of addresses of adjacent property owners and owners of property across street.

After your case is assigned to a planner, you will be contacted and asked to provide an electronic version of this application including associated photos and drawings.

Some applications will require additional materials not listed above. The above checklist does not include material needed for Planning review of a building permit. The “Application Packet” for Building Permit Applications lists those materials.

No application will be accepted by the Department unless the appropriate column on this form is completed. Receipt of this checklist, the accompanying application, and required materials by the Department serves to open a Planning file for the proposed project. After the file is established it will be assigned to a planner. At that time, the planner assigned will review the application to determine whether it is complete or whether additional information is required in order for the Department to make a decision on the proposal.

For Department Use Only

Application received by Planning Department:

By: ___________________________                                      Date: ___________________________
A. SECTION 303 CONDITIONAL USE FINDINGS

Under Planning Code Section 303(c), the Planning Commission shall approve the application and authorize a Conditional Use if the facts presented establish the following:

1. That the proposed use or feature, at the size and intensity contemplated and at the proposed location, will provide a development that is necessary or desirable for, and compatible with, the neighborhood or the community.

   The project is necessary and desirable because it will increase the size of a small single family home by adding a family room and storage space. These additions will make for a more livable home in an area where family-sized housing is strongly encouraged by City Planning and Zoning policies. From the street view, the project will only increase the height of this modestly-sized two story home by one story, thus keeping it compatible with the neighborhood character.

   The requested conditional use is also necessary as the project is already under construction and requires Planning Commission approval now since the dwelling unit demolition thresholds have been exceeded while construction was ongoing. The project will be in a partially-constructed state until conditional use authorization is granted.

2. That such use or feature as proposed will not be detrimental to the health, safety, convenience or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity, or injuries to property, improvements or potential development in the vicinity, with respect to aspects including but not limited to the following:

   (a) The nature of the proposed site, including its size and shape, and the proposed size, shape and arrangement of the structure.

   The proposed home is sensitively designed to minimize impacts on the adjacent residences. In addition, it is of a size, shape, and arrangement similar to other single-family homes in this neighborhood. For these reasons, the project will not be detrimental to the health, safety, convenience or general welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood.

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

   The project will not add any units or bedrooms to the existing building and will retain the same amount of off-street parking that was provided in the existing building. Therefore, the project will not impact traffic patterns in the neighborhood. Furthermore, the property is well-served by public transit. The 24, 35, 48 Muni bus lines are all within a few blocks of the Property, and the Castro Muni station is less than a mile from the Property. As a result, the project will not have a detrimental effect on accessibility and traffic patterns.

   (c) The safeguards afforded to prevent noxious or offensive emissions such as noise, glare, dust and odor.
ATTACHMENT TO CU APPLICATION
655 Alvarado Street

The proposed single family home will not produce noxious or offensive emissions such as noise, glare, dust and odor. Any noise or dust that may result from construction activities is code-compliant and temporary.

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

The property will be thoughtfully landscaped and provide usable open space as required by the Planning Code in a variety of forms, including rear yard, balconies, and roof decks. The project will retain the off-street parking space that is currently provided in the existing building.

3. That such use or feature as proposed will comply with the applicable provisions of this Code and will not adversely affect the General Plan.

Planning Code Section 303(c)(3) requires that facts be established that demonstrate “that such use or feature as proposed will comply with the applicable provisions of this code and will not adversely affect the master plan.” The Project will affirmatively promote, is consistent with, and will not adversely affect the General Plan, specifically the Housing Element as follows:

Housing Element

OBJECTIVE 4 FOSTER A HOUSING STOCK THAT MEETS THE NEEDS OF ALL RESIDENTS ACROSS LIFECYCLES.

POLICY 4.1 Develop new housing, and encourage the remodeling of existing housing, for families with children.

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

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

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

The project provides a well-designed family-sized home that will help diversify the housing stock while enhancing existing neighborhood character, consistent with these policies.

B. PRIORITY MASTER PLAN POLICIES FINDINGS

Planning Code Section 101.1 establishes the following eight priority planning policies and requires review of permits for consistency with said policies. The project is consistent with each of these policies as follows:

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

The project is expanding an existing single-family home, and therefore will have no impact on existing neighborhood-serving retail uses.

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

From the street view, the proposed project will only increase the height of the existing two-story home by one story. Given that there are other three story single-family homes on this block and in this neighborhood generally, the proposed project is compatible with the neighborhood character.

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

The project will have no effect on affordable housing, as it is expanding an owner occupied single-family home.

4. That commuter traffic not impede Muni transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking.

The project does not expand the number of units or bedrooms in the existing single-family home, and therefore will not create any additional commuter traffic. Additionally, the property is well-served by public transit. The 24, 35, and 48 Muni bus lines, and the Castro MUNI station, all serve the Property.

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

The project is not proposing a commercial office development and will not displace any industrial or service uses.

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

The project will conform to the requirements of the San Francisco Building Code, and thus will protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved.

The project is not located in a landmark or historic building, or in a Conservation District or Historic District. The project will have no effect on any historic resource.

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.
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The project is not located near any public parks or open space and will therefore have no effect on such resources.
NOTICE OF BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION (SECTION 311)

On December 11, 2009, the Applicant named below filed Building Permit Application No. 2009.12.11.3061 (Alteration) with the City and County of San Francisco.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Information</th>
<th>Project Site Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant: Ken Linsteadt</td>
<td>Project Address: 655 Alvarado Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 3407 Sacramento Street</td>
<td>Cross Streets: Beaver &amp; Castro Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, State: San Francisco, CA 94118</td>
<td>Assessor’s Block/Lot #: 2603/028C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Height-Bulk District: 40-X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under San Francisco Planning Code Section 311, you, as a property owner or resident within 150 feet of this proposed project, are being notified of this Building Permit Application. You are not obligated to take any action. For more information regarding the proposed work, or to express concerns about the project, please contact the Applicant above or the Planner named below as soon as possible. If your concerns are unresolved, you can request the Planning Commission to use its discretionary powers to review this application at a public hearing. Applications requesting a Discretionary Review hearing must be filed during the 30-day review period, prior to the close of business on the Expiration Date shown below, or the next business day if that date is on a week-end or a legal holiday. If no Requests for Discretionary Review are filed, this project will be approved by the Planning Department after the Expiration Date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Demolition and/or [ ] New Construction or [X] Alteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[X] Vertical Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Change # of Dwelling Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Horiz. Extension (Front)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Horiz. Extension (Side)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Features</th>
<th>Existing Condition</th>
<th>Proposed Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Depth</td>
<td>±48 feet, 3 inches</td>
<td>±74 feet, 3 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard</td>
<td>±65 feet, 9 inches</td>
<td>±39 feet, 9 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height of Building (at Front)</td>
<td>±23 feet</td>
<td>±32 feet (from curb to top of parapet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Stories</td>
<td>±2 over basement level</td>
<td>±3 over basement level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Dwelling Units on Property</td>
<td>±1</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Off-Street Parking Spaces</td>
<td>At least 1</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The subject property is a steeply down sloping lot that contains two-story, single-family dwelling with a basement level below. The project is to construct a two-story over basement level horizontal rear extension, and add a new third story that is setback 15 feet from the existing front building wall. Please see attached plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planner’s Name:</th>
<th>Adrian C. Putra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number:</td>
<td>(415) 575-9079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:adrian.putra@sfgov.org">adrian.putra@sfgov.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date of this Notice: 12-13-10
Expiration Date: 1-12-11
commissioners, the first category on the calendar — items proposed for continuance.

Item one, proposed for continuance to November 10, 2011.

Item two a and b proposed for continuance to September 15, 2011.

Item three, 2011.0523t proposed for continuance to October 20, 2011.

Item four, kansas 2011.0533z, zoning map amendments for the washington-broadway special use district s proposed for continuance to October 20, 2011.

Commissioners, I am not aware of any other item on calendar being proposed for continuance.

is your microphone on?

It is, but I was not speaking into it. Thank you.

Commissioner olague: is there any public comment on items proposed for continuance?

Seeing none, public comment is closed. Commissioners?

Commissioner miguel?

Commissioner miguel: on the items on the continuance, — I move the items on the continuance calendar to the dates specified. >> second.

>> thank you, the commissioners.

The motion before you is to move continuance of all items on the calendar proposed for continuance to the dates as we have discussed.

Commissioner antonini: aye.

Commissioner fong: aye.

Commissioner moore: aye.

Commissioner sugaya: aye.

Commissioner olague: aye.

thank you, commissioners.

Those items have been continued, as discussed.

The next calendar is your consent calendar category.

The items listed on this category constitute the consent calendar. They are considered to be routine and will be acted upon by a single roll call vote of the commission. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a member of this commission, the public, or staff so request. In that event, the matter will be removed to the calendar and considered as a special item — separate item at this or a future hearing.

Again, the items are 5a and b.
The proposal is to construct a three story horizontal rear extension and a one story vertical extension. It will be an extension to an existing first floor and basement level, creating a new basement under the extension. The rear extension will be set back 5 feet from the east property line. The vertical extension will create a new third story that will be set back 15 feet from the front building wall and 9 feet from the rear building wall. The will be a steep down slope and a lateral up slope from the west to east. It contains a two-story over basement single-family building. The property is in the nunnelee valley — noe valley area. The majority of parcels measure 114 feet by 25 feet and buildings range between two and four stories. The residential design team has reviewed and suggests that a five-foot side set back along the east side of the rear addition at the two lowest levels. The project was reviewed by senior management and they agreed with the design recommendations for the top level. However, the recommended having a five-foot side set back on the east property line was only required on the second level of the newer addition, and the
the loveliness that we have in our block.

Many people look at the front of
the building and frankly, we
have no idea the lovely enjoyment that we have in the
backyard and how much it as to us living in the what other neighborhoods would be
considered or other cities would be considered small spaces.

We have daughters that are
raising families and spaces that are 1800 square feet.
They're raising two kids or three kids.
Part of that is because we have access to backyards and space.
we want to be able to keep the
trees, have gardens, and joy
what we have, and we want to
work with this neighbor and get
along, trying to figure out a compromise.

Without doing what seems to be harm to their adjacent neighbors and their block.
Thank you for the time and consideration.

>> my name is john, I work for the city and county.
I element the address along with my sister.
i am not opposed to accommodate
their growing families, but this project is extreme.
I feel like we were purposefully left out of the loot.
We did not have the opportunity to attend a meeting.
their meetings were conveniently held during the busy holiday
seasons and there is the bogus
application where people attended.
They wanted to push this through with minimal opposition.

I am concerned about the
excavation for a second basement level for their garden room.
Our homes have only one basement or garage.
The homes in our block are three stories.
I believe they want to build a hot tub on the fifth level.
It makes their extension even worse.
all of their levels will be way above my property line fence.
At the end of the building.
I feel sorry for my neighbor.
She is a senior citizen and is not here because he does not
want to cause any problems he is like my mother in 1989.
She feels like she participated by supplying copies of the plan she received because she knew that we were not aware of what was going on.
A total disregard dense of the neighbors, and how well
negatively -- and how it will negatively impact them.
The only care about their own house. This fails to maintain like to adjacent properties by providing adequate setbacks. Minimizing impact of privacy and the like. We have sent it open for open space. To address the immediate contents, to design a scale of the building to be compatible with the surrounding buildings at the open space. Preserve the neighborhood character, preserve the community and consider that it can leave residents feeling boxed in or cut off from open space.

If the proposal were to go through, it means the largest house would be next to the smallest house. This is not only massive, it fails to comply with the planning code section.

Commissioner Miguel: are there additional speakers in support? If not, project sponsor?

The evening, commissioners.

This project has been through quite of that of reveal at the planning department. The initial application was close to two years ago. We have gone through several iterations or we have worked with planning staff if it steps down the hill, it is set back so that the appearance of the building at the front is not altered from the sidewalk.

It is an upper addition that is back from the rear wall of the house. A 14 foot extension, guidelines.

Thank you for your time.

>> speakers in favor of the project sponsor?

>> my name is Jonathan, I am an entrepreneur in San Francisco.

I was not the owner of the building when the 1989 renovation took place, that was of setting for her the neighbor to my left. That is the house that I ended up buying.

There are a couple of points that I wanted to make.

Why am I doing this renovation?

I can buy a house in San Francisco except for the $100 million house. We love of ballet and we love all of our neighbors. Where they upset with me?

If it's because she doesn't live in the house, she has renters better there. The nine years that I have lived there, for the first five years, the house was completely and totally vacant when her mom passed away which was terrible for all of us.
I was friends with the family at the time.

the house became wrapped invested.

Finally, the fighting that went on between the family subsided and decided to rent the house.

They still do not live in the house and they are not my neighbors.

The neighbors are my friends.

The people opposed to the project just moved in and have not lived in the neighborhood and want notified because this project has been ongoing for over two years.

The reason I want to do this is because my neighbor to the right of me I understand the neighbor on the left has the smallest house on the block. the neighbor to the right extends a defeat past my house and if you stand on the deck of the neighbor, you can see into my bedroom.

When I get out of bed, I wave to my neighbors.

I wanted to come up with a plan that did not ask for any exceptions, did not ask for anything other than to extend my house back enough so that my neighbor can no longer look into my window.

There is nothing big in to gigantic or massive about this project.

The house is a 3000 square foot house.

Currently it is a small house and it only has two bedrooms and a master suite.

I have to leave my bedroom to get into the bathroom.

My challenge is that I want my neighbors to be happy.

I am always available. I know the neighbors very well.

The fact that someone hasn’t been able to talk to me about this project is ridiculous.

I have been asked by several neighbors, and that of his crazy for me to say, maybe if I helped them with some of their rent or if I could help their renters or help with some other things, maybe they wouldn’t go through this discretionary review.

I think that is ludicrous.

It is why I entered the entire day off of work today even though I am one in —

President Olague: the three minutes are up.

Are there additional speakers in support of the project sponsor?

Seeing none, and discretionary review, you have two minutes over a bottle.

I think it is pretty easy to see that. Anyway, thank you.

President Olague: project sponsor, you have two minutes.

>> thank you.

I would like to put of the same section elevation.

of the building and is set back from the rear building.

President Olague: the public hearing is closed.
Commissioner Antonini: I have a question, a couple of comments first.

A number of issues have been raised. Some of the issues concerned the second baseman that is being added and the concern about underground streams or shoring at the met, but these are generally felt to be — I will ask is that the question. These are issues that will be taken up and have to be dealt with in the approval process for permitting and other things. There was also a privacy issue raised. Given the setbacks, the distance between the structures, the detached homes is fairly significant. The one thing that I am concerned about if I am judging from the map that was given, maybe I can ask the staff about the yard averaging situation. The comment was made that they don’t have to average of the adjacent properties because it is within the area that is allowed and is compliant, it is not asking for a variance. >> that is correct. Beyond that line is when the averaging is done to determine the allowable encroachment beyond that up to 25%. In this case, the proposed project is not exceeding that amount of the than the el al will bond that can be done on the lowest level. the house is code compliance with the rear yard. I think what the filings are referring to is just an average of visual based on the overall death of the house. The logic of that is based on the existing footprint, and in this case, the residence is relatively shallow in comparison to the other residences on this block. And the overall death. >> I think this visual is accurate, but we are dealing with the second basement which is the part that is going down past the additional amount. But you are saying that it is not significant enough to be counted against the the rear yard? >> it was what they used when they were in evaluating this house. They felt that because it is a
down sloping parcel, there was
such a differential that this is actually below the primary
living space.

>> I realize the open space, as you're saying, they are within compliance.
This appears that it gets out a lot farther than anything else.
>> I think there would be a stronger impact
if they were the same elevation
because it is down sloping and
is also a lateral slop on the block as well.
>> theoretically, you could put something green above the top of
that last level and it would look like the rear yard.
Of a, I will see with the other commissioners have this day.
Commissioner moore: it is interesting because what he is
addressing is hard to
understand what the exact brady and his.
It doesn't really fully reveal how the great falls away.
what is missing is the materiality of this building.
There was no suggestion of its
color for its landscape on any of the (S, etc.
It is very difficult understand.
i believe there is an omission ,
the exact kind of detailed
openings create the facades that are compatible.
this project reminds
me of the
heated discussions we had where
the only names
-- you probably remember from a few weeks ago, we did not understand what was going on.
I am not opposed to this
project, but there is something in the presentation that is
missing for me to be really fair to the thing.
The disclosure that I would be
more inclined, it is quite massive.
I am kind of hedging what the other commissioners have to say.
Commissioner antonini: I have to look at rendering of what the appearance of the building will be on the north elevation.
i see a picture here.
It is hard to understand what we are going to see.
It looks as though there is an additional level, a tile roof that will match.
it would be nice if we had a
better image so we could really see.
There are windows, I guess, up on top.
I think the material should
contain something that is a
Commissioner Moore: we are very concerned for large glass railings facing public open spaces, because we are concerned that birds have a tendency to confuse glass as being an open space beyond.

Are you thinking of giving any kind of indication? I am not sure where the code is, but I want to remind us that we are using quite a bit of glass over the five stories of your building.

>> I have not thought about that, but we certainly can.

Commissioner Moore: with the department discussed this, if we move ahead?

>> I think one of the things the commission could do is ask the project sponsor to comply with the new code. The do not think it is in place yet, but they could treat the glass.

Commissioner Moore: this is a lovely study to understand the study. This lets people take a different look at it. You might appreciate reading what they did to find a way of being creative.

I would discourage you to move ahead.

I think I am getting more comfortable, even if I would like to see more drawings. That would be a department task to ask for more.

President Olague: would we have to take dr to include that? >> I can clarify the applicability of the guidelines. Because the commission adopted the policy, we are implementing it. It has not gone to the board of supervisors, so changing to the planning code does not happen. It would apply to the glass railings. We can talk to the project sponsor.

President Olague: if we did one that considered and someone makes a motion, there would have to make a motion to take dr? Or would it be automatic? Great.

Commissioner Sugaya: sorry. It was not important.

President Olague: it should be.

40-x the project sponsor --

Commissioner Sugaya: the project sponsor might want to download. It is interesting.

Vice President Miguel: I would move to not take dr and approve the project as submitted.

Commissioner Antonini: I will second with a friendly amendment that project sponsor work with dr requestors wherever possible to address their concerns and see if we can ameliorate some of their concerns were they do with planning issues.
Commissioner Moore: I would also like to ask that the department continues to work with the applicant about disclosure on color, but this building falls within the general tonality of adjoining buildings and becomes a light building, because it is massive, and does something which reflects the collective feeling of the street is on.

>> the motion before you is to approve the project as proposed with the project sponsor urged to continue dialogue with the department, to work with staff on color. — staff on color — staff on color.

Commissioner Moore: and on the bird ordinance.

>> staff already proposes that. >> staff will make sure the project sponsor — staff will make sure the project sponsor is compliant with the policy on bird mitigation.

President Olague: it makes me wonder how it is being applied by staff.

Commissioner Moore: but if the architect is unaware of it and it has not been brought up in any discussion, I think it needs to be put into the record in order to be accepted by the architect as part of the discussion.

>> on that motion —

Commissioner Antonini: aye.

Commissioner Fong: aye.

Commissioner Moore: aye.

Commissioner Sugaya: aye.

Vice President Miguel: aye.

President Olague: aye.

>> you are not on an 1541456 —

you are now on item 1456 for chestnut street.

>> the subject property is located between franklin and gough.

The proposal is to demolish an existing building and construction a three story building.

There are concerns about the demolition of the building and proposed changes to open space. the department recognizes the proposed building is larger than what exists, but the scale is within character of the neighborhood and does not disrupt the mid blocked open space.

Further, the proposal fully
On December 11, 2009, the Applicant named below filed Building Permit Application No. 2009.12.11.3061 with the City and County of San Francisco.

**Property Information**

- **Project Address:** 655 Alvarado Street
- **Cross Street(s):** Beaver & Castro Streets
- **Block/Lot No.:** 2803/028C
- **Zoning District(s):** RH-2 / 40-X

**Applicant Information**

- **Applicant:** Holey Associates
- **Address:** 5715 Claremont Avenue
- **City, State:** Oakland, CA 94618
- **Telephone:** (415) 509-7979

You are receiving this notice as a property owner or resident within 150 feet of the proposed project. You are not required to take any action. For more information about the proposed project, or to express concerns about the project, please contact the Applicant listed above or the Planner named below as soon as possible. If you believe that there are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances associated with the project, you may request the Planning Commission to use its discretionary powers to review this application at a public hearing. Applications requesting a Discretionary Review hearing must be filed during the 30-day review period, prior to the close of business on the Expiration Date shown below, or the next business day if that date is on a weekend 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**

- **Demolition**
- **Change of Use**
- **Rear Addition**
- **Facade Alteration(s)**
- **New Construction**
- **Side Addition**
- **Front Addition**
- **Vertical Addition**
- **Alteration**

**Project Features**

**Existing**

- Building Use: Residential
- Front Setback: ±3 feet, 5 inches
- Building Depth: ±48 feet, 3 inches
- Rear Yard: ±65 feet, 9 inches
- Building Height: 29'-6"
- Number of Stories: 2 over basement
- Number of Dwelling Units: 1
- Number of Parking Spaces: 1

**Proposed**

- Building Use: Residential
- Front Setback: No Change
- Building Depth: ±74 feet, 3 inches
- Rear Yard: ±39 feet, 9 inches
- Building Height: 40'-0"
- Number of Stories: 4 over basement
- Number of Dwelling Units: No Change
- Number of Parking Spaces: No Change

**Project Description**

The proposal is for one-story vertical addition, three-story horizontal addition and a two-story permitted rear yard obstruction to an existing two-story-over-basement single-family residence. The project also includes infill of the front porch and interior remodelling. This permit was originally noticed in accordance with Planning Code Section 311 from 12/13/2010 to 1/12/2011.

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

For more information, please contact Planning Department staff:

- **Planner:** Jeff Horn
- **Telephone:** (415) 575-6925
- **E-mail:** Jeffrey.horn@sfgov.org

Notice Date: 1/6/16
Expiration Date: 2/5/16

中文询问请电：(415) 575-9010

Para información en Español llamar al: (415) 575-9010
APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

FORM 3 □ OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED
FORM 8 □ OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUANCE

NUMBER OF PLAN SETS

APPLICATION IS HEREBY MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, FOR ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS.

FORM 3 OTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED
FORM 8 OVER-THE-COUNTER ISSUANCE

INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED BY ALL APPLICANTS

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING

A. TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION
   VTS

B. NO. OF STRUCTURES AND BUILDINGS
   1

C. PREVIOUS USE
   SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING

D. CURRENT USE
   SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING

E. NO. OF STOREYS OR LEVELS
   1

F. PROPOSED USE
   SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING

G. OCCUPANCY
   HOUSE

H. BUILDING DESCRIPTION
   OCCUPANT

I. EXISTING MECHANICAL SYSTEMS
   NO

J. EXISTING ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS
   NO

K. UNITS
   1

L. LOCATION OF PLUMBING REPAIRS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS
   NO

M. DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING
   NO

N. DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING AFTER PROPOSED ALTERATION
   NO

O. NUMBER OF PLAN SETS
   2

P. APLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS

IMPORTANT NOTES

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

No portion of building or structure shall be altered, except as herein authorized, by any person without first obtaining a building permit.

Grade lines as shown on drawings accompanying this application are assumed to be correct. If such lines are found to be in error, the same shall be corrected. No grading or excavation shall be permitted until corrected grade lines, as shown together with complete details of grading and leveling are submitted to the Superintendent of Sewers.

Any application required hereon or by code may be appealed.

BUILDING NOT TO BE OCCUPIED UNTIL CERTIFICATE OF FINAL COMPLETION IS ISSUED.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this code, the building permit shall be effective until the building is occupied as a residence.

This is not a building permit. No work shall be started until a building permit is issued.

In developing all utilities and materials must be used in accordance with the instructions and specifications of the permits and all laws and ordinances thereto will be complied with.

APPLICATIONS CERTIFICATION

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

9032.05 REV. (1988)

NOTICE TO APPLICANT

HOLD HARMLESS CLAIMS. This application is not a request for a permit, and is not in any way an offer to sell, buy, exchange, or transfer any property or interest in any property. This application is not a document of title or encumbrance.

In consideration of the provisions of Section 3580 of the Labor Code of the State of California, the applicant shall have coverage under Item 60 of Form 42, or 9, whichever is applicable. If however term (6) is checked, (5) must be checked as well. The appropriate method of compliance below.

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

1. I have and will maintain a certificate of convalescent old-age insurance, as provided by Section 3580 of the Labor Code, for the period of time for which the permit is issued.

2. I have and will maintain workers' compensation insurance, as required by Section 3520 of the Labor Code, for the performance of work for which the permit is issued.

3. I will not utilize any person in a manner that is subject to the provisions of Section 3580 of the Labor Code, that the permit shall apply to shall be deemed invalid.

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

   (A) I will not utilize any person in any manner as to be classified as an employee, as that term is defined, under the provisions of Section 3580 of the Labor Code, that the permit shall apply to shall be deemed invalid.

   (B) I will not utilize any person in any manner as to be classified as an employee, as that term is defined, under the provisions of Section 3580 of the Labor Code, that the permit shall apply to shall be deemed invalid.

5. I acknowledge that the work for which the permit is issued, is subject to the provisions of Section 3580 of the Labor Code, that the permit shall apply to shall be deemed invalid.

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

   (A) I will not utilize any person in any manner as to be classified as an employee, as that term is defined, under the provisions of Section 3580 of the Labor Code, that the permit shall apply to shall be deemed invalid.

   (B) I will not utilize any person in any manner as to be classified as an employee, as that term is defined, under the provisions of Section 3580 of the Labor Code, that the permit shall apply to shall be deemed invalid.

APPLICATIONS CERTIFICATION

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

9032.05 REV. (1988)
CONDITIONS AND STIPULATIONS

APPROVED:

[Signature]

APPROVED:

[Signature]

APPROVED:

[Signature]

APPROVED:

[Signature]

APPROVED:

[Signature]

APPROVED:

[Signature]

APPROVED:

[Signature]

APPROVED:

[Signature]

APPROVED:

[Signature]

APPROVED:

[Signature]

APPROVED:

[Signature]

APPROVED:

[Signature]

APPROVED:

[Signature]

APPROVED:

[Signature]

APPROVED:

[Signature]

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

Number of attachments

OWNERS AUTHORIZED AGENT

SFPUC Capacity Charges
See attached SFPUC Capacity Charge Invoice for total amount due. DBI will collect charges.

NOTIFIED MR.

DATE:

REASON:
Hello,

My name is Max Blakely. I'm the jobsite superintendent, for Thompson Brooks INC, running the project at 655 Alvarado St.

It has been brought to my attention that a complaint was received about the jobsite noise. I am very sorry about this, but regrettfully, I have to say that the heavy noise, i.e. jackhammers and heavy equipment, will be continuing for the next couple of months. Once demolition and excavation are complete the noise will be reduced significantly. Again, I'm very sorry for the noise, but I would ask that you please bear with us as this is a fairly major construction project.

Thank you,

Max

Max Blakely
Superintendent
Thompson Brooks INC
Direct: 415-238-5345

Hi Adrian,

Did you receive the email also?

Thanks, Mary

Adrian Granucci <afgranuc@gmail.com>
To: Mary Ferretti-breidinger <mferrettisf@gmail.com>
Cc: John Feretti <JOHNFREDSF@yahoo.com>

Yeah I did, I'll probably respond to him a little later. My one concern really is only that they start at around 7:20 in the morning. If they could wait like 30 minutes it would be fantastic.

Thanks

Adrian G

Sent from my iPhone, I apologize for any spelling or grammar errors.

Hi Max,

Thanks for reaching out. We know it's a big job. I think the main thing that affects us as of now is the work noise starts about 7:20 every morning. I know it's winter with less daylight but of course if there is anything that could be done to start work a little later would be fantastic. I think the noise during the day is fine for us.

Thank you,

Adrian Granucci
Hi Max,

Thanks for reaching out. We know its a big job. I think the main thing that affects us as of now is the work noise starts about 0720 every morning. I know its winter with less daylight but of course if there is anything that could be done to start work a little later would be fantastic. I think the noise during the day is fine for us.

Thank you,

Adrian Granucci

On Jan 13, 2017, at 11:56 AM, Max Blakely <max@thompsonbrooks.com> wrote:

Hello,

My name is Max Blakely. I'm the jobsite superintendent, for Thompson Brooks INC, running the project at 655 Alvarado St.

It has been brought to my attention that a complaint was received about the jobsite noise. I am very sorry about this, but regretfully, I have to say that the heavy noise, i.e. jackhammers and heavy equipment, will be continuing for the next couple of months. Once demo and excavation are complete the noise will be reduced significantly. Again, I'm very sorry for the noise, but I would ask that you please bear with us as this is a fairly major construction project.

Thank you,

Max

Max Blakely
Superintendent
Thompson Brooks INC
Direct 415-238-5345

--- Forwarded message ---

Mary Ferretti-breidinger <mferrettisf@gmail.com>
To: Adrian Granucci <afgranuc@gmail.com>, Brian Kataoka <byk5000@gmail.com>
FYI- I am forwarding you a copy of the communication I had with the contractors regarding the issues you had with the construction next door.

Mary

From: Mary Ferretti-breidinger <mferrettisf@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Mar 29, 2017 at 3:40 PM
Subject: Construction at 655 Alvarado St.

Hi Patrick,

I'm transmitting you a copy of the communication I had with the construction contractor regarding the issues you had with the construction project at 655 Alvarado St.

Thank you,

Martha

[Quoted text hidden]

Adrian Granucci <afgranuc@gmail.com>
To: Mary Ferretti-breidinger <mferrettisf@gmail.com>
Cc: Brian Kataoka <byk5000@gmail.com>

Hi Mary,

We wanted to know that we just noticed the weather stripping on the bathroom window has basically blown away and it's allowed water or a little leakage in when it rains. Brian cleaned it up but I am noticing it dripping again so it seems when it rains there is a chance for water to leak on the sill and onto the floor of the bathroom.

Thanks

Adrian G

Sent from my iPhone

[Quoted text hidden]

Mary Ferretti-breidinger <mferrettisf@gmail.com>
To: Adrian Granucci <afgranuc@gmail.com>

Thanks for letting me know. We will look into it.
Application No. 2009.12.11.3061 655 Alvarado St. DISAPPROVAL OF PROPERTY LINE WINDOW

Mary Ferretti-breidinger <mferrettisf@gmail.com>

To: Jeffery.horn@sfgov.org
Cc: john ferretti <JOHNFREDSF@yahoo.com>

January 17, 2016

Jeff Horn Jeffrey.horn@sfgov.org
Planning Department

RE: 655 Alvarado St
Application No. 2009.12.11.3061
DISAPPROVAL OF PROPERTY LINE WINDOW

Dear Mr. Horn,

My brother, John Ferretti, and I are the owners of 651 Alvarado St., the property adjacent to the proposed project at 655 Alvarado St. On August 17, 2015, we attended pre-application meeting held at 655 Alvarado St. headed by the architect, Mr. Holey. After reviewing the full set of plans, we voiced our disapproval of the property line window. We had the architect sign a letter (a copy attached), at the meeting, in which we stated our disapproval of the property line window in writing. Last week my brother received a Notice of Building Permit Application, unfortunately, I did not receive a copy, in spite of the fact that Mr. Holey has my San Francisco address. Last week I left a message for Mr. Holey in which requested a of a full set of plans to compare with the plans he presented at the pre-application meeting. On Friday Jan 15, I spoke with Mr. Holey and again requested a full set of plans. I expressed my disapproval of the property line window and hoped that it was addressed in the proposed plans. I hope to receive the plans by Tuesday of next week.

At this point in time, should there be a “property line” window in the proposal. I am requesting, that you, representing the Planning Department, follow the correct procedure. I believe the project needs to obtain clearance from the adjacent property owner that it is ok to build a property line window, before it is built. We do not approve of the property line window. The architect and the project owner need to be aware that the property line window can be completely blocked by a wall, losing their light, if the adjacent property choose to remodel in the future. If the property line window, projected in the proposed plans of 655 Alvarado St. is that important to the project then we recommend the plans be revised to include a 4 foot setback in order to accommodate property line window.

I appreciate your assistance in this matter. I look forward to your response.

Thank you,

Mary Ferretti

alvarado st project property line window.jpg 101K
Permit Details Report
Report Date: 9/14/2017 8:05:13 PM

Application Number: 201702068651
Form Number: 3
Address(es): 2809 / 028C / 0 655 ALVARADO ST
Description: HANDDUG PITS, SOIL SHORING TIEBACKS. REF APP#2009-1211-3061
Cost: $127,000.00
Occupancy Code: R-3
Building Use: 27 - 1 FAMILY DWELLING

Disposition / Stage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Date</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2017</td>
<td>TRIAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2017</td>
<td>FILING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2017</td>
<td>FILED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/2017</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/2017</td>
<td>ISSUED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact Details:
License Number: 315245
Name: JOHN BARCEWSKI LARS LARSEN
Company Name: BARCEWSKI INC DBA SUNSHINE CONSTRUCTION
Address: 4136 REDWOOD HWY, STE 13 * SAN RAFAEL CA
Phone: 4795566

Contractor Details:
License Number: 315245
Name: JOHN BARCEWSKI LARS LARSEN
Company Name: BARCEWSKI INC DBA SUNSHINE CONSTRUCTION
Address: 4136 REDWOOD HWY, STE 13 * SAN RAFAEL CA
Phone: 4795566

Addenda Details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Arrive</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>In Hold</th>
<th>Out Hold</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Checked By</th>
<th>Hold Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>INTAKE</td>
<td>2/6/17</td>
<td>2/6/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2/6/17</td>
<td>SHAWL HAREGGEWAIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CPB</td>
<td>2/15/17</td>
<td>2/15/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2/15/17</td>
<td>SECONDEZ GRACE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BLDG</td>
<td>2/15/17</td>
<td>2/24/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2/24/17</td>
<td>RALLS MATTHEW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>DPW- BSM</td>
<td>2/24/17</td>
<td>2/28/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2/28/17</td>
<td>CHOY CLINTON</td>
<td>Approved, 2/28/17: No alteration or reconstruction of City Right-of-Way under this permit. -CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PPC</td>
<td>2/28/17</td>
<td>2/28/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2/28/17</td>
<td>CHEUNG DEREK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CPB</td>
<td>2/28/17</td>
<td>3/1/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3/1/17</td>
<td>CHAN AMARIS</td>
<td>SAFETY PERMIT REQ: 8 PAGES. APPROV BY AMARIS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This permit has been issued. For information pertaining to this permit, please call 415-558-6096.

Appointments:
Appointment Date| Appointment AM/PM | Appointment Code | Appointment Type | Description | Time Slots

Inspections:
Activity Date | Inspector | Inspection Description | Inspection Status

Special Inspections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addenda No.</th>
<th>Completed Date</th>
<th>Inspected By</th>
<th>Inspection Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CONCRETE (PLACEMENT &amp; SAMPLING)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>SHOTCRETE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24F</td>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td>geotech engr &amp; shoring engr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21B</td>
<td>UNDERPINNING</td>
<td>NOT affecting adjacent property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>OTHERS AS RECOMMENDED BY PROFESSIONAL OF RECORD</td>
<td>Tie back testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21A</td>
<td>SHORING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For information, or to schedule an inspection, call 558-6570 between 8:30 am and 3:00 pm.
Permit Details Report

Report Date: 9/14/2017 8:02:04 PM

Application Number: 201703161980
Form Number: 8
Address(es): 2803 / 028C / 0 655 ALVARADO ST

Description: REVISION TO 20091213061 INCREASE SIZE OF BASEMENT BY 200 SF. MODIFICATION TO WINDOW/DOOR MANUFACTURE (USHGC) AND MINOR IMPROVEMENTS TO WINDOW SIZE AND OPERATION. MINOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THERMAL ENVELOPE AND MECHANICAL EQUIP.

Cost: $33,000.00
Occupancy Code: R-3
Building Use: 27-1 FAMILY DWELLING

Disposition / Stage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Date</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2017</td>
<td>TRIAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2017</td>
<td>FILING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2017</td>
<td>FILED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/4/2017</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/4/2017</td>
<td>ISSUED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact Details:

Contractor Details:
License Number: 483119
Name: PATRICK DAVIS
Company Name: THOMPSON BROOKS INC.
Address: 151 VERMONT ST * SAN FRANCISCO CA 94103-0000
Phone: 5812600

Addenda Details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Arrive</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>In Hold</th>
<th>Out Hold</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Checked By</th>
<th>Hold Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>INTAKE</td>
<td>3/16/17</td>
<td>3/16/17</td>
<td>3/16/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>CHAPMAN MARIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MECH</td>
<td>5/3/17</td>
<td>5/3/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ORTEGA REYNALDO</td>
<td>Approved, OTC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CPB</td>
<td>5/4/17</td>
<td>5/4/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YU ZHANG REN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This permit has been issued. For information pertaining to this permit, please call 415-558-6096.

Appointments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointment Date</th>
<th>Appointment AM/PM</th>
<th>Appointment Code</th>
<th>Appointment Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Tim Slot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/15/2017</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>VS</td>
<td>IVR Scheduled</td>
<td>REINFORCING STEEL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/31/2017</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>VS</td>
<td>IVR Scheduled</td>
<td>REINFORCING STEEL</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inspections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Date</th>
<th>Inspector</th>
<th>Inspection Description</th>
<th>Inspection Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/15/2017</td>
<td>Darlene Hartley</td>
<td>REINFORCING STEEL</td>
<td>OK TO POUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/31/2017</td>
<td>Chester Chiu</td>
<td>REINFORCING STEEL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special Inspections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addenda No.</th>
<th>Completed Date</th>
<th>Inspected By</th>
<th>Inspection Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IB53</td>
<td>CF2R-ADD-02-E - PRESCRIPTIVE RESIDENTIAL ADDITIONS THAT DO NOT REQUIRE HERS FIELD VERIFICATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CF2R-ENV-01-E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Construction at 655 Alvarado St.

9 messages

Mary Ferretti-breidinger <mferrettisf@gmail.com>
To: patrick@thompsonbrooks.com
Cc: john ferretti <JOHNFREDSF@yahoo.com>

Mary Ferretti-breidinger <mferrettisf@gmail.com>
Wed, Mar 29, 2017 at 3:40 PM

Hi Patrick,

This email is to follow up our conversation we just had 2 minutes ago. I am the owner to 651 Alvarado St. My renters at ... about your work hours/noise caused by your construction at 655 Alvarado st. Apparently someone from your company ... to my renters. Could you please get back to me with specifics so I can let my renters know. I contacted your ... to ensure we are all on the same page, I would like you to address their concerns to me and I will forward them a copy of your email response.

appreciate your attention to this matter.

Thank you,

Mary Ferretti

CC: John Ferretti

Patrick Davis <patrick@thompsonbrooks.com>
To: Mary Ferretti-breidinger <mferrettisf@gmail.com>
Cc: john fertetti <JOHNFREDSF@yahoo.com>, Max Blakely <max@thompsonbrooks.com>, Judith Thompson <JAT@thompsonbrooks.com>

Hi Mary,

Wed, Mar 29, 2017 at 3:55 PM

Frst, I went to correct something I said to you. After our conversation I spoke with Mau Blekeley, the She ... for a pour that took place yesterday, and is not something that will happen very oven. Our normal hours of operation ere

Monday -Friday.

The Ciry allows construction work to take place from lam - Bpm, every day, Including Fwlidays. Please see the weblink below.

http://s(dbl. org/what-to-expecthuring-consimgion

em attaching the small chain from back in January that you were copied on. Work at this job stte starts at lam, end ... try to kcep the noise down for the fist 15-30 minutes, we cannot guarantee there will be no rwise before a specific time.

Hope this helps.

PeVick

PMiek Davis

Executive Ywe President

Phone: 415.5812618

Fax: 415 5812601

THOMPSON BROOKS, INC

www.thompsonbrooks.com

http://www. hauu.coMpro/thompson brooksi nc

From: Mary Fettetli-breldfnger (mailto:mferrettisf@gmail.com]
Sort: Wednesday, March 29, 2017 3:40 PM
To: PehiCk Davis <patnck~thompsonbrooks cortu
Ce: john ferretli c10HNFREDSF@yahoo.cortu
Sub~eet: Construction et 655 Alvarado St.

--- Forwarded message ---

From: Adrian Granucci <afgranuc@gmail.com>
To: Max Blakely <max@thompsonbrooks.com>
Cc: "mferrettisf@gmail.com" <mferrettisf@gmail.com>, Patrick Davis <patrick@thompsonbrooks.wm>, Judith Thompson <JAT@thompsonbrooks.com>, Greg Hall <greg@thompsonbrooks com>
Hi Patrick,

John and I were at our property (651 Alvarado St) yesterday. We have 2 concerns:

1. Our building's foundation is cracked at the property line (a piece of ply wood is setting against it. (I have attached a picture).

2. Water is getting into our basement. Apparently the water issue was noted since you have a piece of plastic placed between the properties. This was an issue when 655 Alvarado St went through a major remodel in 1989 and the brick stairs were added. The builders took care of the problem and repaired the damages. (I have included pictures).

Will you be taking care of these issues?

I have pictures of the interior. I would appreciate it if you would not disturb our tenants.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Mary
Hi Mary,

We noticed the crack at your foundation during our demo phase. We assumed you were aware of it too since it is clearly an existing crack that was patched in the past. The picture you provided shows the two colors of concrete, with the lighter of the two being the patch. The plywood we have in place is to isolate your foundation from our work.

Regarding the water intruding into your basement, we have no knowledge of this. The plastic that we have hanging up is to prevent water entering the existing Garage of our client's property. But, we would be happy to meet you on site to review this further and take a look at your basement to see where the water is entering.

Please let us know if you would like to set up a time to meet on site.

Patrick

Patrick Davis
Executive Vice President
Ok I can set something up then during the week before noon hopefully for next week. I'll let you guys know.

Adrian Granucci <afgranuc@gmail.com>

Ok they can do Wednesday 2nd, from 9-11 am. Let me know if they work - it's scheduled for now but I can change it.

Adrian G

On Jul 24, 2017, at 11:32 AM, Mary <mferrettisf@gmail.com> wrote:

Mary Fertetti-breidinger <mferrettisf@gmail.com> Wed, Jul 26, 2017 at 8:23 AM

To: Adrian Granucci <afgranuc@gmail.com>

checked with John. It is ok with him.

Mary

Adrian Granucci <afgranuc@gmail.com> Wed, Aug 2, 2017 at 1:58 PM

To: Mary Ferretti-breidinger <mferrettisf@gmail.com>

Hi Mary,

will drop off the rent a car work today, but the cable I went ahead and cancelled the appointment for today, I left a message with John and haven't heard from him. If I don't hear from him this week I will go ahead and schedule something before noon sometime - let me know.

Thanks,

Adrian G

Mary Ferretti-breidinger <mferrettisf@gmail.com> Fri, Aug 4, 2017 at 1:58 PM

To: Adrian Granucci <afgranuc@gmail.com>

He works evenings now so you can probably reach him about 9:30 am before noon with the

Adrian Granucci <afgranuc@gmail.com> Fri, Aug 4, 2017 at 9:35 AM

To: Mary Ferretti-breidinger <mferrettisf@gmail.com>
Cc: Brian Kataoka <byk5000@gmail.com>

Hi Mary,

wanted to let you know that due to the construction work (I think) the door leading to the backyard has shifted lower...sometimes it takes me like 2 minutes with all my strength to fit it back into the lock, the door is level to the floor and flat with my standards, I tried to adjust but lock the door. This problem never really happened before and never really noticed. I therefore think it is due to a shift in the area with the house next door but maybe that is me jumping to conclusions, I will try to see if there are other complications. I will let you know if there is a delay for the lock. So, maybe John can check it out the same time.

Thanks,

Adrian G

Mary Ferretti-breidinger <mferrettisf@gmail.com> Fri, Aug 4, 2017 at 1:58 PM

To: Adrian Granucci <afgranuc@gmail.com>

Cc: Brian Kataoka <byk5000@gmail.com>

Adrian,

Thanks for letting me know. I will have John look at it while he is there (during the cable setup and follow up with the contractor.

Mary
Hi Patrick,

At our meeting on April 17, 2017, with you, Max and my husband (to discuss the front right side of the foundation which was causing gaps) you went at lengths to describe what you were doing and you would keep me posted on what was going on. Since our meeting there has been extensive work beyond what we discussed. This is a little concerning since that is not how we discussed things would proceed.

Now it has been brought to my attention that you removed my property line fence without my or my renters being notified. I would appreciate your attention to this matter.

Mary Ferretti

cc John Ferretti

Patrick Davis <patrick@thompsonbrooks.com>

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Mary Ferretti-breidinger <mferrettisf@gmail.com>
Date: August 23, 2017 at 1:27:28 PM PDT
To: Patrick Davis <patrick@thompsonbrooks.com>, john ferretti <JOHNFREDSF@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: Construction at 655 Alvarado St.

Hi,

I am not sure what you are specifically referring to. What TBI committed to during the meeting was to reinstall flashing in the areas not under the garage to help prevent water from entering the garage. The commitment was that this work would take place during the duration of the project. We have not forgotten about this scope and still plan to do it. The commitment to reinstall the flashing was to prevent water from entering your garage. The commitment was that the work would take place during the project.

Mary,

Patrick Davis

General Manager

Phone: 415.581-2678
Fax: 415.581-2601

THOMPSON BROOKS, INC

www.thompsonbrooks.com

From: Mary Ferretti-breidinger [mailto:mferrettisf@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 23, 2017 127 PM
To: Patrick Davis <patrick@thompsonbrooks.com>; john ferretti <JOHNFREDSF@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: Construction at 655 Alvarado St.

Hi Patrick,

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Mary
Dear Mary.

We are aware of the foundation issues at your property at 651 Alvarado. Attached are photos we took last December before we started concrete work at 655 Alvarado. In April, after we removed the structure at 655 Alvarado, we met with you and pointed out the condition of your foundation and the previously burned siding on your West wall. As you can clearly see in the photos, your foundation is crumbling at the Southwest Corner and there have been previous unsuccessful attempts to repair it.

We have followed all permitted plans and have passed all building inspections. Our work has been monitored by the San Francisco Building Inspector, the Geotechnical Engineer, our Structural Engineer, Special Inspectors, and the Architect. Your engineer’s suggestion that your foundation should have been underpinned as a part of our work is not feasible, as a failed foundation cannot be underpinned. I can only assume that your engineer is suggesting that we replace your foundation, which failed long before we started any work. With a foundation cracked all the way through and crumbling, even the mildest vibrations or a natural event, such as an earthquake, could cause movement of the structure. We have no issues with the property foundation on the west side of our construction, where the house has an intact foundation that can withstand earthquakes and the mild vibration of construction.

At any rate, we are meeting with the San Francisco Building Department to address the violation notice. You will be notified of the outcome of the meeting by the Building Department.

Sincerely,

Judith Thompson, CEO
THOMPSON BROOKS INC.
http://www.thompsonbrooks.com
http://www.houzz.com/pro/thompsonbrooksinc
The foundation of 651 Alvarado Street was aged but functional before the work at 655 Alvarado Street started. These photographs demonstrate the condition of the foundation was known by the Owner and General Contractor of 655 Alvarado Street. Despite the best efforts of a credible design, construction and ownership team the condition of 651 Alvarado Street's foundation has deteriorated as a result of the ongoing excavation at 655 Alvarado Street. The tenants were happy, the rear door was operable, the City of San Francisco Department of Building Inspection had not issued any violations. None of that is true now.

From: Mary Ferretti-breidinger [mailto:mferrettisf@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 31, 2017 12:16 PM
To: Diarmuid MacNeill <diarmuid@dolmen-engineers.net>; Johnbreidinger@gmail.com; john ferretti <JOHNFREDSF@yahoo.com>
Subject: Fwd: 651 Alvarado

[Quoted text hidden]

Mary Ferretti-breidinger <mferrettisf@gmail.com> Thu, Aug 31, 2017 at 1:26 PM
To: Diarmuid MacNeill <diarmuid@dolmen-engineers.net>

Diarmuid,
Thank you for the response. Your response was sent to me, John B and John F. Should I forward it to Judith and Jonathan (owner of 655 Alvarado) from me or from you.

Thanks, Mary

[Quoted text hidden]

Diarmuid MacNeill <diarmuid@dolmen-engineers.net>  Thu, Aug 31, 2017 at 1:29 PM
To: Mary Ferretti-breidinger <mferrettisf@gmail.com>

I would say yes

From: Mary Ferretti-breidinger [mailto:mferrettisf@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 31, 2017 1:27 PM
To: Diarmuid MacNeill <diarmuid@dolmen-engineers.net>
Subject: Re: 651 Alvarado

[Quoted text hidden]

Mary Ferretti-breidinger <mferrettisf@gmail.com>  Thu, Aug 31, 2017 at 1:58 PM
To: JAT@thompsonbrooks.com
Cc: john ferretti <JOHNFREDSF@yahoo.com>, Kaplan@fishsixrc.com, Diarmuid MacNeill <diarmuid@dolmen-engineers.net>

Dear Judith,

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

The foundation of 651 Alvarado Street was aged but functional before the work at 655 Alvarado Street started. These photographs demonstrate the condition of the foundation was known by the Owner and General Contractor of 655 Alvarado Street. Despite the best efforts of a credible design, construction and ownership team the condition of 651 Alvarado Street’s foundation has deteriorated as a result of the ongoing excavation at 655 Alvarado Street. The tenants were happy, the rear door was operable, the City of San Francisco Department of Building Inspection had not issued any violations. None of that is true now.

Mary

[Quoted text hidden]

Mary Ferretti-breidinger <mferrettisf@gmail.com>  Fri, Jan 5, 2018 at 5:31 PM
Mary Ferretti-breidinger <mferrettisf@gmail.com> Thu, Aug 31, 2017 at 12:16 PM

To: Diarmuid MacNeill <diarmuid@dolmen-engineers.net>, "Johnbreidinger@gmail.com" <Johnbreidinger@gmail.com>, john ferretti <JOHNFREDSF@yahoo.com>

Response from Judith

[Quoted text hidden]
Hi Diarmuid,
FYI...I am not sure if you have these photos. Judith forwarded these to me in August following your initial letter to her.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Diarmuid MacNeill" <diarmuid@dolmen-engineers.net>
Date: August 31, 2017 at 1:29:40 PM PDT
To: "Mary Ferretti-breiderger" <mferrettisf@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: 651 Alvarado

[Quoted text hidden]
**Permit Details Report**

**Report Date:** 9/14/2017 8:20:52 PM

**Application Number:** 201708043907

**Form Number:** 8

**Address(es):** 2803 / 028C / 0 655 ALVAREDO ST

**Description:** REVISION TO PA #201703161580 (ORIG PA #200912113061) - ADDING LANDSCAPING RETAINING WALLS @ REAR YARD.

**Cost:** $100,000.00

**Occupancy Code:** R-3

**Building Use:** 27 - 1 FAMILY DWELLING

### Disposition / Stage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Date</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/4/2017</td>
<td>TRIAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/4/2017</td>
<td>FILING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/4/2017</td>
<td>FILED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/4/2017</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/4/2017</td>
<td>ISSUED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contact Details:

**Contractor Details:**

- **License Number:** 483119
- **Name:** PATRICK DAVIS
- **Company Name:** THOMPSON BROOKS INC.
- **Address:** 151 VERMONT ST * SAN FRANCISCO CA 94103-0000
- **Phone:** 5812600

### Addenda Details:

**Description:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Arrive</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Hold</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Checked By</th>
<th>Hold Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>INTAKE</td>
<td>8/4/17</td>
<td>8/4/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>8/4/17</td>
<td>YIP JANET</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BLDG</td>
<td>8/4/17</td>
<td>8/4/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>8/4/17</td>
<td>PASION MAY</td>
<td>approved OTC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This permit has been issued. For information pertaining to this permit, please call 415-558-6096.

### Appointments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointment Date</th>
<th>Appointment AM/PM</th>
<th>Appointment Code</th>
<th>Appointment Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Time Slot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2017</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>VS</td>
<td>IVR Scheduled</td>
<td>REINFORCING STEEL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/15/2017</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>VS</td>
<td>IVR Scheduled</td>
<td>REINFORCING STEEL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Inspections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Date</th>
<th>Inspector</th>
<th>Inspection Description</th>
<th>Inspection Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2017</td>
<td>Michael (Yuet) Chan</td>
<td>REINFORCING STEEL</td>
<td>OK TO POUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2017</td>
<td>Joseph Duffy</td>
<td>REINFORCING STEEL</td>
<td>REINFORCING STEEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/15/2017</td>
<td>Steve Hajnal</td>
<td>REINFORCING STEEL</td>
<td>OK TO POUR, PARTIAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Special Inspections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addenda No.</th>
<th>Completed Date</th>
<th>Inspected By</th>
<th>Inspection Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

For information, or to schedule an inspection, call 558-6570 between 8:30 am and 3:00 pm.

Station Code Descriptions and Phone Numbers

**Online Permit and Complaint Tracking** home page.

**Technical Support for Online Services**

If you need help or have a question about this service, please visit our FAQ area.
NOTICE OF VIOLATION
of the San Francisco Municipal Codes Regarding Unsafe,
Substandard or Noncomplying Structure or Land or Occupancy

DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION
City and County of San Francisco
1600 Mission St. • San Francisco, CA 94103 - 2414

ADDRESS 651 alvarado st.

OCCUPANCY / USE R-3

DATE 8/29/17

BLOK 2903 LOT 0274

COMPLIANCE NUMBER

OCCURRING TYPE

☑️ FIRST NOTICE

☑️ SECOND NOTICE

☐ OTHER:

201799932

OWNER / AGENT

MAILING ADDRESS

PERSON CONTACTED @ SITE


VIOLATION DESCRIPTION

EXCAVATION ALONG NEIGHBORS EAST PROPERTY LINE (655 ALVARADO ST) HAS UNDERMINED YOUR WEST PROPERTY LINE FOUNDATION PER ENGINEER'S REPORT BY DOLLEN DATED 8/27/17.

CORRECTIVE ACTION

FILE A BUILDING PERMIT WITH PLANS BY close of business Friday 9/1/17.

☑️ 30

$1000

EVERY THURSDAY 7:30 - 8:30

415-558-6252

chester chiu
§ 3307 PROTECTION OF ADJOINING PROPERTY

3307.1 Insert a note at the end of this section as follows:

Protection required. Adjoining public and private property shall be protected from damage during construction, remodeling and demolition work. Protection must be provided for footings, foundations, party walls, chimneys, skylights, and roofs. Provisions shall be made to control water runoff and erosion during construction or demolition activities. The person making or causing an excavation to be made shall provide written notice to the owners of adjoining buildings advising them that the excavation is to be made and that the adjoining buildings should be protected. Said notification shall be delivered not less than 10 days prior to the scheduled starting date of the excavation.

Note: Other requirements for protection of adjacent property of adjacent and depth to which protection is requested are defined by California Civil Code Section 832, and is reprinted herein for convenience.

Section 832. Each coterminous owner is entitled to the lateral and subjacent support which his land receives from the adjoining land, subject to the right of the owner of the adjoining land to make proper and usual excavations on the same for purposes of construction or improvement, under the following conditions:
1. Any owner of land or his lessee intending to make or to permit an excavation shall give reasonable notice to the owner or owners of adjoining lands and of buildings or other structures, stating the depth to which such excavation is intended to be made, and when the excavating will begin.

2. In making any excavation, ordinary care and skill shall be used, and reasonable precautions taken to sustain the adjoining land as such, without regard to any building or other structure which may be thereon, and there shall be no liability for damage done to any such building or other structure by reason of the excavation, except as otherwise provided or allowed by law.

3. If at any time it appears that the excavation is to be of a greater depth than are the walls or foundations of any adjoining building or other structure, and is to be so close as to endanger the building or other structure in any way, then the owner of the building or other structure must be allowed at least 30 days, if he so desires, in which to take measures to protect the same from any damage, or in which to extend the foundations thereof, and he must be given for the same purposes reasonable license to enter on the land on which the excavation is to be or is being made.

4. If the excavation is intended to be or is deeper than the standard depth of foundations, which depth is defined to be a depth of nine feet below the adjacent curb level, at the point where the joint property line intersects the curb and if on the land of the coterminous owner there is any building or other structure the wall or foundation of which goes to standard depth or deeper then the owner of the land on which the excavation is being made shall, if given the necessary license to enter on the adjoining land, protect the said adjoining land and any such building or other structure thereon without cost to the owner thereof, from any damage by reason of the excavation, and shall be liable to the owner of such property for any such damage, excepting only for minor settlement cracks in buildings or other structures.
August 27, 2017

Attention: Mary Ferretti
444 Day Street
San Francisco CA 94131

Re: 651 Alvarado St., San Francisco

Dear Mary:

I visited your property at 651 Alvarado Street in San Francisco with John Breidinger at 2pm on 08/21. Some settlement of the building had been reported by tenants. John walked me through the basement and showed me a door that appeared to have moved recently. It had reportedly been closing and now was significantly far from closing. The rear (South) foundation appears to be rotating and displacing, primarily at the West side. Some newer cracks appear to be opening up in your slab.

Your neighbor at 655 Alvarado Street has excavated a significant hole directly adjacent to your property. Typically when this occurs the neighbor underpins the adjacent properties. Underpinning is the only way to avoid movement of your foundation once subjacent support is removed. It would also allow damage resulting from any minor settlement to be fixed without the concern that it would recur.

John and I met with Max Blakeley, the Project Superintendent with Thompson Brooks, General Contractors for the remodel and additions to 655 Alvarado Street. Max described the earth retention system that was engineered and constructed. While the work appeared to have been performed professionally there is simply no way that the system can retain the earth under your foundation without movement. The likelihood is that this settlement will continue during the course of construction but diminish as the project is completed. Some photographs of the conditions are added on the second page of this letter.

Sincerely,

Diarmuid Mac Neill
President
View of 651 Alvarado West Elevation showing neighbor's excavation

Large gap at basement door of 651 Alvarado Street
NOTICE OF VIOLATION FINAL WARNING

Dear Property Owner(s):

NOTICE OF VIOLATION OUTSTANDING:

On 08/29/2017 your property was inspected and/or a Notice of Violation was issued informing you of required code abatement, and warnings for failure to comply. The time period to correct all cited code violations indicated in this Notice has passed, and the Department records indicate that the required code abatement work remains outstanding. Your case has been referred to the Code Enforcement Division for enforcement.

ASSESSMENT OF COSTS NOW IMPOSED:

Therefore, pursuant to Section 102A.3 of the San Francisco Building Code you will be assessed costs arising from department time accrued pertaining but not limited to: (1) site inspections and reinspections, (2) case management, update, and data entry, (3) case inquiries (meetings, office visits, phone calls, emails, response to correspondence etc), (4) permit history research, (5) notice/hearing preparation, (6) staff appearances/reports at hearings, (7) case referrals, and (8) monthly violation monitoring.

AVOID FURTHER ASSESSMENT:

To keep the assessment of costs at a minimum, and avoid the accrual of further time spent on the actions above such as administrative hearing preparation, and monthly violation monitoring, etc., please complete all work within thirty (30) days. Contact the Code Enforcement Division at (415) 558-6454 if you have questions concerning the referenced Notice of Violation.

IF PERMITS ARE REQUIRED:

Please note that you must also obtain all necessary building, plumbing, and/or electrical permits. Obtain final sign-off from the Building Inspector on the building job card and sign-offs from the Plumbing or Electrical Inspectors for the plumbing permit or for the electrical permit. Otherwise, the work will be deemed incomplete.

CASE WILL BE CLOSED WHEN ALL WORK & ASSESSMENT OF COSTS PAID:

This case will not be closed and assessment of costs will continue to accrue until (1) all required work is completed as verified by site inspections, (2) final sign-offs are obtained for all required permits, and (3) all assessment of costs are paid.

YOUR PROMPT ACTION IS REQUESTED & APPRECIATED!
**Property Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>651 ALVARADO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block/Lot</td>
<td>2803/028C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Construction Date</td>
<td>1925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building Occupancy:** D

**Other possible addresses for this location:**

**Applicant Information**

| First Name | MARY ***INTAKE*** |
| Last Name | FERRETTI |
| Company | |
| Phone | 4154019438 Ext |
| Alt. Phone | Ext |
| E-mail | |

**Request Information**

- **Processed By:** JPURDY
- **Date Received:** 09/18/2017
- **Ready Date:** 10/16/2017
- **Until Date:** 10/30/2017
- **Completed Date:** 10/03/2017
- **Final Date:** 10/03/2017
- **Voided Date:** 10/03/2017
- **Turnaround Time:** 11

**Duplication for Plans**

| Duplication | Yes or No |
| Mailed date | |
| Owner | |
| 35MM: | $0.00 |
| Pvision Plans: | $0.00 |
| Design Prof: | |

**View Only**

- **Aperture Cards:** 0
- **Diazio Cards:** 0
- **Rolls:** 0
- **DivApps:** 0
- **Pvision Permits:** 0
- **Pvision Plans:** 0

**Printed Copies**

- **Aperture Cards:** $0.00
- **Pvision Permits:** $0.00
- **16MM:** $0.00
- **Certification:** $0.00

**Additional Comments**

Spoke with customer, she requests all permits from 2009-present. All records printed, she will pick up. 10/3 - JP

**Payment Amount**

- **Customer Completed Date:** 10/03/2017
- **Total:** 0.00
- **Deposit or adjustment:** 0.00
- **Balance due:** 0.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Printed Copy Paid Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aperture Cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Payments Applied**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receipt</th>
<th>Payment date</th>
<th>Payor</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Issued By</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RR030531</td>
<td>10/3/2017</td>
<td>MARY <em><strong>INTAKE</strong></em> FERRETTI</td>
<td>651 ALVARADO SAN FRANCISCO CA 94114</td>
<td>JKWONG</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
September 23, 2017

Dear Judith and Jonathan,

In Judith's last email (response to my request to have a meeting with owner(s) of Thompson and Brooks, the Project owner and engineers) Judith stated you would be meeting with the San Francisco Building Department to address the Violation Notice and would hear back. It has been 3 weeks and I have not received further contact from you.

I was hoping to have the following questions addressed at the meeting, but since that did not come to be, I am addressing them to you.

1. Where have you excavated and are there any plans to further excavate?
2. Did you excavate bedrock?
3. What measures have you done and are planning to do to protect my building?
4. What is the projected time of completion?

In order to move forward, I went to the the San Francisco Building Department to view all Building Permit Application No. 2009-12-11-3061 Permits and Drawings. The drawings I have, provided by your Architect(s) and the San Francisco Building Department do not reflect what you are doing. It is very confusing to me to interpret via their computer screen. The San Francisco Building Department provided me with a Affidavit of Owner form for the owner of building/project to complete and notarize so the Building Department can release copies of the plans of the project to me. I have attached a copy of the form. I would appreciate it if you would please complete it and return to address 444 Day St. S.F. CA 94131.

I appreciate your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Mary Ferretti
AFFIDAVIT OF OWNER

I hereby certify that Mary Ferretti has my authorization to obtain copies of plans of my building located at 655 Alvarado St. S.F. CA 94114

PROPERTY ADDRESS

*PRINT PROPERTY OWNER'S NAME

Jonathan Kaplan

PROPERTY OWNER'S TELEPHONE NUMBER

601-3549 (Marci)

PROPERTY OWNER ACKNOWLEDGMENT

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document, to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

State of California
County of ____________________________

On ____________________________ before me, (insert name and title of the officer)

personally appeared ____________________________, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature ____________________________ (Seal)

X

PROPERTY OWNER'S Wet Signature Only

RR # ____________________________ OFFICE USE ONLY

No Fax, Email, or Copies Accepted

Records Management Division
1660 Mission Street– San Francisco CA 94103
**Records Request Form**

**Records Management Division**

**Department of Building Inspection**

1500 Mission St., 4th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103

Phone: (415) 558-6080  FAX (415) 575-5875  www.sfdbi.org

**Ready 10/13/2017 until 10/27/2017**

Monday-Friday, business hours 7:30 AM - 4:00 PM

Request unavailable two weeks after ready date.

**Property Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address: 655 ALVARADO ST</th>
<th>Building Occupancy: D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block/Lot: 2803/028C</td>
<td>New Construction Date: 1925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other addresses for this location:

**Applicant Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>MARY <em><strong>INTAKE</strong></em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>FERRETTI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>415-401-9438 Ext</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. Phone</td>
<td>Ext</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Address | 651 ALVARADO |
| City | SAN FRANCISCO |
| State | CA |
| Zip Code | 94114 |

**Building Records**

Requested documents for **View** OR **Print**. All jobs $100.01-$199.99 require prior authorization to printing. Initial if you agree to print: All jobs $200.00 and over require deposit prior to printing. Once the deposit is received, we will call the customer when ready.

- Original Building Permit (New Construction)  
  - Front & Back  
  - All Sheets  
  - ALL Electrical Permits  

- ALL Building Permit Applications  
  - Front & Back  
  - All Sheets  
  - ALL Plumbing/Mechanical Permits  

- ALL Building Permit Job Cards  
  - ALL Advertisement Sign Permit Applications  

- Certificate of Final Completion and Occupancy  
  - ALL  
  - NC  
  - Notice of Violations/Complaints  
  - All  
  - Active  
  - Inact  

**Specific documents by Permit Application**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Application 201708043907 Building</th>
<th>Front &amp; Back Of</th>
<th>All Sheets</th>
<th>Job Card</th>
<th>CFC</th>
<th>Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permit Application 201706199683 Building</td>
<td>Front &amp; Back Of</td>
<td>All Sheets</td>
<td>Job Card</td>
<td>CFC</td>
<td>Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Application</td>
<td>Front &amp; Back Of</td>
<td>All Sheets</td>
<td>Job Card</td>
<td>CFC</td>
<td>Plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Specific documents by Date Range**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Date:</th>
<th>To Date:</th>
<th>Year:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit</td>
<td>Front &amp; Back Of</td>
<td>All Sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>Job Card</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building Plans**

ALL BUILDING PLAN REQUESTS ARE FOR VIEW FIRST ONLY. Duplication requires permission from the property owner and design professional. Do you own the requested property? **YES**  **NO** Once plans are viewed at our office, Duplication of Plans may be requested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Building Plans (New Const.)</th>
<th>ALL Building Plans</th>
<th>Architectural Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural Plans</td>
<td>Elevation Plans</td>
<td>Mechanical Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL Plumbing Plans</td>
<td>ALL Electrical Plans</td>
<td>Life Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Sprinkler</td>
<td>ALL Advertisement Sign Plans</td>
<td>Other:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Comments**

pls email vendor, pls call customer when ready to view

---

FW: Neighbors struts
3 messages

Judith Thompson <JAT@thompsonbrooks.com>             Wed, Nov 15, 2017 at 12:07 PM
To: Mary Ferretti-breidinger <mferrettisf@gmail.com>
Cc: Patrick Davis <patrick@thompsonbrooks.com>

Mary. Fyi here are some photos of the struts, which were installed today. As you know, Jack from Sunshine will obtain a permit for the further work suggested by Diarmuid. I’m glad we were able to come to some resolution on this matter. We will be in touch once we have the drawings required for the permit.

Sincerely,

Judith Thompson, CEO

THOMPSON BROOKS INC.

http://www.thompsonbrooks.com

http://www.houzz.com/pro/thompsonbrooksinc

415-581-2600
Mary Ferretti-breidinger <mferrettisf@gmail.com> Wed, Nov 15, 2017 at 2:19 PM
To: diarmuid@dolmen-engineers.net, John Breidinger <johnbreidinger@gmail.com>, Johnny Ferretti <johnfredsf@yahoo.com>

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Judith Thompson <JAT@thompsonbrooks.com>
Date: November 15, 2017 at 12:07:40 PM PST
You selected:
Address: 655 ALVARADO ST  Block/Lot: 2803 / 028C

Please select among the following links, the type of permit for which to view address information:
Electrical Permits  Plumbing Permits  Building Permits  Complaints

(Building permits matching the selected address.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit #</th>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Street #</th>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Current Stage</th>
<th>Stage Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017060439907</td>
<td>2803</td>
<td>028C</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>ALVARADO ST</td>
<td></td>
<td>ISSUED</td>
<td>08/04/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017061995663</td>
<td>2803</td>
<td>028C</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>ALVARADO ST</td>
<td></td>
<td>ISSUED</td>
<td>06/19/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M756167</td>
<td>2803</td>
<td>028C</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>ALVARADO ST</td>
<td></td>
<td>ISSUED</td>
<td>06/02/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201705197112</td>
<td>2803</td>
<td>028C</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>ALVARADO ST</td>
<td></td>
<td>ISSUED</td>
<td>05/23/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201703161880</td>
<td>2803</td>
<td>028C</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>ALVARADO ST</td>
<td></td>
<td>ISSUED</td>
<td>05/04/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017020666661</td>
<td>2803</td>
<td>028C</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>ALVARADO ST</td>
<td></td>
<td>ISSUED</td>
<td>03/01/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M7433567</td>
<td>2803</td>
<td>028C</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>ALVARADO ST</td>
<td></td>
<td>ISSUED</td>
<td>12/05/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009121133361</td>
<td>2803</td>
<td>028C</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>ALVARADO ST</td>
<td></td>
<td>ISSUED</td>
<td>09/29/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200810077019</td>
<td>2803</td>
<td>028C</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>ALVARADO ST</td>
<td></td>
<td>COMPLETE</td>
<td>02/28/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200811014554</td>
<td>2803</td>
<td>028C</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>ALVARADO ST</td>
<td></td>
<td>COMPLETE</td>
<td>01/31/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200210219506</td>
<td>2803</td>
<td>028C</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>ALVARADO ST</td>
<td></td>
<td>COMPLETE</td>
<td>01/23/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9905430</td>
<td>2803</td>
<td>028C</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>ALVARADO ST</td>
<td></td>
<td>COMPLETE</td>
<td>10/21/1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9910533</td>
<td>2803</td>
<td>028C</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>ALVARADO ST</td>
<td></td>
<td>COMPLETE</td>
<td>10/21/1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8917262</td>
<td>2803</td>
<td>028C</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>ALVARADO ST</td>
<td></td>
<td>COMPLETE</td>
<td>10/10/1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8920590</td>
<td>2803</td>
<td>028C</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>ALVARADO ST</td>
<td></td>
<td>COMPLETE</td>
<td>10/10/1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8916806</td>
<td>2803</td>
<td>028C</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>ALVARADO ST</td>
<td></td>
<td>COMPLETE</td>
<td>11/14/1989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Online Permit and Complaint Tracking home page.

Technical Support for Online Services
If you need help or have a question about this service, please visit our FAQ area.

Contact SFGov  Accessibility  Policies  
City and County of San Francisco © 2017
Monday, October 02, 2017

Diarmuid Mac Neill, President
Dolmen Consulting Engineers, Inc.
2595 Mission St., Ste. 200
San Francisco, CA 94110

Re: 651/655 Alvarado Street

Dear Diarmuid:

Thompson Brooks is the General Contractor for the project taking place at 655 Alvarado St. We are in receipt of your report dated August 27, 2017 regarding the reported settlement of the property located at 651 Alvarado St. due to our construction activities. We do not agree that our activities have contributed to any alleged settlement taking place at 651 Alvarado St.

To give you some background on the project:

- Thompson Brooks first discovered the crumbling foundation at the rental property at 651 Alvarado St. in late December 2016. Attached are some dated photos showing the existing crumbling foundation.
- In January 2017, we contacted Luk & Associates to install markers and take a baseline survey reading of the neighbor's house before we began any concrete demo.
- In April 2017, per the neighbor’s request, our site Superintendent and myself met with the Breidingers to review alleged water infiltration in their Garage. It was discussed that the minor water intrusion was most likely due to the poor condition of their siding, and that flashing between the two properties would be reinstalled as part of the project at 655 Alvarado St. It was also confirmed at that time by the Breidingers that the foundation cracks were existing and that an attempt at repairs had been made at some point in time.
- In August 2017, we received the NOV from the SFDBI and a copy of your report.

Upon receipt of the NOV, we contacted Luk & Associates to conduct another site survey to determine if the adjoining property had moved. The results, which are attached for your use, show that no movement has occurred to 651 Alvarado between January and August 2017.

Our understanding from the SFDBI is that two NOVs were issued, one for 655 Alvarado (201799932) and one for 651 Alvarado (201702562). Due to the NOV issued for 655 Alvarado, the structural portion of the project at 655 Alvarado cannot start again as the SFDBI has stated no work can occur at the property line shared by the two structures. We have attached two letters, one from the Shoring Engineer, DJ Engineers & Associates, and the second from The Structural Engineer of Record, GFDS Engineers. Both letters state the need to continue the structural portion of the project in a timely fashion. The reasons
sting crumbling foundation
in the SE corner of 651 Arado.
On December 11, 2009, the Applicant named below filed Building Permit Application No. 2009.12.11.3061 (Alteration) with the City and County of San Francisco.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTACT INFORMATION</th>
<th>PROJECT SITE INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant: Ken Linsteadt</td>
<td>Project Address: 655 Alvarado Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 3407 Sacramento Street</td>
<td>Cross Streets: Beaver &amp; Castro Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, State: San Francisco, CA 94118</td>
<td>Assessor’s Block /Lot #: 2803/028C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Height-Bulk District: 40-X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under San Francisco Planning Code Section 311, you, as a property owner or resident within 150 feet of this proposed project, are being notified of this Building Permit Application. You are not obligated to take any action. For more information regarding the proposed work, or to express concerns about the project, please contact the Applicant above or the Planner named below as soon as possible. If your concerns are unresolved, you can request the Planning Commission to use its discretionary powers to review this application at a public hearing. Applications requesting a Discretionary Review hearing must be filed during the 30-day review period, prior to the close of business on the Expiration Date shown below, or the next business day if that date is on a week-end or a legal holiday. If no Requests for Discretionary Review are filed, this project will be approved by the Planning Department after the Expiration Date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT SCOPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ] DEMOLITION and/or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[X] VERTICAL EXTENSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] HORIZ. EXTENSION (FRONT)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT FEATURES</th>
<th>EXISTING CONDITION</th>
<th>PROPOSED CONDITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING DEPTH</td>
<td>+48 feet, 3 inches</td>
<td>+74 feet, 3 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAR YARD</td>
<td>+65 feet, 9 inches</td>
<td>+39 feet, 9 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEIGHT OF BUILDING (AT FRONT)</td>
<td>+123 feet</td>
<td>+32 feet (from curb to top of parapet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF STORIES</td>
<td>2 over basement level</td>
<td>3 over basement level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS ON PROPERTY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF OFF-STREET PARKING SPACES</td>
<td>At least 1</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The subject property is a steeply down sloping lot that contains two-story, single-family dwelling with a basement level below. The project is to construct a two-story over basement level horizontal rear extension, and add a new third story that is setback 15 feet from the existing front building wall. Please see attached plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLANNER’S NAME: Adrian C. Putra
PHONE NUMBER: (415) 575-9079
EMAIL: adrian.putra@sfgov.org
DATE OF THIS NOTICE: 12-13-10
EXPIRATION DATE: 1-12-11
NOTICE OF BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION
GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT PROCEDURES

Reduced copies of the site plan and elevations (exterior walls), and floor plans (where applicable) of the proposed project, including the position of any adjacent buildings, exterior dimensions, and finishes, and a graphic reference scale, have been included in this mailing for your information. Please discuss any questions with the project Applicant listed on the reverse. You may wish to discuss the plans with your neighbors and neighborhood association or improvement club, as they may already be aware of the project. Immediate neighbors to the project, in particular, are likely to be familiar with it.

Any general questions concerning this application review process may be answered by the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, 1st Floor (415/558-6377) between 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. Please phone the Planner listed on the reverse of this sheet with questions specific to this project.

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

1. Seek a meeting with the project sponsor and the architect to get more information, and to explain the project's impact on you and to seek changes in the plans.

2. Call the nonprofit organization Community Boards at (415) 920-3820. They are specialists in conflict resolution through mediation and can often help resolve substantial disagreement in the permitting process so that no further action is necessary.

3. Where you have attempted, through the use of the above steps, or other means, to address potential problems without success, call the assigned project planner whose name and phone number are shown at the lower left corner on the reverse side of this notice, to review your concerns.

If, after exhausting the procedures outlined above, you still believe that exceptional and extraordinary circumstances exist, you have the option to request that the Planning Commission exercise its discretionary powers to review the project. These powers are reserved for use in exceptional and extraordinary circumstances for projects, which generally conflict with the City's General Plan and the Priority Policies of the Planning Code; therefore the Commission exercises its discretion with utmost restraint. This procedure is called Discretionary Review. If you believe the project warrants Discretionary Review by the Planning Commission over the permit application, you must make such request within 30 days of this notice, prior to the Expiration Date shown on the reverse side, by completing an application (available at the Planning Department, 1660 Mission Street, 1st Floor, or on-line at www.sfplanning.org). You must submit the application to the Planning Information Center (PIC) during the hours between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., with all required materials, and a check, for each Discretionary Review request payable to the Planning Department. To determine the fee for a Discretionary Review, please refer to the Planning Department Fee Schedule available at www.sfplanning.org or at the PIC located at 1660 Mission Street, First Floor, San Francisco. For questions related to the Fee Schedule, please call the PIC at (415) 558-6377. If the project includes multi 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 approval (or denial) of the permit application by the Planning Department or Planning Commission may be made to the Board of Appeals within 15 days after the permit is issued (or denied) by the Superintendent of the Department of Building Inspection. Submit an application form in person at the Board's office at 1650 Mission Street, 3rd Floor, Room 304. For further information about appeals to the Board of Appeals, including their current fees, contact the Board of Appeals at (415) 575-6880.
DATE: September 12, 2011
TO: Interested Parties
FROM: Linda D. Avery
Planning Commission Secretary
RE: Planning Commission Action – No. DRA – 0225

Property Address: 655 Alvarado Street
Building Permit Application No.: 2009.12.11.3061
Discretionary Review Case No.: 2011.0082D

On September 8, 2011, the Planning Commission conducted a Discretionary Review hearing to consider the following project:

655 ALVARADO STREET – south side between Diamond and Castro Streets; Lot 028C in Assessor’s Block 2803 – Request for Discretionary Review of Building Permit Application No. 2009.12.11.3061, proposing is to construct a three-story horizontal rear extension that involves adding a rear addition at the existing first floor and basement level, creating a new second basement level (under the proposed basement extension), and constructing a one-story vertical extension to a two-story over basement, single-family dwelling within the RH-2 (Residential, House, Two-Family) Zoning District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

ACTION

The Commission did not take Discretionary Review and approved the project but also urged the Project Sponsor to have dialog with the DR Requestor and concerned neighbors on outstanding issues and with Department staff concerning building color and bird-safety glass.

FINDINGS

The reasons the Commission took the action described above include:

There are no extraordinary or exceptional circumstances in the case. The proposal complies with the Planning Code, the General Plan, and conforms to the Residential Design Guidelines. However, the Commission wants to ensure that the Project Sponsor works with staff on building color and complying with bird-safety controls. Additionally, the Commission wants to ensure that the Project Sponsor has continued dialog with DR Requestor and concerned neighbors.

Speakers at the hearing included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In support of the project</th>
<th>In support of the DR request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Babac Doan</td>
<td>Mary Ferretti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ayes: Commissioners Olague, Miguel, Antonini, Moore, Sugaya, and Fong.

Nayes: None

Absent: Commissioner Borden

Case Planner: Adrian C. Putra, (415) 575-9079

You can appeal the Commission’s action to the Board of Appeals by appealing the issuance of the permit. Please contact the Board of Appeals at (415) 575-6880 for further information regarding the appeals process.

cc: Linda D. Avery
On December 11, 2009, the Applicant named below filed Building Permit Application No. 2009.12.11.3061 with the City and County of San Francisco.

**PROPERTY INFORMATION**

- **Project Address:** 655 Alvarado Street
- **Cross Street(s):** Beaver & Castro Streets
- **Block/Lot No.:** 2803/028C
- **Zoning District(s):** RH-2 / 40-X

**APPICANT INFORMATION**

- **Applicant:** Holey Associates
- **Address:** 5715 Claremont Avenue
- **City, State:** Oakland, CA 94618
- **Telephone:** (415) 509-7979

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

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

**PROJECT SCOPE**

- ☐ Demolition
- ☐ New Construction
- ☐ Alteration
- ☐ Change of Use
- ✓ Façade Alteration(s)
- ✓ Front Addition
- ✓ Rear Addition
- ◼ Side Addition
- ✓ Vertical Addition

**PROJECT FEATURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Use</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback</td>
<td>±3 feet, 5 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Depth</td>
<td>±48 feet, 3 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard</td>
<td>±65 feet, 9 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>29'-6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Stories</td>
<td>2 over basement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Dwelling Units</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Parking Spaces</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The proposal is for a one-story vertical addition, three-story horizontal addition and a two-story permitted rear yard obstruction (Per Planning Code Section 136(c)(25)) to an existing two-story-over-basement single-family residence. The project also includes infill of the front porch and interior remodelling. This permit was originally noticed in accordance with Planning Code Section 311 from 12/13/2010 to 1/12/2011.

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

For more information, please contact Planning Department staff:

Planner: Jeff Horn
Telephone: (415) 575-6925
E-mail: Jeffrey.horn@sfgov.org

Notice Date: 1/6/16
Expiration Date: 2/5/16

中文詢問請電：(415) 575-9010
Para información en Español llamar al: (415) 575-9010
GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT PROCEDURES

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

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

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

If, after exhausting the procedures outlined above, you still believe that exceptional and extraordinary circumstances exist, you have the option to request that the Planning Commission exercise its discretionary powers to review the project. These powers are reserved for use in exceptional and extraordinary circumstances for projects which generally conflict with the City’s General Plan and the Priority Policies of the Planning Code; therefore the Commission exercises its discretion with utmost restraint. This procedure is called Discretionary Review. If you believe the project warrants Discretionary Review by the Planning Commission, you must file a Discretionary Review application prior to the Expiration Date shown on the front of this notice. Discretionary Review applications are available at the Planning Information Center (PIC), 1660 Mission Street, 1st Floor, or online at www.sfplanning.org. You must submit the application in person at the Planning Information Center (PIC) between 8:00am - 5:00pm Monday-Friday, with all required materials and a check payable to the Planning Department. To determine the fee for a Discretionary Review, please refer to the Planning Department Fee Schedule available at www.sfplanning.org. If the project includes multiple building permits, i.e. demolition and new construction, a separate request for Discretionary Review must be submitted, with all required materials and fee, for each permit that you feel will have an impact on you.

Incomplete applications will not be accepted.

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

BOARD OF APPEALS

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

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

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

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

- **Project Site**
- **Construction Plan Legend**
  - Existing Wall to Remain
  - New Wall 2x6 WD Framing
  - New Wall 2x4 WD Framing
  - Demo Wall, Door, Window, etc.
  - Doorway
  - Elevation Reference
  - Auditorium

**Area Calculations**

- **Proposed Basement Level:** 1151 SQ. FT.
- **Proposed First Level:** 1463 SQ. FT.
- **Proposed Second Level:** 1405 SQ. FT.
- **Proposed Third Level:** 1278 SQ. FT.
- **Proposed Fourth Level:** 511 SQ. FT.
- **Proposed Total:** 5096 SQ. FT.

**Existing Area**

- **Existing First Level:** 613 SQ. FT.
- **Existing Second Level:** 1125 SQ. FT.
- **Existing Third Level:** 999 SQ. FT.
- **Existing Total:** 3737 SQ. FT.

**Building Code Data**

- **2017 California Building Code**
- **2017 CALG Building Code**
- **2017 CALG Plumbing Code**
- **2017 CALG Electrical Code**
- **2017 San Francisco Code Amendments**
- **2013 San Francisco Street Code Amendments**

**Project Description**

The building permits required to construct this building include:... (continues)

**Project Directory**

- **Architect/Engineer:** Zachary Maddrey
- **Structural Engineer:** Jonathan Kaplan & Marci Glazer
- **Energy Consultant:** Rick's Energy Solutions
- **MEP Engineer:** MHC Engineers
- **Geotechnical Engineer:** Rockridge Geotechnical

**Index of Drawings**

- A0.1: Cover Sheet, Site Plan
- A0.2: Existing Site Plan
- A0.3: Existing Site Plan
- A0.4: SF Zoning Code Building Setback Diagram
- A0.5: SF Zoning Code Height Bulk Diagram
- A2.0: Proposed Basement Level Plan
- A2.1: Existing First Level Plan
- A2.2: Proposed First Level Plan
- A2.3: Proposed Second Level Plan
- A2.4: Proposed Second Level Plan
- A2.5: Proposed Third Level Plan
- A2.6: Proposed Third Level Plan
- A2.7: Existing Roof Plan
- A2.8: Proposed Roof Plan
- A2.9: Proposed Roof Plan
- A3.1: Existing North and South Elevations
- A3.2: Proposed North and South Elevations
- A3.3: Existing East Elevations
- A3.4: Proposed East Elevations
- A3.5: Existing West Elevations
- A3.6: Proposed West Elevations

**Cover Sheet, Site Plan & Project Info**

- **Sheet:** A0.1
- **Scale:** 1/5" = 1'-0"
EXISTING ROOF PLAN
1 | EXISTING NORTH ELEVATION

2 | EXISTING SOUTH ELEVATION

SCALE: 3/16" = 1'-0"