# DISCRETIONARY REVIEW ABBREVIATED ANALYSIS 

## HEARING DATE：November 4， 2021

| Record No．： | 2018－003779DRP－02 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Project Address： | 619 22 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue |
| Permit Applications：2018．0315．3729 |  |
| Zoning： | RH－2［Residential House－Two Family］ 40－X Height and Bulk District |
| Block／Lot： | 1622／ 002 |
| Project Sponsor： | Roberta Wahl |
|  | Plum Architects |
|  | 936 Clement Street |
|  | San Francisco，CA 94118 |
| Staff Contact： | David Winslow－（628）652－7335 david．winslow＠sfgov．org］ |

Recommendation：Do Not Take DR and Approve

## Project Description

The project proposes to construct a rear horizontal addition at the first and second stories（totaling 266 square feet），and a two－story vertical addition（totaling 1，974 square feet）to create a new second unit to the existing single－family dwelling．The new 3rd floor level will align with the existing building while the new 4th floor will be set back approximately 16 feet from the front property line and 55 feet from the rear property line．Roof decks are also proposed at the rear of the two－story addition．

## Site Description and Present Use

The site is a $25^{\prime}$ wide $\times 120^{\prime}$ deep slightly lateral sloping key lot containing an existing 2－story，single family home． The existing building is a Category＇C＇－No historic resource built in 1922.

## Surrounding Properties and Neighborhood

The buildings on this block of $22^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue are predominantly 3 －stories with a handful of 2 －and 4 story buildings． Due to the depth of existing lots and the configuration of existing surrounding buildings the rear yards combine
to provide generous mid-block open space. The adjacent 3-story corner building to the north occupies almost the entirety of its lot. The adjacent building to the south is 3 -stories at the rear.

## Building Permit Notification

| Type | Required <br> Period | Notification <br> Dates | DR File Date | DR Hearing Date | Filing to Hearing <br> Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 311 Notice | 30 days | July 22, 2021- <br> August 23, 2021 | August 19, 2021 | November 4.2021 | 77 days |

## Hearing Notification

| Type | Required <br> Period | Required Notice <br> Date | Actual Notice Date | Actual Period |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Posted Notice | 20 days | October 16,2021 | October 16, 2021 | 20 days |
| Mailed Notice | 20 days | October 16,2021 | October 16,2021 | 20 days |
| Online Notice | 20 days | October 16,2021 | October 16,2021 | 20 days |

## Public Comment

|  | Support | Opposed | No Position |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjacent neighbor(s) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other neighbors on the block or <br> directly across the street | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Neighborhood groups | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## Environmental Review

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

## DR Requestors

1. Adam Schnal, resident of the adjacent property.
2. James Yu of $62322^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue, resident of the adjacent property to the south of the proposed project.

## DR Requestor's Concerns and Proposed Alternatives

DR requestor \#1 is concerned that:

1. The project does not meet the standards of the Planning Code or the Residential Design Guidelines
2. Plum Architects is not licensed in the State of California.
3. The height of the proposed project will make it the tallest building and impact the aesthetics of the neighborhood.
4. An environmental review should have been required.
5. A potential previous construction accident was not considered in the Planning Department's review of this project.
6. The proposal fails to address parking requirements of increased occupancy.
7. Because of the deficiencies cited above this violates substantive and procedural due process.

## Proposed alternatives:

1. Reduce the proposed addition from 2 additional stories plus observation deck to a single additional story.

See attached Discretionary Review Application, dated August 19, 2021.

DR requestor \#2 is concerned that the proposed project has severe side effects on his physical and mental health because it will block all light and air into his kitchen bedroom and living room:

## Proposed alternatives:

1. Modify the design to provide more light air flow and visibility to home.

See attached Discretionary Review Application, dated August 19, 2021.

## Project Sponsor's Response to DR Application

The proposed addition meets the Planning Code and Residential Design Guidelines. This is not an exceptional interpretation of the City's development standards as five of the 12 lots in the immediate area are already 4 -stories. The project Sponsor conducted a Pre-Application meeting with residents, along with the 311 notification. The project made several setbacks and matched the neighbor's lightwell in consideration of the issues raised by neighbors related to light and air. As shadow study indicated modest impacts in the winter months to the $2^{\text {nd }}$ and $3^{\text {rd }}$ floors of $60922^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue.

See attached Responses to Discretionary Reviews, dated September 30, 2021

## Department Review

The Planning Department's review of this proposal confirms support for this project as it conforms to the Code and the Residential Design Guidelines.

Roberta Wahl is a licensed principal architect for Plum Architects. Firms are not required to be licensed, only individuals are.

There are other 4-story buildings on this block with setbacks similar to this one.
An environmental review was conducted and deemed to be a Categorical Exemption - Included in case report packet.

There are no records of previous construction. Whether previous construction was warranted by issuance of permits or not, no complaints until now have been made either for the construction or the demolition of this structure.

Parking is not required by the Planning Code in acknowledgment of the various transportation options people have and the transit-first priority established by the City. However, the garage of this project could accommodate four cars.

The information on the drawings that were sent out for neighborhood notification were complete per the Department's standards.

The Department carefully reviews, considers, and recommends measures to protect light and air to adjacent properties - especially in sensitive situations such as key lot conditions. The articulation and setbacks of the proposed building were prescribed to respond to the adjacent conditions. The 4th Floor is set back $16^{\prime}-2^{\prime \prime}$ from the front building wall, $5^{\prime}-1$ " from the north side property line and $4^{\prime}-1$ from the south side. The third-story reciprocates the southern neighbors' light well. The rear wall extends no further than the current existing building, but side spaces are filled in to align with the south neighbor's rear building wall.

The Residential Design Guidelines consider the prevailing height of surrounding buildings as they define a scale at the street and rear yard. In this case because the adjacent corner building is three stories at the street face a three-story building at the street face is acceptable. The fourth story is set back to render it minimally visible.

Therefore, staff deems there are no exceptional or extraordinary circumstances.

## Recommendation: Do Not Take DR and Approve

## Attachments:

Block Book Map
Sanborn Map
Zoning Map
Aerial Photographs
Context Photographs
Section 311 Notice
CEQA Determination
DR Applications
Responses to DR Applications, dated September 30, 2021
311 plans

## Exhibits

Discretionary Review Hearing Case Number 2018-003779DRP-02

## Parcel Map

BALBOA


Discretionary Review Hearing
Case Number 2018-003779DRP-02
$61922^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue

## Sanborn Map*


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

## Zoning Map



## Aerial Photo



Discretionary Review Hearing
Case Number 2018-003779DRP-02
$61922^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue

## Aerial Photo



Discretionary Review Hearing

## Aerial Photo



## Aerial Photo



Discretionary Review Hearing
Case Number 2018-003779DRP-02
$61922^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue

## Site Photo



Discretionary Review Hearing Case Number 2018-003779DRP-02 619 22 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue

## NOTICE OF BULDING PERMIT APPLICATION ［SECTION 311］

On 3／15／2018，Building Permit Application No．201803153729S was filed for work at the Project Address below．

Notice Date：7／22／21
Expiration Date：8／23／21

## APPLICANT INFORMATION

Applicant：Keiming Yen c／o Roberta Wahl，Architect
Address： 936 Clement Street
City，State：San Francisco，CA 94118
Telephone：（415）837－0900
Email：roberta＠plumarchitects．com

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

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

| PROJECT SCOPEDemolitionChange of UseRear AdditionNew ConstructionFaçade Alteration（s）Side AdditionAlterationFront AdditionVertical Addition | PROJECT FEATURES | Existing | Proposed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Building Use： | Residential | No change |
|  | Front Setback： | None | No change |
|  | Side Setbacks： | None | No Change |
|  | Building Depth： | 74 feet | No change |
|  | Rear Yard： | 46 feet | No change |
|  | Building Height： | 20 feet | 40 feet |
|  | Number of Stories： | 2 | 4 |
|  | Number of Dwelling Units | 1 | 2 |
|  | Number of Parking Spaces | 2 tandem | No change |
| PROJECT DESCRIPTION |  |  |  |
| The project includes：（1）rear horizontal additions at the first and second stories（totaling 266 square feet），and（2）a two－story vertical addition（totaling 1,974 square feet）to create a new second unit to the existing single family dwelling．The new $3^{\text {rd }}$ floor level will align with the existing building while the new $4^{\text {th }}$ floor will be set back approximately 16 feet from the front property line and 55 feet from the rear property line．Roof decks are also proposed at the rear of the two－story addition． |  |  |  |

To view plans or related documents，visit sfplanning．org／notices and search the Project Address listed above．
For more information，please contact Planning Department staff：
Planner：Mary Woods Telephone：628．652．7350 Email：mary．woods＠sfgov．org

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

Reduced copies of the proposed project plans have been included in this mailing for your information. If you have questions about the plans, please contact the project Applicant listed on the front of this notice. You may wish to discuss the plans with your neighbors or neighborhood association, as they may already be aware of the project. If you have specific questions about the proposed project, you should contact the planner listed on the front of this notice. If you have general questions about the Planning Department's review process, contact the Planning counter at the Permit Center via email at pic@sfgov.org.

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

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

If, after exhausting the procedures outlined above, you still believe that exceptional and extraordinary circumstances exist, you have the option to request that the Planning Commission exercise its discretionary powers to review the project. These powers are reserved for use in exceptional and extraordinary circumstances for projects that conflict with the City's General Plan and the Priority Policies of the Planning Code; therefore the Commission exercises its discretion with utmost restraint. This procedure is called Discretionary Review ("DR"). If you believe the project warrants Discretionary Review by the Planning Commission, you must file a DR Application prior to the Expiration Date shown on the front of this notice.

To file a DR Application, you must:

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

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

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. The Board of Appeals is accepting appeals via e-mail. For further information about appeals to the Board of Appeals, including current fees, contact the Board of Appeals at (628) 652-1150.

## Environmental Review

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

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

## CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination

## PROPERTY INFORMATION／PROJECT DESCRIPTION

| Project Address | Block／Lot（s） |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 619 22ND AVE | $1622 / 002$ |  |
| Case No． | Permit No． |  |
| 2018－003779ENV | 201803153729 |  |
| Addition／ <br> Alteration | Demolition（requires HRE for <br> Category B Building） | $\square$ <br> New <br> Construction |

Project description for Planning Department approval．
The project is a first and second story rear yard horizontal addition with a third and fourth story vertical unit addition to an existing two story，single family home．The scope will include the addition of a second dwelling unit at the vertical addition including rear yard roof decks for the new unit．The proposed building will be approximately 40 feet tall， 5,863 square feet and consist of 2 units．

## STEP 1：EXEMPTION CLASS

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

| $\square$ | Class 1 －Existing Facilities．Interior and exterior alterations；additions under 10，000 sq．ft． |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\square$ | Class 3 －New Construction．Up to three new single－family residences or six dwelling units in one <br> building；commercial／office structures；utility extensions；change of use under 10，000 sq．ft．if principally <br> permitted or with a CU． |
| $\square$ | Class 32－In－Fill Development．New Construction of seven or more units or additions greater than <br> 10,000 sq．ft．and meets the conditions described below： <br> （a）The project is consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan <br> policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations． <br> （b）The proposed development occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than 5 acres <br> substantially surrounded by urban uses． <br> （c）The project site has no value as habitat for endangered rare or threatened species． <br> （d）Approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic，noise，air quality，or <br> water quality． <br> （e）The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services． <br> FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING USE ONLY |
| $\square$ | Class —— |

## STEP 2：CEQA IMPACTS

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

| If any box is checked below，an Environmental Evaluation Application is required． |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\square$ | Air Quality：Would the project add new sensitive receptors（specifically，schools，day care facilities， hospitals，residential dwellings，and senior－care facilities within an Air Pollution Exposure Zone？Does the project have the potential to emit substantial pollutant concentrations（e．g．，backup diesel generators， heavy industry，diesel trucks，etc．）？（refer to EP＿ArcMap＞CEQA Catex Determination Layers＞Air Pollution Exposure Zone） |
|  | Hazardous Materials：If the project site is located on the Maher map or is suspected of containing hazardous materials（based on a previous use such as gas station，auto repair，dry cleaners，or heavy manufacturing，or a site with underground storage tanks）：Would the project involve 50 cubic yards or more of soil disturbance－or a change of use from industrial to residential？If yes，this box must be checked and the project applicant must submit an Environmental Application with a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment．Exceptions：do not check box if the applicant presents documentation of enrollment in the San Francisco Department of Public Health （DPH）Maher program，a DPH waiver from the Maher program，or other documentation from Environmental Planning staff that hazardous material effects would be less than significant（refer to EP＿ArcMap＞Maher layer）． |
| $\square$ | Transportation：Does the project create six（6）or more net new parking spaces or residential units？ Does the project have the potential to adversely affect transit，pedestrian and／or bicycle safety（hazards） or the adequacy of nearby transit，pedestrian and／or bicycle facilities？ |
| $\square$ | Archeological Resources：Would the project result in soil disturbance／modification greater than two （2）feet below grade in an archeological sensitive area or eight（8）feet in a non－archeological sensitive area？（refer to EP＿ArcMap＞CEQA Catex Determination Layers＞Archeological Sensitive Area） |
| $\square$ | Subdivision／Lot Line Adjustment：Does the project site involve a subdivision or lot line adjustment on a lot with a slope average of $20 \%$ or more？（refer to EP＿ArcMap＞CEQA Catex Determination Layers＞ Topography） |
| $\square$ | Slope $=$ or $\mathbf{> 2 0 \%}$ ：Does the project involve any of the following：（1）square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq．ft．outside of the existing building footprint，（2）excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil，（3）new construction？（refer to EP＿ArcMap＞CEQA Catex Determination Layers＞Topography）If box is checked，a geotechnical report is required． |
| $\square$ | Seismic：Landslide Zone：Does the project involve any of the following：（1）square footage expansion greater than $1,000 \mathrm{sq}$ ．ft．outside of the existing building footprint，（2）excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil，（3）new construction？（refer to EP＿ArcMap＞CEQA Catex Determination Layers＞Seismic Hazard Zones）If box is checked，a geotechnical report is required． |
| $\square$ | Seismic：Liquefaction Zone：Does the project involve any of the following：（1）square footage expansion greater than $1,000 \mathrm{sq}$ ．ft．outside of the existing building footprint，（2）excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil，（3）new construction？（refer to EP＿ArcMap＞CEQA Catex Determination Layers＞ Seismic Hazard Zones）If box is checked，a geotechnical report will likely be required． |
| If no boxes are checked above，GO TO STEP 3．If one or more boxes are checked above，an Environmental Evaluation Application is required，unless reviewed by an Environmental Planner． |  |
| Comments and Planner Signature（optional）：Laura Lynch |  |

STEP 3：PROPERTY STATUS－HISTORIC RESOURCE
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER
PROPERTY IS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING：（refer to Parcel Information Map）
Category A：Known Historical Resource．GO TO STEP 5.
Category B：Potential Historical Resource（over 45 years of age）．GO TO STEP 4.
Category C：Not a Historical Resource or Not Age Eligible（under 45 years of age）．GO TO STEP 6.

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

Check all that apply to the project．

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

## STEP 5：CEQA IMPACTS－ADVANCED HISTORICAL REVIEW

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

| Check all that apply to the project． |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\square$ | 1．Project involves a known historical resource（CEQA Category A）as determined by Step 3 and <br> conforms entirely to proposed work checklist in Step 4． |
| $\square$ | 2．Interior alterations to publicly accessible spaces． |
| $\square$ | 3．Window replacement of original／historic windows that are not＂in－kind＂but are consistent with <br> existing historic character． |
| $\square$ | 4．Façade／storefront alterations that do not remove，alter，or obscure character－defining features． |
| $\square$ | 5．Raising the building in a manner that does not remove，alter，or obscure character－defining <br> features． |
| $\square$ | 6．Restoration based upon documented evidence of a building＇s historic condition，such as historic <br> photographs，plans，physical evidence，or similar buildings． |


| $\square$ | 7. Addition(s), including mechanical equipment that are minimally visible from a public right-of-way and meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | 8. Other work consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (specify or add comments): |
| $\square$ | 9. Other work that would not materially impair a historic district (specify or add comments): <br> (Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator) |
| $\square$ | 10. Reclassification of property status. (Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Reclassify to Category A Reclassify to Category C <br> a. Per HRER dated (attach HRER) <br> b. Other (specify): Reclassify to Category $C$ as per PTR form signed on $4 / 24 / 18$ |
| Note: If ANY box in STEP 5 above is checked, a Preservation Planner MUST check one box below. |  |
| $\square$ | Further environmental review required. Based on the information provided, the project requires an Environmental Evaluation Application to be submitted. GO TO STEP 6. |
|  | Project can proceed with categorical exemption review. The project has been reviewed by the Preservation Planner and can proceed with categorical exemption review. GO TO STEP 6. |
| Comments (optional): |  |
| Preservation Planner Signature: Michelle A Taylor |  |
| STEP 6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER |  |
| $\square$ | Further environmental review required. Proposed project does not meet scopes of work in either (check all that apply): Step 2 - CEQA Impacts Step 5 - Advanced Historical Review <br> STOP! Must file an Environmental Evaluation Application. |
|  | No further environmental review is required. The project is categorically exempt under CEQA. There are no unusual circumstances that would result in a reasonable possibility of a significant effect. |
|  | Project Approval Action: Signature: <br> Building Permit Michelle A Taylor |
|  | If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, <br> the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project.$\quad 04 / 24 / 2018$ |
|  | Once signed or stamped and dated, this document constitutes a categorical exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31of the Administrative Code. <br> In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, an appeal of an exemption determination can only be filed within 30 days of the project receiving the first approval action. <br> Please note that other approval actions may be required for the project. Please contact the assigned planner for these approvals. |

## STEP 7：MODIFICATION OF A CEQA EXEMPT PROJECT

## TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

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

PROPERTY INFORMATION／PROJECT DESCRIPTION

| Project Address（If different than front page） |  | Block／Lot（s）（If different than <br> front page） |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 619 22ND AVE | Previous Building Permit No． | $1622 / 002$ |
| Case No． | 201803153729 | New Building Permit No． |
| 2018－003779PRJ | Previous Approval Action |  |
| Plans Dated | Building Permit | New Approval Action |
|  |  |  |
| Modified Project Description： |  |  |

DETERMINATION IF PROJECT CONSTITUTES SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

Compared to the approved project，would the modified project：
$\square \quad$ Result in expansion of the building envelope，as defined in the Planning Code；
$\square \quad$ Result in the change of use that would require public notice under Planning Code Sections 311 or 312；
$\square \quad$ Result in demolition as defined under Planning Code Section 317 or 19005（f）？
Is any information being presented that was not known and could not have been known at the time of the original determination，that shows the originally approved project may no longer qualify for the exemption？

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

## DETERMINATION OF NO SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

The proposed modification would not result in any of the above changes．
If this box is checked，the proposed modifications are categorically exempt under CEQA，in accordance with prior project approval and no additional environmental review is required．This determination shall be posted on the Planning Department website and office and mailed to the applicant，City approving entities，and anyone requesting written notice．

| Planner Name： | Signature or Stamp： |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |

PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW FORM

| Preservation Team Meeting Date: |  | Date of Form Completion | 4/12/2018 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PROJECT INFORMATION: |  |  |  |
| Planner: | Address: |  |  |
| Michelle Taylor | 619 22nd Avenu |  |  |
| Block/Lot: | Cross Streets: |  |  |
| 1622/002 | Balboa and Cabrill | Streets |  |
| CEQA Category: | Art. 10/11: | BPA/Case No.: |  |
| B | N/A | 2018-003779ENV |  |

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning Information:
415.558.6377

| PURPOSE OF REVIEW: |  | 4ry | PROJECT DESCRIPTION: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - CEQA | C Article 10/11 | C Preliminary/PIC | © Alteration | C Demo/New Construction |


| DATE OF PLANS UNDER REVIEW: | $3 / 12 / 2018$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


| PROJECTISSUES: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\boxed{Z}$ | Is the subject Property an eligible historic resource? |
| $\square$ | If so, are the proposed changes a significant impact? |
|  | Additional Notes: |
| Supplemental Information Form prepared by Roberta Wahi, PLUM Architects (dated <br> $2 / 26 / 2018)$. |  |
| Proposed project: First and second story rear yard horizontal addition with a third and <br> fourth story vertical unit addition of Type V-B construction to an existing two story single <br> family home. The scope will include the addition of a second dwelling unit at the vertical <br> addition including rear yard roof decks for the new unit. |  |



| Complies with the Secretary's Standards/Art 10/Art 11: | $14$ | $C$ Yes | C No | (-N/A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CEQA Material Impairment to the individual historic resource: |  | CYes | $\bigcirc$ - No |  |
| CEQA Material Impairment to the historic district: |  | CYes | © No |  |
| Requires Design Revisions: |  | CYes | © No |  |
| Defer to Residential Design Team: |  | CYes | CNo |  |

## PRESERVATION TEAM COMMENTS:

According to Planning Department records and the Supplemental Information prepared by Roberta Wahl, 619 22nd Avenue is a single family residence constructed in 1922 and located in the Outer Richmond neighborhood. Developer E.A. Janssen constructed the subject building along with the three neighboring buildings to the south of similar style and design. Research suggests that E.A. Janssen can be credited with a few small clusters of modest housing in the Richmond District in the 1910's and 1920's.

619 22nd Avenue is a one-story over garage building clad in smooth stucco and features a flat roof with a projecting cornice supported by decorative brackets. A wide three sided angled bay dominates the upper level of the primary (east) elevation. The bay features a large tripartite metal-frame window over fixed yellow tinted glazing at center and single openings with two-light, metal-frame sliders over fixed yellow tinted glazing on each side. The garage is located at center of the ground floor and includes a non-original garage door with two small viewing windows. A set of terrazzo stairs on the north side of the building provide access to the primary entrance and a small landing adjacent to a wood-frame four-over-one double hung window. According to the permit history, the subject building has undergone some exterior alterations including a rear sunporch addition (1929), enlargement of rear sunporch (1964), installation of railing at front stairs (1966), construction of rear addition (1969), replacement of original garage door (date unknown), and replacement of original windows with metal frame windows (date unknown).

The subject building is not eligible for individual listing in the California Register of Historical Resources under Criterion 1 (events), 2 (persons), 3 (architecture), or 4 (information potential). According to the information provided, the subject property is not associated with events found to be sufficiently important to be significant under Criterion 1. No person associated with the building is significant to history and therefore the property does not appear significant under Criterion 2. Architecturally, the building features a simple design that has undergone several alterations since construction. Additionally, the subject building is not associated with a master architect or builder and therefore it is not eligible for listing under criterion 3 . The subject building is not significant under Criterion 4 , since the significance criteria typically applies to rare construction types when involving the built environment. The subject building is not an example of a rare construction type.
(continued)


PLanNitie DEPAFTMENT

# $61922^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue, San Francisco 

Preservation Team Review Form, Comments

## (continued)

The subject building is not located adjacent to any known historic resources (Category A properties) and does not appear to be located in a potential historic district. The building stock on this portion of 22nd Avenue includes a range of residential building styles built from c. 1915 to $c .1989 .619$ 22nd Avenue and the neighboring building stock do not possess sufficient architectural, historical significance or cohesion to identify as a historic district.

$61922^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue (Image: Google Maps)

## DISCRETIONARY REVIEW PUBLIC [DRP]

## APPLICATION

## Discretionary Review Requestor's Information

Name: ADAM SCHNAL

Address: Email Address: ADAMSCHNALG@YAHOO.COM

Please Select Billing Contact:
X Applicant Telephone:
$\qquad$ Email:

ADAMSCHNALG@YAHOO.COM
Name: $\qquad$
Information on the Owner of the Property Being Developed
Name: KEIMING YEN
Company/Organization:
619 22ND AVE
Email Address: ROBERTA@PLUMARCHITECTS.COM
Address: SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121
Telephone:

## Property Information and Related Applications

Project Address: 619 22ND AVE SAN FRANCISCO CA 94121
Block/Lot(s): 1622/002
Building Permit Application No(s): 201803153729 / 2018-003779PRJ

## ACTIONS PRIOR TO A DISCRETIONARY REVIEW REQUEST

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

Changes Made to the Project as a Result of Mediation.
If you have discussed the project with the applicant, planning staff or gone through mediation, please summarize the result, including any changes that were made to the proposed project.

NONE

## DISCRETIONARY REVIEW REQUEST

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

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

## THE PROJECT DOES NOT MEET THE STANDARD OF THE PLANNING CODE AND RESIDENTIAL DESIGN GUIDELINES, OR OTHER REQUIREMENTS, AND HAS A SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT - SEE ATTACHED

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

## SEE ATTACHED

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

## REDUCE PROJECT FROM TWO ADDITIONAL STORIES PLUS AN OBSERVTION DECK TO A SINGLE ADDITIONAL STORY OF STANDARD HEIGHT.

## DISCRETIONARY REVIEW REQUESTOR'S AFFIDAVIT

Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:
a) The undersigned is the DR requestor or their authorized representation.


## REQUESTOR

## Relationship to Requestor

(i.e. Attorney, Architect, etc.)

Phone

## ADAM SCHNAL

Name (Printed)

ADAMSCHNALG@YAHOO.COM
Email

For Department Use Only
Application received by Planning Department:
By: $\qquad$

Date: $\qquad$

DR Applicant is a neighbor within 150 feet of the proposed project. DR Applicant is immediately adjacent to the project. DR Applicant contests the project application and additionally requests a DR on the following basis.

These concerns can be partially mitigated by limiting the permit approval to a single additional story of standard height (total building height of 3 stories). DR Applicant wants the building owners to be able to enjoy their property, but not at the expense of everyone else in the Richmond District.

Residents already held discussions with the building owners representative to express their concerns (approx. summer of 2018), but none of those concerns appear to have been addressed.

DR Applicant hereby incorporates all prior filings and records related to the application and subject property into this document, as well as simular prior projects within a 3 block radius.

## 1. The California Board of Architects indicates that Plum Architects are not licensed in the State of California.

The building owner submitted architectural plans from PLUM Architects (project team), with a stamp from Roberta Ann Wahl. A records search of the California Architect’s Board, through DCA https://search.dca.ca.gov/, indicates that PLUM Architects are not licensed with the California Board of Architects, although Robert A Wahl (license C 28322) is a licensed architect. DR Applicant assumes this could be a clerical error (eg, "Plum Architects" needing to be added to the licensing information at the Board), but should be clarified.
2. The height of the resulting property would be one of the tallest 2 unit residential buildings in the Richmond District. Since the property is located near the top of one of the tallest hills in the Central Richmond District, the total elevation must be considered. Correct total elevation information appears to be missing from the application.

A visual survey of the neighborhood immediately surrounding the project indicates that the resulting structure would be one of the tallest residential or commercial structures in the immediate neighborhood, and one of the tallest 2 unit residential structures (if not the tallest). Since the structure also is situated near the top of one of the tallest hills in the Central Richmond District, the resulting structure would dwarf almost every other structure. Correct total elevation information (building height plus land elevation) does not appear in the submitted plans and may not have been considered.

Additionally, the total elevation of the building and observation tower will have significant impact on the aesthetics of the neighborhood and visual skyline, regardless of permitted building heights due to disparate building heights. SF Planning would be treating similarly situated building owners in a disparate manner without material cause.
3. An environmental review should have been required. SF Planning is not only approving the current 4 story observation tower in the middle of a residential district but SF Planning will be legally required to approve all similar future applications that follow.

If the permit is finally approved, SF Planning will be required to treat all other building owners similarly and approve the new height and elevation standards for the Richmond District. This will have significant environmental impact for the entire neighborhood. SF Planning should not review such permit applications on the basis of a single permit application, but rather the impact of the resulting building growth, as owners in the entire neighborhood realize they can build observations decks with views that rival the de Young Museum's Hamon Observation Tower. The resulting cumulative building growth also will impact the overall density of this 100 year old+ neighborhood and should be thoughtfully planned, not haphazardly patched together.
4. Did the property sustain a previous construction accident resulting from the same project in approximately 2018? If so, how does that affect the current project?

In approximately 2017 or 2018, did the subject property experience a construction accident related to the same project? Over a period of many hours, significant amounts of water and apparent construction debris, including sand and apparent liquid concrete, flowed unabated from the home. The flows were heavy enough to deposit debris at the corner of $22^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue and Cabrillo, which is completely down the street.

During this same approximate period, DR Applicant felt vibration of the walls and windows of their own residence (which is not attached to the subject property) and noise from the subject property, consistent with heavy construction equipment, and the neighbors immediately adjacent to the subject property also reported similar noise and vibration. However, construction equipment was not observed at that time.

If so, how does that event affect the current project? Was this considered by SF Planning?
5. The plans submitted fail to address additional parking requirements of increased occupancy in a highly congested neighborhood.

The building owners seek to double the occupancy of their building without adding a single parking space. The neighborhood is already $100 \%$ saturated in terms of parked vehicles, and the City \& County further reduced parking on the street in approximately 2018 to facilitate pedestrian safety improvements. How will additional parking spaces be addressed to facilitate the added occupancy?
6. The permit application process violates substantive and procedural due process of the neighbors within 150 feet, as well as all San Francisco residents impacted by the project, because of the missing information regarding prior construction (if any) and total elevation, and missing information regarding environmental impact. Additionally, DR Applicant never received prior notice to provide input on the application prior to receiving the present notice (which DR Applicant is informed by the SF Planning Dept requires a DR Application).

The permit application process violates substantive and procedural due process of the neighbors within 150 feet as well as all San Francisco residents or groups impacted by the project because of the missing information regarding prior construction (if any) and total elevation, as well as missing information regarding environmental impact. Concerned parties cannot meaningfully respond to the permitting process when relevant material information is missing from an application.

Additionally, DR Applicant never received prior notice to provide input on the application prior to receiving the present notice (which DR Applicant is informed by the SF Planning Dept requires a DR Application). Input should have been solicited from the impacted residents by SF Planning prior to imposition of discretionary review, which would have afforded residents a lower standard of review.


## DSCRITOMARY BEVIEWPUBLC CRPPY <br> APPLICATION PALKET

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

For questions，you can call the Planning counter at 628.652 .7300 or email pic＠sfgov，org where planners are able to assist you．

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

## WHAT TO SUBMIT：

$\square$ Two（2）complete applications signed．
$\square A$ Letter of Authorization from the $D R$ requestor giving you permission to communicate with the Planning Department on their behalf，if applicable．
$\square$ Photographs or plans that illustrate your concerns．Related covenants or deed restrictions（if any）．A digital copy（CD or USB drive）of the above materials（optional）．Payment via check，money order or debit／credit for the total fee amount for this application．（See＿ Fee Schedule）．

## HOW TO SUBMIT：

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

Español：Si desea ayuda sobre cómo llenar esta solicitúd en español，por favor llame al 628．652．7550．Tenga en cuenta que el Departamento de Planificación requerirá al menos un día hábil para responder．

中文：如果您希望獲得使用中文填寫這份申請表的箔助，請致電628．652．7550。請注意，規劃部門需要至少一個工作日來回應。

Filipino：Kung gusto mo ng tulong sa pagkumpleto ng application na ito sa Filipino，paki tawagan ang 628．652．7550．Paki tandaan na mangangailangan ang Planning Department ng hindi kukulangin sa isang araw na pantrabaho para makasagot．

## RECEIVED

## DISCRETIONARY REMEW PUBLLC (TDRP)

## APPLICATION

## Discretionary Review Requestor's Information

Name: ${ }^{\text {James } \mathrm{Yu}}$

| 623 22nd Av | Email Address: jimbo16894121@gmail.com |
| :---: | :---: |
| Address: | Telephone: ${ }^{\text {415-627-7788 }}$ |
| Please Select Billing Contact: | Other (see below for details) |

Name: Same as above
Email: $\qquad$ Phone: $\qquad$

## Information on the Owner of the Property Being Developed

Name: Keiming Yen c/o Roberta Wahl, Architect
Company/Organization: Keiming Yen c/o Roberta Wahl, Architect
Address: 936 Clement St S.F. Ca 94118 Email Address: ${ }_{\text {Toberta@plumarchitects.com }}^{\text {Telephene: }}{ }^{415-837-0900}$

## Property Information and Related Applications

Project Address:
619 22nd Ave S.F. Ca 94121
Block/Lot(s): ${ }^{1622 / 002}$
Building Permit Application No(s): ${ }^{201803153729 S}$

## ACTIONS PRIOR TO A DISCRETIONARY REVIEW REQUEST

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

Changes Made to the Project as a Result of Mediation.
If you have discussed the project with the applicant, planning staff or gone through mediation, please summarize the . result, including any changes that were made to the proposed project.

We neighbors had 1 discussing with their architect (Ms. Roberta Wahl) without any result nor the architect ever get back to us per request (2 years without any reply)!

Ms. Woods (S.F. City Planning) tried to help by reaching out thru email; however only reply with 1 email without any further discussion!

No changes or what so ever!

## DISCRETIONARY REVIEW REQUEST

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

1. What are the reasons for requesting Discretionary Review? The project meets the standards of the Planning Code and the Residential Design Guidelines. What are the exceptional and extraordinary circumstances that justify Discretionary Review of the project? How does the project conflict with the City's General Plan or the Planning Code's Priority Policies or Residential Design Guidelines? Please be specific and site specific sections of the Residential Design Guidelines.
Modification from itś original design to meet reasonable accommodations!
Itś design had severe side effects on my health, mental issues!
2. The Residential Design Guidelines assume some impacts to be reasonable and expected as part of construction. Please explain how this project would cause unreasonable impacts. If you believe your property, the property of others or the neighborhood would be unreasonably affected, please state who would be affected, and how.
Based on the original design. It will cut off all lighting, air flow into my home (Bed room, kitchen, living room, 4th story tall building); in that it will cause health issues of my vision (No lights), breathing space (Air flow), mental health (Almost like prison environment)!
3. What alternatives or changes to the proposed project, beyond the changes (if any) aiready made would respond to the exceptional and extraordinary circumstances and reduce the adverse effects noted above in question \#1?
Please modify from the original design to give me more lighting, air flow, visibility into my home!

## 

Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:


Relationship to Requestor
(l.e. Attomey, Architect, etc)

Phone

jimbo16894121@gmail.com
Email

- By:
$\qquad$
$\qquad$







$\square$


## DISCRETIONARY REMIEW PUBLIC［DRP） <br> APPLICATION PACKET

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

For questions，you can call the Planning counter at 628．652．7300 or email pic＠sfgov．org where planners are able to assist you．

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

## WHAT TO SUBMIT：

$\square$ Two（2）complete applications signed．A Letter of Authorization from the $D R$ requestor giving you permission to communicate with the Planning Department on their behalf，if applicable．Photographs or plans that illustrate your concerns．Related covenants or deed restrictions（if any）．
$\square$ A digital copy（CD or USB drive）of the above materials（optional）．Payment via check，money order or debit／credit for the total fee amount for this application．（See． Fee Schedule）．

## HOW TO SUBMIT：

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

Español：Si desea ayuda sobre cómo llenar esta solicitud en español，por favor llame al 628．652．7550．Tenga en cuenta que el Departamento de Planificación requerirá al menos un día hábil para responder．

中文：如果您希望獲得使用中文填寫這份申請表的鷘助，請致電628．652．7550。請注意，規劃部門需要至少一個工作日來回應。

Filipino：Kung gusto mo ng tulong sa pagkumpleto ng application na ito sa Filipino，paki tawagan ang 628．652．7550．Paki tandaan na mangangailangan ang Planning Department ng hindi kukulangin sa isang araw na pantrabaho para makasagot．

## RECEIVED

## AUG 192021 <br> CITY \＆COUNTY OF S．F． LưWing DEPARTMENT PiG

## DISCRETIONARY REMEW PUELIC TITRP] <br> APPLCATION

## Discretionary Review Requestor's Information

## Name: ${ }^{\text {James } \mathrm{Yu}}$

# 623 22nd Ave S.F. Ca 94121 

Address:
Email Address: jimbo16894121@gmail.com
Telephone: ${ }^{\text {415-627-7788 }}$

## Please Select Billing Contact:

7 ApplicantOther (see below for details)
Name: $\qquad$ Email: $\qquad$ Phone: $\qquad$

## Information on the Owner of the Property Being Developed

Name: Keiming Yen c/o Roberta Wahl, Architect
Company/Organization: Keiming Yen c/o Roberta Wahl, Architect
936 Clement St S.F. Ca 94118 Email Address: roberta@plumarchitects.com Address:

## Property Information and Related Applications

Project Address: ${ }^{619}$ 22nd Ave S.F. Ca 94121
Block/Lot(s): ${ }^{1622 / 002}$
Building PermitApplication No(s): ${ }^{201803153729 S}$

## ACTIONS PRIOR TO A DISCRETIONARY REVIEW REQUEST

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

Changes Made to the Project as a Result of Mediation.

- If you have discussed the project with the applicant, planning staff or gone through mediation, please summarize the result, including any changes that were made to the proposed project.

We neighbors had 1 discussing with their architect (Ms. Roberta Wahl) without any result nor the architect ever get back to us per request (2 years without any reply)!

Ms. Woods (S.F. City Planning) tried to help by reaching out thru email; however only reply with 1 email without any further discussion!

No changes or what so ever!

## DISCRETIONARY REVIEW REQUEST

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

1. What are the reasons for requesting Discretionary Review? The project meets the standards of the Planning_ Code and the Residential Design Guidelines. What are the exceptional and extraordinary circumstances that justify Discretionary Review of the project? How does the project conflict with the City's General Plan or the Planning Code's Priority Policies or Residential Design Guidelines? Please be specific and site specific sections of the Residential Design Guidelines.
Modification from itś original design to meet reasonable accommodations!
Itś design had severe side effects on my health, mental issues!
2. The Residential Design Guidelines assume some impacts to be reasonable and expected as part of construction. Please explain how this project would cause unreasonable impacts. If you believe your property, the property of others or the neighborhood would be unreasonably affected, please state who would be affected, and how.
Based on the original design. It will cut off all lighting, air flow into my home (Bed room, kitchen, living room, 4th story tall building); in that it will cause health issues of my vision (No lights), breathing space (Air flow), mental health (Almost like prison environment)!
3. What alternatives or changes to the proposed project, beyond the changes (if any) already made would respond to the exceptional and extraordinary circumstances and reduce the adverse effects noted above in question \#1?
Please modify from the original design to give me more lighting, air flow, visibility into my home!

## OSCRETIONARY REWIEM REQUESTOR'S AFFIDAMIT

$\cdot$
Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:


Name (Printed)
jimbo16894121@gmail.com
Relationship to Requestor
Phone
Email

For Department Use Oily
Application received by Planning:Department:
By: $\qquad$ Date: $\qquad$








September 30, 2021

```
David Winslow
Principal Architect
Design Review | Citywide and Current Planning
San Francisco Planning Department
49 South Van Ness, Suite 1400 | San Francisco, California, 94103
```

> RE: $\quad$ Discretionary Review \#1252588 - Project Sponsor Response for $61922^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue Building Permit Application \# 2020.0810.1497
> Discretionary Review Applicant: Mr. Schnal (no address listed)

Dear, Mr. Winslow,

Attached to the end of this Discretionary Review Project Sponsor Response letter is the pre-app package with mailing info. Mr. Schnal is not on the list however, here pasted below is what we found on the assessors record for Adam Schnal. Brunner Stanton was at our pre-app and his address is $60522^{\text {nd }}$, so the corner unit directly adjacent to the north. Mr. Stanton was copied on all pre-app meeting discussion including the light study. Mr. Schnal identified that he had contacted the project applicant prior on his DR application however, we do not have correspondence from Mr. Schnal.

| Document Number | Document Date | Title(s) | Names |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017545850 | 12/6/2017 | LIFETIME LEASE | (R) BRUNNER STANTON <br> (E) DAVIS ROBIN | 官 | $\cdots$ |
| 2015174314 | 12/18/2015 | OFFER LIFETIME LEASE | (R) BRUNNER STANTON P <br> (E) SCHNALADAM | $\square^{-1}$ | E |

DR Applicant contests the project application and additionally requests a DR on the following basis here described item by item on the DR application with the project sponsor (Plum Architects Inc.) response.

1) What are the reasons for requesting Discretionary Review? The project meets the standards of the Planning Code and the Residential Design Guidelines. What are the exceptional and extraordinary circumstances that Justify Discretionary Review of the project? How does the project conflict with the City's General Plan or the Planning Code's Priority Policies or Residential Design Guidelines? Please be specific and site specific sections of the Residential Design Guidelines.
DR APPLICANT REASON: The project does not meet the standard of the Planning Code and Residential Design Guidelines or other requirements, and has a significant environmental impact - see attached. (here pasted and incorporated into this document in bold)

These concerns can be partially mitigated by limiting the permit approval to a single additional story of standard height (total building height of 3 stories). DR Applicant wants the building owners to be able to enjoy their property, but not at the expense of everyone else in the Richmond District.

Residents already held discussions with the building owners representative to express their concerns (approx. summer of 2018), but none of those concerns appear to have been addressed.

## DR Applicant hereby incorporates all prior filings and records related to the application and

 subject property into this document, as well as simular prior projects within a 3 block radius.1. The California Board of Architects indicates that Plum Architects are not licensed in the State of California.
The building owner submitted architectural plans from PLUM Architects (project team), with a stamp from Roberta Ann Wahl. A records search of the California Architect's Board, through DCA https://search.dca.ca.gov/, indicates that PLUM Architects are not licensed with the California Board of Architects, although Robert A Wahl (license C28322) is a licensed architect. DR Applicant assumes this could be a clerical error (eg,"Plum Architects" needing to be added to the licensing information at the Board), but should be clarified.

Response: Roberta Wahl is the Principal and Owner of PLUM Architects, Inc, and has maintained good standing as a fully licensed practitioner with the California Architects Board since 2000 per the Board's online records.
2. The height of the resulting property would be one of the tallest 2 unit residential buildings in the Richmond District. Since the property is located near the top of one of the tallest hills in the Central Richmond District, the total elevation must be considered. Correct total elevation information appears to be missing from the application.
A visual survey of the neighborhood immediately surrounding the project indicates that the resulting structure would be one of the tallest residential or commercial structures in the immediate neighborhood, and one of the tallest 2 unit residential structures (if not the tallest). Since the structure also is situated near the top of one of the tallest hills in the Central Richmond District, the resulting structure would dwarf almost every other structure. Correct total elevation information (building height plus land elevation) does not appear in the submitted plans and may not have been considered.
Additionally, the total elevation of the building and observation tower will have significant impact on the aesthetics of the neighborhood and visual skyline, regardless of permitted building heights due to disparate building heights. SF Planning would be treating similarly situated building owners in a disparate manner without material cause.

Response: The Planning Department does not require applicants to demonstrate total elevation, only relative elevation to local grade at the curb. Per SF Planning Code Section 260(a)(1)(B),this is measured at the centerline of the building from the top of the curb at the street to the highest point of a finished flat roof. This particular property is subject to 40-X height restrictions, and the project proposal complies with this 40' maximum limit, as well as incorporates SF Planning's Residential Design Guidelines on reducing building scale by providing setbacks at the fourth story. This proposal does not represent an exceptional interpretation of the City's developmental standards for this area, as approximately five of the twelve lots within the same block are of
similar height with four stories already. (631 22 nd $, 64122^{\text {nd }}, 2155$ Balboa, 662-664 $23^{\text {rd }}$ and 676 $23^{r d}$ )
3. An environmental review should have been required. SF Planning is not only approving the current 4 story observation tower in the middle of a residential district but SF Planning will be legally required to approve all similar future applications that follow.
If the permit is finally approved, SF Planning will be required to treat all other building owners similarly and approve the new height and elevation standards for the Richmond District. This will have significant environmental impact for the entire neighborhood. SF Planning should not review such permit applications on the basis of a single permit application, but rather the impact of the resulting building growth, as owners in the entire neighborhood realize they can build observations decks with views that rival the de Young Museum's Hamon Observation Tower. The resulting cumulative building growth also will impact the overall density of this 100 year old+ neighborhood and should be thoughtfully planned, not haphazardly patched together.

Response: The DR Applicant's grievance here appears directed not at the project sponsor but rather at the Planning Department's long-established developmental guidelines for properties in RH-2 Districts. The project sponsor has made use of these developmental guidelines to not only increase the housing stock in a desirable area of the City's residential neighborhoods, but has also proposed improvements that explicitly avoid maximizing the buildable areas at the third and fourth stories. These guidelines encourage moderate development that allow the City to accommodate the growing housing needs of the area while mitigating impact on lower density neighborhoods.

PLUM Architects provided Environmental and Historic Resource assessments, supplemental documentation, sun studies and 3D renderings of the project in the fully Planning Submittal to demonstrate the potential impact of the proposed project on adjacent properties and its visual character from the street. The City does not require applicants make these documents available to the general public and found the proposal in keeping with the City's guidelines and requirements.
4. Did the property sustain a previous construction accident resulting from the same project in approximately 2018? If so, how does that affect the current project?

In approximately 2017 or 2018, did the subject property experience a construction accident related to the same project? Over a period of many hours, significant amounts of water and apparent construction debris, including sand and apparent liquid concrete, flowed unabated from the home. The flows were heavy enough to deposit debris at the corner of 22nd Avenue and Cabrillo, which is completely down the street.

During this same approximate period, DR Applicant felt vibration of the walls and windows of their own residence (which is not attached to the subject property) and noise from the subject property, consistent with heavy construction equipment, and the neighbors immediately adjacent to the subject property also reported similar noise and vibration. However, construction equipment was not observed at that time.

If so, how does that event affect the current project? Was this considered by SF Planning?

Response: PLUM Architects has no knowledge of any code enforcement issues or violations related to this property and provided a full permit history to the Planning Department with the initial submittal.
5. The plans submitted fail to address additional parking requirements of increased occupancy in a highly congested neighborhood.
The building owners seek to double the occupancy of their building without adding a single parking space. The neighborhood is already $100 \%$ saturated in terms of parked vehicles, and the City \& County further reduced parking on the street in approximately 2018 to facilitate pedestrian safety improvements. How will additional parking spaces be addressed to facilitate the added occupancy?

Response: The Planning Department does not require applicants to provide off-street parking spaces for dwelling units in RH Districts, but permits up to 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit per San Francisco Planning Code Section 151. This project provides at least (2) tandem parking spaces at the ground story, as well as (2) bicycle parking spaces per the City's requirements (Sec. 155.2(a)(2)) and initiatives to reduce car traffic and vehicle pollution in transit-accessible neighborhoods.
6. The permit application process violates substantive and procedural due process of the neighbors within 150 feet, as well as all San Francisco residents impacted by the project, because of the missing information regarding prior construction (if any) and total elevation, and missing information regarding environmental impact. Additionally, DR Applicant never received prior notice to provide input on the application prior to receiving the present notice (which DR Applicant is informed by the SF Planning Dept requires a DR Application). The permit application process violates substantive and procedural due process of the neighbors within 150 feet as well as all San Francisco residents or groups impacted by the project because of the missing information regarding prior construction (if any) and total elevation, as well as missing information regarding environmental impact. Concerned parties cannot meaningfully respond to the permitting process when relevant material information is missing from an application.

Additionally, DR Applicant never received prior notice to provide input on the application prior to receiving the present notice (which DR Applicant is informed by the SF Planning Dept requires a DR Application). Input should have been solicited from the impacted residents by SF Planning prior to imposition of discretionary review, which would have afforded residents a lower standard of review.

Response: The project sponsor conducted a Pre-Application Meeting to meet and discuss the project proposal with neighbors in January 2018. Applicable residents and neighborhood organizations were notified of the meeting per the City's Pre-Application protocols by letter via

Radius Services. During the meeting, some residents express concerns that were addressed either in the meeting directly or incorporated into the design proposal prior to submittal. The complete list of notified neighbors and organizations, meeting minutes, and architect's response were provided to the Planning Department with the initial submittal. See attached at the end of this document.
2) The Residential Design Guidelines assume some Impacts to be reasonable and expected as part of construction. Please explain how this project would cause unreasonable impacts. If you believe your property, the property of others or the neighborhood would be unreasonably affected, please state who would be affected, and how.
DR APPLICANT REASON: See attached.
Response: See above responses to all issues addressed in Mr. Schnals attachment under DR Item \#1.
3) What alternatives or changes to the proposed project, beyond the changes (if any) already made would respond to the exceptional and extraordinary circumstances and reduce the adverse effects noted above in question \#1?
DR APPLICANT REQUESTS: Reduce project from two additional stories plus an observation deck to a single additional story of standard height.
Response: See responses 2 \& 3 to Mr. Schnal's attachment inserted above.


Roberta Wahl, Architect
Plum Architects Inc.

PLANNING
DEPARTMENT

Planning Department
1650 Mistion Street
Suite 400
San Franciaco, CA
94103-9425
T. 415.558 .6978

F: 415.558.6409

Note: A Pre-Application Meeting is required even if the horizontal addition referenced above does not increase the overall depth of the building. Similarly, a Pre-Application Meeting is required even if the vertical addition referenced above does not change the overall building height.

# INSTRUCTION PACKET AND AFFIDAVIT FOR Pre-Application Meeting 

This packet consists of instructions and templates for conducting the Pre:
Application Meeting. Planning Department staif are avallable to advise you in the preparation of these materials, Call the Planning Intormation Center at (415) 558 6377 for further information.

## WHAT IS A PRE-APPLICATION MEETING?

The Pre-Application Meeting is a mandatory form of community outreach conducted by the project sponsor to receive initial feedback regarding certain project types prior to submittal to the Planning Department or the Department of Building Inspection. Adjacent neighbors and relevant neighborhood organizations are invited to attend this meeting which must take place during certain hours of the day and within a certain distance from the project site. The meeting's intention is to initiate neighbor communication and identify issues and concerns early on; provide the project sponsor the opportunity to address neighbor concerns about the potential impacts of the project prior to submitting an application; and, reduce the number of Discretionary Reviews (DRs) that are filed.

## WHEN IS A PRE-APPLICATION MEETING REQUIRED?

- New Construction; or
- Any vertical addition of 7 feet or more; or
- Any horizontal addition of 10 feet or more; or
- Decks over 10 feet above grade or within the required rear yard (excludes roof decks); or
- All Formula Retail uses subject to a Conditional Use Authorization; or
- Section 313, PDR-I-B; or
- Community Business Priority Processing Program (CB3P); or
- Department Staff may request a Pre-Application meeting be conducted for any project.


## WHY IS A PRE-APPLICATION MEETING REQUIRED?

The Pre-Application process is required for certain projects subject to Planning Code Section 311 or 312 Notification, or as required by other activities listed above. It serves as the first step in the process prior to building permit application or entitlement (Conditional Use Authorization, Variance, etc.) submittal. Those contacted as a result of the Pre-Application process will also receive a formal entitlement notice or 311 or 312 notification when the project is submitted and reviewed by Planning Department staff.

The benefits to project sponsors include: early identification of neighbor concerns; ability to mitigate neighbor concerns before project submittal; a more streamlined, predictable review from the Planning Department; and, elimination of delays associated with Discretionary Reviews.
The benefits to the neighbors include: the opportunity to express concerns about a project before it is submitted and eliminating the need to file a Discretionary Review.

## INSTRUCTIONS

Prior to filing any entitlement (this includes but is not limited to Building Permits, Variances, and Conditional Use Authorizations) the Project Sponsor must conduct a minimum of one PreApplication meeting if the proposed scope of work triggers such a meeting, as referenced on the previous page.
This meeting must be held in accordance with the following rules.
These groups and individuals must be invited to the meeting:

- Invite all Neighborhood Organizations for the relevant neighborhood(s). Note that the number of organizations extends beyond just your neighborhood association. The full list for your area can be found by first typing "neighborhood groups" in the search bar at www.sfplanning.org. Then, click on the relevant neighborhood on the map to find the neighborhood organization list in spreadsheet format. If the property is located on the border of two or more neighborhoods, you must invite all bordering neighborhood organizations.
- Invite all abutting property owners and occupants and property owners and occupants directly across the street from the project site. Please be sure to include all occupants of the subject building. (Note: Sec. 313 PDR-I-B projects require mailing to owners and occupants within a 300 foot radius). Refer to the Neighborhood Notification handout, available at www.sfplanning.org, for clarification.
- One copy of the invitation letter must be mailed to the project sponsor as proof of mailing. Invitations shall be sent at least 14 calendar days before the meeting. The postal date stamp will serve as record of timely mailing.
The meeting must be conducted at one of these places:
- The project site;
- An alternate location within a one-mile radius of the project site (i.e. community center, coffee shop, etc.); or,
- The project sponsor may opt to have a Pre- Application Meeting held at the Planning Department instead of the project site, for a fee. A planner will be available for questions.

The meeting must be held within specific timeframes and meet certain requirements:

- Meetings are to be conducted within 6:00 p.m. -9:00 p.m., Mon.-Fri.; or within 10:00 a.m. -9:00 p.m., Sat-Sun. If the Project Sponsor has selected a Pre-Application Meeting held at the Planning Department, this meeting will be conducted during regular business hours.
- A sign-in sheet must be used in order to verify attendance. Note if no one attended.
- Preliminary plans must be available at the meeting that include the height and depth of the subject building and its adjacent properties, and dimensions must be provided to help facilitate discussion. Neighbors may request reduced copies of the plans from the Project Sponsor by checking the "please send me plans" box on the sign-in sheet, and the Project Sponsor shall provide reduced copies upon such request.
- Questions and concerns by attendees, and responses by Project Sponsor, if any, must be noted.

For accountability purposes, please submit the following with your Application:

- A copy of the letter mailed to neighbors and neighborhood organizations (use attached invitation) AND a letter with postmark as proof of mailing;
- A list of those persons and neighborhood organizations invited to the meeting;
- A copy of the sign-in sheet (use attached template);
- A summary of the meeting and a list of any changes made to the project as a result of the neighborhood comments (use attached template);
- The affidavit, signed and dated (use attached template);
- One reduced copy of the plans presented to the neighbors at pre-application meeting.

Note: When the subject lot is a corner lot, the notification area shall further include all properties on both block faces across from the subject lot, and the corner property diagonally across the street,

## Note: Please see the

 Department Facilitated PreApplication Meeting form at www.sfplanning.org for more information. Refer to the Planning Department Fee Schedule, which may be obtained from the Planning Department's website at www.sfplanning.org/planning or in person at the Public Information Counter (PIC) located at 1680 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94103. For questions related to the Fee Schedule, please call the PIC at 415.558.6377.
## Notice of Pre-Application Meeting

## January 162018

Date

Dear Neighbor:
You are invited to a neighborhood Pre-Application meeting to review and discuss the development proposal at g1922nd AVENUE cross street(s) BALBOA STREET______ (Block/Lot\#: 1822002 ; Zoning: RH-2 _), in accordance with the San Francisco Planning Department's Pre-Application procedures. The Pre-Application meeting is intended as a way for the Project Sponsor(s) to discuss the project and review the proposed plans with adjacent neighbors and neighborhood organizations before the submittal of an application to the City. This provides neighbors an opportunity to raise questions and discuss any concerns about the impacts of the project before it is submitted for the Planning Department's review. Once a Building Permit has been submitted to the City, you may track its status at www.sfgov.org/dbi.

The Pre-Application process serves as the first step in the process prior to building permit application or entitlement submittal. Those contacted as a result of the Pre-Application process will also receive a formal entitlement notice or 311 or 312 notification after the project is submitted and reviewed by Planning Department staff.

A Pre-Application meeting is required because this project includes (check all that apply):
$\square$ New Construction;
$\square$ Any vertical addition of 7 feet or more;
[ Any horizontal addition of 10 feet or more;
$\square]$ Decks over 10 feet above grade or within the required rear yard;
$\square$ All Formula Retail uses subject to a Conditional Use Authorization;
$\square$ PDR-I-B, Section 313;
$\square$ Community Business Priority Processing Program (CB3P).

The development proposal is to: add rear yard horizontal additions at existing 1st and 2nd stories, add 3rd +4 th stories to the existing building for a new two-story unit including rear yard roof decks.


Pre-Application Meeting Sign-in Sheet
Meeting Date: JANUARY 31,2018
Meeting Time: 6:00PM
Meeting Address: CAFE ENCHANTE, 6157 GEAR BLVD, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121
Project Address: 619 22nd AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121
Property Owner Name: KEIMING YEN
Project Sponsor/Representative: PLUM ARCHITECTS, INC.
Please print your name below, state your address and/or affiliation with a neighborhood group, and provide your phone number. Providing your name below does not represent support or opposition to the project; it is for documentation purposes only.

3. $\qquad$
4. STANTON BPDNNER/605. 23 NA AVE, SF G4Iz1
5. 415-635-c5l66/t-doquees esscgloshin=ta
6. Mrephanil Tang/ 609 22nd Are SF 94121
7. $\quad 650.814 .1137 /$ stephtang.sfegmail.com
8. EUGENE CHI./2115 Balboa st. (4/5)-379-8667


13. $\qquad$ $\square$
14. $\qquad$ $\square$
15. $\qquad$ $\square$
16. $\qquad$
17. $\qquad$
18. $\qquad$ $\square$

## Summary of discussion from the Pre-Application Meeting

Meeting Date: JANUARY 31,2018
Meeting Time: 6:00 PM
Meeting Address: CAFE ENCHANTE, 6157 GEARY BLVD., SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121
Project Address: 619 22nd AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121
Property Owner Name: MING YEN
Project Sponsor/Representative: PLUM ARCHITECTS, INC.
Please summarize the questions/comments and your response from the Pre-Application meeting in the space below. Please state if/how the project has been modified in response to any concerns.
 the ad action world heel sunlight.
Project Sponsor Response: The projest as eon ged Lox. The th ot story
 fin the hugh turell and anwlalife the north side at inert
 new 3 nd ir story addition themselves.
Question/Concern \#3:
$\qquad$

Project Sponsor Response: $\qquad$
$\qquad$

Question/Concern \#4: $\qquad$
$\qquad$

Project Sponsor Response:

## Affidavit of Conducting a Pre-Application Meeting, Sign-in Sheet and Issues/Responses submittal

- Rebentan Wall do hereby declare as follows:

1. I have conducted a Pre-Application Meeting for the proposed new construction, alteration or other activity prior to submitting any entitlement (Building Permit, Variance, Conditional Use, etc.) in accordance with Planning Commission Pre-Application Policy. on $1 / 31 / 18$ (date) from cider - 7: (time).
2. I have included the mailing list, meeting invitation and postmarked letter, sign-in sheet, issue/ response summary, and reduced plans with the entitlement Application. I understand that I am responsible for the accuracy of this information and that erroneous information may lead to suspension or revocation of the permit.
3. I have prepared these materials in good faith and to the best of my ability.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

EXECUTED ON THIS DAY, /1//~~2, 20_18 IN SAN FRANCISCO.


Signature
Rabentot Wail
Name (type of print)
Aratethet
Plum Ar chtects, 3298 Preral St. 94121
(ii Agent, give business name \& profession)
619 22nd Avenue
Project Address

INVOICE FOR SERVICES

| PLUM ARCHITELTS | Date |
| :---: | :---: |
| ${ }^{\text {Requested for }} 3298$ PIERCE ST | DUE |
| SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94123 | PHONE |
|  | EMAIL |
| MELISA | PHONE |




## OUTER RICHMOND

## Anni Chung <br> Self-Help for the Elderly <br> 407 Sansome Street

San Francisco, CA 94111
Jesse Fink
Clement Street Merchants Association
401 Clement Street
San Francisco, CA 94118

Peter Winkelstein
Planning Association for the Richmond (Par)
129 24th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94121

Yuka loro
Balboa Village Merchants Association
3519 Balboa Street
San Francisco, CA 94121

Dan Baroni
Planning Association for the Richmond (PAR)
2828 Fulton Street
San Francisco, CA 94118-3300

Megan Sillivan
Mid-Richmond Coalition
376 17th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94121

Dyan Ruiz
People Power Media
366 10th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94118

Peter Tempel
Sea Cliff Cares
230 El Camino Del Mar
San Francisco, CA 94121

Sandra Fewer
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room \#244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Norman Kondy
Lincoln Park Homeowners Association
271 32nd Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94121

Joseph Smooke
Housing Rights Committee of San Francisco
4301 Geary Boulevard
San Francisco, CA 94118


September 30, 2021

David Winslow<br>Principal Architect<br>Design Review | Citywide and Current Planning<br>San Francisco Planning Department<br>49 South Van Ness, Suite 1400 | San Francisco, California, 94103

RE: Discretionary Review \#1255588-Project Sponsor Response for $61922^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue Building Permit Application \# 2020.0810.1497
Discretionary Review Applicant: Mr. James Yu @ 623-625 22 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue

Dear, Mr. Winslow,

DR Applicant is a neighbor within 150 feet of the proposed project. DR Applicant is immediately adjacent to the south of said $61922^{\text {nd }}$ Ave. (the project). DR Applicant contests the project application and additionally requests a DR on the following basis here described item by item on the DR application with the project sponsor (Plum Architects Inc.) response.

1) What are the reasons for requesting Discretionary Review? The project meets the standards of the Planning Code and the Residential Design Guidelines. What are the exceptional and extraordinary circumstances that Justify Discretionary Review of the project? How does the project conflict with the City's General Plan or the Planning Code's Priority Policies or Residential Design Guidelines? Please be specific and site specific sections of the Residential Design Guidelines.
DR APPLICANT REASON: Modification from its original design to meet reasonable accommodations! Its design had severe side effects on my health, mental issues.
Response: Plum Architects Inc. has discussed this project with Mr. Yu in the pre-application meeting as well as in email with Mr. Yu and the neighbors who attended the Pre-Application meeting (here attached at the back of this DR Response) and from this revised the project as follows to accommodate their concerns;
a. We set the $4^{\text {th }}$ floor back $4^{\prime}-4^{\prime \prime}$ on the south side and $5^{\prime}-1^{\prime \prime}$ on the north side for additional light.
b. We did a sun study to know how the sun passes across the south elevation of 605/609 $22^{\text {nd }}$ currently with the building at 2 stories and what the difference would be with four stories. We took the sun angles at June $21^{\text {st }}$ and December $21^{\text {st }}$ at noon, 2:00pm, 4:00pm and 6:00pm respectively. During the summer months, there is no difference with a four story building than what is currently projected on the façade. There is an affect in the winter months on $60922^{\text {nd }}$ at the $2^{\text {nd }}$ and $3^{\text {rd }}$ floor.
c. The owner has been sensitive to the neighbors concerns and has not built out as allowable. 635-637 $22^{\text {nd }}$ extends the $4^{\text {th }}$ story which to the rear allowable and includes a $5^{\text {th }}$ story penthouse. The allowable occupied FAR (floor area ratio to site) is 5400 for $61922^{\text {nd }}$ and the project is well under this allowable at 3630sf. The actual square footage excluding decks and garage is 4,290.
2) The Residential Design Guidelines assume some Impacts to be reasonable and expected as part of construction. Please explain how this project would cause unreasonable impacts. If you
believe your property, the property of others or the neighborhood would be unreasonably affected, please state who would be affected, and how.
DR APPLICANT REASON: Based on the original design. It will cut off all lighting, air flow into my home (Bed room, kitchen, living room, 4th story tall building); in that it will cause health issues of my vision (No lights), breathing space (Air flow), mental health (Almost like prison environment)
Response: Please see response in item 1, a \& b. Additionally, we have created a lightwell with the same dimensions as Mr. Yu's lightwell. This lightwell is not covered by a roof and is open for light and air to pass through.
3) What alternatives or changes to the proposed project, beyond the changes (if any) already made would respond to the exceptional and extraordinary circumstances and reduce the adverse effects noted above in question \#1?
DR APPLICANT REQUESTS: Please modify from the original design to give me more lighting, air flow, visibility into my home!
Response: The project sponsor has made use of the long-established developmental guidelines for properties in RH-2 Districts to not only increase the housing stock in a desirable area of the City's residential neighborhoods, but has also proposed improvements that explicitly avoid maximizing the buildable areas at the third and fourth stories. These guidelines encourage moderate development that allow the City to accommodate the growing housing needs of the area while mitigating impact on lower density neighborhoods.

PLUM Architects provided Environmental and Historic Resource assessments, supplemental documentation, sun studies and 3D renderings of the project in the fully Planning Submittal to demonstrate the potential impact of the proposed project on adjacent properties and its visual character from the street. The City does not require applicants make these documents available to the general public and found the proposal in keeping with the City's guidelines and requirements.


Roberta Wahl, Architect Plum Architects Inc.

Pre-Application Meeting Sign-in Sheet
Meeting Date: JANUARY 31,2018
Meeting Time: 6:OOPM
Meeting Address: CAFE ENCHANTE, 6157 GEAR BLVD, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121
Project Address: 619 22nd AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121
Property Owner Name: KEIMING YEN
Project Sponsor/Representative: PLUM ARCHITECTS, INC.
Please print your name below, state your address and/or affiliation with a neighborhood group, and provide your phone number. Providing your name below does not represent support or opposition to the project; it is for documentation purposes only.

2. $\qquad$
3. $\qquad$
4. STANTON BRUNNER/605-23NA AVE, SF GYIZI 415-c35-c5t66/tod.guees esbeglosolinat $\sqrt{6}$
5. $\qquad$
6. Stephanie Tang /609 22nd Are SF 94121
7. 650.814 .1137 / stephtang.sfegmail.com $\triangle$

12. $\qquad$
13. $\qquad$
14. $\qquad$
15. $\qquad$ $\square$
16. $\qquad$ $\square$
17. $\qquad$ $\square$
18. $\qquad$

PLANNING
DEPARTMENT

Planning Department
1650 Mistion Street
Suite 400
San Franciaco, CA
94103-9425
T. 415.558 .6978

F: 415.558.6409

Note: A Pre-Application Meeting is required even if the horizontal addition referenced above does not increase the overall depth of the building. Similarly, a Pre-Application Meeting is required even if the vertical addition referenced above does not change the overall building height.

# INSTRUCTION PACKET AND AFFIDAVIT FOR Pre-Application Meeting 

This packet consists of instructions and templates for conducting the Pre:
Application Meeting. Planning Department staif are avallable to advise you in the preparation of these materials, Call the Planning Intormation Center at (415) 558 6377 for further information.

## WHAT IS A PRE-APPLICATION MEETING?

The Pre-Application Meeting is a mandatory form of community outreach conducted by the project sponsor to receive initial feedback regarding certain project types prior to submittal to the Planning Department or the Department of Building Inspection. Adjacent neighbors and relevant neighborhood organizations are invited to attend this meeting which must take place during certain hours of the day and within a certain distance from the project site. The meeting's intention is to initiate neighbor communication and identify issues and concerns early on; provide the project sponsor the opportunity to address neighbor concerns about the potential impacts of the project prior to submitting an application; and, reduce the number of Discretionary Reviews (DRs) that are filed.

## WHEN IS A PRE-APPLICATION MEETING REQUIRED?

- New Construction; or
- Any vertical addition of 7 feet or more; or
- Any horizontal addition of 10 feet or more; or
- Decks over 10 feet above grade or within the required rear yard (excludes roof decks); or
- All Formula Retail uses subject to a Conditional Use Authorization; or
- Section 313, PDR-I-B; or
- Community Business Priority Processing Program (CB3P); or
- Department Staff may request a Pre-Application meeting be conducted for any project.


## WHY IS A PRE-APPLICATION MEETING REQUIRED?

The Pre-Application process is required for certain projects subject to Planning Code Section 311 or 312 Notification, or as required by other activities listed above. It serves as the first step in the process prior to building permit application or entitlement (Conditional Use Authorization, Variance, etc.) submittal. Those contacted as a result of the Pre-Application process will also receive a formal entitlement notice or 311 or 312 notification when the project is submitted and reviewed by Planning Department staff.

The benefits to project sponsors include: early identification of neighbor concerns; ability to mitigate neighbor concerns before project submittal; a more streamlined, predictable review from the Planning Department; and, elimination of delays associated with Discretionary Reviews.
The benefits to the neighbors include: the opportunity to express concerns about a project before it is submitted and eliminating the need to file a Discretionary Review.

## INSTRUCTIONS

Prior to filing any entitlement (this includes but is not limited to Building Permits, Variances, and Conditional Use Authorizations) the Project Sponsor must conduct a minimum of one PreApplication meeting if the proposed scope of work triggers such a meeting, as referenced on the previous page.
This meeting must be held in accordance with the following rules.
These groups and individuals must be invited to the meeting:

- Invite all Neighborhood Organizations for the relevant neighborhood(s). Note that the number of organizations extends beyond just your neighborhood association. The full list for your area can be found by first typing "neighborhood groups" in the search bar at www.sfplanning.org. Then, click on the relevant neighborhood on the map to find the neighborhood organization list in spreadsheet format. If the property is located on the border of two or more neighborhoods, you must invite all bordering neighborhood organizations.
- Invite all abutting property owners and occupants and property owners and occupants directly across the street from the project site. Please be sure to include all occupants of the subject building. (Note: Sec. 313 PDR-I-B projects require mailing to owners and occupants within a 300 foot radius). Refer to the Neighborhood Notification handout, available at www.sfplanning.org, for clarification.
- One copy of the invitation letter must be mailed to the project sponsor as proof of mailing. Invitations shall be sent at least 14 calendar days before the meeting. The postal date stamp will serve as record of timely mailing.
The meeting must be conducted at one of these places:
- The project site;
- An alternate location within a one-mile radius of the project site (i.e. community center, coffee shop, etc.); or,
- The project sponsor may opt to have a Pre- Application Meeting held at the Planning Department instead of the project site, for a fee. A planner will be available for questions.

The meeting must be held within specific timeframes and meet certain requirements:

- Meetings are to be conducted within 6:00 p.m. -9:00 p.m., Mon.-Fri.; or within 10:00 a.m. -9:00 p.m., Sat-Sun. If the Project Sponsor has selected a Pre-Application Meeting held at the Planning Department, this meeting will be conducted during regular business hours.
- A sign-in sheet must be used in order to verify attendance. Note if no one attended.
- Preliminary plans must be available at the meeting that include the height and depth of the subject building and its adjacent properties, and dimensions must be provided to help facilitate discussion. Neighbors may request reduced copies of the plans from the Project Sponsor by checking the "please send me plans" box on the sign-in sheet, and the Project Sponsor shall provide reduced copies upon such request.
- Questions and concerns by attendees, and responses by Project Sponsor, if any, must be noted.

For accountability purposes, please submit the following with your Application:

- A copy of the letter mailed to neighbors and neighborhood organizations (use attached invitation) AND a letter with postmark as proof of mailing;
- A list of those persons and neighborhood organizations invited to the meeting;
- A copy of the sign-in sheet (use attached template);
- A summary of the meeting and a list of any changes made to the project as a result of the neighborhood comments (use attached template);
- The affidavit, signed and dated (use attached template);
- One reduced copy of the plans presented to the neighbors at pre-application meeting.

Note: When the subject lot is a corner lot, the notification area shall further include all properties on both block faces across from the subject lot, and the corner property diagonally across the street,

## Note: Please see the

 Department Facilitated PreApplication Meeting form at www.sfplanning.org for more information. Refer to the Planning Department Fee Schedule, which may be obtained from the Planning Department's website at www.sfplanning.org/planning or in person at the Public Information Counter (PIC) located at 1680 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94103. For questions related to the Fee Schedule, please call the PIC at 415.558.6377.
## Notice of Pre-Application Meeting

## January 162018

Date

Dear Neighbor:
You are invited to a neighborhood Pre-Application meeting to review and discuss the development proposal at g1922nd AVENUE cross street(s) BALBOA STREET______ (Block/Lot\#: 1822002 ; Zoning: RH-2 _), in accordance with the San Francisco Planning Department's Pre-Application procedures. The Pre-Application meeting is intended as a way for the Project Sponsor(s) to discuss the project and review the proposed plans with adjacent neighbors and neighborhood organizations before the submittal of an application to the City. This provides neighbors an opportunity to raise questions and discuss any concerns about the impacts of the project before it is submitted for the Planning Department's review. Once a Building Permit has been submitted to the City, you may track its status at www.sfgov.org/dbi.

The Pre-Application process serves as the first step in the process prior to building permit application or entitlement submittal. Those contacted as a result of the Pre-Application process will also receive a formal entitlement notice or 311 or 312 notification after the project is submitted and reviewed by Planning Department staff.

A Pre-Application meeting is required because this project includes (check all that apply):
$\square$ New Construction;
$\square$ Any vertical addition of 7 feet or more;
[ Any horizontal addition of 10 feet or more;
$\square]$ Decks over 10 feet above grade or within the required rear yard;
$\square$ All Formula Retail uses subject to a Conditional Use Authorization;
$\square$ PDR-I-B, Section 313;
$\square$ Community Business Priority Processing Program (CB3P).

The development proposal is to: add rear yard horizontal additions at existing 1st and 2nd stories, add 3rd +4 th stories to the existing building for a new two-story unit including rear yard roof decks.


Pre-Application Meeting Sign-in Sheet
Meeting Date: JANUARY 31,2018
Meeting Time: 6:00PM
Meeting Address: CAFE ENCHANTE, 6157 GEAR BLVD, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121
Project Address: 619 22nd AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121
Property Owner Name: KEIMING YEN
Project Sponsor/Representative: PLUM ARCHITECTS, INC.
Please print your name below, state your address and/or affiliation with a neighborhood group, and provide your phone number. Providing your name below does not represent support or opposition to the project; it is for documentation purposes only.

3. $\qquad$
4. STANTON BPDNNER/605. 23 NA AVE, SF G4Iz1
5. 415-635-c5l66/t-doquees esscgloshin=ta
6. Mrephanil Tang/ 609 22nd Are SF 94121
7. $\quad 650.814 .1137 /$ stephtang.sfegmail.com
8. EUGENE CHI./2115 Balboa st. (4/5)-379-8667


13. $\qquad$ $\square$
14. $\qquad$ $\square$
15. $\qquad$ $\square$
16. $\qquad$
17. $\qquad$
18. $\qquad$ $\square$

## Summary of discussion from the Pre-Application Meeting

Meeting Date: JANUARY 31,2018
Meeting Time: 6:00 PM
Meeting Address: CAFE ENCHANTE, 6157 GEARY BLVD., SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121
Project Address: 619 22nd AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121
Property Owner Name: MING YEN
Project Sponsor/Representative: PLUM ARCHITECTS, INC.
Please summarize the questions/comments and your response from the Pre-Application meeting in the space below. Please state if/how the project has been modified in response to any concerns.
 the ad action world heel sunlight.
Project Sponsor Response: The projest as eon ged Lox. The th ot story
 fin the hugh turell and anwlalife the north side at inert
 new 3 nd ir story addition themselves.
Question/Concern \#3:
$\qquad$

Project Sponsor Response: $\qquad$
$\qquad$

Question/Concern \#4: $\qquad$
$\qquad$

Project Sponsor Response:

## Affidavit of Conducting a Pre-Application Meeting, Sign-in Sheet and Issues/Responses submittal

- Rebentan Wall do hereby declare as follows:

1. I have conducted a Pre-Application Meeting for the proposed new construction, alteration or other activity prior to submitting any entitlement (Building Permit, Variance, Conditional Use, etc.) in accordance with Planning Commission Pre-Application Policy. on $1 / 31 / 18$ (date) from cider - 7: (time).
2. I have included the mailing list, meeting invitation and postmarked letter, sign-in sheet, issue/ response summary, and reduced plans with the entitlement Application. I understand that I am responsible for the accuracy of this information and that erroneous information may lead to suspension or revocation of the permit.
3. I have prepared these materials in good faith and to the best of my ability.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

EXECUTED ON THIS DAY, /1//~~2, 20_18 IN SAN FRANCISCO.


Signature
Rabentot Wail
Name (type of print)
Aratethet
Plum Ar chtects, 3298 Preral St. 94121
(ii Agent, give business name \& profession)
619 22nd Avenue
Project Address

INVOICE FOR SERVICES

| PLUM ARCHITELTS | Date |
| :---: | :---: |
| ${ }^{\text {Requested for }} 3298$ PIERCE ST | DUE |
| SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94123 | PHONE |
|  | EMAIL |
| MELISA | PHONE |




## OUTER RICHMOND

## Anni Chung <br> Self-Help for the Elderly <br> 407 Sansome Street

San Francisco, CA 94111
Jesse Fink
Clement Street Merchants Association
401 Clement Street
San Francisco, CA 94118

Peter Winkelstein
Planning Association for the Richmond (Par)
129 24th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94121

Yuka loro
Balboa Village Merchants Association
3519 Balboa Street
San Francisco, CA 94121

Dan Baroni
Planning Association for the Richmond (PAR)
2828 Fulton Street
San Francisco, CA 94118-3300

Megan Sillivan
Mid-Richmond Coalition
376 17th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94121

Dyan Ruiz
People Power Media
366 10th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94118

Peter Tempel
Sea Cliff Cares
230 El Camino Del Mar
San Francisco, CA 94121

Sandra Fewer
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room \#244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Norman Kondy
Lincoln Park Homeowners Association
271 32nd Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94121

Joseph Smooke
Housing Rights Committee of San Francisco
4301 Geary Boulevard
San Francisco, CA 94118


| From: | roberta plumarchitects.com |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | roberta plumarchitects.com |
| Subject: | FW: 619 22nd Ave - Neighbor hood Pre-App follow-up with Sun Study Rendering |
| Date: | Tuesday, September 28, 2021 1:29:14 PM |
| Attachments: | 619 22ND SUN STUDY.pdf <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  3-31-2018 Pre-App Drawing Binder1.pdf. |
|  |  |

From: Roberta Wahl [roberta@plumarchitects.com](mailto:roberta@plumarchitects.com)
Sent: Tuesday, May 1, 2018 1:20 PM
To: 'Simon Yu' [simonyu415@gmail.com](mailto:simonyu415@gmail.com)
Subject: FW: 619 22nd Ave - Neighbor hood Pre-App follow-up with Sun Study Rendering

Hello, Simon.
I received your email yesterday where you asked for a 3D rendering. I've attached what I previously sent out to all of you (I guess that you changed emails). It contains a 3D image.

Roberta Wahl, Principal
PLUM Architects
www.plumarchitects.com
3298 Pierce St. San Francisco, CA 94123
t 4158370900

From: Roberta Wahl [roberta@plumarchitects.com](mailto:roberta@plumarchitects.com)
Sent: Thursday, March 8, 2018 9:49 AM
To: 'stephanie tang' [stephtang.sf@gmail.com](mailto:stephtang.sf@gmail.com); 'Stanton Brunner' [todoquees@sbcglobal.net](mailto:todoquees@sbcglobal.net);
'Jimeo16894121@gmail.com' < Jimeo16894121@gmail.com>; 'Saammyyuu@gmail.com'
[Saammyyuu@gmail.com](mailto:Saammyyuu@gmail.com)
Subject: 619 22nd Ave - Neighbor hood Pre-App follow-up with Sun Study Rendering

Hello, Stephanie, Stanton, Eugene, Simon, James and Samantha.
For those of you with emails, please forward to Eugene, Simon and James who did not list an email.

Attached are the original 1-31-2018 Pre Application Drawings that I presented to you at our meeting.
We've revised the $4^{\text {th }}$ floor to pull it back along both sides to allow for a bit more light. The revised package dated 3-7-2018 is also attached.

We also did a sun study which is here attached. We were curious to know how the sun passes across the south elevation of 605/609 $22^{\text {nd }}$ currently with the building at 2 stories and what the difference would be with four stories. We took the sun angles at June $21^{\text {st }}$ and December $21^{\text {st }}$ at noon, 2:00pm, 4:00pm and 6:00pm respectively. During the summer months, there is no difference with the four story building than what is currently projected on the façade. There is an affect in the winter months which affects Stephanie's sunlight significantly and Stanton's partially.

I believe that the owner has been sensitive to your concerns and has not built out as allowable - take a look at 635-637 $22^{\text {nd }}$ where the $4^{\text {th }}$ story extends to the rear allowable and a $5^{\text {th }}$ story penthouse was constructed. The allowable occupied FAR (floor area ratio to site) is 5400 for $61922^{\text {nd }}$ and the project is well under this allowable at 3630sf. The actual square footage excluding decks and garage is 4,290.

We will submit the project as revised to the Planning Department. I expect that the 311 will go out in 9-10 months.

Roberta Wahl, Principal

## PLUM Architects

www.plumarchitects.com
3298 Pierce St. San Francisco, CA 94123
t 4158370900

## SUN STUDY

619 22ND AVE. SAN FRANCISCO, CA

## PLUM ARCHITECTS

















 Programming
FNAL SCHEMATC
NEICHMOHROM

FINAL SCHENATIC DESIGN
NEICHBORHOOD PREAPP MTC



HORIZONTAL ADDITIONS WITH VERTICAL DWELLING UNIT ADDITION

| LEGEND |
| :---: |
| PROPSEED AdodTION <br>  |



PLUM architects







## programming  $\underset{\substack{1212212017 \\ 01192018 \\ 01312018}}{\substack{18 \\ 0}}$





(1) EXISTING SIDE ELEVATION - VIEWED BY NORTH NEIGHBOR


619 22ND Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121 BLOCK/LOT: 1622/002 EXTERIOR BUILDING ELEVATIONS

A3.04



HORIZONTAL ADDITIONS WITH VERTICAL DWELLING UNIT ADDITION

619 22ND Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121
BLOCK/LOT: $1622 / 002$

GENERAL NOTES \& ABBREVIATIONS





- rear rapr roof decks.




| GREENING |  |  | EXIST. SITE PHOTOGRAPH |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 TREES FOR 25 FT FRONTAG |  | $171$ |  |
| LEGEND |  |  |  |  |
| Propose adortion <br> Exstinc walls | (12) Ker |  |  |  |

A0.01


HORIZONTAL ADDITIONS WITH VERTICAL DWELLING UNIT ADDITION

A0.02


PLUM architects

## Programming FINALSCHEMATC DE




HORIZONTAL ADDITIONS WITH VERTICAL DWELLING UNIT ADDITION

619 22ND Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121
BLOCK/LOT: $1622 / 002$ EXISTING FIRST FLOOR DEMOLITION PLAN


DEMOLITION NOTES




 PATCHING, AND DEMOLITION REOURED TO FACIITATT
PROPRR NSTALLATON OF AL NEW CONTRUCTION.
2. CONTRACTOR TO PROTECT ALL EXITING AREAS TO REMAIN
FROM DAMAGE, OUT, DEBRIS, ETC. DURING CONSTRUCTION. 3. Where Accessoriss fxtures, walls etc. have ben REMOVED OR MOOEED, PATCH NEWLYE EXPOSED AREA
4. For demolition, relocation and or instllation of IS NOT LIMTED TO: REMOVE EXITTRE, IISCONNECT PPING,


${ }^{\text {SHEET }}$ SLAB
5. AT AREAS Of DEMOLITION OR REMOVAL O F FIXTURES, Patch
AND PAINT AlL AREAS LEFT EXPOSEED TO MATCH ADIACENT
6. AL EXSTING TTEMS ARE TO REMIN UNEESS OTHERNSE REPARARG AND OR REPACING A THE CONTRACTOR'S
XPENSE ANY EXISTNG ITEMS DMAGGE OR DESTRYYED B EXPENSEANYEXISTINC ITEMS
CONSTRUCTION OPREATONS.



8. CAP all abandoned plumbing in wall or below sla 9. CONTRACTOR SHALL REEOVE ALL ABANDONED CONDUTS,



DEMOLITION LEGEND

|  | (e) framed wall to remain |
| :---: | :---: |
| -=-=-=: | (E) Framed wall to be demoushed |
| - | (e) area to remain |
|  | (E) Item to be demolished |
|  | AREA OF (E) Roofinc to be DEMOLSHED, |
|  | AREA OF (E) VINYL FLOORING TO BE REMOVED, SEE FINISH SCHEDULE |
| $\cdots$ | (e) door to be demolished |
|  | (e) door to be remain |

## $\xrightarrow[\substack{\text { Programming } \\ \text { FRNLLSCHMEMATC DE }}]{ }$

 NEIGHBORHOOD PRE-APP MTG

HORIZONTAL ADDITIONS WITH VERTICAL DWELLING UNIT ADDITION

619 22ND Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121
BLOCK/LO: $1622 / 002$ bLOCK/LOT. 1622/002
EXISTING SECOND FLOOR + ROOF DEMOLITION PLANS

A1. 02


|  | SHEET NOTES |
| :---: | :---: |
| ALITEMS SHOWN, NOTED, SPECIFIFD, AND/ /R SCHEDULED AR <br>  SPECLIFED TO BE OWNER PURCHASED CONTTACTOR INTALLED (OPCI). |  |
| any item shown craphically, but not specifically noted |  |
| r. run seberate plumbing drain ppes for unit a + unit b. <br>  <br>  |  |
| CONTRACTOR TO PROVIDE BONDING FOR WATER AND GAS PIPING. |  |
| SPECIFICATIONS \& UL LISTINGS FOR THE FOLLOWING TO BE SUBMITTED TO THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT: WATER HEATER |  |
| F. PROVIDE THE BUILDING INSPECTOR WITH ALL REQUIRED CF-6R FORMS (INSTALLATION CERTIFICOR BEFORE FINAL INSPECTION. |  |
| c.c. To provide building offical with cas shut-off Locations <br>  BEHIND APPLANCE PER C CCC 12125 . |  |
| G.C. To verify that installation of all sink plumbing VENTS WLL MEET NOTCHING \& BORING REQUREMENTS OF CBC2308.9.10 \& 11 PROVIDE INFORMATION TO BULDING OFFICIAL For Approval prior to close-in. |  |
| I. SEE Window and doors schedule for tempered/Safety GLAZING NOTES |  |
| J. (E) FURNACE, WATER HEATER AND BOILER AT FIRST STORY TO REMAIN. RELOCATE WALL HEATER AT BACK ROOM |  |
| K. FIRE SPRINKLER SYSTEM AT (UNIT B) VERTICAL ADDITION. NOT REQUIRED AT (E) UNIT 'A' . TWO MEANS OF EXIT PROVIDED. |  |
| L. Provide and install electrical radiant heat mats with REQUIRED POWER AT BATHROOMS IN SCOPE |  |
| M. ALL WINDOWS PROVIDE $>4 \%$ MIN. VENTILATION AND $>8 \%$ NATURAL LIGHT OF FLOOR AREA IN HABITABLE AREAS PER CBC 1203 \& 1205 |  |
| N. MAINTAIN SEPARATE KITCHEN HOOD EXHAUST BETWEEN UNITS A + B. |  |
| KEYNOTES |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| LEGEND |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | To Rem |
|  | AREA OF FLOORING TO bE PATCHED TO MATCH ADJAC |
|  | mnow/ Louver |
|  | -(02) KEY NOTE, SEE ABO |
|  | NeW door + Door ta |
|  | (existng door to remaln |




PLUM architects


## Programming FINALSCHEMATC DES





HORIZONTAL ADDITIONS WITH VERTICAL DWELLING UNIT ADDITION

619 22ND Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121 BLOCK/LOT: 1622/002 ROOF PLAN

A2.03


PLUM architects





















| KEYNOTES |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| (01) $\begin{aligned} & \text { INSTALL 1-HR RATED FLOOR-CELING ASSEMBLY } \\ & \text { BETWEEN SECOND FLOOR AND THIRD FLOOR WITH }\end{aligned}$ PER DETAIL 3 /A2. 05 <br> (02) PROVIDE 1-HOUR FIRE RESISTANCE RATED ASSEMBLY AT ALL PROPERTY LINE BUILDING WALLS (PER CBC SEC 705). |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| (03) PAINTED TYPE 'C' CYPsum board cellic. TTP |  |
| (04) relocate (E) LIGHt fixture |  |
| (05) Remove (e) licht fixture. See ceiling plan for NEW LIGHT FIXTURE LAYOUT. |  |
| LEGEND |  |
| $\mathrm{CRAPHIC}^{\text {TYPE }}$ |  |
| E | (E) FRAMED WALL TO REMAIN NEW WALL, FULL HT |
| -(12) | KEY note, see Above |
| ヌ | SO CFM PANASONIC FAN MODEL "\#FV-05-11 VKSI" SWITCHED TO RUN 24HRS DAY - W/ 4 " $\varnothing$ DUCT VENTED TO OUTSIDE. SONE RATING @ 110 CFM IS $<0.3$ |
| (E) | EXIST. LICHT fiXTURE TO REMAI IN PLAC UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED |
| LF | 59 WATT 1 X4 FLUORESCENT SURFACE MOUNT FIXTURE |
| 9 | LED WAL S SONCE |
| - | RECESSED LEED Down licht - 10 WATT |
| ¢ | Pendant Led licht fixture |
| - $\dagger$ | SURFACE MOUNT LED LIGHT FIXTURE |
| - | UNDER CABINET RIGID 12 V LINEAR LIGHT STRIP T.B.D |



PLUM architects

REFLECTED CLNG. PLAN NOTES

| Refer to sher notis ona 2.04 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | KEYNOTES |
| 02 PROVIDE 1-HOUR FIRE RESISTANCE RATED ASSEMBLY AT ALL PROPERTY LINE BUILDING WALLS (PER CBC SEC 705). <br> (03) PAINTED TYPE 'C' GYPSUM BOARD CEILING. TYP <br> (04) CLEAR STAINED CEDAR T\&G EXTERIOR SOFFIT. TYP |  |
| LEGEND |  |
| $\mathrm{CRAPHIC}^{\text {TYPE }}$ |  |
| $\bar{\square}$ | (E) FRAMED WALL TO REMAIN NEW WALL, FULL HT. |
| -(02) | KEY Note, se above |
| ® | 80 CFM PANASONIC FAN MODEL <br>  OUTSIDE. SONE RATING @ 11 OCFM IS $<0.3$ |
| (E) | Exist. Light fixture to remain in Place |
| $\square$ | 59 WATT 1 X4 FLUORESCENT SURFACE MOUNT FIXTURE |
| 오아아 | LeD WALL SCONCE |
| $\bigcirc$ | RECESSED LED Down licht - 10 WATT |
| $\phi$ | PENDANT LED LICHT fixture |
| - ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | SURFACE MOUNT LED LIGHT FIXTURE |
| - | UNDER CABINET RIGID 12V LINEAR LIGHT STRIP T.B.D. |



## Progeraming FiNAL SCHEMATIC desicial
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HORIZONTAL ADDITIONS WITH VERTICAL DWELLING UNIT ADDITION

619 22ND Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121 LOCK/LOT. $1622 / 002$
THIRD + FOURTH REFLECTED CEILING PLANS UNIT B

A2.05








HORIZONTAL ADDITIONS WITH

A4.02


PLUM architects
936 Clement Street, San Francisco CA, 941
TEL: 415-837-09000

## PROGRAMMNG FINALSCHEMT NNICHMTM





HORIZONTAL ADDITIONS WITH VERTICAL DWELLING UNIT ADDITION

619 22ND Avenue
San Francisco, CA 9412 BLOCK/LOT: $1622 / 002$


PLUM architects






HORIZONTAL ADDITIONS WITH VERTICAL DWELLING UNIT ADDITION

619 22ND Avenue San Francisco, CA 9412 BLOCK/LOT: 1622/002

WINDOW SCHEDULE, DETAILS \& TYPES
A5.02



