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DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT

BY AND BETWEEN

THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

AND LAUREL HEIGHTS PARTNERS, LLC

FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 3333 CALIFORNIA STREET

Block 1032 Lot 003
membership interests in Developer or any Transferee, (2) grants of easement or of occupancy rights for existing or completed Buildings or other improvements (including, without limitation, space leases in Buildings), and (3) the placement of a Mortgage on the Project Site.

1.102 "Transportation Demand Management" benefits are described in Exhibit J.

1.103 "Vested Elements" has the meaning set forth in Section 5.1.
1.104 "Walnut Walk North" is described in Section 1.f of Exhibit C.
1.105 "Walnut Walk South" is described in Section 1.f of Exhibit C.
1.106 "Workforce Agreement" means the Workforce Agreement attached as Exhibit I.

2. EFFECTIVE DATE; TERM

2.1 Effective Date. This Agreement shall take effect upon the later of (i) the full execution and delivery of this Agreement by the Parties and (ii) the date the Enacting Ordinances are effective and operative ("Effective Date").

2.2 Term. The term of this Agreement shall commence upon the Effective Date and shall continue in full force and effect for fifteen (15) years thereafter unless extended or earlier terminated as provided herein ("Term"); provided, however, that (i) the Term shall be extended for each day of a Litigation Extension and (ii) Developer shall have the right to terminate this Agreement with respect to a Development Parcel upon completion of the Building within that Development Parcel and the Associated Community Benefits for that Building, as set forth in Section 7.1. The term of any conditional use permit or planned unit development shall be for the longer of the Term (as it relates to the applicable parcel) or the term otherwise allowed under the conditional use or planned unit development approval, as applicable. The term of the Tentative Map and any Subdivision Map shall be for the longer of the Term (as it relates to the applicable parcel) or the term otherwise allowed under the Subdivision Map Act.

3. GENERAL RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS

3.1 Development of the Project. Developer shall have the vested right to develop the Project in accordance with and subject to the provisions of this Agreement, and the City shall consider and process all Later Approvals for development of the Project in accordance with and subject to the provisions of this Agreement. The Parties acknowledge that Developer (i) has obtained all Approvals from the City required to Commence Construction of the Project, other
performed pursuant to Section 8. The Planning Director, acting on behalf of the City, shall execute and return such certificate within twenty (20) days following receipt of the request.

5.11 Existing, Continuing Uses and Interim Uses. The Parties acknowledge that the Existing Uses are lawfully authorized uses and may continue as such uses may be modified by the Project, provided that any modification thereof not a component of or contemplated by the Project is subject to Planning Code Section 178 and the applicable provisions of Section 5. Developer may install interim or temporary uses on the Project Site, which uses must be consistent with those uses allowed under the Project Site's zoning, the Approvals, the Project SUD, or any planned unit development authorization granted under the Project SUD, as applicable.

5.12 Taxes. Nothing in this Agreement limits the City's ability to impose new or increased taxes or special assessments, or any equivalent or substitute tax or assessment, provided (i) the City shall not institute, on its own initiative, proceedings for any new or increased special tax or special assessment for a land-secured financing district (including the special taxes under the Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982 (Government Code Section 53311 et seq.) but not including business improvement districts or community benefit districts formed by a vote of the affected property owners) that includes the Project Site unless the new district is City-Wide or Developer gives its prior written consent to or requests such proceedings, and (ii) no such tax or assessment shall be targeted or directed at the Project, including, without limitation, any tax or assessment targeted solely at all or any part of the Project Site. Nothing in the foregoing prevents the City from imposing any tax or assessment against the Project Site, or any portion thereof, that is enacted in accordance with Law and applies to all similarly-situated property on a City-Wide basis.

6. NO DEVELOPMENT OBLIGATION

There is no requirement under this Agreement that Developer initiate or complete development of the Project, or any portion thereof. There is also no requirement that development be initiated or completed within any period of time or in any particular order, subject to the requirement to complete Associated Community Benefits for each Building (or for any market rate residential unit in excess of three hundred eighty-six (386), as applicable) commenced by Developer as set forth in Section 4.1. The development of the Project is subject to numerous factors that are not within the control of Developer or the City, such as availability of financing, interest rates, access to capital, and similar factors. In Pardee Construction Co. v. City of
the cured event of default shall terminate.

11. AMENDMENT; TERMINATION; EXTENSION OF TERM

11.1 Amendment or Termination. This Agreement may only be amended with the mutual written consent of the City and Developer; provided, however, that following a Transfer, the City and Developer or any Transferee may amend this Agreement as it affects Developer or the Transferee and the portion of the Project Site owned by Developer or the Transferee without affecting other portions of the Project Site or other Transferees. Other than upon the expiration of the Term and except as provided in Sections 2.2, 7.3, 9.4.2, and 11.2, this Agreement may only be terminated with the mutual written consent of the Parties. Any amendment to this Agreement that does not constitute a Material Change may be agreed to by the Planning Director (and, to the extent it affects any rights or obligations of a City department, with the approval of that City department). Any amendment that is a Material Change will require the approval of the Planning Director, the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors (and, to the extent it affects any rights or obligations of a City department, after consultation with that City Department). The determination of whether a proposed change constitutes a Material Change shall be made, on City’s behalf, by the Planning Director following consultation with the City Attorney and any affected City Agency.

11.2 Early Termination Rights. Developer shall, upon thirty (30) days prior notice to the City, have the right, in its sole and absolute discretion, to terminate this Agreement in its entirety at any time if Developer does not Commence Construction on any part of the Project Site by the date which is five (5) years following the Effective Date as such five (5) year date may be extended by any Litigation Extension. Thereafter, the City shall, upon sixty (60) days prior notice to Developer, have the right, in its sole and absolute discretion, to terminate this Agreement if the Developer has not Commenced Construction; provided Developer can prevent any such termination by the City by providing to the City notice, within the above sixty (60) day period, of Developer’s intent to start construction and the Developer thereafter Commences Construction within one hundred twenty (120) days following delivery of Developer’s notice to the City, or, if unable to actually Commence Construction within said time period, demonstrates reasonable, good faith and continuing efforts to Commence Construction, such as by pursuing all necessary Later Approvals, and thereafter promptly Commences Construction upon receipt of the Later Approvals.

11.3 Termination and Vesting. Any termination under this Agreement shall
Exhibit B

Project Description

The Project Site is an approximately 446,490-square-foot, or 10.25-acre, parcel bounded by California Street to the north, Presidio Avenue to the east, Masonic Avenue to southeast, Euclid Avenue to the south, and Laurel Street/Mayfair Drive to the west, at the southern edge of San Francisco's Presidio Heights neighborhood in the northwest portion of San Francisco. The project sponsor, Laurel Heights Partners, LLC, owns the site and temporarily leases it to the Regents of the University of California, which uses the Project Site for its University of California San Francisco (UCSF) Laurel Heights Campus. The Project Site does not include the San Francisco Fireman’s Credit Union (now called the SF Fire Credit Union) at the southwest corner of California Street and Presidio Avenue, which is on a separate parcel.

The Project Site is currently used as office and related research, child care, and parking. It is developed with a four-story, approximately 455,000-gross-square-foot office building including a three-level, 212-space, an approximately 93,000-gross-square-foot partially below-grade parking garage at the center of the site; a one-story, approximately 14,000-gross-square-foot annex building at the corner of California and Laurel streets; three surface parking lots with a total of 331 spaces connected by internal roadways; two circular garage ramp structures leading to below-grade parking levels; and landscaping or landscaped open space for the UCSF Laurel Heights Campus occupants.

The proposed project includes approximately 1,427,832 gross square feet of new and rehabilitated space, comprising approximately 977,437 gross square feet of residential floor area with approximately 744 dwelling units; approximately 34,496 gross square feet of retail floor area; and an approximately 14,665 gross-square-foot child care center use. The proposed project would provide approximately 857 off-street parking spaces (including approximately 10 car share spaces), approximately 762 Class One bicycle spaces, and 77 Class Two bicycle spaces. These proposed uses would be located in 13 new buildings (known as Plaza A, Plaza B, Walnut, Mayfair, Laurel Townhomes, Euclid and Masonic) and in the adaptively reused office building (known as Center A and Center B), which would be divided into two separate buildings and converted to residential use.

25% of the proposed project's units will be deed-restricted, on-site affordable units designated for low-income senior households. These affordable units will be located in the proposed Walnut Building on California Street and consist of 185 studios and 1-bedrooms for seniors plus one (1) on-site manager's unit. The Walnut Building would also include an approximately 175-seat child care facility, including a contiguous outdoor activity area. The project includes approximately 34,496 square feet of neighborhood-serving retail located in the buildings fronting onto California Street (Plaza A, Plaza B and the Walnut Building). This retail
“Title Policy” is defined in Section 4.F.

“Utility Allowance” means a dollar amount determined in a manner acceptable to the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee, which may include an amount published periodically by the San Francisco Housing Authority or successor based on standards established by HUD, for the cost of basic utilities for households, adjusted for Household Size. If both the San Francisco Housing Authority and HUD cease publishing a Utility Allowance, then Developer may use another publicly available and credible dollar amount approved by MOHCD.

“Walnut Affordable Housing Building” is defined in Section 2.A.

“Walnut Child Care Parcel” is defined in Section 2.A.

“Walnut Housing Parcel” is defined in Section 2.A.

“Walnut Retail Parcel” is defined in Section 2.A.

“Walnut Land” is defined in Section 2.A.

2. Walnut Affordable Housing Building

A. Description. The 185 BMR Units and the Manager Unit will all be located in a single residential building (the “Walnut Affordable Housing Building”) that will be located within a condominium parcel (the “Walnut Housing Parcel”) on the portion of the Project Site depicted as the “Walnut Land” on Attachment D-1 (the “Walnut Land”). The Walnut Affordable Housing Building will be comprised only of the BMR Units, the Manager Unit (which shall only be occupied by the Walnut Affordable Housing Building manager or, to the extent permitted under law, other property management staff), and the common and parking area for the BMR Units and Manager Unit. A condominium parcel for retail uses (the “Walnut Retail Parcel”) and a condominium parcel for child care uses (the “Walnut Child Care Parcel”) will also be located on the Walnut Land. The Walnut Housing Parcel, the Walnut Retail Parcel, and the Walnut Child Care Parcel will be created through a final map prepared under the Tentative Map as required in the Subdivision Map.

Before obtaining a First Construction Document for any portion of the Project or transferring the Walnut Land or the Walnut Housing Parcel to the Housing Entity, the Developer shall obtain legal descriptions for the Walnut Housing Parcel and the Walnut Child Care Parcel that are reasonably acceptable to City, cause the Walnut Land to be made a separate legal parcel, and record a declaration of restrictions (in a form approved by City and using such approved legal descriptions) that limits the use of the Walnut Housing Parcel to the construction and operation of the Walnut Affordable Housing Building and the Walnut Child Care Parcel to the construction and operation of a child care facility. In connection with the development of the Project, Developer shall have the right to enter into commercially reasonable licenses, easements, covenants, conditions and restrictions, reciprocal easement agreements, and similar agreements that affect the Walnut Housing Parcel to the extent necessary for the use or operation of any portion of the Walnut Housing Parcel (each, a “Property Covenant”); provided, however, that (i) Developer shall deliver the final version of each proposed Property Covenant to the MOHCD Director at least thirty (30) days before it is fully executed or recorded in the
Official Records of San Francisco County and (ii) all maintenance, repair, replacement and installation costs to be paid under a Property Covenant for the common area benefitting the Walnut Retail Parcel, the Walnut Housing Parcel, and the Walnut Child Care Parcel shall be proportionately allocated to the owners of the Walnut Retail Parcel, the Walnut Housing Parcel, and the Walnut Child Care Parcel based on the relative size of their respective parcel or any other commercially reasonable allocation that is approved in advance by the MOHCD Director, which approval shall not be unreasonably withheld.

B. Housing Entity. Before commencing the construction of the Project’s first Market Rate Unit, the Housing Entity will be formed and the Developer will contribute the Walnut Housing Parcel (subject to the requirements of the Development Agreement) to the Housing Entity. As a non-profit affordable housing developer and operator, the Affordable Housing Developer will operate the Walnut Affordable Housing Building to only serve Senior Households with incomes below 80% of MOHCD AMI, with an overall average of not more than 59% of MOHCD AMI.

C. Financing. The Housing Entity will structure equity and debt financing for construction, and the Developer will fund all predevelopment costs and gap financing required to complete the construction of the Walnut Affordable Housing Building. The Housing Entity will seek LIHTC and City-issued tax-exempt bond financing for construction. The Developer or the Housing Entity may apply to the following state funding programs for constructing the Walnut Affordable Housing Building without the City’s prior written consent: the Multifamily Housing Program (MHP) and the Infill Infrastructure Grant Program (IIG). At the time of such application, the Developer or the Housing Entity shall provide the MOHCD Director with written notification of such application and a commitment that the award of such funding would lower the average MOHCD AMI for the Walnut Affordable Housing Building. Neither the Developer nor the Housing Entity can seek other federal or other state resources for constructing the Walnut Affordable Housing Building without the prior written consent of the MOHCD Director, which consent may be withheld if the award of such funding would not result in a lower average MOHCD AMI for the Walnut Affordable Housing Building or applying for the proposed funding would compete with the application of a MOHCD-supported project. A failure to obtain LIHTC, MHP, IIG, or non-competitive federal or state resources for constructing the Walnut Affordable Housing Building shall not decrease the Developer’s affordable housing or other obligations under the Development Agreement. City has no obligation to provide any funding for the Walnut Affordable Housing Building. Developer may collaborate with other entities to obtain additional funding sources to the extent that those sources contribute to the feasibility, production speed, or increase the affordability of the Walnut Affordable Housing Building.

D. Project Phasing. The Developer may not obtain CofO for more than three hundred eighty-six (386) Market Rate Units until DBI issues a CofO for the Walnut Affordable Housing Building. In addition, the Developer must obtain a CofO for the Walnut Affordable Housing Building before the expiration of the Term.

E. Equivalency. The Walnut Affordable Housing Building shall be substantially equivalent to the Project’s other multi-unit residential buildings in exterior appearance and overall quality of construction. All BMR Units must be wired for telephone, cable, and internet
commences to construct before the Tax Credit Closing, the Developer shall, at its sole election, either deposit an amount equal to the Rental Gap Fee or Ownership Gap Fee, as applicable, for that unit in the Escrow Account before obtaining a First Construction Document for that unit, or deposit an amount equal to the Rental Gap Fee or Ownership Gap Fee, as applicable, for that unit and the Development Fee Deferral Surcharge for such Rental Gap Fee or Ownership Gap Fee (as calculated by DBI at the time of the Developer deposits such Rental Gap Fee or Ownership Gap Fee) in the Escrow Account between obtaining the First Construction Document and the Cofo for that unit.

At any time within thirty (30) days after Developer's written request (accompanied by reasonable supporting materials), City shall authorize the release of funds from the Escrow Account to reimburse Developer for reasonable and customary Walnut Affordable Housing Building pre-development costs incurred prior to the Tax Credit Closing, such as, but not limited to, design drawings, schematic drawings, and commercially reasonable costs for financing that expedites the construction of the Walnut Affordable Housing Building. If the Tax Credit Closing occurs, all remaining funds in the Escrow Account needed to finance the construction of the Walnut Affordable Housing Building shall be disbursed to pay construction and development costs that are approved by the Walnut Affordable Housing Building construction lender at the time such costs are due and payable. If the Developer provides reasonable documentation to City that there are excess Escrow Account funds that are not required to finance the construction of the Walnut Affordable Housing Building, such excess Escrow Account funds shall be disbursed to the Developer.

If the Tax Credit Closing does not occur by the Outside Date, subject to extension for any applicable Excusable Delay, then City shall have the right to receive the Escrow Account funds by delivering written notice to the Escrow Account holder any time after the Outside Date for deposit in City’s Citywide Affordable Housing Fund established in San Francisco Administrative Code Section 10.100-49. Within three (3) business days of receiving such written notice, the Escrow Account holder shall deliver the funds to the address specified by the MOHCD Director.

4. Transfer of Walnut Land to City.

A. Transfer Notice. If the Tax Credit Closing does not occur by the Outside Date, subject to extension for any applicable Excusable Delay, and construction of any Building occurs during the Term, then City shall have the right to acquire, and Developer agrees to transfer to the City, fee ownership of the Walnut Land pursuant to the form of grant deed (the “Grant Deed”) attached as Attachment D-2, with the Approved Legal Description attached to it as Exhibit A. City shall have the right to exercise its right to acquire the Walnut Land by giving Developer, between the Outside Date and the last day of the Term, written notice of the City's request to acquire the Walnut Land pursuant to this Section (the “Transfer Notice”). If City receives the Walnut Land pursuant to this Section, and Developer later obtains all financing needed to commence and complete construction of retail improvements on the Walnut Retail Parcel (or child care improvements on the Walnut Child Care Parcel), City shall transfer fee ownership of the Walnut Retail Parcel or the Walnut Child Care Parcel, as applicable, to Developer within ten (10) business days of Developer’s receipt of a First Construction Document for such improvements.
under Section 4.C above (the "Title Policy"), and (ii) to execute and deliver the Grant Deed and the Transfer Documents, if any, to City. Within 7 days after the City's receipt of the Title Policy, the duly executed and acknowledged Grant Deed, and, if any, the Transfer Documents, duly executed and acknowledged as applicable, City shall execute and return one (1) fully executed original of any Transfer Document to the Developer.

G. **City's Remedies.** If the Developer fails to transfer the Walnut Land to City in accordance with this Section, then City shall have the right to specific performance to compel the transfer of the Walnut Land to City in accordance with this Section or to exercise its rights under the Deed of Trust to foreclose and take title to the Walnut Land. Following any specific performance to transfer the Walnut Land to City or any foreclosure of the Walnut Land by City under the Deed of Trust, Developer's obligations under this Section shall be satisfied; provided if the Developer is not able to transfer the Walnut Land to City in the condition required by this Section (a "Condition Preventing Transfer"), then City, as its sole remedy for a Condition Preventing Transfer, shall instead accept an in lieu payment in the amount of Fair Market Value. City's exercise of its remedy for a Condition Preventing Transfer shall be by delivering written notice of such exercise to Developer, with a statement explaining the basis for the determination that the Walnut Land cannot be transferred in accordance with this Section. If City delivers such notice, the Developer shall pay City an in lieu payment in the amount of Fair Market Value made within 60 days following the determination of the Fair Market Value. Any failure by Developer to make such in lieu payment when due shall accrue interest at 10% per annum from the date it is due until paid.

H. **Fulfillment of Developer's Obligations.** On City's receipt of (i) fee ownership of the Walnut Land through an action for specific performance or foreclosure under the Deed of Trust or a payment of an in lieu payment due to a Condition Preventing Transfer, and (ii) the funds deposited in the Escrow Account as required in Section 3 above, City shall have no further rights or remedies under the Development Agreement resulting from Developer's failure to timely commence or complete construction of the Walnut Affordable Housing Building. If the Developer obtains a First Construction Document for any Market Rate Unit after the Outside Date, nothing in the foregoing sentence shall limit the Developer's obligation to pay the fee calculated under Section 415.5 for such Market Rate Unit.

5. **Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act**

**A. Non-Applicability of Costa-Hawkins Act.** Chapter 4.3 of the California Government Code directs public agencies to grant concessions and incentives to private developers for the production of housing for lower income households. The Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act, California Civil Code Sections 1954.50 et seq. (the "Costa-Hawkins Act"), provides for no limitations on the establishment of the initial and all subsequent rental rates for a dwelling unit with a certificate of occupancy issued after February 1, 1995, with exceptions, including an exception for dwelling units constructed pursuant to a contract with a public agency in consideration for a direct financial contribution or any other form of assistance specified in Chapter 4.3 of the California Government Code (Section 1954.52(b)). The Parties agree that the Costa-Hawkins Act does not and in no way shall limit or otherwise affect the restriction of rental charges for the BMR Units. The Development Agreement falls within the express exception to the Costa-Hawkins Act, Section 1954.52(b) because the Development Agreement is a contract
With the clink of champagne glasses, kudos to the development team and its community partners, and the cutting of a red ribbon, the new housing development at 38 Dolores St. had its grand opening celebration on Nov. 14, a couple weeks after the Whole Foods on its ground floor opened its doors to Market Street.

In many ways, 38 Dolores is pretty typical of the new housing opening in this part of town these days. It took seven years to complete the project, "on time and under budget in a way this community can be proud of," developer Dan Safier of The Prado Group told the assembled crowd.

That process included countless meetings with various community groups, who successfully pushed for progressive features that include some key pedestrian safety improvements and limiting the number of parking spaces to just one spot for every two units.

"It was an amazing example of a developer working closely with the various neighborhood associations," said Sen. Scott Wiener told the well-dressed crowd at the event, a sentiment...
also voiced by his predecessor, Bevan Dufty, who said, "They’ve been the gold star as far as listening to people."

But not everyone agrees with that praise. Peter Cohen, a housing activist who also works for the San Francisco Council of Community Housing Organizations, said Safer broke longtime assurances that he would satisfy his affordable housing obligations by building below-market-rate (BMR) units on site, rather than just paying an "in-lieu" fee to the city, two options under Inclusionary Housing Ordinance.

"They basically did a bait and switch. It was a real bullshit move," Cohen told the Guardian, noting how desperate the city is for more affordable housing now. "The bottom line is they promised to do affordable housing on site and they didn’t do it."

"There are so many nuances to how affordable housing works," Saifer told us, vaguely explaining why he couldn’t do on-site BMR units, including the demands of project funders. He worked with the city on doing a land dedication for off-site affordable housing, but the Mayor’s Office of Housing was resistant, and it would have required a change in city codes to do in this part of town.

"They wanted to develop faster than we had to capacity to develop," MOH Director Olson Lee told the Guardian, explaining that his office was dealing with transitioning affordable housing projects under the old Redevelopment Agency and it didn’t have the capacity to help Saifer build the BMR units now. Instead, it accepted a check for about $5 million.

"We felt there should be more options for developers," Saifer said. "But the reality is the city needs the fees."

Yes, over the long haul, the city does need those fees to build more BMR units, which require big public subsidies to build in San Francisco. But those will take many years and much effort to build. Lee said the $37 million now in the city’s Affordable Housing Trust Fund will eventually translate into 185 BMR units.

"That’s why we want the units on site," Cohen said, "because the clearest path is to build the damn units in your building."

By time the party started at 38 Dolores, 40 of its 81 units had already been rented, and the developers expected even more to be rented out by the end of the party, after attendees had toured the open units sipping free champagne or cocktails.

"If you’ve brought your checkbook, you can even rent a unit," Saifer told the crowd.

Prices ranged from $2,950 per month for one of a half-dozen 505-square-foot studio apartments to $4,395 for the two-bedroom, two-bath, 1,000-square-foot units that the event was really pushing up to $8,000 for a few three-bedroom apartments with the balcony and killer views on the seventh floor.

Compare those rents to San Francisco’s median rent of nearly $1,500, the highest in the nation, according to a recent US Census report, which also noted that occupants in 38
with the City's General Plan and eight priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1. The
Board adopts these findings as its own. A copy of said Resolution is on file with the Clerk of
the Board of Supervisors in File No._______, and is incorporated herein by reference.
(c) Pursuant to Planning Code Section 302, this Board finds that this ordinance will
serve the public necessity, convenience, and welfare for the reasons set forth in Planning
Commission Resolution No._______ and the Board incorporates such reasons herein by
reference. A copy of Planning Commission Resolution No._______ is on file with the Clerk of
the Board of Supervisors in File No._______.

Section 2. The Planning Code is hereby amended by adding Section 249.20, to read as
follows:

SEC. 249.20. GEARY-MASONIC SPECIAL USE DISTRICT.
(a) General. A Special Use District entitled the Geary-Masonic Special Use District
("District"), the boundaries of which are shown on Sectional Map SU03 of the Zoning Maps of
the City and County of San Francisco, is hereby established for the purpose set out below.
(b) Purpose. In order to provide for a mixed use development project with ground floor
retail, and a combination of very low income, low-income, moderate-income, middle-income,
and market rate residential units, at densities higher than what otherwise would be permitted
in the NC-3 zoning district and 80 foot height district, in an area well-served by transit, there
shall be a Geary-Masonic Special Use District consisting o(Assessor's Block 1071, Lot 003
as designated on Sectional Map SU03 of the Zoning Maps of the City and County o(San
Francisco.
(c) Development Controls. Applicable provisions of the Planning Code for NCT-3
Districts as set forth in Section 752 shall apply within this Special Use District, except for the
following:
(1) Use Size. Non-residential uses 3000 square feet and above shall
require a conditional use under Section 121.2. Uses more than 6000 square feet in size are not permitted.

(2) Accessory Vehicle Parking. There are no minimum off-street parking requirements for any use in this District. No parking shall be permitted above .5 cars for each Dwelling Unit.

(3) Car-sharing. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 166, no less than 25% of parking spaces provided shall be an off-street car-share parking space and shall be provided on the building site. Except as expressly provided herein, all other provisions of section 166 shall apply.

(4) Parking and Loading Access. Parking and Loading access from Masonic Avenue is not permitted.

(5) Dwelling Unit Mix. The project shall provide a minimum dwelling unit mix of
(A) at least 40% two and three bedroom units, including at least 10% three bedroom units, or
(B) any unit mix which includes some three bedroom or larger units such that 50% of all bedrooms within the project are provided in units with more than one bedroom.

(d) Inclusionary Housing. Compliance with the Inclusionary Housing Program can occur in one of the two following methods: In order to allow for the increased residential densities provided by this Special Use District, on-site inclusionary units pursuant to Planning Code Section 415.6 shall be required and required in the following amounts and income levels:

(1) Affordable Housing Fee. Payment of the Affordable Housing Fee pursuant to Section 415.5 and the following provisions:

(1) For a project providing Owned Units, the applicable percentage shall be 33% of the residential gross floor area.

(2) For a project providing Rental Units, the applicable percentage shall be 30% of
the residential gross floor area.
Exhibit 1

LEVEL E LOT CONFIGURATION VS. EXISTING CONDITIONS
Opposition to Permit # 2019-014314 CUA
49 Hopkins Ave

* Permit application proposes a structure
~300 % larger than average house on Hopkins Ave

-----------------------------

Presented by the Hopkins Ave. Neighbors
August 29, 2019
Historical and Current Perspective

• The developer was stopped by the city on September 2018 for an illegal demolition of a historical home
• He was ordered by the SF Planning Commission to build a replica of the historic Richard Neutra original house
• Permit under consideration today requests an even larger footprint than the original plan
• The Hopkins Avenue neighborhood residents are long term neighbors (some since 1963)
  • 103 year old resident, Mexican American Woman Educator, Woman 5X CEO, Woman Health Care Exec, Apple designer, Small Business Owner, Lawyer (more than 38% of homes owned by woman)
• We welcome a new neighbor
  • However, want a house in keeping with the character and scale of our neighborhood
• Hopkins Ave neighbors ask the commission to reject this permit or create conditions that make it acceptable with the scale and character of our existing neighborhood.
The Proposed Permit does not follow the **Character and Scale** directive requirements of the ADU

Developer is asking for an approx. **4200 sq.ft.** structure (1200 sq ft ADU, 2660 sq ft House, 355 sq ft Garage)

- The average size of the homes in the HOPKINS neighborhood is app. **1400 sq.ft.**
  Proposed structure is almost **300% bigger than average house on Hopkins Ave.**

- The house next door to the proposed structure is **1063 sq.ft.**
  Proposed structure is almost **400% larger than the house next door**

- Original structure at 49 Hopkins is recorded in city records as **927 sq.ft.** of living space
  Proposed structure is almost **450% larger than the original house**
The proposed ADU at 49 Hopkins is not intended
to create affordable housing

Section 2, (i) of Planning Administrative Codes, Construction of Accessory Dwelling Units: This infill strategy would create more apartments in the areas of the city that are already built-out without changing the character, increasing building heights, or altering the built form. Such small-scale residential infill could create additional homes for existing and future San Franciscans.

Section 2(e) ADU’s will be small units with relatively low rents
- A 1200 sq. ft ADU is not small, nor likely to be “low rent”
- The proposed ADU by itself is larger than 50% of the homes on the block

Section 2(j) ADU’s states that their purpose should become a major provider of affordable housing
- Without agreeing to recording Specific Restrictions for rent controlled or BMR (Below Market Rate) rent, this proposed housing will be market rate and not affordable

Section 2(g): allowing more residents to live within walking distance of transit, shopping and services.
- The Twin Peaks neighborhood has no services within walking distance

Opposition to Permit # 2019-014314 CUA (49 Hopkins Ave)
We ask the commission to reject this permit or create conditions that make this permit acceptable with the Character and Scale of our neighborhood.

- A Smaller Footprint home: 1400 sq. ft.
- A Smaller ADU: approximately 400 sq. ft.
- Hopkins entrances for both of the dwellings
- Guaranteed Affordability
- Enforceable Rent Restrictions recorded in the deed
- Supervision of his contractor’s work ongoing by the city
San Francisco and The Bay area are in the midst of a housing affordability crisis.

Communities experience sharp increases in homelessness when median rent accounts for 32% or more of median income and SF is well above this threshold at 39% (Zillow).

The unsheltered population has increased 19%.

Two-thirds of the increase in the number of unsheltered is attributable to people sleeping in vehicles.
The proposed site:

- Will be managed by a trusted provider who will provide 24/7 security and site management.
- Will be restricted to clients that are already engaged with HSH’s Vehicle Encampment Resolution Team (VERT), an arm of the Homeless Outreach Team (HOT).
- Creates a safe place to store a vehicle as an incentive to engage with the Homelessness Response System.
Will allow a small number of individual adults to remain onsite if they continue to engage with services

- Families with children will be highly encouraged to utilize temporary shelter

- Will provide clients support in getting their vehicles legal, operable and unencumbered by fines

- Will abide by a Good Neighbor Policy and provide the public a 24/7 phone number to call with concerns
DESIGN

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELESSNESS AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING
TIMELINE

- Begin Construction -- October 2019
- Site Opens -- November 2019
- Program Runs November 2019 – November 2020
DESIGN – PARAMETERS

- Schedule
  - Quick deployment needed

- Cost
  - Low, due to limited duration

- Resulting concept plan: minimal site improvements
  - No permanent utility infrastructure
  - Work within existing grade
  - Do not touch rail tracks or stoppers
  - Temporary facilities
- Parking spots: 33
- Guests: 30; staff: 3
- Mix of standard, ADA, and van/RV
- Keep existing gate
- Add new, secured vehicle and pedestrian gates
- Add screening to existing chain link fence
Design - Site Plan

- Office trailer for staff
DESIGN – SITE PLAN

- Toilets
- Sanitation Stations
- Canopy
> Temporary fence or barricades
> Block off train stoppers, rocky sloped area
Extend level pedestrian path

- Vehicle Entry:
  - (2) 12'-wide gates
  - (1) 15'-wide gate

- Rail Tracks, Typ
- Accessible Path (48'-wide min)

- Site Entrance
- Gate
- Fire Hydrant

- Solar Generator with Light Tower and Crash Barrier / Fence

- Provide (N) Wheel Stops at All Parking Stalls

- NOTE: Patch Holes at (E) Tracks

- Conc Swale
- Asphalt Path

- Balboa Bart Station Passenger Drop Off

- Office
- Handwash Station
- Portable Toilets (1) ADA Toilet
- Video Camera

- Sidewalk
- Bus Stop
- Privacy Screen for Entire (E) Perimeter Fence
- Edge Fencing Attached to Retaining Wall
- Fire Hydrant

- Video Cameras
- Pedestrian Gate
- Curb Cut

- Vehicle Parking
- Solar Panels
- Vehicle Entry
- Video Camera

- 1/32 = 1'-0" Scale

San Jose Ave
→ Mobile site lighting
→ Generator
→ Solar power
QUESTIONS?

Dylan Rose Schneider
Policy & Legislative Affairs Manager
Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing
Contact: Dylan.Schneider@sfgov.org
To whom it may concern;
As a long time resident of Sunnyside, myself and all of my family are totally in support of this temporary usage of the parking lot at the BP BART station.
These challenged people are already having to park in our neighborhood, and in our whole city.
The lot in question is about 3 blocks from my home on Marston Ave.
Fell free to use my name if necessary.
Thanks,
David Tejeda
Dtrepairs@gmail.com
415-585-3272
Dear Sir/Madam,

I am a homeowner near the proposed Triage Lot and I walk from my house to Bart everyday. Please record that I am against this because it will put the safety of all of those walking from their house to Bart station at risk. It will just create congestion, sanitation, crime, drugs and alcohol use abuse problems. There had been a lot of crimes in that area and the proposed Triage lot will just create more crimes.

I hope you will consider my concerns regarding the issue.

Sincerely,
Sheryl
Dear Commissioners:

This letter/email is in support of the above-mentioned related item that will be heard at the Planning Commission on Thursday August 29th.

I, on behalf of myself and Kenneth Kalani, we support Supervisor Ahsha Safai’s implementation of a trial program, for a “Triage Vehicle Center” at the above-referenced address at the Balboa Transit Center at San Jose Avenue/Geneva Avenue.
This proposal is in line with the agreements, proposed by Supervisor Matt Haney and agreed by the eleven supervisors, to support and help alleviate the crisis suffered by San Francisco, the agencies, residents, tourists, and all who are involved with this city regarding this homeless epidemic.

As we believe in all districts helping to start solving this homeless problem as it stands, this small gesture in helping those living in their vehicles to triage them and their families, helping them with the services that are proposed in providing, the hopes of long term housing and services will be welcomed by those in need the most. I think our District would benefit, in this cause and ordinance in keeping our streets and neighborhoods safe and free from those living in their vehicles.

Please vote to move this forward to the Board of Supervisors for approval.

Steven R. currier
Kenneth K. Kalani

NOTE: This email is being sent from New York. We will not be able to testify at the hearing.
Hi Diego - it's Sara Vellve.

Just a quick question about the Ordinance noted above. For clarity, we live in the neighborhood and I fully support the project.

I don’t see where the packet mentions BOS action for the amendment, but I’m assuming they will vote at some point in the near future? Yes? No? If not, could you provide some clarity? I’ve not kept up with anything having to do with the PC so am ignorant of any changes to the amendment process.

Hope you and yours are well.

Thanks.

Sara
Hi,

I live in Sunnyside with my wife, about a 15 minute walk from this site. We walk in the neighborhood daily. We strongly support the proposed triage lot.

People need help and we should help them. This is a perfect match of need (somewhere to live for people hanging on to a vehicle) and opportunity (underutilized parking lot). It's the perfect location: a residential neighborhood, for people to reside.

Long-term we need more housing, and fewer parking spaces, in San Francisco. But this is a good idea to help people right now.

Thanks,
Rajiv Batra
Sunnyside neighbor
I think the RV 90 day parking lot at Balboa Bart is a good short term solution. I think having facilities, security services and counseling available make this a viable temporary solution.

Denise Ruggeri
225 Capistrano Ave
SF 94112

Sent from my iPhone
Dear Sir/Madam,

Please record that I am against this Triage Lot for the following reasons:

- Puts the safety of my family and I at risk.
- Congestion, sanitation, crime, drug/alcohol use and abuse.
- Too close to residential area.
- Not the best use of taxpayer funds for a temporary solution. Wasteful since not permanent.

I am a homeowner and have resided at 127 Rome St. San Francisco, CA 94112 since 1991.

Sincerely,
Rudy Senora
Hello,

I hope this email is on topic. I just saw a link on Nextdoor.

I would prefer RVs to be parked in a lot with City oversight.

I really feel sorry for the homeowners on Judson who have to look at that really disgusting RV that has been parked on the CCSF side of the street for years with crap hanging and all over it and stuffed under it. This is the only one that is really an issue for me and there are lots of RVs and vans that have been in our neighborhood for years. I don’t know if there have been issued especially with trash and sewage but it has not been an issue for me with the exception of this one RV owner who doesn’t seem to make the slightest effort to be part of the neighborhood. I would be so upset if I was struggling to pay a mortgage and had to face that disgusting eyesore every morning.

There are only going to be more RVs on the street and for sewage and water and public safety I would prefer the RVs and vans to be in lots with services both for infrastructure and social support.

Wendy Poinsot
Mr Sanchez,

I wanted to take a minute to balance out the mass of angry emails in opposition to this project. I feel that it is absolutely critical that projects like these are completed and treatment becomes more accessible to these already maligned and forgotten people. Like the navigation center on the Embarcadero currently in progress, this triage lot will be an asset to all members of our community. Treatment reduces crime, this is a fact. Ignoring a problem never ends well and that is why we are were we are today.

Thank you for your time and have a great day.

Ed Walter
9 Edgar Pl, 94112
Hello,

It was mentioned on Next Door that it was your suggestion to place a Triage Lot in District 11 at Balboa Park Bart. Please make this part of the official record for upcoming meeting Case Number 2019-014759PCA. I will also be sending in a hard copy in opposition to Overnight Safe Parking Pilot plan proposed for Balboa Park Parking Lot.

I am in opposition to this proposal for various reasons and feel that this should not be forced upon our area alone and that if the Board of Supervisors intends to make our neighborhood yet another dumping ground for the RV Transients that you should also implement that other areas also be required to assume responsibility. One of the reasons that was stated that we are targeted for this location was because our District currently does not provide compassionate services to the homeless. This reasoning is not enough for me and many of the residents in the area also agree.

For one you propose to place this transient population right smack in the middle of five schools ranging from Elementary School to High Schools not including City College. Also, this is a very busy transit hub by which people travel by bus and by Bart - many of them employed in lower paying jobs downtown where they get off late at night. Your proposal for 24 hour security is not enough and your plan is weak. I travel via bus and Bart five days a week and Bart is cold and dark during the winter months and even though we are within blocks of the police station, you never see a police presence nor do you see any Bart Security which I only see monitoring to make sure people paid downtown towards Powell Street and the Financial District. Hiding this lot in plain sight which has no adequate facilities is not a good option. Where do these people go when you propose to begin construction - are these people assured to have housing when this structure is built, do they get free parking and how do you propose to get them trained and employed? Where are they going to be dumped when a year is up? The streets lining Balboa Park, Crocker Amazon and City College? We were told they would be pre-screened and should not have a criminal record? Well lots of junkies do not have a record so what prevents them from turning Bart into the shameful sewer that is called Civic Center Bart where they opening shoot up in the stairwells and corridors? This is not a safe proposal at all.

Many of the questions people posed at the community meeting were not answered adequately and I really think that you should have been required to send out written notice to all residents in the area to provide them with the opportunity to express agreement/disagreement. I don’t believe that the Supervisors nor Mayor who cannot even get a handle on the homeless mess directly in front of City Hall should be allowed to turn our Bart Station into Civic Center or Powell Street by example with junkies blatantly abusing drugs out in the open. I also think that there are other options that would never be considered because citizens in wealthier areas have access to attorneys who could oppose through litigation by which the Mayor will no doubt face in areas such as her proposed plan for the Embarcadero lot.

Basically it should not be the Supervisors right nor decision to further jeopardize our residential neighborhoods safety with a plan that has no long term solution. Just because these RV’s now line a wealthier area - Lake Merced and the Beach it is not your right nor the right of our District Supervisor nor the MAYOR to determine that you can place them in a lot in our area that has no proper facilities with no long term plan. San Francisco is much to politically liberal and needs to establish boundaries and stop giving money to transients shipped here or gravitating here from other areas or states.
No doubt you will face fierce opposition from the residents along the Embarcadero and additional outlying areas such as Bayview and District 11.

If you make our District adhere to such proposals then you need to include other areas such as Pacific Heights, Seacliff, the Richmond, The Marina, Noe Valley - it is not right for you to bounce these folks to us without making the aforementioned areas provide equal services and placement options for this population. What exactly are your plans for the higher valued areas? Is that exactly fair to low to middle income residents?

Had I not heard about this through Social Media nor the Media, I would not have been aware and I believe we have been denied our rights to weigh in on this decision and should have been notified in writing and be part of the decision. This is not right on many levels.

I am really tired of the Supervisors, the Mayor and Governor being allowed to make decisions regarding our safety without bringing the decision to the voters. Bail reform is a huge example whereby it totally jeopardizes the safety of the citizens of SF. When did the Supervisors turn into the decision makers and take the choice and right to make a choice out of the tax payers hands?

Regards,
Michell Houwer
Dear Diego Sanchez,

I am writing about the proposed Balboa Upper Yard rezoning. I pass this site every weekday on my commute to BART, and I live just up the hill at 192 Caine Ave. I am writing to urge the Planning Commission to approve this because compassionate support for people suffering from homelessness belongs in every neighborhood.

Thanks,
Zack Subin

Zack Subin
San Francisco, CA 94112

subin@post.harvard.edu | subin@berkeley.edu | zachary.subin@ethree.com
https://www.facebook.com/zsubin
https://twitter.com/zack_subin
https://www.linkedin.com/in/zachary-subin-9b6435bb/
August 22, 2019

Dear San Francisco Planning Commission,

I am writing to you in regard to the Conditional Use Review and Variance request to expand 42/42A Ord Court, a vintage San Francisco cottage, into a Monster Home. I oppose the project in its current form. It is too tall, too large and too bulky for our small, narrow cul-de-sac. There is no legal justification for allowing the owners to exceed the building limits of the Corona Heights Special District or to grant a Variance.

Over 100 neighbors oppose the current design. We have submitted copies of their petition to the Honorable Planning Commission for your consideration.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Please note that as recently as your March 7, 2019 hearing architect John Duffy misstated 42 Ord Court as a single family home. Both Mr. Duffy and the owners knew there was also a small studio in the basement that had been continuously occupied as an AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNIT. The previous owner evicted the last tenant, Erika Leder, but Erika continued to occupy the apartment for two months after the new owners took possession. Since then the owners' Nanny has been living in the Studio.

As I noted in my letter to the Commission in March, 42A Ord Court had been an affordable housing unit for decades. In contrast, the proposed replacement apartment, if rented at all, would be market rate and financially out of the reach of low or middle-income residents.

DESIGN PLAN DECEPTIVE

In addition, the site plan of 42/42A Ord Court is deceptive. The size and bulk of this development are massive compared to the existing cottage and even other larger homes on the Court. The photographs tell the real story. Please look at them closely.

THE LARGER BUILDINGS SHOWN ON THE DESIGN PLANS ARE ACTUALLY HIGH ABOVE ON STATES STREET, NOT ORD COURT. THE EXISTING 42 ORD COURT COTTAGE HAS OPEN SPACE ON ONE SIDE AND A ONE STORY GARAGE AND LARGE GARDEN ON THE OTHER SIDE.
ORD COURT

I moved to Ord Court 35 years ago because our little cul-de-sac is so beautiful with its large gardens, abundant open space and small Victorian and Edwardian cottages. It is a tiny piece of San Francisco paradise nestled between the Vulcan Stairway and States Street. Walking tours regularly visit our street to experience the unique combination of nature and people living quietly in harmony. Those of us who oppose this project are keenly aware that if you approve a development this large others will follow and Ord Court as we know and love it will be destroyed. The Corona Heights Special Use District, ENACTED TO PREVENT DEVELOPMENTS LIKE THIS ONE, will be rendered meaningless and a precedent will be set that will pave the way for the demolition of the other cottages and gardens.

Please help us save Ord Court from Monster Homes. Save our gardens! Save our Open Space! Please require the owners of 42/42A Ord Court to conform to the Corona Heights Special Use District and build a home and second unit that are compatible with our neighborhood.

Thank you very much for your consideration of our concerns.

Respectfully yours,

Barbara Taylor Mayper
33 Ord Court
San Francisco, CA 94114
415-265-4055
barbarataylorsf@gmail.com
PROPOSED NORTH ELEVATION (SIDE)

PROPOSED WEST ELEVATION (FRONT) - ORD CT

ORD COURT

States Street
Planning Commission Submission

40/42 Ord Court
8a. 2018-000547CUA
8b. 2018-000547VAR

William Holtzman
Board member: Corbett Heights Neighbors (CHN)

August 29, 2019
Developer veracity
(or lack there of)

3/7/19  First posting of proposed development
- One unit with proposed "additional" unit
- No mention of existing second unit (decades)
- Neighbors immediately protest
- Nanny was living in the second unit

4/8/19  Revised application quickly re-submitted
4/25/19  Testimony by (CHN) leads to investigation/delay
Key Dates

• 10/30/15 Property purchased
• 12/02/15 Building permit granted
• 12/29/15 Renter forced to move out

Today

• Two units before application, two units remain
• Low-cost unit illegally removed
• Rent goes from hundreds of dollars per month to thousands
• Parking garage added
Key questions

- Developer takes possession, applies for building permit but didn’t notice the existing renter?
- Developer proposal didn’t reference the second unit that housed the nanny?
Developer veracity
(or lack there of)

Bottom Line:
Such behavior (and impact) should not be rewarded

Please deny this application
30-DAY NOTICE OF TERMINATION OF TENANCY

Erika Leder, Does 1 to 20, and all other occupants claiming the right to possession of the following premises:

42A Ord Court
City of County of San Francisco, State of California, ZIP: 94114
including all garage(s), storage and common areas.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that this tenancy is terminated as of thirty (30) days after service on you of this Notice. You and those occupying with you are hereby required to quit and surrender possession thereof to the undersigned authorized agent of the landlord and to deliver possession on or before the expiration of said thirty (30) day period.

Rent will be due on a pro rata basis if the termination date of your tenancy is not the end of a rental period. This is a thirty (30) day legal notice for the purposes of terminating your tenancy.

If you fail to vacate on or before the expiration of said thirty (30) day period, the landlord intends to take legal action against you which could result in a judgment against you which would include costs, necessary disbursements, attorney's fees and costs, rent, damages and court costs as may be permitted by law.

This notice supersedes prior notice(s).

[Signature]
Kathryn Quetel, Esq.
Law Offices of Bornstein & Bornstein
Attorney and Duly Authorized Agent for Landlord
Hi Dirk, this is the best I could do in so little time, just written in the last 5 minutes to get it off before 2pm. Thanks for sending me all the info, I did speak with Tommi before I got your email, not sure if he is presenting, he is going. To clarify, they just rescinded my eviction via letter last week, then, strangely, this week have offered me 10k and 3 months free rent if I vacate by December 31st....I have until tomorrow eve at 5 to accept that offer. I'm speaking with my lawyer this afternoon to get his input, I'm wondering who the potential buyer is, very concerned that it is the same developer, wondering how and if my refusing their offer could help our cause overall in the neighborhood. Let me know if you have any thoughts.

I could not move my client, ( I tried ) but I will be there tomorrow anyway as long as I can, Tommi seemed to think we might actually be heard earlier.

thanks!

Erika

On Wednesday, September 23, 2015 1:54 PM, Erika Leder <eisabel@sbcglobal.net> wrote:

Dear Mr. Ionin,

My name is Erika Leder, and my husband Bill Harris and I have lived at 57 Ord Court for the last 25 years. We own our home. As you know, our neighborhood made the front page of the Chronicle this past year as "developers find Corona Heights!", with Ord Street, Ord Court and States Street being hit very hard. This proposed project on Ord Court/States Street threatens both States and Ord Court streets in my opinion and the neighborhood over all. We on Ord Court are very land locked on a cul de sac, very very little street parking, only one access/ exit off the court for vehicles, we are beyond our capacity at this moment to have more cars and people on this street...there are many days when it is difficult to get on or off the court with ongoing construction on Ord Street below. not to mention the fact that we are a last bastion of charming cottages single family homes, and modest apartment buildings that could remain ( relatively ) affordable when up for sale if they were left alone and not over developed. This developer who developed a previous project on States Street is currently renting one of his new units for 15k. Clearly this is not affordable housing. I highly doubt that this developer is interested in building "affordable" housing, and since he is also not a stake holder in the community, nor does he intend to be, he has already shown a profound disregard for the community aspect and livability of this neighborhood. 24 Ord Court is an adorable bungalow that might possibly be affordable for a 2 income family, I doubt that the expansion in mind will be. We also are blessed to be surrounded by precious pockets of open space, these are being threatened by this proposal. I am concerned that this sets a precedent for many of our other properties which are owned by elderly people who are transitioning either to senior homes or dying, realtors and developers are literally hovering like vultures to swoop in and take these properties. I am currently renting a studio from an elderly woman who owns 42 Ord
RE: 42A ORD COURT, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114

ELLEN SCHAEFER Landlord
and
ERIKA LEDER, Tenant

BUYOUT AGREEMENT, SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT, RELEASE, AND COVENANT NOT TO SUE
Voluntary Termination of Single Tenancy
San Francisco Administrative Code §37.9E

This Buyout Agreement, Settlement Agreement, Release and Covenant Not to Sue ("Agreement") is entered into by and between Ellen Schaefer (hereinafter "landlord") and Erika Leder (hereinafter "tenant").

DEFINITIONS AND RECITALS

1. WHEREAS, the parties wish and hereby intend to resolve any potential disputes between and among the parties which have arisen or may arise regarding the residential tenancy of Erika Leder at 42A Ord Court, San Francisco, CA 94114, a residential rental unit (hereinafter "subject premises").

2. WHEREAS tenant was residing peacefully at the subject premises and has been residing therein at all times relevant hereto and is in good standing under the operative rental agreement. No eviction notice has been served, and no eviction action has been initiated.

3. WHEREAS landlord has been represented by Kathryn Quetel of Bornstein & Bornstein, 507 Polk Street #410, San Francisco, California 94102, telephone (415) 409-7611 (attorney); and tenant has been represented by Dave Crow of Crow & Rose, 605 Market Street, #400, San Francisco, California 94105, telephone (415) 552-9060 (attorney).

4. WHEREAS, tenant understands that tenant is under no obligation to enter into any settlement agreement and vacate the subject premises, and that tenant is freely entering into this Agreement of tenant’s own volition and without coercion. Whereas the parties have asserted claims against each other and/or may have claims against each other, and the bases for said claims have been disputed, continue to be disputed, and denied by the respective party against whom the claims were brought.

5. Tenant has been apprised of and acknowledges the following by initialing after each paragraph:
   a. You, the tenant, have a right not to enter into a buyout agreement.
   b. You, the tenant, may choose to consult with an attorney and/or a tenants’ rights organization before signing this agreement. You can find a list of tenants’ rights organizations on the Rent Board’s website – http://www.sfrb.org.
   c. The Rent Board has created a publically available, searchable database that may include information about other buyout agreements in your neighborhood. You can search this database at the Rent Board’s office at 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 320.
BUYOUT AGREEMENT, SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT, RELEASE AND COVENANT
NOT TO SUE (Voluntary Termination of Tenancy)

d. Under Section 1396(e)(4) of San Francisco’s Subdivision Code, a property owner may not convert a building into a condominium where: (A) a senior, disabled, or catastrophically ill tenant has vacated a unit under a buyout agreement after October 31, 2014, or (B) two or more tenants who are not senior, disabled, or catastrophically ill have vacated units under buyout agreements, if the agreements were entered after October 31, 2014 and within the ten years prior to the condominium conversion application. A ‘senior’ is a person who is 60 years or older and has been residing in the unit for ten years or more at the time of Buyout Agreement; a ‘disabled’ tenant is a person who is disabled under the Americans with Disabilities Act (Title 42 United States Code Section 12102) and has been residing in the unit for ten years or more at the time of Buyout Agreement; and a ‘catastrophically ill’ tenant is a person who is disabled under the Americans with Disabilities Act (Title 42 United States Code Section 12102) and who is suffering from a life threatening illness and has been residing in the unit for five years or more at the time of Buyout Agreement.

Do you, Erika Leder, believe that you are senior, disabled, or catastrophically ill as those terms are defined above? Yes [x] No [ ] I don’t know [ ] I prefer not say [ ].

6. WHEREAS, except that which is specifically excluded herein, the parties to this Agreement wish and hereby intend to resolve, terminate and forever settle all other actual or potential disputes or legal causes of action (known or unknown), which currently exist or may exist between them as a result of any set of facts in existence immediately prior to the execution of this Agreement by said parties and which were or could have been the basis for any legal action, whether in law, equity or otherwise, which could have been commenced prior to the date of execution of this Agreement.

7. WHEREAS, the liability for all such claims is denied by all parties, and this final Settlement thereof shall never be treated as an admission of liability or responsibility at any time for any purpose.

8. “Party” or “parties” means or refers to any party executing this Agreement, and any of their successors, assigns, heirs, executors, administrators or insurance carriers.

9. Whenever the singular is used in this Agreement, it includes the plural. Whenever the masculine gender is used, it includes the feminine or neuter gender. Whenever the word “complaint” is used, it includes any and all amended complaints, amendments to complaints, cross-complaints, complaints in intervention, amended complaints in intervention, and

Init.:
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NOT TO SUE (Voluntary Termination of Tenancy)

amendments to complaints in intervention. Whenever the word “lien” is used, it includes any and all liens of any type and kind, including but not limited to any mechanic’s lien and those provided by law.

10. WHEREAS, tenant desires to negotiate a surrender of possession of the subject premises, freely, voluntarily, without coercion and with full knowledge of his rights under California Law and the San Francisco Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance, and hereby freely, voluntarily, and without coercion, waives those rights, subject to the provisions of paragraph 33, herein.

11. For good and valuable consideration, including but not limited to payment and/or rent waivers to Erika Leder as described herein, tenant hereby voluntarily surrenders possession of and permanently terminates her tenancy and current and future right of occupancy, if any, at the subject premises, no later than 5:00p.m., December 31, 2015 leaving the premises in broom clean condition, free of all occupants, free of all personal possessions, and delivering all keys to landlord or landlord’s agent. Upon forty six (46) days after all parties have signed a final version of this hereto agreement, landlord’s counsel shall deliver one check to Erika Leder, made payable to Erika Leder in the amount of one thousand dollars ($1,000.00), by delivery to tenant’s counsel’s office. On or before January 5, 2016, and upon timely surrender of subject premises, landlord’s counsel shall deliver one check to Erika Leder, made payable to Erika Leder, in the amount of nineteen thousand dollars ($19,000.00), by delivery to tenant’s counsel’s office. The total amount of payments pursuant to this covenant is twenty thousand dollars ($20,000.00). The parties acknowledge and agree that said payment shall satisfy all payment obligations of landlord as provided by the San Francisco Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance.

The parties further acknowledge and agree that landlord shall deposit the total sum of twenty thousand dollars ($20,000.00) into tenant’s counsel’s client trust account on or before October 31, 2015. Tenant’s counsel shall not release any funds to tenant without landlord’s counsel’s written authorization.

12. RENT: Upon tenant’s timely surrender of possession of the subject premises, Tenant’s rent shall be waived for the period of October 1, 2015 through and including December 31, 2015.

13. SECURITY DEPOSIT: Security deposit and interest due thereon, if any, shall be accounted for pursuant to law.

14. RELEASE: With the exceptions noted herein and subject to the provisions of paragraph 33 herein, the parties and their heirs, successors, and assigns, do hereby forever, finally, fully and completely release, relieve, acquit, remise and discharge one another and one another’s agents, partners, trustees, officers, attorneys, directors, property managers, employees, independent contractors, and all others associated with the parties and/or acting on behalf of the parties from any and all claims, liens, debts, liabilities, demands, obligations, promises, acts, agreements, costs, expenses (including, without limitation, attorneys’ fees), damages, Init.:              Page 3 of 8
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injuries, suits, actions commenced prior to, and causes of action of whatever kind or nature, whether known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, or contingent or fixed as a result of any set of facts in existence immediately prior to the date of execution of this Agreement by said parties and which are or which could have been the basis for any legal action, whether in law, equity or otherwise, which could have been filed on the date of execution of this Agreement.

15. COVENANT NOT TO SUE: With the exceptions noted herein, for good, valuable and other consideration described herein, the parties covenant never to institute any action, arbitration or other legal proceeding, including but not limited to, any matters before the San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board against any other party, person or entity arising from or related to the matters alleged in Paragraphs 1-14 of this Agreement and the subject property. The parties unconditionally, fully and finally release and discharge each other from any and all duties, claims, rights, complaints, charges, injuries, damages, costs, losses, expenses, taxes, attorneys' fees, debts, demands, actions, obligations, liabilities, and causes of action, of any and every kind, nature, and character whatsoever, whether arising out of contract, tort, statute, settlement, equity or otherwise, whether known or unknown, whether foreseen or unforeseen, whether fixed, liquidated, or contingent, which the parties ever had, now have, or may in the future claim to have had against the other (and each of them) based on any act or omission concerning any matter, cause, or thing directly or indirectly which were raised or could have been raised against each other, from the beginning of time to the day this Agreement is fully executed.

16. SECTION 1542 WAIVER: With respect to the matters released herein, the parties hereto expressively waive any and all rights, except those expressly reserved, they may have under Section 1542 of the Civil Code of the State of California, which provides as follows:

A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS WHICH THE CREDITOR DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTION OF THE RELEASE, WHICH IF KNOWN BY HIM OR HER MUST HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR.

17. LATER DISCOVERY: The parties hereto acknowledge they may hereafter discover claims presently unknown or unsuspected, or facts in addition to or different from those that are known or believed to be true, as to the matters released herein. Nevertheless, it is the intention of the parties, through this Agreement, to fully, finally and forever release all such matters and all claims related thereto that do now exist, may exist or heretofore have existed. In furtherance of such intention, the release herein given shall be and remain in effect as a full and complete release of such matters, notwithstanding the discovery or existence of any additional or different claims or facts related thereto by the parties hereto.

18. WARRANTY OF NON-ASSIGNMENT: Each party warrants said party has not assigned, Init.:
BUYOUT AGREEMENT, SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT, RELEASE AND COVENANT
NOT TO SUE (Voluntary Termination of Tenancy)

sold, hypothecated or transferred any rights said party may have against any other party.

19. WARRANTY OF AUTHORIZATION: Each person executing this Agreement warrants he or she is authorized to execute the Agreement on behalf of the person, partnership, joint venture, corporation, unincorporated association, estate, or governmental entity for which he or she signs and that all necessary resolutions and authorizations have been obtained prior to execution of this Agreement.

20. BINDING AGREEMENT: The Agreement benefits and is binding upon each party and his/her heirs, legatees, transferees, parents, subsidiaries, successors and assigns. This Agreement shall bind and inure to the benefit of the parties hereto and their respective successors, heirs, agents, independent contractors, employees, officers, directors and assigns. No change in the law which may occur between the time of execution of this agreement and by the time either party is under a duty to perform under this Agreement shall impact the parties' obligations arising from and out of this agreement.

21. INTEGRATION; MODIFICATION; SEVERABILITY; SAVINGS CLAUSE: This Agreement supersedes all prior negotiations and agreements between the parties and is their full and final agreement with respect to its subject matter. This Agreement may not be modified unless by written agreement signed by all parties. In the event that any portion of this Agreement shall be found void or voidable by a court of competent jurisdiction, such portion shall be stricken and this Agreement reformed to as closely approximate, as the law permits, the intent of stricken portion or portions. The terms of this Agreement may not be contradicted by evidence of any prior agreement(s) or contemporaneous oral agreement(s). The parties further intend that this Agreement constitutes the complete and exclusive statement of its terms and that no extrinsic evidence whatsoever may be introduced in any judicial or arbitration proceeding, if any, involving this Agreement.

22. ATTORNEYS' FEES: In any action to enforce the terms of this Agreement by either party, the prevailing party shall be awarded, in addition to any other compensation or award, its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

23. AUTHORSHIP OF AGREEMENT: Each party acknowledges the drafting of this Agreement was the product of negotiation; no party is the author of the Agreement; and this Agreement shall not be construed against any party on the ground such party authored or drafted this Agreement. No party shall be held liable or responsible for any word(s), phrase(s), and/or number(s) that have been included or excluded from this Agreement.

24. CONTROLLING LAW/IMPLEMENTATION OF AGREEMENT: This Agreement shall be construed and shall be enforced pursuant to the laws of the State of California. The San Francisco County Superior Court shall have jurisdiction with regard to disputes in implementation of this Agreement.

Init.:
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25. ADVICE OF COUNSEL: The parties hereto represent and warrant all the waivers, warranties, representations and covenants set forth in this Agreement are made after consultation with legal counsel of each party's choosing and with an understanding of their significance and consequence, and they are reasonable and a benefit to the parties. In the alternative, each party has been provided the opportunity to obtain such counsel and expressly waives said opportunity and he or she understands the consequences of executing this Agreement. Thus, each party acknowledges he or she has been represented by counsel or knowingly and voluntarily waives his or her opportunity to obtain counsel.

26. DEFENSE OF SUIT: Each party hereto agrees that this Agreement may be pled by any party as a full and complete defense to and may be used as the basis for an injunction against any action, suit, arbitration, or other proceeding which may be instituted, prosecuted, or attempted by another party, or any person, firm, corporation, or organization on that party's behalf, wherein the claim concerns any facts, claims or matters released by this Agreement. If a party ever claims, asserts, or brings an action in any forum alleging or asserting that this Agreement or any terms contained herein violate any local, county, state or federal ordinances, codes, regulations, statutes, or laws, or are a violation of public policy or regulation, then said party shall indemnify the other for bringing such an action or claim and for all consequences visited upon the other party as a result thereof, including reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, whether or not the initiating party is deemed the prevailing party.

27. TERMINATION OF TENANCY NON-RESCINDABLE: Except as provided in paragraph 33 below, this Agreement hereby serves as tenant's non-rescindable notice of termination of tenancy which landlord, by this document, hereby accepts and acknowledges. Should tenant fail to timely vacate the subject premises no later than 5:00pm, December 31, 2015, tenant understands that a lawsuit shall be immediately filed to effect her removal therefrom.

Initials: (LE)

28. FREE AND VOLUNTARY: This Agreement is freely and voluntarily entered into by the parties. The parties hereto represent, declare, admit and warrant that in executing this Agreement they relied solely upon their own judgment, belief, and knowledge and the advice and recommendations of their own independently selected counsel, if so selected and relied upon, concerning the nature, extent and duration of their rights and claims. The parties also acknowledge that they and their respective counsels, if so selected and relied upon, have had a full, complete and uninterrupted opportunity to make whatever investigation or inquiry they deem necessary, appropriate or desirable in connection with the subject matter and terms of this Agreement prior to its execution. In executing this Agreement, no party hereto relied upon or has been influenced to any extent whatsoever in executing the same by any representation or statements covering any matter made by another party hereto or by any person representing any other party hereto, save the representations, warranties and statements contained herein. This Agreement shall bind and inure to the benefit of the parties.
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hereto and their respective successors, heirs, agents, independent contractors, attorneys, insurance carriers, employees, officers, directors and assigns.

29. PERSONAL PROPERTY: Any and all personal possessions or other personal property remaining on the premises after tenant vacates, are hereby declared abandoned and of no value. Landlord may dispose of said property as landlord sees fit. The parties agree that the provisions of Civil Code Sec. 1980-1991 have been complied with.

30. COUNTERPARTS: This Agreement may be executed in counterparts, and when each party has signed and delivered at least one such counterpart, each counterpart shall be deemed an original, and taken together shall constitute one and the same agreement, which shall be binding and effective as to all parties. Faxed signatures shall be fully honored as if they were original inked signatures.

31. CONFIDENTIALITY AND NON-DISPARAGEMENT: Provided that owner and occupants satisfy all their legal obligations owed under this Agreement, owner and occupants agree that they will not publicize, disclose, permit or authorize the publication or disclosure regarding any and all aspects of this tenancy and or subject premises, including the contents of any agreements made between owner and occupants, without the prior express written consent of the other. Notwithstanding the foregoing sentence, the parties are not prohibited from making disclosures to their accountants, attorneys, or governmental taxing authorities and are further authorized to make any disclosures occasioned pursuant to service of legal process such as service of subpoena, provided that the parties use their best efforts to ensure that the persons who receive said disclosures maintain their confidentiality. The provisions of this paragraph shall survive the termination or satisfaction of this Agreement.

32. The undersigned acknowledge they have read this Agreement, understand each and every term and all its terms together. Each and every term and all the terms of this Agreement together are reasonable, and each party hereto signs of said party's own free will.

Init.:
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33. CANCELLATION: You, the tenant, may cancel this agreement at any
time before the 45th day after all parties have signed this agreement. To
cancel this agreement, mail or deliver a signed and dated notice stating that
you, the tenant, are cancelling this agreement, or words of similar effect.
The notice shall be sent to: Ellen Schaefer, c/o Bornstein & Bornstein, 507 Polk Street,
Suite 410, San Francisco, CA 94102.

Ellen Schaefer

Dated: 9/28/2015

Erika Leder

Dated: 9/28/2015
Neighborhood: Corona Heights

MEDIAN ZESTIMATE

$1,778,300
1.0%
Past 12 months

Zillow predicts will increase 0.8% next year, compared to a 1.5% increase for San Francisco as a whole. Among Corona Heights homes, this home is valued 22.8% more than the midpoint (median) home, and is valued 63.8% more per square foot.

Walk Score ® 90 (Walker’s Paradise)  Transit Score ™ 91 (Rider’s Paradise)
Permit Details Report

Report Date: 8/22/2019 1:21:04 PM

Application Number: 201512023929
Form Number: 8
Address(es): 2619 / 060 / 0 42 ORD CT
Description: MOVE (E) CARPET, REFINISH HARDWOOD FLOORS, REPLACE KITCHEN CABINETS & PAINT.
Cost: $7,500.00
Occupancy Code: R-3
Building Use: 27 - 1 FAMILY DWELLING

Disposition / Stage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Date</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/2/2015</td>
<td>TRIAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2/2015</td>
<td>FILING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2/2015</td>
<td>FILED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2/2015</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2/2015</td>
<td>ISSUED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact Details:

Contractor Details:

License Number: 923107
Name: BRENDAN M. MCGRATH
Company Name: MODERN ART CONSTRUCTION
Address: 153 LIBERTY ST * SAN FRANCISCO CA 94110-0000
Phone:

Addenda Details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>In Hold</th>
<th>Out Hold</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Checked By</th>
<th>Hold Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLDG</td>
<td>12/2/15</td>
<td>12/2/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/2/15</td>
<td>PANG DAVID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPW-BSM</td>
<td>12/2/15</td>
<td>12/2/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/2/15</td>
<td>DENNIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTB</td>
<td>12/2/15</td>
<td>12/2/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/2/15</td>
<td>GREEN EMILIE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Appointments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointment Date</th>
<th>Appointment AM/PM</th>
<th>Appointment Code</th>
<th>Appointment Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Time Slots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Inspections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Date</th>
<th>Inspector</th>
<th>Inspection Description</th>
<th>Inspection Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Special Inspections:

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

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

Station Code Descriptions and Phone Numbers

Online Permit and Complaint Tracking home page.

Technical Support for Online Services

If you need help or have a question about this service, please visit our FAQ area.
Hi All,

My move date was technically 12/31/15, and I remember that it was very stressful finding places to store stuff as we could not move it back to our house so I'm sure I wasn't completely out until then. Hope that helps

E

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone

[Quoted text hidden]
We oppose a four-story tower at 42 Ord Court!

We, Corbett/Caarteenrningers. It’s too big and too high.

We, the undersigned residents of the proposed expansion of 42 Ord Court from approximately 1,110 square feet (as of the certificate of occupancy notice) increasing by more than 4X in size to 4,100 square feet plus two car garage.

We specifically oppose the expansion of the project to remove the fourth floor and reduce the size to no more than 3,000 square feet.

Ord Court is a truly essential San Francisco cottages and duplexes. This project, if allowed, it would tower above every other home on Ord Court.

Printed name: (108 neighbors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on July 11?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCOTT</td>
<td>145 CORBETT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>July 21/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Schaeffer</td>
<td>154 CORBETT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>July 21/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Dresch</td>
<td>145 CORBETT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>July 21/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Schwartz</td>
<td>1212 17th St.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>July 21/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Shull</td>
<td>24 ORD CT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Aug 10/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey Condonoth</td>
<td>4302 17th St.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8/12/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Landon</td>
<td>1302 17th St.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8/12/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Flanagan</td>
<td>90 ORD ST.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8/12/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed Name</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Could you testify on July 11?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Berline</td>
<td>JMBerline</td>
<td>37 A LEVANT ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzy Dell</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>263 States St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Goldstein</td>
<td>RG</td>
<td>230 States St.</td>
<td>maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Shepard</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>263A States St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Lechm Lechm</td>
<td>JLL</td>
<td>4304 17th St.</td>
<td>maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epic Murphy</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>56 Clarewood Ave. (Owner of 4304 17th St.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Walters</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>4304 17th Street</td>
<td>maybe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We oppose a four-story tower at 42 Ord Court!

We, Corbett/Corona Heights neighbors, oppose this project. It's too big and too high.

We, the undersigned, oppose the size, bulk and design of the proposed expansion of 42 Ord Court from approximately 1,110 square feet (as described in the Planning Department notice) increasing by more than 4X in size to 4,100 square feet plus two car garage.

We specifically ask that the Property Owners be required to remove the fourth floor and reduce the size to no more than 3,000 square feet.

Ord Court is a tiny cul-de-sac comprised mostly of quintessential San Francisco cottages and duplexes. This project, if allowed, would not only destroy one of those historic cottages but it would tower above every other home on Ord Court.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on July 11?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Cooper</td>
<td></td>
<td>54 Lower Terrace</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5-11-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Hiltzman</td>
<td></td>
<td>60 Lower Terrace</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5-11-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Marie Barcier</td>
<td></td>
<td>60 Lower Terrace</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5-12-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Shaw</td>
<td></td>
<td>117 Lower Terrace</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6-23-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Corbell</td>
<td></td>
<td>117 Lower Terrace</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4-23-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Turney</td>
<td></td>
<td>106 Lower Terrace</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6-29-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camryn Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td>106 Lower Terrace</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6-29-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Keesch</td>
<td></td>
<td>197 Corbett</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7-8-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Keesch</td>
<td></td>
<td>197 Corbett</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7-8-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed Name</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Could you testify on July 11?</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette McLaughlin</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 0rd St., Apt 1 SF CA 94114</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6-11-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK MAYER</td>
<td></td>
<td>33 ORD CT SF CA 94114</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>6-11-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregor Freund</td>
<td></td>
<td>26 Vulcan St.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6-11-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrielle Crawford</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 Vulcan Stairway</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6-11-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Mitchell</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 ORG Cast</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6-11-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Quinn</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 ORG ST</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>6-12-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Cue</td>
<td></td>
<td>27 Saturn St.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6-13-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Baker</td>
<td></td>
<td>78 ORG St.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>6-17-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Silverman</td>
<td></td>
<td>34 Douglas St.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6-17-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard Bruny</td>
<td></td>
<td>34 Douglas St.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6-17-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK BAUMER</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 Douglas St.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6-17-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Costa</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 Douglas St.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6-17-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Gellerman</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Vulcan Stairway</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-17-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Burbidge</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Vulcan Stairway</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-17-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melody Marks</td>
<td></td>
<td>44 Vulcan St.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6-17-19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We, Corbett/Corona Heights neighbors, oppose this project. It's too big and too high.
We, the undersigned, oppose the size, bulk and design of the proposed expansion of 42 Ord Court from approximately 1,110 square feet (as described in the Planning Department notice) increasing by more than 4X in size to 4,100 square feet plus two car garage.
We specifically ask that the Property Owners be required to remove the fourth floor and reduce the size to no more than 3,000 square feet.
Ord Court is a tiny cul-de-sac comprised mostly of quintessential San Francisco cottages and duplexes. This project, if allowed, would not only destroy one of those historic cottages but it would tower above every other home on Ord Court.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on July 11?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Taylor</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>33 Ord Ct</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6/8/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dede Dulin</td>
<td>Dulin</td>
<td>245 States St.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6/8/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Smart</td>
<td>Smart</td>
<td>245 States St.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6/8/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June Schardt</td>
<td>Schardt</td>
<td>10 Ord Court</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6/8/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Buehler</td>
<td>Buehler</td>
<td>30 Ord Ct #147</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6/8/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Fonseca</td>
<td>Fonseca</td>
<td>10 Ord Ct Apt 5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6/8/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirk Aquilar</td>
<td>Aquilar</td>
<td>36 Ord Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6/8/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilia Freuna</td>
<td>Freuna</td>
<td>26 Wiccan St, SF, CA 94114</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6/8/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We oppose a four-story tower at 42 Ord Court!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on July 11?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maurice Belefe</td>
<td>Mbilo</td>
<td>74 Vulcan Stairway SF 94114</td>
<td>maybe</td>
<td>6/17/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Broussard</td>
<td>Alen Broussard</td>
<td>74 Vulcan Stairway SF 94114</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>6/17/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erika Lecek</td>
<td>Erika Lecek</td>
<td>57 Ord Court SF 94114</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>6/18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poe Asher</td>
<td>Poe Asher</td>
<td>444 Ord Court</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>6/18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td>34 Ord Court</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>6/19/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Louie</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 Museum Way</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>6/19/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRNI Beyer</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 Museum Way</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>6/19/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td></td>
<td>4427 18th St, SF 94114</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>6/20/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Czkeries</td>
<td></td>
<td>4427 18th St, SF 94114</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>6/20/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed Name</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Could you testify on July 11?</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Nizzadini</td>
<td>Rick Nizzadini</td>
<td>2 Vulcan Stanway</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6-24-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darryl Leon</td>
<td>Cliff</td>
<td>7800 Opd St</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6/26/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**We oppose a four-story tower at 42 Ord Court!**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Email/Phone Contact</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brad Lyman</td>
<td>Brad Lyman</td>
<td>234 Corbett Ave</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Bradlyman.john@gmail.com">Bradlyman.john@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>6/18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Chapman</td>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>368 Corbett Ave</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Achainman666@gmail.com">Achainman666@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>6/27/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Wang</td>
<td>Rich Wang</td>
<td>368 Corbett Ave</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Rich@richdesigner.com">Rich@richdesigner.com</a></td>
<td>6/29/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris B Houston</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>52 Dorc Avenue</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Secretplaces8@gmail.com">Secretplaces8@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>7/13/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farid De la Casa</td>
<td>Farid</td>
<td>234 Corbett Avenue</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fariddelacasa@gmail.com">fariddelacasa@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We, Corbett/Corona Heights neighbors, oppose this project. It's too big and too high.

We, the undersigned, oppose the size, bulk and design of the proposed expansion of 42 Ord Court from approximately 1,110 square feet (as described in the Planning Department notice) increasing by more than 4X in size to 4,100 square feet plus two car garage.

We specifically ask that the Property Owners be required to remove the fourth floor and reduce the size to no more than 3,000 square feet.

Ord Court is a tiny cul-de-sac comprised mostly of quintessential San Francisco cottages and duplexes. This project, if allowed, would not only destroy one of those historic cottages but it would tower above every other home on Ord Court.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on July 11?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elina Razdobadina</td>
<td>JHDL</td>
<td>173 Lower Tera</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7/15/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Barlow</td>
<td>KB</td>
<td>4466 17th Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Barlow</td>
<td>JEB</td>
<td>4466 17th Ave</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alford Briggs</td>
<td>CWM</td>
<td>145 Corbett</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal Wood</td>
<td>Neal Wood</td>
<td>523 Corbett Ave</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>7/15/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirner</td>
<td>CSJ</td>
<td>145 Corbett Ave</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>7/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Weiss</td>
<td>SLL</td>
<td>75 M AVS</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7/15/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We, Corbett/Corona Heights neighbors, oppose this project. It’s too big and too high.

We, the undersigned, oppose the size, bulk and design of the proposed expansion of 42 Ord Court from approximately 1,110 square feet (as described in the Planning Department notice) increasing by more than 4X in size to 4,100 square feet plus two car garage.

We specifically ask that the Property Owners be required to remove the fourth floor and reduce the size to no more than 3,000 square feet.

Ord Court is a tiny cul-de-sac comprised mostly of quintessential San Francisco cottages and duplexes. This project, if allowed, would not only destroy one of those historic cottages but it would tower above every other home on Ord Court.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Cozenman</td>
<td></td>
<td>145 Corbett</td>
<td>7/15/19</td>
<td>July 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Stephens</td>
<td></td>
<td>49 Ord Ct.</td>
<td>7/15/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Jackman</td>
<td></td>
<td>4179 17th St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Driggs</td>
<td></td>
<td>145 Corbett</td>
<td>7/15/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Downes</td>
<td></td>
<td>565 Corbett</td>
<td>7/15/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Peoples</td>
<td></td>
<td>32 Muro St.</td>
<td>7/15/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We oppose a four-story tower at 42 Ord Court!

We, Corbett/Corona Heights neighbors, oppose this project. It's too big and too high.

We, the undersigned, oppose the size, bulk and design of the proposed expansion of 42 Ord Court from approximately 1,110 square feet (as described in the Planning Department notice) increasing by more than 4X in size to 4,100 square feet plus two car garage.

We specifically ask that the Property Owners be required to remove the fourth floor and reduce the size to no more than 3,000 square feet. The property features two housing units and it should remain two housing units.

Ord Court is a tiny cul-de-sac comprised mostly of quintessential San Francisco cottages and duplexes. This project, if allowed, would not only destroy one of those historic cottages but it would tower above every other home on Ord Court.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Email/Phone Contact</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chris Parker</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>231 State St. #4</td>
<td>714-687-2343</td>
<td>6/19/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Hultz</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>231 State St. #3</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/19/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Connelly</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>16 Ord Ct. #4</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/19/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya Nakhimovsky</td>
<td>Tanya</td>
<td>16 Ord Ct. #1</td>
<td>t.nakhimovsky@...</td>
<td>6/19/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cary Norwood</td>
<td>Cary</td>
<td>16 Ord Court #3</td>
<td>carynorwood@...</td>
<td>6/19/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryam Dresler</td>
<td>Maryam</td>
<td>30 Ord Court</td>
<td>415-864-9635</td>
<td>6/19/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kasberg</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>4134 17 1/2 St.</td>
<td>415 385 8517</td>
<td>7/9/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Ryser</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>135 Ord St SF</td>
<td>415 553 8033</td>
<td>7/10/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We, Corbett/Corona Heights neighbors, oppose this project. It's too big and too high.

We, the undersigned, oppose the size, bulk and design of the proposed expansion of 42 Ord Court from approximately 1,110 square feet (as described in the Planning Department notice) increasing by more than 4X in size to 4,100 square feet plus two car garage.

We specifically ask that the Property Owners be required to remove the fourth floor and reduce the size to no more than 3,000 square feet.

Ord Court is a tiny cul-de-sac comprised mostly of quintessential San Francisco cottages and duplexes. This project, if allowed, would not only destroy one of those historic cottages but it would tower above every other home on Ord Court.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on July 11?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rick Walsh</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 Ord St</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>6/25/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Dowd</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 Ord St</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>6/25/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Lindauer</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 Ord St</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>6/25/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan D'Errico</td>
<td></td>
<td>68 Douglas St</td>
<td>Maybe?</td>
<td>6/25/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Huss</td>
<td></td>
<td>68 Douglas St</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>6/25/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Nelson</td>
<td></td>
<td>64 Douglas</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>6/26/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Zinser</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 Ord St</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>6/26/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Neuberger</td>
<td></td>
<td>4E Ord St</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6/26/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Opposition to a 4,855 gross sq ft / 4-story structure at 42 Ord Court

Join us in preventing a bad precedent in our Special Use District and an oversize building in our charming cul-de-sac. Corbett Heights Neighbors (CHN) opposes the current design of a proposed development project at 42 Ord Court, because it sets a bad precedent in our Special Use District, on our street, and the project creates no new housing. Our negotiations with the owners have not succeeded thus far. However, we believe that we are very close. Please sign this petition to express your opposition to the current design and encourage the owners to resume their negotiations with CHN.

We, neighbors of Corbett and Corona Heights, oppose the current design. It's too big and too high.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on 8/22?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George White</td>
<td>George E. White</td>
<td>3 Vulcano Street</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7/22/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph White</td>
<td>Josephine White</td>
<td>3 Vulcano Street</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7/22/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Opposition to a 4855 gross sq ft / 4-story structure at 42 Ord Court

Corbett Heights Neighbors (CHN) opposes the current design of a proposed development project at 42 Ord Court, because it sets bad precedent in our Special Use District, on our street and the project creates no new housing. Our negotiations with the owners have not succeeded thus far. However, we believe that we are very close. Please sign this petition to express your opposition to the current design and encourage the owners to resume their negotiations with CHN.

We, neighbors of Corbett and Corona Heights, oppose the current design. It's too big and too high.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on 8/22?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patricia F. Frank</td>
<td>Patricia F. Frank</td>
<td>110 Everglade Dr, San Fernando, CA 94132</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8/10/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Opposition to a 4855 gross sq ft / 4-story structure at 42 Ord Court**

Join us in preventing a bad precedent in our Special Use District and an oversize building in our charming cul-de-sac.

Corbett Heights Neighbors (CHN) opposes the current design of a proposed development project at 42 Ord Court, because it sets bad precedent in our Special Use District, on our street and the project creates no new housing. Our negotiations with the owners have not succeeded thus far. However, we believe that we are very close. Please sign this petition to express your opposition to the current design and encourage the owners to resume their negotiations with CHN.

**Sign now, testify**

We, neighbors of Corbett and Corona Heights, oppose the current design. It's too big and too high.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on 8/22?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIANA GOLDSTEIN</td>
<td>Diana Goldstein</td>
<td>22 Vulcan Starway</td>
<td>I will be away on Vacation.</td>
<td>08/10/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Opposition to a 4855 gross sq ft / 4-story structure at 42 Ord Court

**Corbett Heights Neighbors (CHN) opposes the current design of a proposed development project at 42 Ord Court, because it sets bad precedent in our Special Use District, on our street and the project creates no new housing. Our negotiations with the owners have not succeeded thus far. However, we believe that we are very close. Please sign this petition to express your opposition to the current design and encourage the owners to resume their negotiations with CHN.**

*We, neighbors of Corbett and Corona Heights, oppose the current design. It's too big and too high.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on 8/22?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAY TISELL</td>
<td></td>
<td>5680 Robin Hill Drive</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>7-18-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LAKEPORT, CA. 95453</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Opposition to a 4855 gross sq ft / 4-story structure at 42 Ord Court

Corbett Heights Neighbors (CHN) opposes the current design of a proposed development project at 42 Ord Court, because it sets bad precedent in our Special Use District, on our street and the project creates no new housing. Our negotiations with the owners have not succeeded thus far. However, we believe that we are very close. Please sign this petition to express your opposition to the current design and encourage the owners to resume their negotiations with CHN.

We, neighbors of Corbett and Corona Heights, oppose the current design. It's too big and too high.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on 8/22?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KEVIN RHEIL</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>222 STATES ST/SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/18/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Join us in preventing a bad precedent in our Special Use District and an oversize building in our charming cul-de-sac.

Sign now, testify.
Opposition to a 4855 gross sq ft / 4-story structure at 42 Ord Court

Join us in preventing a bad precedent in our Special Use District and an oversize building in our charming cul-de-sac. Corbett Heights Neighbors (CHN) opposes the current design of a proposed development project at 42 Ord Court, because it sets bad precedent in our Special Use District, on our street and the project creates no new housing. Our negotiations with the owners have not succeeded thus far. However, we believe that we are very close. Please sign this petition to express your opposition to the current design and encourage the owners to resume their negotiations with CHN.

Sign now, testify

We, neighbors of Corbett and Corona Heights, oppose the current design. It's too big and too high.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on 8/22?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOYCE S. PERKINS</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>45 ORD COURT, S.F.</td>
<td>NO (I WORK)</td>
<td>7/23/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Opposition to a 4855 gross sq ft / 4-story structure at 42 Ord Court

Join us in preventing a bad precedent in our Special Use District and an oversize building in our charming cul-de-sac

Corbett Heights Neighbors (CHN) opposes the current design of a proposed development project at 42 Ord Court, because it sets bad precedent in our Special Use District, on our street and the project creates no new housing. Our negotiations with the owners have not succeeded thus far. However, we believe that we are very close. Please sign this petition to express your opposition to the current design and encourage the owners to resume their negotiations with CHN.

Sign now, testify

We, neighbors of Corbett and Corona Heights, oppose the current design. It's too big and too high.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on 8/22?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben Sam I.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>10 Plaza St East 116</td>
<td>1O</td>
<td>7/22/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed Name</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Could you testify on July 11?</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Medina</td>
<td></td>
<td>75 Ord</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6/July/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth DeBerry</td>
<td></td>
<td>72 Ord Street</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7/8/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Stonehecker</td>
<td></td>
<td>72 ord St</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7/8/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Schulte</td>
<td></td>
<td>126 Museum way</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7/8/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Riley</td>
<td></td>
<td>55 Ord St</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7/16/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas Adamsiel</td>
<td></td>
<td>53 Ord CT</td>
<td>8/10/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Hanson</td>
<td></td>
<td>53 Ord CT</td>
<td>8/10/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonya Renner</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 Ord St</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8/10/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Clements</td>
<td></td>
<td>52 Ord St</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8/17/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
30-DAY NOTICE OF TERMINATION OF TENANCY

To Erika Leder, Does 1 to 20, and all other occupants claiming the right to possession of the following premises:

42A Ord Court
City of County of San Francisco, State of California, ZIP: 94114
including all garage(s), storage and common areas.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that your tenancy of the aforesaid premises is terminated as of thirty (30) days after service on you of this Notice (excluding the date of service). You are hereby required to quit and surrender possession thereof to the undersigned no later than thirty (30) days after service of this Notice upon you. You are required to deliver possession of said premises to:

Kathryn Quetel, Esq.
Bornstein & Bornstein
507 Polk Street Suite 410
San Francisco, CA 94102
Telephone: (415) 409-7611

the landlord's duly authorized agent at said address, on or before the expiration of said thirty (30) day period.

Rent will be due on a pro rata basis through the last day of the notice period if that day does not coincide with the end of a rental period. This is intended as a thirty (30) day legal notice for the purposes of terminating your tenancy.

If you fail to vacate on or before the expiration of said thirty (30) day period, the landlord intends to take legal action against you which could result in a judgment against you which would include costs, necessary disbursements, attorney's fees and costs, rent, damages and court costs as may be permitted by law.

This notice supersedes prior notice(s).

Kathryn Quetel, Esq.
Law Offices of Bornstein & Bornstein
Attorney and Duly Authorized Agent for Landlord
This Buyout Agreement, Settlement Agreement, Release and Covenant Not to Sue ("Agreement") is entered into by and between Ellen Schaefer (hereinafter "landlord") and Erika Leder (hereinafter "tenant").

DEFINITIONS AND RECITALS

1. WHEREAS, the parties wish and hereby intend to resolve any potential disputes between and among the parties which have arisen or may arise regarding the residential tenancy of Erika Leder at 42A Ord Court, San Francisco, CA 94114, a residential rental unit (hereinafter “subject premises”).

2. WHEREAS tenant was residing peacefully at the subject premises and has been residing therein at all times relevant hereto and is in good standing under the operative rental agreement. No eviction notice has been served, and no eviction action has been initiated.

3. WHEREAS landlord has been represented by Kathryn Quetel of Bornstein & Bornstein, 507 Polk Street #410, San Francisco, California 94102, telephone (415) 409-7611 (attorney); and tenant has been represented by Dave Crow of Crow & Rose, 605 Market Street, #400, San Francisco, California 94105, telephone (415) 552-9060 (attorney).

4. WHEREAS, tenant understands that tenant is under no obligation to enter into any settlement agreement and vacate the subject premises, and that tenant is freely entering into this Agreement of tenant’s own volition and without coercion. Whereas the parties have asserted claims against each other and/or may have claims against each other, and the bases for said claims have been disputed, continue to be disputed, and denied by the respective party against whom the claims were brought.

5. Tenant has been apprised of and acknowledges the following by initialing after each paragraph:
   a. You, the tenant, have a right not to enter into a buyout agreement.
   b. You, the tenant, may choose to consult with an attorney and/or a tenants’ rights organization before signing this agreement. You can find a list of tenants’ rights organizations on the Rent Board’s website - http://www.sfrb.org.
   c. The Rent Board has created a publically available, searchable database that may include information about other buyout agreements in your neighborhood. You can search this database at the Rent Board’s office at 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 320.
d. Under Section 1396(e)(4) of San Francisco’s Subdivision Code, a property owner may not convert a building into a condominium where: (A) a senior, disabled, or catastrophically ill tenant has vacated a unit under a buyout agreement after October 31, 2014, or (B) two or more tenants who are not senior, disabled, or catastrophically ill have vacated units under buyout agreements, if the agreements were entered after October 31, 2014 and within the ten years prior to the condominium conversion application. A ‘senior’ is a person who is 60 years or older and has been residing in the unit for ten years or more at the time of Buyout Agreement; a ‘disabled’ tenant is a person who is disabled under the Americans with Disabilities Act (Title 42 United States Code Section 12102) and has been residing in the unit for ten years or more at the time of Buyout Agreement; and a ‘catastrophically ill’ tenant is a person who is disabled under the Americans with Disabilities Act (Title 42 United States Code Section 12102) and who is suffering from a life threatening illness and has been residing in the unit for five years or more at the time of Buyout Agreement.

Do you, **Erika Leder**, believe that you are senior, disabled, or catastrophically ill as those terms are defined above? Yes ☒ No ____ I don’t know_______ I prefer not say _____.

6. **WHEREAS**, except that which is specifically excluded herein, the parties to this Agreement wish and hereby intend to resolve, terminate and forever settle all other actual or potential disputes or legal causes of action (known or unknown), which currently exist or may exist between them as a result of any set of facts in existence immediately prior to the execution of this Agreement by said parties and which were or could have been the basis for any legal action, whether in law, equity or otherwise, which could have been commenced prior to the date of execution of this Agreement.

7. **WHEREAS**, the liability for all such claims is denied by all parties, and this final Settlement thereof shall never be treated as an admission of liability or responsibility at any time for any purpose.

8. “Party” or “parties” means or refers to any party executing this Agreement, and any of their successors, assigns, heirs, executors, administrators or insurance carriers.

9. Whenever the singular is used in this Agreement, it includes the plural. Whenever the masculine gender is used, it includes the feminine or neuter gender. Whenever the word “complaint” is used, it includes any and all amended complaints, amendments to complaints, cross-complaints, complaints in intervention, amended complaints in intervention, and

Init.:
BUYOUT AGREEMENT, SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT, RELEASE AND COVENANT
NOT TO SUE (Voluntary Termination of Tenancy)

amendments to complaints in intervention. Whenever the word “lien” is used, it includes any and all liens of any type and kind, including but not limited to any mechanic’s lien and those provided by law.

10. WHEREAS, tenant desires to negotiate a surrender of possession of the subject premises, freely, voluntarily, without coercion and with full knowledge of his rights under California Law and the San Francisco Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance, and hereby freely, voluntarily, and without coercion, waives those rights, subject to the provisions of paragraph 33, herein.

11. For good and valuable consideration, including but not limited to payment and/or rent waivers to Erika Leder as described herein, tenant hereby voluntarily surrenders possession of and permanently terminates her tenancy and current and future right of occupancy, if any, at the subject premises, no later than 5:00 p.m., December 31, 2015 leaving the premises in broom clean condition, free of all occupants, free of all personal possessions, and delivering all keys to landlord or landlord’s agent. Upon forty six (46) days after all parties have signed a final version of this hereto agreement, landlord’s counsel shall deliver one check to Erika Leder, made payable to Erika Leder in the amount of one thousand dollars ($1,000.00), by delivery to tenant’s counsel’s office. On or before January 5, 2016, and upon timely surrender of subject premises, landlord’s counsel shall deliver one check to Erika Leder, made payable to Erika Leder, in the amount of nineteen thousand dollars ($19,000.00), by delivery to tenant’s counsel’s office. The total amount of payments pursuant to this covenant is twenty thousand dollars ($20,000.00). The parties acknowledge and agree that said payment shall satisfy all payment obligations of landlord as provided by the San Francisco Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance.

The parties further acknowledge and agree that landlord shall deposit the total sum of twenty thousand dollars ($20,000.00) into tenant’s counsel’s client trust account on or before October 31, 2015. Tenant’s counsel shall not release any funds to tenant without landlord’s counsel’s written authorization.

12. RENT: Upon tenant’s timely surrender of possession of the subject premises, Tenant’s rent shall be waived for the period of October 1, 2015 through and including December 31, 2015.

13. SECURITY DEPOSIT: Security deposit and interest due thereon, if any, shall be accounted for pursuant to law.

14. RELEASE: With the exceptions noted herein and subject to the provisions of paragraph 33 herein, the parties and their heirs, successors, and assigns, do hereby forever, finally, fully and completely release, relieve, acquit, remise and discharge one another and one another’s agents, partners, trustees, officers, attorneys, directors, property managers, employees, independent contractors, and all others associated with the parties and/or acting on behalf of the parties from any and all claims, liens, debts, liabilities, demands, obligations, promises, acts, agreements, costs, expenses (including, without limitation, attorneys’ fees), damages,
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injuries, suits, actions commenced prior to, and causes of action of whatever kind or nature, whether known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, or contingent or fixed as a result of any set of facts in existence immediately prior to the date of execution of this Agreement by said parties and which are or which could have been the basis for any legal action, whether in law, equity or otherwise, which could have been filed on the date of execution of this Agreement.

15. COVENANT NOT TO SUE: With the exceptions noted herein, for good, valuable and other consideration described herein, the parties covenant never to institute any action, arbitration or other legal proceeding, including but not limited to, any matters before the San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board against any other party, person or entity arising from or related to the matters alleged in Paragraphs 1-14 of this Agreement and the subject property. The parties unconditionally, fully and finally release and discharge each other from any and all duties, claims, rights, complaints, charges, injuries, damages, costs, losses, expenses, taxes, attorneys’ fees, debts, demands, actions, obligations, liabilities, and causes of action, of any and every kind, nature, and character whatsoever, whether arising out of contract, tort, statute, settlement, equity or otherwise, whether known or unknown, whether foreseen or unforeseen, whether fixed, liquidated, or contingent, which the parties ever had, now have, or may in the future claim to have had against the other (and each of them) based on any act or omission concerning any matter, cause, or thing directly or indirectly which were raised or could have been raised against each other, from the beginning of time to the day this Agreement is fully executed.

16. SECTION 1542 WAIVER: With respect to the matters released herein, the parties hereto expressly waive any and all rights, except those expressly reserved, they may have under Section 1542 of the Civil Code of the State of California, which provides as follows:

A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS WHICH THE CREDITOR DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTION OF THE RELEASE, WHICH IF KNOWN BY HIM OR HER MUST HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR.

17. LATER DISCOVERY: The parties hereto acknowledge they may hereafter discover claims presently unknown or unsuspected, or facts in addition to or different from those that are known or believed to be true, as to the matters released herein. Nevertheless, it is the intention of the parties, through this Agreement, to fully, finally and forever release all such matters and all claims related thereto that do now exist, may exist or heretofore have existed. In furtherance of such intention, the release herein given shall be and remain in effect as a full and complete release of such matters, notwithstanding the discovery or existence of any additional or different claims or facts related thereto by the parties hereto.

18. WARRANTY OF NON-ASSIGNMENT: Each party warrants said party has not assigned,
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sold, hypothecated or transferred any rights said party may have against any other party.

19. WARRANTY OF AUTHORIZATION: Each person executing this Agreement warrants he
or she is authorized to execute the Agreement on behalf of the person, partnership, joint
venture, corporation, unincorporated association, estate, or governmental entity for which he
or she signs and that all necessary resolutions and authorizations have been obtained prior to
execution of this Agreement.

20. BINDING AGREEMENT: The Agreement benefits and is binding upon each party and
his/her heirs, legatees, transferees, parents, subsidiaries, successors and assigns. This
Agreement shall bind and inure to the benefit of the parties hereto and their respective
successors, heirs, agents, independent contractors, employees, officers, directors and assigns.
No change in the law which may occur between the time of execution of this agreement and
by the time either party is under a duty to perform under this Agreement shall impact the
parties’ obligations arising from and out of this agreement.

21. INTEGRATION; MODIFICATION; SEVERABILITY; SAVINGS CLAUSE: This
Agreement supersedes all prior negotiations and agreements between the parties and is their
full and final agreement with respect to its subject matter. This Agreement may not be
modified unless by written agreement signed by all parties. In the event that any portion of
this Agreement shall be found void or voidable by a court of competent jurisdiction, such
portion shall be stricken and this Agreement reformed to as closely approximate, as the law
permits, the intent of stricken portion or portions. The terms of this Agreement may not be
contradicted by evidence of any prior agreement(s) or contemporaneous oral agreement(s).
The parties further intend that this Agreement constitutes the complete and exclusive
statement of its terms and that no extrinsic evidence whatsoever may be introduced in any
judicial or arbitration proceeding, if any, involving this Agreement.

22. ATTORNEYS’ FEES: In any action to enforce the terms of this Agreement by either party,
the prevailing party shall be awarded, in addition to any other compensation or award, its
reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs.

23. AUTHORSHIP OF AGREEMENT: Each party acknowledges the drafting of this
Agreement was the product of negotiation; no party is the author of the Agreement; and this
Agreement shall not be construed against any party on the ground such party authored or
drafted this Agreement. No party shall be held liable or responsible for any word(s),
phrase(s), and/or number(s) that have been included or excluded from this Agreement.

24. CONTROLLING LAW/IMPLEMENTATION OF AGREEMENT: This Agreement shall be
construed and shall be enforced pursuant to the laws of the State of California. The San
Francisco County Superior Court shall have jurisdiction with regard to disputes in
implementation of this Agreement.
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25. ADVICE OF COUNSEL: The parties hereto represent and warrant all the waivers, warranties, representations and covenants set forth in this Agreement are made after consultation with legal counsel of each party's choosing and with an understanding of their significance and consequence, and they are reasonable and a benefit to the parties. In the alternative, each party has been provided the opportunity to obtain such counsel and expressly waives said opportunity and he or she understands the consequences of executing this Agreement. Thus, each party acknowledges he or she has been represented by counsel or knowingly and voluntarily waives his or her opportunity to obtain counsel.

26. DEFENSE OF SUIT: Each party hereto agrees that this Agreement may be pled by any party as a full and complete defense to and may be used as the basis for an injunction against any action, suit, arbitration, or other proceeding which may be instituted, prosecuted, or attempted by another party, or any person, firm, corporation, or organization on that party's behalf, wherein the claim concerns any facts, claims or matters released by this Agreement. If a party ever claims, asserts, or brings an action in any forum alleging or asserting that this Agreement or any terms contained herein violate any local, county, state or federal ordinances, codes, regulations, statutes, or laws, or are a violation of public policy or regulation, then said party shall indemnify the other for bringing such an action or claim and for all consequences visited upon the other party as a result thereof, including reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, whether or not the initiating party is deemed the prevailing party.

27. TERMINATION OF TENANCY NON-RESCINDABLE: Except as provided in paragraph 33 below, this Agreement hereby serves as tenant's non-rescindable notice of termination of tenancy which landlord, by this document, hereby accepts and acknowledges. Should tenant fail to timely vacate the subject premises no later than 5:00pm, December 31, 2015, tenant understands that a lawsuit shall be immediately filed to effect her removal therefrom.

Initials: [Signature]

28. FREE AND VOLUNTARY: This Agreement is freely and voluntarily entered into by the parties. The parties hereto represent, declare, admit and warrant that in executing this Agreement they relied solely upon their own judgment, belief, and knowledge and the advice and recommendations of their own independently selected counsel, if so selected and relied upon, concerning the nature, extent and duration of their rights and claims. The parties also acknowledge that they and their respective counsels, if so selected and relied upon, have had a full, complete and uninterrupted opportunity to make whatever investigation or inquiry they deem necessary, appropriate or desirable in connection with the subject matter and terms of this Agreement prior to its execution. In executing this Agreement, no party hereto relied upon or has been influenced to any extent whatsoever in executing the same by any representation or statements covering any matter made by another party hereto or by any person representing any other party hereto, save the representations, warranties and statements contained herein. This Agreement shall bind and inure to the benefit of the parties.
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hereto and their respective successors, heirs, agents, independent contractors, attorneys, insurance carriers, employees, officers, directors and assigns.

29. PERSONAL PROPERTY: Any and all personal possessions or other personal property remaining on the premises after tenant vacates, are hereby declared abandoned and of no value. Landlord may dispose of said property as landlord sees fit. The parties agree that the provisions of Civil Code Sec. 1980-1991 have been complied with.

30. COUNTERPARTS: This Agreement may be executed in counterparts, and when each party has signed and delivered at least one such counterpart, each counterpart shall be deemed an original, and taken together shall constitute one and the same agreement, which shall be binding and effective as to all parties. Faxed signatures shall be fully honored as if they were original inked signatures.

31. CONFIDENTIALITY AND NON-DISPARAGEMENT: Provided that owner and occupants satisfy all their legal obligations owed under this Agreement, owner and occupants agree that they will not publicize, disclose, permit or authorize the publication or disclosure regarding any and all aspects of this tenancy and or subject premises, including the contents of any agreements made between owner and occupants, without the prior express written consent of the other. Notwithstanding the foregoing sentence, the parties are not prohibited from making disclosures to their accountants, attorneys, or governmental taxing authorities and are further authorized to make any disclosures occasioned pursuant to service of legal process such as service of subpoena, provided that the parties use their best efforts to ensure that the persons who receive said disclosures maintain their confidentiality. The provisions of this paragraph shall survive the termination or satisfaction of this Agreement.

32. The undersigned acknowledge they have read this Agreement, understand each and every term and all its terms together. Each and every term and all the terms of this Agreement together are reasonable, and each party hereto signs of said party's own free will.
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33. CANCELLATION: You, the tenant, may cancel this agreement at any time before the 45th day after all parties have signed this agreement. To cancel this agreement, mail or deliver a signed and dated notice stating that you, the tenant, are cancelling this agreement, or words of similar effect. The notice shall be sent to: Ellen Schaefer, c/o Bornstein & Bornstein, 507 Polk Street, Suite 410, San Francisco, CA 94102.

[Signatures and dates]

Ellen Schaefer
Dated: 9/28/2015

Erika Leder
Dated: 9/28/2015
NOTICE OF VIOLATION
of the San Francisco Municipal Codes Regarding Unsafe, Substandard or Noncomplying Structure or Land or Occupancy

DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION  NOTICE: 1
City and County of San Francisco
1660 Mission St. San Francisco, CA 94103

ADDRESS: 42 ORD CT
OCCUPANCY/USE: R-3 (RESIDENTIAL- 1 & 2 UNIT DWELLINGS,TOWNHOUSES)
BLOCK: 2619  LOT: 060

If checked, this information is based upon site-observation only. Further research may indicate that legal use is different. If so, a revised Notice of Violation will be issued.

OWNER/AGENT: MCGRATH BRENDAN & KELLY
MAILING ADDRESS: 42 ORD CT
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94114

PERSON CONTACTED @ SITE: MCGRATH BRENDAN & KELLY
PHONE #: --

VIOLATION DESCRIPTION:

WORK WITHOUT PERMIT
ADDITIONAL WORK-PERMIT REQUIRED
EXPIRED OR CANCELLED PERMIT PA#:

UNSAFE BUILDING  SEE ATTACHMENTS

THE LEGAL USE OF THIS BUILDING IS R-3, SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING ON ONE FLOOR OF OCCUPANCY. There are currently two units on two floors of occupancy, including an illegal dwelling unit, with kitchen & bath, behind the garage.

THE FOLLOWING CODE VIOLATIONS EXIST AT THIS PROPERTY:
* WORK WITHOUT PERMIT (301 HC, 106A, 108.4 SFBC)
* UNAPPROVED WIRING (SFHC 1001-e)
* UNAPPROVED PLUMBING (SFHC-1001-f)
* LACK OF REQUIRED SMOKE DETECTORS (SFHC-909)
* IMPROPER EXITING (THROUGH GARAGE) (SFHC 801, 1001-m)
* NO EVIDENCE THAT THE REQUIRED ONE HOUR FIRE RESISTANT MATERIALS WERE CORRECTLY INSTALLED BETWEEN ADDED DWELLING UNITS AND AT PROPERTY LINE (601 SFHC).
* ROOM USED FOR SLEEPING IS LESS THAN 7 FEET WIDE (503-c SFHC)
* EGRESS OBSTRUCTION (801, 1001-1 SFHC)
* INADEQUATE CEILING HEIGHT (503 HC)
* NO APPROVED PERMANENT SOURCE OF HEAT IN LIVING SPACE (701 SFHC)
* NO APPROVED EMERGENCY EGRESS AT SLEEPING ROOM (801 SFHC)
* LACK OF REQUIRED LIGHT AND VENTILATION IN A HABITABLE ROOM (504 SFHC)
* CHANGE OF USE (3406 CBC)

The following violations were noted:
- Unapproved plumbing & electrical (SFHC 1001e,f)
- No approved one hour separation between garage & illegal unit (SFHC 601)
- No second means of egress (SFHC 801-1)

Inspection revealed that the use of the premises is the correct legal use, 1 dwelling unit on 2 floors of occupancy.

CORRECTIVE ACTION:

• STOP ALL WORK SFBC 104.2.4
• FILE BUILDING PERMIT WITHIN 30 DAYS  (WITH PLANS) A copy of This Notice Must Accompany the Permit Application
• OBTAIN PERMIT WITHIN 30 DAYS AND COMPLETE ALL WORK WITHIN 60 DAYS, INCLUDING FINAL INSPECTION SIGNOFF.
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- CORRECT VIOLATIONS WITHIN 90 DAYS.
- NO PERMIT REQUIRED

☐ YOU FAILED TO COMPLY WITH THE NOTICE(S) DATED, THEREFORE THIS DEPT. HAS INITIATED ABATEMENT PROCEEDINGS.

- FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THIS NOTICE WILL CAUSE ABATEMENT PROCEEDINGS TO BEGIN.

SEE ATTACHMENT FOR ADDITIONAL WARNINGS.

Because of the above cited alterations without permit, you are required to comply with the following ordinance:
NOTICE per Ordinance 33-16: SFBC Section 102A.3.1. Dwelling units constructed or installed without required permit(s). In case of an unauthorized dwelling unit constructed or installed in an existing building without the required permit or permits, in addition to the above requirements the written Notice of Violation shall order the property owner to file an application for a building and other permits required to legalize the unit pursuant to Building Code Section 106A.3.1.3 and Planning Code 207.3.

Exceptions:
* Removal of the unit has been approved by the Planning Commission pursuant to Planning Code Section 317; or
* After performing a screening under Section 106A.3.1.3(a) of this Code, the Department has determined that the unauthorized dwelling unit is not able to be legalized under Section 106A.3.1.3 of this Code; or
* The Building Official has determined that a serious and imminent hazard under Section 102A.16 of this Code exists on the subject property.

If none of the three exceptions listed above are met, submit a copy of this Notice and two sets of plans with a Building Permit Application to legalize the conversion of the rear of the garage into a legal dwelling unit. After the Building Permit is issued, Plumbing and Electrical Permits must be obtained.

If any of the above 3 exceptions are met, the owner shall submit a copy of this Notice and two sets of plans with a Building Permit Application to revert the areas of violation back to their last legal use by removing the unpermitted dwelling unit. After the Building Permit is issued, Plumbing and Electrical Permits must be obtained.

Whether areas of violation are brought in to conformance pursuant to Ordinance 33-16, or reverted to last legal use, a Building Permit is required to remove all unpermitted property line windows/doors and re-install approved siding.

To abate this Notice of Violation, you must obtain all permits and complete all work as specified above. Then, when work is completed and all Building, Plumbing, and Electrical Permits are signed off and completed, you must contact the district Housing Inspector for a final inspection. At final inspection, all finalized Building, Plumbing and Electrical Permits and plans must be produced, and access must be provided to all storage rooms and other uninhabitable spaces.
NOTICE OF VIOLATION
of the San Francisco Municipal Codes Regarding Unsafe, Substandard or Noncomplying Structure or Land or Occupancy

SUBMIT A COPY OF THIS NOTICE AND TWO SETS OF PLANS WITH THE BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION TO LEGALIZE UNPERMITTED WORK OR TO REVERT BACK TO THE LAST LEGAL USE. AFTER THE BUILDING PERMIT IS ISSUED, PLUMBING AND ELECTRICAL INSPECTIONS MUST ALSO BE OBTAINED AND BUILDING PERMIT FINAL SIGN-OFF. TO ABATE THIS NOTICE OF VIOLATION YOU MUST CONTACT A HOUSING INSPECTOR FOR A FINAL INSPECTION AND PRODUCE ALL APPROVED PLANS AND PERMITS.

INVESTIGATION FEE OR OTHER FEE WILL APPLY

- 9x FEE (WORK W/O PERMIT AFTER 9/1/60)
- 2x FEE (WORK EXCEEDING SCOPE OF PERMIT)
- OTHER:
- REINSPECTION FEE $  
- NO PENALTY (WORK W/O PERMIT PRIOR TO 9/1/60)

APPROX. DATE OF WORK W/O PERMIT: 03-NOV-17  VALUE OF WORK PERFORMED W/O PERMITS: $30000

BY ORDER OF THE DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

CONTACT INSPECTOR: Christina H D. Moy
PHONE #: 415-558-6632  DIVISION: HIS  DISTRICT: 13
By:(Inspectors's Signature)
Pursuant to SFBC 304(e) and 332.3 investigation fees are charged for work begun or performed without permits or for work exceeding the scope of permits. Such fees may be appealed to the Board of Permit Appeals within 15 days of permit issuance, at 875 Stevenson St., 4th floor, 554-6720.

WARNING: Failure to take immediate action as required to correct the above violations will result in abatement proceedings by the Department of Building Inspection. If an Order of Abatement is recorded against this property, the owner will be billed or the property will be seized for all costs incurred in the code enforcement process from the posting of the first “Notice of Violation” until all costs are paid. SFBC 203(b) & 332.3

WARNING: Section 204 of the San Francisco Housing Code provides for immediate fines of $100 for each instance of initial non-compliance, followed by $200 fines per violation for the second instance of non-compliance, up to a maximum of $7,500 per building. This section also provides for issuance of a criminal charge as a misdemeanor for each violation, resulting in fines of not less than $1,000 per day or six months' imprisonment or both.

WARNING: Anyone who derives rental income from housing determined by the Department of Building Inspection to be substandard cannot deduct from state personal income tax and bank and corporate income tax interest, depreciation or taxes attributable to such substandard structure. If construction work is not completed or being diligently, expeditiously and continuously prosecuted after six (6) months from the date of this notice, notification will be sent to the Franchise Tax Board as provided in Section 17264(c) of the Revenue and Taxation Code.

WARNING: Section 205 of the San Francisco Building Code provides for civil fines of up to $500 per day for any person who violates, disobeys, omits, neglects or refuses to comply with or opposes the execution of any provisions of this code. This section also provides for misdemeanor fines, if convicted, of up to $500 and/or imprisonment up to six months for each separate offense for every day such offense occurs.

De acuerdo a las Secciones 304(e) y 332.3 de el Código de Construcción de Edificios de San Francisco, gastos de investigación serán cobrados por trabajo comenzado o realizado sin los debidos permisos o por trabajo que exceda el límite estipulado en los permisos. Dichos cobros pueden ser apelados ante la Junta de Apelaciones de Permisos (Board of Permit Appeals) dentro de los primeros quince días de haberse obtenido el permiso. Las apelaciones se hacen en el 875 de la calle Stevenson, cuarto piso, teléfono 554-6720.

ADVERTENCIA: Si no cumple con las acciones inmediatas requeridas para corregir las infracciones, el Departamento de Inspección de Edificios tendrá el derecho de iniciar el proceso de mitigación. Si una Orden de Mitigación es registrada contra dicha propiedad, los gastos incurridos durante el proceso de mitigación para corregir las infracciones serán evaluados y pagados al Departamento de Inspección de Edificios. Se deberá informar a la Junta de Apelaciones de Permisos (Board of Permit Appeals) dentro de los primeros quince días de haberse obtenido el permiso. Las apelaciones se hacen en el 875 de la calle Stevenson, cuarto piso, teléfono 554-6720.

ADVERTENCIA: Si no cumple con las acciones inmediatas requeridas para corregir la infracción, el Departamento de Inspección de Edificios tendrá el derecho de iniciar el proceso de mitigación. Si una Orden de Mitigación es registrada contra dicha propiedad, los gastos incurridos durante el proceso de mitigación para corregir las infracciones serán evaluados y pagados al Departamento de Inspección de Edificios. Se deberá informar a la Junta de Apelaciones de Permisos (Board of Permit Appeals) dentro de los primeros quince días de haberse obtenido el permiso. Las apelaciones se hacen en el 875 de la calle Stevenson, cuarto piso, teléfono 554-6720.

ADVERTENCIA: Si no cumple con las acciones inmediatas requeridas para corregir las infracciones, el Departamento de Inspección de Edificios tendrá el derecho de iniciar el proceso de mitigación. Si una Orden de Mitigación es registrada contra dicha propiedad, los gastos incurridos durante el proceso de mitigación para corregir las infracciones serán evaluados y pagados al Departamento de Inspección de Edificios. Se deberá informar a la Junta de Apelaciones de Permisos (Board of Permit Appeals) dentro de los primeros quince días de haberse obtenido el permiso. Las apelaciones se hacen en el 875 de la calle Stevenson, cuarto piso, teléfono 554-6720.

ADVERTENCIA: Si no cumple con las acciones inmediatas requeridas para corregir las infracciones, el Departamento de Inspección de Edificios tendrá el derecho de iniciar el proceso de mitigación. Si una Orden de Mitigación es registrada contra dicha propiedad, los gastos incurridos durante el proceso de mitigación para corregir las infracciones serán evaluados y pagados al Departamento de Inspección de Edificios. Se deberá informar a la Junta de Apelaciones de Permisos (Board of Permit Appeals) dentro de los primeros quince días de haberse obtenido el permiso. Las apelaciones se hacen en el 875 de la calle Stevenson, cuarto piso, teléfono 554-6720.

ADVERTENCIA: Si no cumple con las acciones inmediatas requeridas para corregir las infracciones, el Departamento de Inspección de Edificios tendrá el derecho de iniciar el proceso de mitigación. Si una Orden de Mitigación es registrada contra dicha propiedad, los gastos incurridos durante el proceso de mitigación para corregir las infracciones serán evaluados y pagados al Departamento de Inspección de Edificios. Se deberá informar a la Junta de Apelaciones de Permisos (Board of Permit Appeals) dentro de los primeros quince días de haberse obtenido el permiso. Las apelaciones se hacen en el 875 de la calle Stevenson, cuarto piso, teléfono 554-6720.
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August 7, 2019

Planning Director John Rahaim
Quadrant Manager Delvin Washington
Planning Department of the City and County of San Francisco
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103-2479

Via US Postal Service and

Via email to John.Rahaim@sfgov.org
Via email to Delvin. Washington@sfgov.org

Regarding 42/42 A Court, Application of Property owner to enlarge 2018-000547CUA

Dear Planning Director Rahaim and Quadrant Manager Washington:

I am writing this letter as the current President of Corbett Heights Neighbors, the recognized neighborhood association which includes all of the streets in San Francisco known as Ord Court and Ord Street.

The Corona Heights Large Residence Special Use District was established in order to scrutinize over-development in our neighborhood. Your Department is currently preparing a Conditional Use Application packet for 42/42A Ord Court (2018-000547CUA) - an application that will be heard by the Planning Commission on August 22, 2019.

This project requires a Conditional Use Authorization, because it exceeds the allowable size set forth in the aforementioned Special Use District. In order to earn a Conditional Use Authorization the project must demonstrate: “That the proposed use or feature, at the size and intensity contemplated and at the proposed location, will provide a development that is necessary or desirable for, and compatible with, the neighborhood or the community.” (Source: San Francisco Planning Department)
However, the project is unnecessary for the community, because:

- It creates **no new housing**. In fact, it turns an affordable unit into an expensive one.
- It violates the terms and does not meet the intent of the Corona Heights Large Residence Special Use District.
- Its size and mass are inappropriate and they set a bad precedent on Ord Court.

In addition, more than 100 neighbors have joined our organization in opposing this project, showing that it is also **undesirable for the neighborhood**.

In light of these facts we respectfully ask the Planning Department to please not recommend a Conditional Use Authorization at 42/42A Ord Court. Corbett Heights Neighbors is requesting, with this letter, that the Planning Department oppose the Conditional Use Authorization sought by the owners of 42/42A Ord Court.

You may contact me at my office phone 415-864-7636, during daytime hours, with any questions or concerns.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Best regards,

Maryann Dresner
President of Corbett Heights Neighbors

Copy via email to  Jeffery Horn (Jeffery. Horn@sfgov.org)
Rafael Mandelman (Rafael. Mandelman@sfgov.org)
Kyle Smeallie (Kyle.Smeallie@sfgov.org)
We oppose a four-story tower at 42 Ord Court!

We, Corbett/Corona Heights neighbors, oppose this project. It's too big and too high.

We, the undersigned, oppose the size, bulk and design of the proposed expansion of 42 Ord Court from approximately 1,110 square feet (as described in the Planning Department notice) increasing by more than 4X in size to 4,100 square feet plus two car garage.

We specifically ask that the Property Owners be required to remove the fourth floor and reduce the size to no more than 3,000 square feet.

Ord Court is a tiny cul-de-sac comprised mostly of quintessential San Francisco cottages and duplexes. This project, if allowed, would not only destroy one of those historic cottages but it would tower above every other home on Ord Court.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on July 11?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RICK WALSH</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 ORD ST</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>6/25/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick A Dowd</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 Ord ST</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>6/25/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES LINDAUER</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 Ord ST</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>6/25/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Detwiler</td>
<td></td>
<td>68 Douglas St</td>
<td>maybe</td>
<td>6/25/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Huss</td>
<td></td>
<td>68 Douglas St</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>6/25/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Nelson</td>
<td></td>
<td>64 Douglas</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>6/26/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KATHERINE ZINSSER</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 Ord ST</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>6/26/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Neuberg</td>
<td></td>
<td>4E Ord ST</td>
<td></td>
<td>6-26-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed Name</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Could you testify on July 11?</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Medina</td>
<td></td>
<td>75 Ord</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6/7/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth DeBerry</td>
<td></td>
<td>72 Ord Street</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7/8/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Stonehocker</td>
<td></td>
<td>72 Ord St</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7/8/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Schulte</td>
<td></td>
<td>126 Mission Way</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7/8/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Riley</td>
<td></td>
<td>55 Ord St.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7/16/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas Adamsen</td>
<td></td>
<td>53 Ord CT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8/10/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Hanson</td>
<td></td>
<td>53 Ord CT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8/10/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonya Renner</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 Ord St</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8/10/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Clements</td>
<td></td>
<td>52 Ord St</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8/17/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Opposition to a 4855 gross sq ft / 4-story structure at 42 Ord Court**

Join us in preventing a bad precedent in our Special Use District and an oversized building in our charming cul-de-sac.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on 8/22?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George White</td>
<td></td>
<td>3120 S Tomkins Dr</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7/22/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph White</td>
<td></td>
<td>3120 South Marshall</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7/22/17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Opposition to a 4855 gross sq ft / 4-story structure at 42 Ord Court

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Join us in preventing a bad precedent in our Special Use District and an oversize building in our charming cul-de-sac</th>
<th>Corbett Heights Neighbors (CHN) opposes the current design of a proposed development project at 42 Ord Court, because it sets bad precedent in our Special Use District, on our street and the project creates no new housing. Our negotiations with the owners have not succeeded thus far. However, we believe that we are very close. Please sign this petition to express your opposition to the current design and encourage the owners to resume their negotiations with CHN.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign now, testify</td>
<td>We, neighbors of Corbett and Corona Heights, oppose the current design. It’s too big and too high.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on 8/22?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patricia E. Frank</td>
<td>Patricia E. Frank</td>
<td>110 Everglade Dr., San Fed., CA 94132</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8/10/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on 8/22?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Opposition to a 4855 gross sq ft / 4-story structure at 42 Ord Court

Join us in preventing a bad precedent in our Special Use District and an oversize building in our charming cul-de-sac

Corbett Heights Neighbors (CHN) opposes the current design of a proposed development project at 42 Ord Court, because it sets bad precedent in our Special Use District, on our street and the project creates no new housing. Our negotiations with the owners have not succeeded thus far. However, we believe that we are very close. Please sign this petition to express your opposition to the current design and encourage the owners to resume their negotiations with CHN.

We, neighbors of Corbett and Corona Heights, oppose the current design. It's too big and too high.

Printed Name | Signature | Address | Could you testify on 8/22? | Date
---|---|---|---|---
DIANA GOLDSTEIN | Diana Goldstein | 22 Vulcan Stairway | I will be away on vacation. | 08/10/2015


Opposition to a 4855 gross sq ft / 4-story structure at 42 Ord Court

Join us in preventing a bad precedent in our Special Use District and an oversize building in our charming cul-de-sac

Corbett Heights Neighbors (CHN) opposes the current design of a proposed development project at 42 Ord Court, because it sets bad precedent in our Special Use District, on our street and the project creates no new housing. Our negotiations with the owners have not succeeded thus far. However, we believe that we are very close. Please sign this petition to express your opposition to the current design and encourage the owners to resume their negotiations with CHN.

Sign now, testify

We, neighbors of Corbett and Corona Heights, oppose the current design. It's too big and too high.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on 8/22?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAY TISELL</td>
<td>Ray Tisell</td>
<td>5680 Robin Hill Drive</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>7-18-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LAKEPORT, CA. 95453</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Opposition to a 4855 gross sq ft / 4-story structure at 42 Ord Court**

| Join us in preventing a bad precedent in our Special Use District and an oversize building in our charming cul-de-sac | Corbett Heights Neighbors (CHN) opposes the current design of a proposed development project at 42 Ord Court, because it sets bad precedent in our Special Use District, on our street and the project creates no new housing. Our negotiations with the owners have not succeeded thus far. However, we believe that we are very close. Please sign this petition to express your opposition to the current design and encourage the owners to resume their negotiations with CHN. |
| Sign now, testify | We, neighbors of Corbett and Corona Heights, oppose the current design. It’s too big and too high. |
Opportunity to a 4855 gross sq ft / 4-story structure at 42 Ord Court

Join us in preventing a bad precedent in our Special Use District and an oversize building in our charming cul-de-sac

Corbett Heights Neighbors (CHN) opposes the current design of a proposed development project at 42 Ord Court, because it sets bad precedent in our Special Use District, on our street and the project creates no new housing. Our negotiations with the owners have not succeeded thus far. However, we believe that we are very close. Please sign this petition to express your opposition to the current design and encourage the owners to resume their negotiations with CHN.

Sign now, testify

We, neighbors of Corbett and Corona Heights, oppose the current design. It's too big and too high.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on 8/22?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOYCE S. PERKINS</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>45 ORD COURT, S.F. (OWNED)</td>
<td>NO (WORKING)</td>
<td>7/23/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on 8/22?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on 8/22?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on 8/22?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on 8/22?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on 8/22?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Opposition to a 4855 gross sq ft / 4-story structure at 42 Ord Court

Join us in preventing a bad precedent in our Special Use District and an oversize building in our charming cul-de-sac.

Sign now, testify

Corbett Heights Neighbors (CHN) opposes the current design of a proposed development project at 42 Ord Court, because it sets bad precedent in our Special Use District, on our street and the project creates no new housing. Our negotiations with the owners have not succeeded thus far. However, we believe that we are very close. Please sign this petition to express your opposition to the current design and encourage the owners to resume their negotiations with CHN.

We, neighbors of Corbett and Corona Heights, oppose the current design. It’s too big and too high.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on 8/22?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin P. Erman</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>10 Plaza St. EAST 11G, Brooklyn, NY 11238</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7/20/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

[Image of the printed form with entries]:

- **Printed Name**: Benjamin P. Erman
- **Signature**: [Signature]
- **Address**: 10 Plaza St. EAST 11G, Brooklyn, NY 11238
- **Could you testify on 8/22?**: No
- **Date**: 7/20/19
We oppose a four-story tower at 42 Ord Court!

We, Corbett/Corona Heights neighbors, oppose this project. It’s too big and too high.

We, the undersigned, oppose the size, bulk and design of the proposed expansion of 42 Ord Court from approximately 1,110 square feet (as described in the Planning Department notice) increasing by more than 4X in size to 4,100 square feet plus two car garage.

We specifically ask that the Property Owners be required to remove the fourth floor and reduce the size to no more than 3,000 square feet.

Ord Court is a tiny cul-de-sac comprised mostly of quintessential San Francisco cottages and duplexes. This project, if allowed, would not only destroy one of those historic cottages but it would tower above every other home on Ord Court.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on July 11?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scott E. McPherson</td>
<td></td>
<td>145 Corbett</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>July 21/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy S. Bunchet</td>
<td>David Bollinger</td>
<td>154 Corbett</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred D. Greggs</td>
<td></td>
<td>145 Corbett</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Schwartz</td>
<td></td>
<td>7012 17th St.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John S. Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 Ord Ct.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Aug 10/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey Gordon</td>
<td>Andrew Smith</td>
<td>4302 17th St.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8/12/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Randolph</td>
<td></td>
<td>1302 17th St.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8/12/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Flanagan</td>
<td></td>
<td>90 Ord St.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed Name</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Could you testify on July 1?</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. BERLINE</td>
<td>J. Berlim</td>
<td>37 A LEVANT ST</td>
<td></td>
<td>8/17/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzy Dool</td>
<td></td>
<td>263 States St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richi Goldfinch</td>
<td></td>
<td>280 States St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Shepard</td>
<td></td>
<td>263A States St</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Lethen</td>
<td>J. Lethen</td>
<td>4304 17th St</td>
<td>maybe</td>
<td>7/12/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Murphy</td>
<td>E. Murphy</td>
<td>56 Clarendon Ave (corner of 4304 17th St)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>7/12/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Walters</td>
<td></td>
<td>4304 17th St</td>
<td>maybe</td>
<td>7/12/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We oppose a four-story tower at 42 Ord Court!

We, Corbett/Corona Heights neighbors, oppose this project. It’s too big and too high.

We, the undersigned, oppose the size, bulk and design of the proposed expansion of 42 Ord Court from approximately 1,110 square feet (as described in the Planning Department notice) increasing by more than 4X in size to 4,100 square feet plus two car garage.

We specifically ask that the Property Owners be required to remove the fourth floor and reduce the size to no more than 3,000 square feet.

Ord Court is a tiny cul-de-sac comprised mostly of quintessential San Francisco cottages and duplexes. This project, if allowed, would not only destroy one of those historic cottages but it would tower above every other home on Ord Court.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on July 11?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Cooper</td>
<td></td>
<td>541 Lower Terrace</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5-11-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Hultman</td>
<td></td>
<td>60 Lower Terrace</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5-11-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Marie Barrier</td>
<td></td>
<td>60 Lower Terrace</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5-17-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Shaw</td>
<td></td>
<td>117 Lower Terrace</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6-23-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Correll</td>
<td></td>
<td>117 Lower Terrace</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4-18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Turney</td>
<td></td>
<td>106 Lower Terrace</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6-29-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Lamb</td>
<td></td>
<td>106 Lower Terrace</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6-29-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Koelsch</td>
<td></td>
<td>197 Corbett</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7-8-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Koelsch</td>
<td></td>
<td>197 CORBETT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7-8-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed Name</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Could you testify on July 11?</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette McLaughlin</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 Ord St, Apt 1 SFCA91114</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6-11-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK MAYPER</td>
<td></td>
<td>33 Ord St SFCA91114</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6-11-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregor Freund</td>
<td></td>
<td>26 Vulcan St.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6-11-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrielle Crawford</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 Vulcan Stairway</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6-11-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Mitchell</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 Ord Ct</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6-11-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT QUINN</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 Ord St</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>6-12-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuinn Cue</td>
<td></td>
<td>27 Saturn St</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6-13-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM BAKEA</td>
<td></td>
<td>78 Ord St</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>6-17-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Silverman</td>
<td></td>
<td>34 Douglas St</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6-17-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard Brinly</td>
<td></td>
<td>34 Douglas St</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6-17-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK BAUMG</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 Douglas St</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6/17/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID COOM</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 Douglas St</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6/17/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Gelfman</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Vulcan Stairway</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>6-17-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Burbidge</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Vulcan Stairway</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>6-17-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melody Marks</td>
<td></td>
<td>44 Vulcan Stairway</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6/17/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We oppose a four-story tower at 42 Ord Court!

We, Corbett/Corona Heights neighbors, oppose this project. It's too big and too high.

We, the undersigned, oppose the size, bulk and design of the proposed expansion of 42 Ord Court from approximately 1,110 square feet (as described in the Planning Department notice) increasing by more than 4X in size to 4,100 square feet plus two car garage.

We specifically ask that the Property Owners be required to remove the fourth floor and reduce the size to no more than 3,000 square feet.

Ord Court is a tiny cul-de-sac comprised mostly of quintessential San Francisco cottages and duplexes. This project, if allowed, would not only destroy one of those historic cottages but it would tower above every other home on Ord Court.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on July 11?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Taylor Playper</td>
<td>Taylor Playper</td>
<td>33 Ord Ct</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6-8-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke Dabbin</td>
<td>Duke Dabbin</td>
<td>245 States St</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>6-8-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Smart</td>
<td>Joel Smart</td>
<td>245 States St</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>6-8-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June Vassar</td>
<td>June Vassar</td>
<td>60 Ord Court</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6-8-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Buell</td>
<td>Carol Buell</td>
<td>30 Ord Ct, #7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6-8-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Fontes</td>
<td>Fontes</td>
<td>30 Ord Ct Apt 5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6-8-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirk Aguilera</td>
<td>Dirk Aguilera</td>
<td>30 Ord St Apt 5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6-8-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilia Freuna</td>
<td>Cecilia Freuna</td>
<td>26 Vulcan St, Apt 1 San</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6-8-19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We oppose a four-story tower at 42 Ord Court!

We, Corbett/Corona Heights neighbors, oppose this project. It's too big and too high.

We, the undersigned, oppose the size, bulk and design of the proposed expansion of 42 Ord Court from approximately 1,110 square feet (as described in the Planning Department notice) increasing by more than 4X in size to 4,100 square feet plus two car garage.

We specifically ask that the Property Owners be required to remove the fourth floor and reduce the size to no more than 3,000 square feet.

Ord Court is a tiny cul-de-sac comprised mostly of quintessential San Francisco cottages and duplexes. This project, if allowed, would not only destroy one of those historic cottages but it would tower above every other home on Ord Court.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on July 11?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maurice Belete</td>
<td></td>
<td>74 Vulcan Stairway SF 94114</td>
<td>maybe</td>
<td>6/17/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Broussard</td>
<td></td>
<td>74 Vulcan Stairway SF 94114</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6/17/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erika Ledeker</td>
<td></td>
<td>57 Ord Court SF 94117</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6/18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poe Asher</td>
<td></td>
<td>44 Ord Court</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6/18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td>34 Ord Court</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6/19/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Louie</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 Museum Way</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6/19/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frni Beyer</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 Museum Way</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6/19/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Czerkies</td>
<td></td>
<td>4427 18th St SF 94114</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6/20/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Czerkies</td>
<td></td>
<td>4427 18th St SF 94114</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6/20/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed Name</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Could you testify on July 11?</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Nizzadini</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Vulcan Stairway</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6-24-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danny Leon</td>
<td></td>
<td>78 0PD CT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6-24-19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We oppose a four-story tower at 42 Ord Court!

We, the undersigned, oppose the size, bulk and design of the proposed expansion of 42 Ord Court from approximately 1,110 square feet (as described in the Planning Department notice) increasing by more than 4X in size to 4,100 square feet plus two car garage.

We specifically ask that the Property Owners be required to remove the fourth floor and reduce the size to no more than 3,000 square feet. The property features two housing units and it will remain two housing units.

Ord Court is a tiny cul-de-sac comprised mostly of quintessential San Francisco cottages and duplexes. This project, if allowed, would not only destroy one of those historic cottages but it would tower above every other home on Ord Court.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Email/Phone Contact</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brad Lyman</td>
<td>Brad Lyman</td>
<td>234 Corbett Ave</td>
<td><a href="mailto:BradLyman@gmail.com">BradLyman@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>6/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Chizzon</td>
<td>Aaron Chizzon</td>
<td>368 Corbett Ave</td>
<td><a href="mailto:AaronChizzon@gmail.com">AaronChizzon@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>6/29/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Wang</td>
<td>Rich Wang</td>
<td>368 Corbett Ave</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Rich@Richdesign.com">Rich@Richdesign.com</a></td>
<td>6/29/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris B Houston</td>
<td>Chris B Houston</td>
<td>52 Dorc Avenue</td>
<td><a href="mailto:secretplacey@gmail.com">secretplacey@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>7/3/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faund H. Oss Ander</td>
<td>Faund H. Oss Ander</td>
<td>234 Corbett Avenue</td>
<td><a href="mailto:faundeloss@gmail.com">faundeloss@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We oppose a four-story tower at 42 Ord Court!

We, Corbett/Corona Heights neighbors, oppose this project. It's too big and too high.

We, the undersigned, oppose the size, bulk and design of the proposed expansion of 42 Ord Court from approximately 1,110 square feet (as described in the Planning Department notice) increasing by more than 4X in size to 4,100 square feet plus two car garage.

We specifically ask that the Property Owners be required to remove the fourth floor and reduce the size to no more than 3,000 square feet.

Ord Court is a tiny cul-de-sac comprised mostly of quintessential San Francisco cottages and duplexes. This project, if allowed, would not only destroy one of those historic cottages but it would tower above every other home on Ord Court.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on July 11?</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elina Rasboabina</td>
<td>JH DE</td>
<td>173 Lower Terre</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7/15/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Backer</td>
<td>JH DE</td>
<td>4466 17th St</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Barlow</td>
<td>JH DE</td>
<td>4456 17th St</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Briggs</td>
<td>JH DE</td>
<td>145 Corbett</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal Weiss</td>
<td>Neal Weiss</td>
<td>523 Corbett Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/15/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Rasmussen</td>
<td>RASMUSSEN</td>
<td>145 Corbett Ave</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>7/15/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Weiss</td>
<td>GR W</td>
<td>78 M Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/15/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We oppose a four-story tower at 42 Ord Court!

We, Corbett/Corona Heights neighbors, oppose this project. It's too big and too high.
We, the undersigned, oppose the size, bulk and design of the proposed expansion of 42 Ord Court from approximately 1,110 square feet (as described in the Planning Department notice) increasing by more than 4X in size to 4,100 square feet plus two car garage.

We specifically ask that the Property Owners be required to remove the fourth floor and reduce the size to no more than 3,000 square feet.

Ord Court is a tiny cul-de-sac comprised mostly of quintessential San Francisco cottages and duplexes. This project, if allowed, would not only destroy one of those historic cottages but it would tower above every other home on Ord Court.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Could you testify on</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JENNIFER CRYEMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>145 CORBETT</td>
<td>7/15/19</td>
<td>7/15/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAM STEPHENS</td>
<td></td>
<td>49 ORD CT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARY JACKMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>4179 17th St.</td>
<td>7/15/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Drigs</td>
<td></td>
<td>145 Corbett</td>
<td>7/15/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Downey</td>
<td></td>
<td>565 Corbett</td>
<td>7/15/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCY PEOPLES</td>
<td>Nancy Peoples</td>
<td>32 Marx St.</td>
<td>7/15/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We oppose a four-story tower at 42 Ord Court!

We, Corbett/Corona Heights neighbors, oppose this project. It's too big and too high.

We, the undersigned, oppose the size, bulk and design of the proposed expansion of 42 Ord Court from approximately 1,110 square feet (as described in the Planning Department notice) increasing by more than 4X in size to 4,100 square feet plus two car garage.

We specifically ask that the Property Owners be required to remove the fourth floor and reduce the size to no more than 3,000 square feet. The property features two housing units and it should remain two housing units.

Ord Court is a tiny cul-de-sac comprised mostly of quintessential San Francisco cottages and duplexes. This project, if allowed, would not only destroy one of those historic cottages but it would tower above every other home on Ord Court.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Email/Phone Contact</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chris Parker</td>
<td></td>
<td>231 State St. #4</td>
<td>714-922-2333</td>
<td>6/19/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Holtz</td>
<td></td>
<td>231 State St. #3</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/19/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Connelly</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 Ord Ct. #4</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/19/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya Nakhimovsky</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 Ord Ct. #1</td>
<td><a href="mailto:t.nakhimovsky@me.com">t.nakhimovsky@me.com</a></td>
<td>6/24/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cary Norworsky</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 Ord Court #3, SF</td>
<td><a href="mailto:CaryNorworsky@me.com">CaryNorworsky@me.com</a></td>
<td>6/24/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianne Desai</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 Ord Court</td>
<td>415-864-7683</td>
<td>6/19/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Keating</td>
<td></td>
<td>4134 17th St. SF CA</td>
<td>415-385-8517</td>
<td>7/9/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Ryser</td>
<td></td>
<td>135 Ord St SF CA</td>
<td>415-553-8033</td>
<td>7/10/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 20, 2019

Dear San Francisco Planning Commission,

I am writing to you in regard to the Conditional Use Review and Variance request to expand 42/42A Ord Court, a vintage San Francisco cottage, into a Monster Home. I oppose the project in its current form. It is too tall and too large for our small, narrow cul-de-sac. There is no legal justification for allowing the owners to exceed the building limits of the Corona Heights Special Use District or to grant a Variance.

Opponents of this project have collected over 100 signatures of neighbors who also oppose the scope of the current plans. We are submitting copies of that petition to the Honorable Planning Commission for your consideration.

Please note that as recently as your March 7, 2019 hearing architect John Duffy lied claiming that 42 Ord Court was a single family home. Both Mr. Duffy and the owners knew there was also a small studio in the basement that had been continuously occupied as an AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNIT. (See attachment) The previous owner evicted the last tenant, Erika Leder, but Erika continued to occupy the apartment for two months after the new owners took possession. Since then the owners’ Nanny has been living in the Studio.

Mr. Duffy submitted architectural plans under penalty of perjury that labeled the studio as “Storage” and labeled the Living Room as "Bedroom 2" (see attachments).

As I noted in my letter to the Commission in March, 42A Ord Court had been an affordable housing unit for decades. In contrast, the proposed replacement apartment would be market rate. Therefore, San Francisco would lose yet another affordable housing unit, replaced with an apartment financially out of the reach of low or middle-income residents.

In addition, the site plan of 42/42A Ord Court is deceptive. The size and bulk of this development are massive compared to the existing cottage and even other larger homes on the Court. The photographs tell the real story. Please look at them closely and don’t be fooled by the deceptive nature of the design plans.
ORD COURT

I moved to Ord Court 35 years ago because our little cul-de-sac is so beautiful with its large gardens, abundant open space and small Victorian and Edwardian cottages. It is a tiny piece of San Francisco paradise nestled between the Vulcan Stairway and States Street. Walking tours regularly visit our street to experience the unique combination of nature and people living quietly in harmony. Those of us who oppose this project are keenly aware that if you approve a development this large others will follow and Ord Court as we know and love it will be destroyed.

Please help us save Ord Court from Monster Homes like this one. Save our gardens! Save our Open Space! Please require the owners of 42/42A Ord Court to conform to the Corona Heights Special Use District and build a home and second unit that are compatible with our neighborhood.

Thank you very much for your consideration of our concerns.

Respectfully yours,

Barbara Taylor Mayper
33 Ord Court
San Francisco, CA 94114
415-265-4055
barbarataylorsf@gmail.com
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Hearing Date: Thursday, March 7, 2019
Time: Not before 1:00 PM
Location: City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 400
Case Type: Conditional Use
Hearing Body: Planning Commission

PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Address: 42 Ord Court
Cross Street(s): Ord Street
Block /Lot No.: 2619 / 060
Zoning District(s): RH-2 / 40-X
Area Plan: NA
Record Number: 2018-000547CUA

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Applicant: John Duffy
Company: The Building Design Group
Applicant Address: 4620 Ben Hur Road
City, State: Mariposa, CA 95338
Telephone: (415) 309-8896
E-Mail: iduffyarchitect@gmail.com

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Request for Conditional Use Authorization, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 249.77 and 303(c), to construct a vertical and horizontal addition to an existing 1,860 square foot, two-story-with-attic single-family home on a 117 foot-10 inch deep through lot that extends from Ord Court to States Street. The existing structure will remain but be lifted 2 feet in height, two floors will be added on top of the rear portion of the existing structure and a 4-story rear addition will be constructed. In total, the proposed structure is 4,110 gross square feet in size and will add one new residential unit and a new garage. The project is within an RH-2 (Residential House, Two-Family) Zoning District, a 40-X Height and Bulk District, and the Corona Heights Large Residence Special Use District (Planning Code Sec 249.77).

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

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

ARCHITECTURAL PLANS: To view the plans and related documents for the proposed project, visit sf-planning.org/notices and search the Project Address listed above. The plans and Department recommendation of the proposed project will also be available one week prior to the hearing through the Commission agenda at: sf-planning.org/hearings or by request at the Planning Department office located at 1650 Mission Street, 4th Floor.

FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE CONTACT PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF:
Planner: Jeff Horn Telephone: (415) 575-6925 E-Mail: jeffrey.horn@sfgov.org
APPLICANT'S AFFIDAVIT

Under penalty of perjury the following declarations are made:

a) The undersigned is the owner or authorized agent of the owner of this property.

b) The information presented is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

c) Other information or applications may be required.

JOHN DUFFY

Signature

Project Architect 415 309-8896

Relationship to Project Phone
(i.e. Owner, Architect, etc.)

Email

JOHN DUFFY

Signature

03-01-19

Date

For Department Use Only

Application received by Planning Department:

By: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
Dear Commissioner XXX,

We are writing today in response to the proposed over-sized development at 42 Ord Court, to which we are strongly opposed. We are have been residents of Corona Heights for 33 years, and are supporters of the Large Residences Special Use District. The proposed four-story building on Ord Court far exceeds the restrictions for which the neighborhood fought so hard. As owners of a through-lot stretching from States Street to Museum Way, we believe that regulating the size of projects in this area is not about preventing homeowners, like us, from using land for personal needs, but is meant to prevent developers from building large, looming multi-million dollar single-family residences that shadow our modest neighborhood and overrun rare swaths of open space that currently host an amazingly diverse habitat for wildlife and humans alike. Once huge buildings encroach on these small properties, there will be no turning back. When mature trees and green spaces are replaced by massive structures, habitats disappear, wildlife vanishes, the flora of adjoining properties are threatened, and public street-views are gone forever.

Although we are aware of the dire need for affordable housing in San Francisco, this development has nothing to do with creating “housing.” This property, originally a small 2-unit home, is being taken out of the middle-class market and hurled into the category of “luxury” housing, for which there is no shortage in this city or this neighborhood.

We accept that time will continue to alter the nature of any neighborhood, but the recent pace of development in Corona Heights has been alarming and inappropriate. We believe that a significant proportion of each lot in this unique neighborhood should be held back to preserve the trees, grasses and gardens, for the sake of the city’s air quality, to curb wind speed, retain rainfall, along with so many other important contributions of these urban green-spaces.

The recent large developments in this neighborhood have not been built by the efforts of our neighbors attempting to expand their living space, but by outside developers with deep pockets and no interest in the nature of the community, the quality of the residences or the future of this neighborhood or this city.

We urge the Planning Commission to require the developers of 42 Ord Court to comply with the current restrictions on large residences, scale back the project size to a reasonable two floors and 2500 square feet, thereby fitting the tone of the neighborhood and avoiding a precedent-setting onslaught of over-sized houses that serve only the wealthy and which will forever eliminate the true nature of our unique neighborhood.

Thank you,
Joell Hallowell & Tricia Garlock
212 States Street
415-846-0091
June 24, 2019

Planning Commission,
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, #400,
San Francisco CA 94103

RE: 42 Ord Court Conditional Use & Variance Request

Dear Planning Commissioners,

Since 1968, I have owned the home at 22 Vulcan Stairway. My daughter grew up in this house and now lives there. The auto access to the house is from Ord Court. For many years this neighborhood retained its aesthetic appeal because of the consistent small scale of the buildings even after remodelling took place.

Recently, however, with the intended replacement of the existing building at 42 Ord Court, with one almost three times the size, there seems to be no consideration for the existing character of the neighborhood. And why should this particular property be granted a variance and conditional use instead of rebuilding according to existing planning restrictions applying to the whole area?

I wish to add my name to the list of residents in the neighborhood who have already written to you voicing their objections to the scale of the proposed changes at #42 and outlining their several other reasons for so-doing.

Sincerely,

Diana Goldstein

Sent from my iPhone
This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Here is the letter from Diana Goldstein.
Barbara Taylor
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: DIANA GOLSTEIN <dievenary@aol.com>
Date: June 24, 2019 at 9:46:30 AM PDT
To: Barbara Taylor <sfwordgal@aol.com>
Subject: 42 Ord Court
Testimony by Carolyn Kenady: Oppose Upzoning of Market and Van Ness

Good afternoon President Melgar and Planning Commissioners. I’m Carolyn Kenady from the Dolores Heights Improvement Club. I oppose the upzoning of the Market and Van Ness Hub Plan area -- owing to the impact that it will have on our already overburdened Muni transit system.

The Environmental Impact Report appears exhaustive. However, the EIR missed the impacts to TRANSIT underground. We need to dig into the Market Street tunnel.

Here’s the current state of Muni for riders under Van Ness & Market Streets. I commuted to work on Muni Metro until 2017. I experienced the delays and lack of on-time performance in the tunnel. I’m sure everyone in this room has been on the Muni underground and heard “We’re delayed by traffic in the tunnel.” I just heard it on my way to Van Ness station yesterday at 9:30am. And the downtown platform crowds at rush hour mean SRO on the way home. No surprise: according to the SFMTA’s own stats, Muni Metro -- the streetcars that use the Market Street tunnel -- has an average weekday ridership of 173,500 (up 16% from 2015.) In the past year these streetcars only had an on-time performance of 41% - less than half of Muni’s official on-time target of 85%. (The attached bar chart has details.)

What really worries me .... SFMTA is unable to increase capacity and performance to meet even today’s demands. Last week the DHIC board gave two SFMTA planners feedback on a project to improve the J Church line. They clarified that this short-term project will not address the much larger issues of the Muni Metro speed and its delays in the Market Street tunnel. They told us that the tunnel was not designed to handle current passenger loads ... that average speeds are lower than prior years owing to the traffic. And we all know that the epic system meltdown on April 26 revealed how fragile the tunnel truly is. We asked how SFMTA will fix the tunnel. They told us that a project is on the books but will take 20 to 30 years to complete.

So here we are ... today, San Franciscans are frustrated, angry, and tired by the daily challenges of traffic, congestion, transit delays and Muni overcrowding. Do you really want to throw more gasoline on the bonfire by approving 8000 new housing units in the epicenter of the Muni meltdown?

Please delay green-lighting the EIR and the Hub and ask Planning staff and/or SFMTA to identify the impacts of the increased population on Muni Metro and to recommend ways to create the additional capacity. We need to fund and build transit infrastructure BEFORE massive upzoning projects like the Hub plan or the broader impact of SB 50 are felt. Thank you.
SFMTA - On-time Performance: Muni Metro Streetcars - J, KT, L, M, N

https://www.sfmta.com/reports/muni-time-performance
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85% On-Time Performance Goal (City Charter)

% of Arrivals
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27 August 2019

Planning Department
1650 Mission Street
San Francisco, CA

RE: 461 29th Street
2018-0326-4615

Dear Commissioners:

I am writing with additional materials that may address very recent neighborhood concerns. But, first, I owe everyone an apology; an old massing model was inadvertently placed on the cover of the drawing set that went out. This was two iterations ago, and bears little resemblance to the final proposal as agreed by the Planner and RDAT.

Unfortunately, given the very short timeframe, we cannot generate photo realistic drawings. Instead, we have submitted the most recent massing models, and included a project with similar finishes. While similar, this proposal will further emphasize the control joints in the stucco to further break up the massing.

We have also included a couple of detail drawings for you reference.

If I can answer any further questions, please do not hesitate to call or write

Sincerely

Earle Weiss
415.531.5270
earle@eeweiss.com
Subject Property (461 29th Street)- Proposed Front Elevation w/Material Palate
Subject Property (461 29th Street) Rendering #1:
Massing Model (6-Feet Above Mid-Street) From Left
Subject Property (461 29th Street) Rendering #2:
Massing Model (6-Feet Above Mid-Street) From Right
Subject Property (461 29th Street) Rendering #3:
Massing Model (6-Feet Above Mid-Street) From Center
2755 McAllister Street - Built Comparable Façade Material/Finishes Example
854 Capp Street- Built Comparable Deck Material/Finishes Example
3305 Broderick Street - Built Comparable Façade Material/Finish At Entry Example
This message is from outside the CD.

Dear Planning Commission Members,

I reside in the building next to 461 29th home and yard. It would create a den my yard.

I have lived in the neighborhood 40 years class roots and design with an eye awe what I believe is San Francisco’s true n Thank you.

On Aug 28, 2019, at 7:47 AM, Andy Levine <andy@levinearch.com> wrote:

President Melgar and Members of the Planning Commission:

Please see the attached petition signed to date by 28 neighbors who live on the 400 block of 29th Street, along with a few supportive relatives and friends

In less than a week since our first viewing of the permit drawings, we have uncovered considerable opposition from the neighbors regarding the proposed project at 461 29th Street. This is case #13 on Planning Commission agenda at the 8/29/19 meeting, for a mandatory Conditional Use hearing based on demolition and rebuild.

Thanks for your attention to this matter.
Sincerely,

Andy Levine
Levine Architects
415.282.4643
www.levinearch.com

<08 28 19 Petition for CU hearing re 461 29th St.pdf>
Dear Planning Commissioners:

I am in opposition to the proposed development at 461 29th Street, for several reasons.

My partner are renters of 13 years at 467 29th St, the lower flat on the house next door. In addition to the objections many of my neighbors have expressed about the project (out of scale and unattractive), we have many additional concerns about the project plan, which we have just seen for the first time this week when it went live on the sfplanning site.

1) The height and design of the new project significantly changes the amount of light that will come in to the 2 interiors rooms through our light well.

   - Currently, the light well opens up all the way to the back yard and is on a building that is only as tall as our first floor. We get sun for most of the morning through both of these windows, one which is a bedroom, the other is our living room and office.
   - In the new design, the light well be closed off and 3 stories higher than now, effectively shutting off all natural sunlight. Attached are photos of our current light.

2) The extension of the house exponentially into the backyard, for 4 stories.

   - The light in our back window, our bedroom, will be significantly reduced.
   - The extreme size will add significant bulk and shadow to our deck, and yard- likely killing our beautiful rose bush.

3) I do not trust the current developer to take our yard and quality of life into consideration during construction. The developer has failed to notify us or get proper permits when they have previously done potentially dangerous demolition to remove asbestos.
- I work from home, and 2 months ago I heard them working out back. I asked what they were doing, and was told they are "removing the asbestos".
- I did not think to call the city, as I should have, but now realize they did not get the proper permits or follow protocol for removing dangerous materials. No one was wearing masks, or had any type of safety processes that I could see.
- I am including a picture of the asbestos that they could not reach which is still on the house.

4) Last, but not least, the size of the house is not Affordable by Design and will only further this neighborhood's move away from a diverse and welcoming mix of residents.

- As two queer women who work in the arts, public health, and non-profits, we have seen our friends, coworkers, and family pushed out of San Francisco and this neighborhood specifically, by the rising rents and transition of housing to these Mega-condo buildings (among other factors).
- We are not opposed to a larger development at this site, if it was designed to fit multiple families and a mixture of incomes. This house was left in disrepair by the previous owner, and then empty for many more years, and we would love for it to be livable housing again.

I plan to attend the Conditional Use hearing on Thursday 8/29/19, and will bring further images to illustrate my points if I can.

Thanks for your support,
Susie
Office/Living Room #1
light from 10am-3:30pm
picture taken at 12:30pm
Office/Living Room #1

Visible sky, light from 10am-4pm daily
Interior Bedroom #1

light from 10am-3:30pm
picture taken at 12:30pm
Interior Bedroom #1
light from 10am-3:30pm
picture taken at 12:30pm
Interior Bedroom #1
visible sky and light all day
picture taken at 12:30pm
Exterior from Deck.
Window of back bedroom and lightwell visible.
Visible asbestos remaining, removed below and along back of addition.
Exterior from Deck.
Visible asbestos remaining.
Proposed project is 2 stories taller and as deep as next building, which will significantly reduce the sun coming into our bedroom, back laundry room, and kitchen.
Exterior from Deck.

Window of back bedroom and lightwell visible.
President Melgar and Members of the Planning Commission:

Please see the attached petition signed to date by 28 neighbors who live on the 400 block of 29th Street, along with a few supportive relatives and friends.

In less than a week since our first viewing of the permit drawings, we have uncovered considerable opposition from the neighbors regarding the proposed project at 461 29th Street. This is case #13 on Planning Commission agenda at the 8/29/19 meeting, for a mandatory Conditional Use hearing based on demolition and rebuild.

Thanks for your attention to this matter.
Sincerely,

Andy Levine
Levine Architects
415.282.4643
www.levinearch.com
Petition
8/24/19

461 29th Street

Demolition DBI permit application #2018 / 03 / 26 / 4612
Construction DBI permit application #2018 / 03 / 26 / 4615

I am opposed to the proposed design for the development at 461 29th Street.

I want the Planning Commissioners at the Conditional Use Hearing on 8/29/19 to require the developer to:
   a) Reduce the height to 3 stories to be compatible with the houses on the block.
   b) Decrease the bulk of the proposed development to make its scale more appropriate to the surrounding neighborhood.
   c) Revise the front façade details and material palette to be more in character with the context of quality houses on the block.

1. Emme Klama 447-29st. (Emme Klama)
2. Teresa Kay 474-29th st. (Teresa Kay)
3. Daisy Santos 474-29th St. (Daisy Santos)
4. Sandy Holmes 567 Edinburgh St (Sandy Holmes)
5. Susie Smith 467 29th St (Susie Smith)
6. Janon Franklin 467 29th St. (Jamon Franklin)
7. Kristi Belshaw 427 29th St. (Kristi Belshaw)
8. Amy Hood 427 29th St. (Amy Hood)
10. Evan Markiewicz 451 29th St (Evan Markiewicz)
11. Marc Curtis 468-29th St. (Marc Curtis)
Petition
8/24/19

461 29th Street

Demolition DBI permit application #2018 / 03 / 26 / 4612
Construction DBI permit application #2018 / 03 / 26 / 4615

I am opposed to the proposed design for the development at 461 29th Street.

I want the Planning Commissioners at the Conditional Use Hearing on 8/29/19 to require the developer to:

a) Reduce the height to 3 stories to be compatible with the houses on the block.
b) Decrease the bulk of the proposed development to make its scale more appropriate to the surrounding neighborhood.
c) Revise the front façade details and material palette to be more in character with the context of quality houses on the block.

12. Andy Case
   447 29th St.
   49 Allison St.
   (Andy Levine)

13. Albert Mendora
   447 29th St.
   49 Allison St.
   (Albert Mendora)

14. Ted Levine
   447 29th St.
   (Ted Levine)

15. Jennifer Mills
   475 29th St.
   (Jennifer Mills)

16. Jim Mills
   475 29th St.
   (Jim Mills)

17. Mary Beth Stone
   469 29th St.
   (Mary Beth Stone)

18. Miles Ross
   469 29th St.
   (Miles Ross)

19. Alexis C. Peters
   469 29th St.
   (Alexis C. Peters)

20. Cheryl MacKay
   407 29th St.
   (Cheryl MacKay)

21. Sybil Meyer
   435 29th St.
   (Sybil Meyer)

22. Mary Anne Buyle
   435 29th St.
   (Mary Anne Buyle)

23. Catherine Coleman
   465 29th St. #201
Petition
8/24/19

461 29th Street

Demolition DBI permit application #2018 / 03 / 26 / 4612
Construction DBI permit application #2018 / 03 / 26 / 4615

I am opposed to the proposed design for the development at 461 29th Street.

I want the Planning Commissioners at the Conditional Use Hearing on 8/29/19 to require the developer to:
  a) Reduce the height to 3 stories to be compatible with the houses on the block.
  b) Decrease the bulk of the proposed development to make its scale more appropriate to the surrounding neighborhood.
  c) Revise the front façade details and material palette to be more in character with the context of quality houses on the block.

24. Philip Cohen
   430 29th St. (Philip Cohen)

25. Debra Dale
   430 29th Street (Debra Dale)

26. Kevin Coleman
   432 29th St. (Kevin Coleman)

27. (Hillary Creagan)
   444 29th St.

28. (Zach Kirkman)
   444 29th St. (Zach Kirkman)
President Melgar and Members of the Planning Commission:

Please see my attached letter outlining the numerous conflicts and omissions on the permit drawings for the demo-and-rebuild project at 461 29th Street. This is the subject of the mandatory Conditional Use hearing this Thursday 8/29/19, case #13.

Even though we waited to receive our first view of the permit drawings until last Wednesday, 8/21/19, we have gotten considerable opposition from the neighbors regarding the proposed project.

Thanks for your attention to this matter.
Sincerely,

Andy Levine
Levine Architects
415.282.4643
www.levinearch.com
8/26/19
President Melgar and Members of the Planning Commission:

I am writing as an architect and a concerned 35-year resident of Noe Valley, more than 20 on the 400 block of 29th Street. My family lives 4 houses down the street from the proposed demo and rebuild project at 461 29th Street, subject of the mandatory Conditional Use hearing (item #13) on your agenda this Thursday 8/29/19.

I have reviewed the permit drawing set and observed the following conflicts and omissions:

1) Site section missing: A Site section showing the impact of the 4th floor from the sidewalk across the street has not be included in this set of drawings. This is an omission from what is typically required in a Site permit submittal.

2) Site survey missing: For a Conditional Use hearing, I understand that a survey is required. It is not included in the permit set as published.

3) Building depth incorrect: Based on my visits with neighbors, I observed that the existing depth of the subject property is longer than the neighbor to the west, not shorter as shown on the permit drawings. This inaccuracy is misleading.

4) Lightwell infills: The new lightwells at the west side of the property do not follow the RDG guidelines to respect and mimic the existing lightwell at the neighbor's property. There are 3 bedrooms at each of the two flats that will be impacted by the infill and the proposed 4th floor addition.

5) Light court step back: The proposed lightwells don't comply with the Building code CBC section 1206.3 for Light Court. The code prescribes that light courts get wider as they get taller to allow for light and ventilation at operable windows and habitable rooms.

6) Building height conflict: On the Front and Rear elevations on Drawing sheets A-3.1 and 3.2, the building height is dimensioned as 39'-11 7/8". On the Building section on Drawing sheet A-4.1, the building height is dimensioned as 40'-0". This is a minor, but never-the-less sloppy conflict.

7) Facade materials undefined and conflicts: On the Front (north) facade on Drawing sheet A-3.1, keynotes 6 and 8 specify the material as "solid rail" and "solid overhang." This material needs to be defined more than just "solid." Also, the wall above the entry door is shown with a keynote 9 for "thin set stone tile," but it is rendered the same as the "smooth trowel stucco. This is a conflict.

8) Floor heights undefined: On the Building section on Drawing sheet A-4.1, the floor-to-floor heights have not been dimensioned, except at the lowest level, in which there is a 14'-4" ceiling height. The ceiling height of the 3rd floor scales less than 7'-6" which would be in violation of the CBC Building code. This omission is unresolved.

All these conflicts and omissions in the permit drawings need to be resolve before we can understand or accurately judge their proposed project. Sorry for this late letter. It is based on the very tardy distribution of the drawings by the staff planner. Our first viewing of the drawings was last Wednesday 8/21/19.

Sincerely,
Andy Levine

447 29th Street, San Francisco, CA 94131
(415) 282-4643
andy@levinearch.com
President Melgar and Members of the Planning Commission,

Please see the attached letter from Noe Neighborhood Council in opposition to the Conditional Use Authorization of the proposed project at 461 29th Street.

Sincerely,

Ozzie Rohm
August 25, 2019

President Melgar and Members of the Planning Commission:

On behalf of Noe Neighborhood Council (NNC), I am writing to express our opposition regarding the proposed project at 461 29th Street. Our reasons are as follows:

• The proposed design is out of scale and not in keeping with the height and bulk of the homes on this street. This block of 29th Street is mostly comprised of two- or three-story buildings. There are only two exceptions to this norm and that is exactly why we are opposed to this four-story behemoth that will further erode the predominant pattern of homes on this block.

• The plans miss important information such as the height of each floor as indicated by the Section plan on page A-4.1. The overall height of the building, which per Planning Code is supposed to be no more than 30 feet at the curb level is undefined on this page. The drawing shows 30' next to a line that starts at the curb level and ends somewhere between the 3rd and 4th floor!

• The proposed project does not fully respect the neighboring light wells and instead of matching them, it only goes as far as 70% of the existing adjacent light wells. Yet worse, the project blocks the neighboring light wells on lower levels because the proposed building’s light wells are only at the top floors and don’t extend all the way down.

• Most importantly, the proposed project is an insult given our affordability crisis. To demolish a 750 square foot home to build a luxury duplex of 6,459 square feet does nothing to address our affordability crisis. Each unit of the proposed project will be worth at least $3MM dollars at today’s prices. Most likely, both units will be acquired by a single buyer at a price attainable to only 1% of San Franciscans. Does the extra unit that justifies the demolition of this modest home do anything for our housing shortage? Who can afford a $3MM dollar condo assuming that these units are sold separately?

As these are serious issues that should have been addressed, we are puzzled as to how the Planning staff has seemingly overlooked them in order to recommend approval. We trust that the Commission will scrutinize this further and hopefully, will reach the same conclusion as we have: a modest and relatively affordable home should not be demolished to make room for an out of scale and out of reach development. Please require the project sponsor to eliminate the 4th floor and reduce the expansion into the rear yard to ensure the proposed units are affordable by design and the new building is within the mass and scale of surrounding homes.

Sincerely,

Ozzie Rohm
For the 300+ members of Noe Neighborhood Council
This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Planning Commissioners:

I am writing in opposition to the proposed plans for a 4-story house to be built at 461 29th Street.

This house has been abandoned for a long time. We only recently received the first communication from the architect/developer for this project.

There is no precedent set for a 4-story, 2-unit building on 29th Street. We would prefer not to have a repeat of the single homes (#438 and #440) that were built above the allowed height limit, even with repeated requests to the Building Department to not allow this to happen.

In fairness to those of us who have lived here for 25 years+, we would have appreciated any correspondence from the architect/developer or the City. Other residences have been renovated or re-built with much more notice than we received for 461 29th Street.

Please take into account that this is a mostly single-home neighborhood, which is what attracted us to this area initially. It doesn't seem right to us that a developer comes into the neighborhood and with hardly any prior notice, sends out a plan for a 4-story house.

We will be at the hearing on Thursday, 8/29/19.

Thank you,
Sybil Meyer
Mary Anne Ruyle
435 29th Street
Dear Planning Commissioners:

I am in opposition to the proposed development at 461 29th Street since I believe it is:

a) Out of scale with the neighborhood in terms of 4-story height and total construction of 6457 square feet proposed to replace a 750 square foot house.
b) Badly designed with a front facade that has window fenestration and material pattern that is not appropriately-scaled and an awkward addition to the neighborhood.

My family has lived on 29th Street for over 20 years. I plan to attend the Conditional Use hearing on Thursday 8/29/19

I suggest that the developer and his architect:

a) Remove the 4th story with its awkward setback
b) Reduce the total amount of construction, since what is proposed is not Affordable by Design. Two units with 2-bedrooms can be much smaller than 3200 square foot each.
b) Consider adding to the lower basement level and connecting it to the rear yard, like numerous other projects on this down-sloping side of the block
c) Clarify the undefined materials on the front facade, and reduce the number of materials, so it doesn't look like the shoddy recently built construction on the block at 438 and 440 29th Street.

By the way, this Wednesday 8/21/19 was the first opportunity that any of us had the chance to view the proposed drawings. We were not contacted by the architect or project sponsor, and had to wait for the staff planner to send us copies of the drawings.

Thanks for your support to maintain the integrity and quality of our neighborhood,

Andy

Andy Levine
Levine Architects
415.282.4643
www.levinearch.com
Hi Andy and Mark,

For your information.

Philip

----- Forwarded Message ----- 

From: Earle Weiss <earle@eeweiss.com>
To: chris.townes@sfgov.org <chris.townes@sfgov.org>; Tom McGrath <tommcgrathconstruction@yahoo.com>
Cc: Hillary Creeggan <hillary.creeggan@gmail.com>; Zach Kirkman <z.kirkman@gmail.com>; Debra Dale and Philip Cohen <cohendale46@yahoo.com>; Merilee McDougal <merileemcdougal@gmail.com>; Tiffany Wade <tiffanywade@gmail.com>; Jennifer Mills <jenabellmills@hotmail.com>; Jim Mills <jcmills@gmail.com>; "emme@levinearch.com" <emme@levinearch.com>; "Myrna Melgar@sfgov.org" <Myrna Melgar@sfgov.org>; "Joel Koppel@sfgov.org" <Joel Koppel@sfgov.org>; "richhillissf@gmail.com" <richhillissf@gmail.com>; "Milicent Johnson@sfgov.org" <Milicent Johnson@sfgov.org>; "kathrin.moore@sfgov.org" <kathrin.moore@sfgov.org>; "dennis.richards@sfgov.org" <dennis.richards@sfgov.org>

Sent: Friday, August 23, 2019, 6:47:58 PM GMT+2
Subject: 461 29th Street

All

I am disappointed that no one contacted me in the last 18 months we have been working on this project; our contact information has been clearly posted. We work closely with neighbors, and take their comments seriously. Unfortunately, to simply attack a week before the final meeting gives us little time to respond or adjust the application.

The Planner asked I send an example of my work in Noe Valley. The Chronicle wrote up a project on 28th Street. Note I normally work with a lighter palate on the facade, but in this case the neighbors wanted something more 'grounded', but not dark. I use this example as it was constructed by an outside party; it takes bias out of what is being photographed.

With 461 29th street we have proposed a limestone base with smooth towel stucco above. Accents, and garage door are in clear finished wood. The block face is mixed, and their is a big contrast between the adjacent neighbors. The concept is to generate a facade the blends, as opposes to screaming for attention or imitating past styles. The City deserves better than another fake Victorian.

We had done some massing models that unfortunately were sent out by Planning. Those are no longer valid as we have set the upper story, and parapet back from the street to reduce street presence.

Again, any and all comments are welcome. I would also ask for specific comments such as 'we don't like limestone' as opposed to a general comment such as 'we don't like modern'. It is difficult to respond to the subjective.

Please email comments separately, as this chain will get hard to follow fast. I will collate specific items and come up with suggestions.

Thanks
Earle Weiss
Dear Chris,
I do not think my Comments were included in the packet and I thought I had sent them as a pdf in time per our email correspondence.
I am cc’ing them to the Commission myself to save you the printing. I would appreciate it if you would mention it in your presentation next week.
Thank you.
Georgia Schuttish

Sent from my iPad
August 12, 2019

To: Planning Commission
From: Georgia Schuttish
cc: Chris Townes

Re: 461 29th Street Case No. 2008.0023CUA
Conditional Use Hearing August 29, 2019

This is a very fancy house. Actually it is a very fancy 2 unit building. It is very large with an ample amount of square footage per unit, including an elevator.

The main concern I have is "Whether the project protects the relative affordability of existing housing". This is the criterion for Section 317 I.

Attached to this memo is the sales brochure for 2 units each currently for sale on Cesar Chavez. They just hit the market in the past week. This project was an Alteration, not a Demo with new construction. Unfortunately it did not have a DR. The neighbors are unhappy with the large size of the building and the loss of privacy which they find beyond the tolerances of privacy. I don’t think they fully understood the plans, but that is another matter as is the issue of whether it was actually a Demolition or not.

The Section 317 I criterion for Relative Affordability was not applied to this project on Cesar Chavez because it wasn’t a Demo, but given the asking price, the criterion should have been applied. The original building, pre Alteration sold for $1.5 million, the entitlements were sold again for over $2 million. The current prices for each unit is listed on the brochure.

This is not relative affordability.

The units at 461 29th Street seem even larger with more bedrooms and more bells and whistles such as the subterranean media room and the huge exclusive roof deck. The Cesar Chavez Street sales brochure is included for a comparison between the two projects.

In the 29th Street project there is a great deal of square footage that is just like floating space....unattached to any specific use. Prior to the Commission’s break, at the July 25th General Public Comment, I showed examples from three premier architects’ (Richard Neutra, William Wurster and Gardner Dailey) San Francisco projects. They did not design the kitchen as the focus of a dwelling, surrounded by space. The floor plans they designed were both beautiful and livable with dining and living rooms and even family rooms that were unique and specific. Their kitchens were intended to be kitchens, to cook and store food, not something just to look at. The square footage of both proposed units at 461 29th Street is not efficient and that lack of efficiency and common sense will compromise Relative Affordability. This will be two very expensive condos. The two units should be smaller and smarter.

I know that this property can be put to better use and likely warrants a Demolition although I saw no Soundness Report in the files. I often walked by 461 29th in the 1990s to pick up my boys from the school bus stop at 30th and Noe and remember this neglected property.

However this project is not the way to densify. It is a poor template. Many 2 unit buildings in Noe Valley are now in the pipeline. There are two on Valley and two on Clipper and one on Duncan. There are two on Cesar Chavez. And on Sanchez. Future two unit projects can still accommodate families with multi bedrooms for multi generations or however a modern family may chose to live but they need to better strive for the Relative Affordability criterion in Section 317 I if we are to move towards solving the housing affordability crisis. Smaller is smarter.

Georgia Schuttish
Incredible views from these newly constructed two light-filled exquisite Noe Valley luxury condominiums located at 4061-63 Cesar Chavez Street. The epitome of modern, urban living. Each unit is spread over two levels and boasts of incredible open living spaces with walls of glass with stunning views of downtown and surrounding areas. Ideally located within walking distance of 24th Street shopping and community life. Distinctive European designer flair which include Italian and Spanish tile, Venetian Plaster, Cesarstone and Miele appliances, European Cabinetry, American Oak floors and European designer solid doors. These sophisticated residences set a new standard for quality craftsmanship, with attention to detail. Other features include wet-bars, view decks, elevator, urban outdoor roof garden, outdoor barbeque kitchen, landscaped south facing garden, radiant heating, 1 car parking per unit. Surround sound system, exterior camera security system remotely programmable.

EDWINA TYNAN
REALTOR®
Berkshire Hathaway HomeServices
CaldRE# 01998359
(415) 994-8394 MOBILE
TYNANRE@GMAIL.COM

BERKSHIRE HATHAWAY
HomeServices
Drysdale Properties

THIS INFORMATION IS BELIEVED TO BE CORRECT BUT HAS NOT VERIFIED AND ASSUMES NO LEGAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR ITS ACCURACY. BUYERS SHOULD INVESTIGATE THESE ISSUES TO THEIR OWN SATISFACTION.
August 20, 2019

Zoning Administrator  
Planning Commission  
C/O San Francisco Planning Department  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400  
San Francisco, CA 94103

RE: 4118 21st St.  
Record number: 2018-002602CUAVAR

Dear Planning Commission:

Writing to share our concerns regarding the project at 4118 21st St., which adjoins the south side of our property at 378 Diamond St., where we've lived since 1997.

- The proposed four-story building is significantly taller than the previous building at that address and taller than its neighbors on either side, including uphill.

- All four floors have large window configurations that will impact our access to privacy and illuminate our house and yard at night.

- The proposed structure will be the tallest, deepest, and biggest on the block, changing the character of and setting a precedent for development in a neighborhood of mostly two- and three-story homes.

- Extensive demolition, foundation, and framing work have been completed to date with a permit approved for an interior remodel only. Neighbors were not notified of the project's real scope until after a December 2018 complaint had halted the work and a pre-app meeting was held in March 2019. Allowing a variance after the fact or an unusually large building to go up seem to favor the owners and their methods rather than the quality of life of those in the neighborhood.

Thank for your consideration,

Anne Guaspari  
John Guaspari
Aug 19, 2019

Record Number: 2018-0026002CUAVAR
4118 - 21st Street

Honorable Commissioners,

My neighborhood is a residential one of modest, mostly one- and some two-family dwellings. The current plans for 4118 - 21st Street are for a large, four floor house that is out of character in bulk and height. It would be taller than the approved plans for its uphill neighbor, 4112 - 21st Street, interrupting the downhill flow.

My garden abuts the property on its east side, so that the backs of the buildings are fairly close. The current plans are for three floors of large windows that would look into my bedroom and bath. I am concerned about nighttime light pollution and the intrusion into my privacy.

I would like to see the plans for this project amended to reduce the overall height so that the building steps down from the height in the approved plans for 4112 and the depth of the top two floors matches the depth in the approved plans for 4112. This reduction in bulk and height would make the project more compatible with the neighborhood. I would also like to see a reduction in the size of the rear windows on the three upper floors in order to retain some privacy and reduce light pollution.

Thank you for your consideration,

Kay Klumb
382 Diamond Street
Hello George and Jenna,

I apologize to come to this conversation so late in the process. I’ve been unable to participate until now. I am a co-owner with Kay Klumb, living in the upper unit. All development you do will directly impact my home, esp. privacy, light and views.

I don’t understand your statement in the first paragraph and I quote: “this significant reduction will provide more light, air and views than you currently have available or had available to you when you purchased your properties.”

I must be missing something. Please clarify how by adding massive height and depth to your property will provide light, air and views to my property.

Thank you for your response.

Dorothy Kelly
384 diamond street
August 21, 2019

Planning Commission
c/o San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

RE: 4118 21st Street
Record Number: 2018-002602CUAVAR

Dear Planning Commission:

After a recent in-person review of the 4118's 07.30.19 COND USE/VAR design plans with homeowners, Jenna and George, we continue to have significant concern with the height and depth of the proposed structure and the impact that it will have on our property's west facing living spaces' access to natural light. These changes leave us feeling "boxed-in" for most of the year because of the building mass extending beyond 4112 - 21st Street building.

ACCESS TO NATURAL LIGHT

The proposed height and depth of the top two floors of the four-story structure will negatively impact our access to adequate light and air at 390 Diamond Street. The proposed new vertical third-floor addition and the second-floor outlined in the 07.30.19 CU/VAR design plan extends 4-feet beyond the depth of recently approved new 4-story home expansion at 4112 -21st Street.

The proposed home significantly limits our access to light on the west-facing side of our property, specifically from the far southern edge of our property to near the mid-point of our entire property for a majority of the calendar year. The light that currently comes from the southern side of our house through our west-facing windows on all three floors will be severely impacted during the already limited daylight hours in the fall, winter and spring months.

The proposed height and depth of this expansion will significantly reduce daytime light from entering our main living areas. For our family, this renders most of our main living area (e.g. master and 2nd bedroom, bathroom, dining room and kitchen) dark for the majority of the year.
DESIGN SOLUTION
A reduction of 4118 - 21st Street’s proposed depth and height for the top two floors will help to retain some light. This can be achieved by:

1. **A reduction in the top two floors’ depth (back mass) by at least 4-feet** which will maintain a 47’11” rear lot depth. Also, this reduction allows 4118 to maintain the same building depth as their immediate neighbors on both sides (4112 - 21st Street and 4124-21st Street).

2. **A reduction in the overall building height 2-3 feet** will help to retain light at 390 Diamond Street. This can be obtained by having 9’ ceilings by reducing height from the 10’6” on the third-floor, 9’8” on the second floor, 10’1” on the first floor, and 10’0” for the basement family room.

OUT OF SCALE
We believe the proposed designs at 4118 21st Street is out-of-scale for the neighborhood as it will be largest home on 21st Street. Initially, the home owners described all home renovations to be contained within the envelope of the original home and basement excavation would occur to gain additional space.

Within one month of permit issuance for interior renovation and excavation, all walls and floors were demolished, and eventually the entire home except one original wall remained despite a second pending permit. As their entire home was being rebuilt, neighbors noticed visual discrepancies in height and depth from the original house. By mid-January 2019, the house structure and exterior walls were built up through the 2nd floor with visual height and depth discrepancies.

Today, the proposed project is asking for approval for four-story home with a two-story rear extension beyond the 45% rear setback and a new vertical extension with a depth longer and taller than all homes on the entire block.

DESIGN SOLUTION
We ask that you uphold and maintain character of the block and neighborhood. As you consider its conditional use and variance, you can achieve character with:

1. **A reduction of the rear mass of at least 4-feet** to maintain alignment with the rear depths of all homes on 21st Street

2. **A reduction in the overall building height 2-3 feet.**

As 15 year residents of this neighborhood, we thank you for the opportunity to share our concerns. We urge you to consider the recommended design solutions so that all homes can co-exist together as a neighborhood with new and long-time families and residents.

Sincerely,

Cynthia and Marc Schroeder
390 Diamond Street

2018-002602CUAVAR
Dear Nancy,

I am the owner of 4124 21st Street. I'm writing to you because I found out that someone sent your office a letter with my name on it, and it is not my letter or my signature. This email attached I sent on August 15 is the only letter I have sent to you about the 4118 house. If you got another letter pretending to be mine, it is a fake. My concerns are in this email that I sent you. Please use my email to understand my concerns.

1. Also, I was told that the window would be removed on my property line. That is not reflected in the plans.
2. If the window is going to stay on the property line, no one has asked me to sign anything to allow the window on the property line.

Thank you in advance for your attention to this email.

Sincerely yours,

Carlos Ibarra

Aug 27 2019
Dear Nancy,

My name is Carlos Ibarra, and I live at 4124 - 21st Street. I am writing because I have some serious concerns about the construction being done on 4118 - 21st Street.

First, I am concerned that the light in front of my house is being shaded by the extra construction on the front of 4118. It is pushed out farther than it was before.

Toward the back of my house, their window on the west side would open right toward my bedroom which invades my privacy. That window was built without my knowledge.

In the backyard, they tore down the existing fence and the concrete foundation and they left a gap. The house is almost on top of me, and I really don't want them to add another floor. My backyard and house are now in a tunnel shaded by this big house. The shade is even making my house feel colder. I am a retired person whose garden will now be shadowed.

Also, there used to be a shared space between our houses where I could get light through my bathroom window. Now that window is mostly obstructed with no light and little air coming through it. That space was used to store garbage cans and for people who needed to get in to make repairs, and now it is gone.
I would like the window removed that looks into my bedroom, and I do not want them to add the extra floor to the top of this house because it will completely overshadow my house.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Carlos Ibarra
Dear San Francisco Planning Department,

We are writing about the construction being done at 4118 21st Street. We have resided at 4107 21st Street since 1997. Our home sits south, directly across the street from the property in question. This past weekend we met with Jenna and George and are encouraged by their willingness to meet with us and explain their plans. We are however still left with some unresolved concerns.

From everything that we've seen, the height and square footage remain unclear.
- Code calls for homes to step downhill, following the grade. The plans we have seen seem to show 4118 higher than 4112 (approved plans) which is uphill.
- There is contradicting square footage in the documentation. We are still trying to understand how much bulkier and out of character this new home will be on a street with relatively small homes.

From current plans, this new building will be larger than all the others on our street. We are concerned that its height and mass will shadow the smaller houses and yards around it in this residential part of the Castro.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Elizabeth A. Andrews
Katrina Madsen
Curtis Larsen  
385 Eureka Street  
San Francisco, California 94114  

August 20, 2019  

Planning Commission  
c/o San Francisco Planning Department  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400  
San Francisco, CA 94103  

RE: 4118 21st Street  
Record Number: 2018-002602CUAVAR  

Dear Planning Commission:  

I am a homeowner whose property looks onto the proposed construction and am potentially impacted by any variances that may be granted. In a recent meeting with the property owners (August 17, 2019), some of my issues were verbally addressed but I want to ensure that the Planning Commission is formally aware of my concerns:

1. **Neighborhood Precedent:** It is vital to preserve the nature our neighborhood and maintaining the general footprint and height of residences. Variances could materially change our neighborhood.

2. **Project Depth:** The rear portion of the—now suspended—construction is wildly inconsistent with the depths of any of the houses on the north side of the 4100 block. I have been assured by the property owners that 12' of the illegal build will be removed. I would ask you to consider and approve a new residence that conforms to your rear yard preservation formulas and is consistent with existing, or already approved, residences in the 4100 block of 21st Street.

3. **Architectural Plan Consistency:** The plans that were shown to neighbors may have relied on erroneous heights and widths and contain discrepancies between blueprints and dimensions pending approval especially as they relate to height and proposed width. I would ask that all dimensions be verified and settled as consistent before any variances are granted.

4. **Side Set-In Provision Variance:** The property owners informed us of an existing retaining wall that has a 3' variance intruding into 4118's eastern boundary. Rather than granting a set-in variance, wouldn't this be an opportunity to correct this retaining wall placement error in light of the wall being the eastern separator of both properties (4118 and 4112) that are now—or about to be—demolished?

5. **Conditional Use Authorization:** This project morphed from a remodel, to illegal demolition and construction, and now to variance all based on the notion that the structural integrity of the original dwelling was discovered to be beyond repair. Determining this would have been more than reasonable prior to beginning the remodel process and failure to do so resulting now in this Conditional Use Authorization including “tantamount demolition” and variance doesn’t quite pass the smell test. Again, my concern here is setting precedence as to how project planning and building is handled for our block as well as the city in general.

Thank-you for this opportunity to express my concerns with you.

Best,

Curtis Larsen
Demolition without permit. Whenever the demolition of any building or structure containing one or more residential units takes place without the issuance of a demolition permit as required by this code, the site on which the unlawful demolition occurred shall be subject to the following restriction: For five years from the date of the unlawful demolition, no permit authorizing the construction or alteration of any building or structure for that site shall be issued, except for a permit for the construction or alteration of a building or structure with the same number of residential units, with the same proportion of residential to nonresidential units, and with the same or fewer square feet as the building or structure that was unlawfully demolished.

103A.3.2 Definitions. For the purposes of this section, the following definitions shall apply:

DEMOLITION means the total tearing down or destruction of a building containing one or more residential units, or any alteration which destroys or removes, as those terms are defined by the Building Official of the Department of Building Inspection, principal portions of an existing structure containing one or more residential units.

PRINCIPAL PORTION means that construction which determines the shape and size of the building envelope (such as the exterior walls, roof and interior bearing elements), or that construction which alters two-thirds or more of the interior elements (such as walls, partitions, floors or ceilings).

RESIDENTIAL UNIT means any dwelling unit, as defined in this code, or any guest room, as defined in the San Francisco Housing Code, other than the following:

1. Any guest room in a building classified as a residential hotel pursuant to the Residential Hotel Unit Conversion and Demolition Ordinance
2. Any residential unit in a building where the demolition or alteration is required to comply with this code, the Housing Code or the City Planning Code.

103A.3.3 Hearing. The Building Official shall hold a hearing within a reasonable period of time after discovering that an unlawful demolition may have taken place. The Building Official shall cause notice to be given to the owners of the affected property, and to the owners and occupants of property on the same block as the affected property's site and across the street from the site for one block (that is, on lots which abut the same street as that which abuts the site to the nearest intersections on either side of the site), using the names and addresses of the owners as shown on the last assessment rolls of the City and County of San Francisco. For corner lots, notice shall be provided to the owners and occupants of property on the same block as the affected property's site and for one block along both streets which the lot abuts (that is, on lots which abut the two streets which the site abuts to the nearest intersection on either side of the site) and, in addition, to the other corner lots at the intersection where the site is located. Notice may be given either by personal service or any mail, not less than 30 days before the scheduled date of the hearing. Immediately after giving such notice, the Building Official shall cause a copy of the notice, printed on a card of not less than 8 inches by 10 inches (203.2 mm x 254 mm), to be posted in a conspicuous place on the affected property. The notice shall specify the date and nature of the hearing and that the following issues will be determined at the hearing: whether an unlawful demolition has taken place as described in Sections 103A.3.1 and 103A.3.2, and, if so, the number of residential units that existed on the site, the proportion of residential to nonresidential units that existed on the site and the total square feet of the building or structure that existed on the site. Upon determination that an unlawful demolition has taken place, the Building Official shall promptly record a notice in the official records of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco; the recorded notice shall state that the property is subject to the restrictions set forth in Section 103A.3.1 of this code.
3847 – 3849 Eighteenth Street: Lack of Code Enforcement: Who is Inspecting the Inspectors?

**Building Inspections**
Sample of 26 On-Site Inspections

- 12/2014 – Start of Work Inspection
- 02/2015 – Reinforcing Steel Inspection
- 06/2015 – Pre-Final Inspection of Excavation to Create Storage
- 06/2015 – Pre-Final Inspection of Conversion of Storage to Garage

**Planning Actions**

- 01/2016 – OTC Planning Department Permit Issuance

**Complaints**

"Looks like I should have caught this one at the counter. I'm sure you're probably on this, but we can add this case to the City Attorney's list of (Mercury Engineering) / SF Garage sites." 02/2018

**Building Actions**

- 05/2016 – Okay to Cover Inspection
- 04/2017 – Okay to Cover Inspection
- 06/2017 – Voluntary Seismic Upgrade Inspection
- 10/2017 – Final CFCO Inspection
- 05/2018 – Planning Department NOV Issued
- 07/2016 – Serial Permitting
- 05/2017 – Building Beyond Original Envelop
- 12/2017 – Illegal Unit Merger
- 07/2018 – Work Beyond Scope
- 11/2018 – Vacant Property
- 05/2019 – Building Department NOV Issued
Building Department NOV “resulted from a site visit on May 20, 2019 where it became apparent that even the combination of issued permits did not document the actual as-built conditions.”

Discrepancies and Beyond the Scope

1) PA # 201409226974 shows basement being converted to storage to comply with NOV #201310261 for removal of unauthorized dwelling unit.

2) PA # 201411252493 represents building envelope expansion without permit.

3) PA # 201412123665: There are no calculations on the plans showing the amount of excavation, but it is probably about 100 cubic yards.

4) PA # 201412304758 proposed "new" storage on December 12 is identified as "existing" storage on December 30, 2014.

5) PA # 201606301316: There are no calculations showing the extent of the excavation added to what was done at the front under PA # 201412304758 and at the rear under...

6) PA # 201512245908: The as-built attic window and the garage door were enlarged and two of the east side dormers were combined into a single 8 foot by 16 foot dormer.
# Neighbors Opposing Project at 4363 26th St – Douglass St

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Pearson</td>
<td></td>
<td>1145 Douglass St</td>
<td>8-18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnie Finder</td>
<td></td>
<td>1133 Douglass</td>
<td>8-18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curry Jued</td>
<td></td>
<td>1111 Douglass</td>
<td>8-18-19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 28, 2019

Lauren Koch
4394 26th St
SF, CA 94131

Re: Proposed Project at 4363 26th St

Dear Commissioners:

I have serious concerns about the proposed project at 4363 26th St, which is excessive in height and scale and not in keeping with the established pattern of houses. This portion of the block has 2-story and 3-story houses with 3rd floor setbacks. I’m concerned this design will set a precedent that will negatively impact the neighborhood.

Please reconsider this project.

Thank you,

Lauren Koch

[Signature]
Re: Proposed Project at 4363 26\textsuperscript{th} St

Dear Planning Commission:

I live at 4357 26\textsuperscript{th} St adjacent to the project at 4363 26\textsuperscript{th} St. This proposed 4-story house seems excessive in size, scale and height relative surrounding properties along 26\textsuperscript{th} St and would negatively impact the air, light, and privacy to adjacent property.

Please reconsider these proposed plans.

Sincerely,

\[\text{[Signature]}\]

\[\text{SATUS LINJALA}\]
August 29, 2019

Dear Members of the San Francisco Planning Commission,

I feel it necessary to write to you in opposition to the Project being proposed at 4363 26th Street. I am a 23 year resident of Noe Valley and see this project as an example of a disturbing trend that pushes the limits of height, overall size in relation to surrounding homes, and design guidelines.

The existing home is probably less that 1000 square feet. While I cannot determine the square footage on the proposed home, I would guess that it is close to 4 times that size, making it much larger than most of the surrounding homes. The impact to light, air and green space and privacy is considerable.

There are no surrounding homes that are 4 levels. This is not a precedent that should be set in this neighborhood, for the sake of a second family room. Indeed, there is precedent for not allowing the 4th level to be built.

While I understand the property owners right to demolish the existing small but beautiful 1920’s home, and build a new modern building, I would hope that this can be done with respect for the surrounding neighbors and the larger neighborhood in which the intend to live. (?)

I urge the planning commission to take Discretionary Review not allow the 4th floor of this project to be built.

Sincerely,
Lorraine Aiken
1424 Diamond Street
San Francisco, CA 94131
4363 26th Street

MURDOCH RESIDENCE – RESPONSE TO DISCRETIONARY REVIEW
Agenda

- About my family and the project
- Other neighbors’ response to the project
- Response to Mr. Shurtz’s DR
- Response to Mr. Chiang’s DR
About my family and the project

- My wife Marlies and I bought this home to renovate it for our growing family
  - My parents will be living in the basement, else need overnight child care (Marlies works 24hr shifts)
  - We are planning to have 3 children, so need adequate space / bedrooms
- We are certainly **not** developers – I’m a physician working in biotech, my wife a neonatal transport nurse
  - We embarked on this as we couldn’t afford a home in the neighborhood that meets our needs
- The **top floor is critical to our family** for three uses:
  - Family room in proximity to living floor
  - At same time, separated space that can be used for my work meetings, without disrupting family
  - Guest BR given our large extended family who live out of town (7 siblings, 10 nieces and nephews)
Agenda

- Context of our project
- Other neighbors' response to the project
- Response to Mr. Shurtz's DR
- Response to Mr. Chiang's DR
Other neighbors feel design is highly consistent with the neighborhood.

Owner to the east:

"the façade seems to be consistent with the newer houses that are already in the neighborhood, and the upper floor as it is currently envisioned seems quite modest and wouldn’t be problematic”

Thomas Bomba
Jul 8

Hello all. Gabriella, you may recall that you and I have already met earlier in the planning process, when I was trying to familiarize myself with the project and the planning process. David, nice to meet you electronically here.

I don’t currently see any problems with Travis’s and Marlies’s current plans. It seems to have gone through a good review with you already in which various issues were taken into account and the project was scaled back appropriately. In particular, the facade seems to be consistent with the newer houses that are already in the neighborhood, and the upper floor as it is currently envisioned seems to be quite modest and wouldn’t be problematic either.

Let me know if you would like any further feedback. I travel quite a bit so email would probably be best. But if you prefer you can reach me this week by phone at 415-691-9139 or next week onward at +49-176-5988-6701.

Best regards,
Tom Bomba
4357 26th Street
Other neighbors feel design is highly consistent with the neighborhood

**Tenant to the east:**

"I support the current plan with top floor as presented in the plans"

Importantly, Mr Shurtz previously had Mrs Linjala sign a prewritten letter, but she “feel[s] like [she] was mis-informed”; she makes it clear that “had I had all the correct information I would not have signed it”
Dear Gabriela and David – I am writing to express my support for the proposed development of 4363 26th Street. By way of background, my name is Oleg Nodelman and I have lived on 26th Street for almost 15 years where I own two residences. I bought 4380 26th Street in October of 2004, and recently purchased 4352 26th Street where I reside with my wife and 8 year old twin girls.

I have reviewed the architectural plans for the residence, as I do for all projects within a block of our home. I think the design is clever and is highly consistent with the character of our neighborhood. The family developing the property has clearly put a great deal of thought into the project, and complaints that I was recently made aware of regarding the setback of the living floor and the existence of the top floor are entirely unfounded.

I am looking forward to our new neighbors bettering our street and the entire neighborhood. If there is any other way that I can be helpful or answer any questions I can be reached on my cell phone – 415-722-1038 or over email.

Sincerely,

Oleg
Other neighbors feel design is highly consistent with the neighborhood

**Owner of 4333 26th St:**

“I feel that the proposed scope and design of the project will be a positive contribution to the block and is highly consistent with the character of the neighborhood.”
Agenda

- Context of our project
- Other neighbors’ response to the project
- Response to Mr. Shurtz’s DR
- Response to Mr. Chiang’s DR
We have made multiple edits in response to Mr Shurtz’s complaint

- Reduced the size of the floor ~50% from what was originally contemplated
- Reduced the ceiling height of floor
- Removed any parapets from floor
- Minimized windows on back of floor for privacy
- Further stepped in floor from sides and rear of property
- Commissioned survey confirming that upsloping nature of lot conforms to Code Section 261
- Confirmed with planning department that project constitutes a remodel not demo
Mr Shurtz’s assertions about our 4th floor addition are deeply flawed

- The notion that the 4th floor somehow impacts the light / air / privacy of neighboring properties is entirely unfounded
  - Mr Shultz’ home is over 100 feet away, and significantly uphill – this only affects his views
  - The floor is set back significantly from each side, and doesn’t impinge on the midblock light/air to the south
  - Our lot is significantly upsloped, and the design is only 2 stories above grade at the rear of the lot.

- The design is highly consistent with the neighborhood
  - There are multiple other 4 story homes on the block in close proximity to our home, and this floor is minimally visible from the street anyways
  - Other neighbors feel that the design is highly consistent with the character of the neighborhood
  - Proposed square footage smaller than many in the neighborhood – including smaller than neighbor to West
Proposed floor has no impact on rear neighbors’ ‘light, air, and privacy”

Mr Shurtz is ~130 feet away and 40-50 feet uphill from our home. His assertion that remodel will affect light, air, privacy is entirely unfounded.
4th floor design highly respects adjacent neighbors’ light and privacy

- Floor is set back in the rear to maintain midblock light
- Increased side setbacks to minimize impact on neighbors
- Over 27ft setback from front of property
There are multiple other 4\textsuperscript{th} floors on the block given upsloping lots.

Multiple 4+ story homes \textit{without} significant 4\textsuperscript{th} floor setbacks (light green has plans for 4\textsuperscript{th} floor addition).
Multiple 4+ story homes on block (South side of street)

Highly varied designs with 3-4 stories at street level (North side of street)
We have set back our 4th floor much more than other homes in response to complaint

Setbacks color coded by property (Murdoch property in blue)

4th floor as proposed (light blue) is much more setback than other neighbors’ on the block
Mr. Shurtz has created images that misrepresent our project.

Incorrect scale of building

Only one floor will be visible above fence, *not two*

It is unfortunate that these images misrepresented our home – suggesting to other neighbors that the scale of the project is much larger than in reality.
Agenda

- Context of our project
- Other neighbors’ response to the project
- Response to Mr. Shurtz’s DR
- Response to Mr. Chiang’s DR
We have made multiple edits in response to Mr Chiang

- Multiple concessions made to minimize effect on Mr. Chiang’s light and views
  - Articulated back the 3rd floor
  - Created a notch on his side 5ft in from property line to minimize effect on his light
  - Reduced the massing / parapets to ensure that the project scale is in keeping with the neighborhood
  - Rear setback of home 3.5 ft less than Mr Chiang
- We disagree with request for even further setback of 3rd floor
  - Design as contemplated is highly consistent with the neighborhood; home to west has a very prominent bay and solid guardrail that makes it read more like 3 stories straight up
  - Mr Chiang’s request is not consistent with 3rd floor setbacks in close vicinity, and our current setback is at a midpoint balanced between Mr Chiang’s and that of properties downhill
We articulated the 3rd floor to improve Mr Chiang’s light and views.
The proposed design is highly consistent with the character of the neighborhood.
3rd floor setbacks of adjacent properties are not consistent with DR requestor’s

Setbacks color coded by property (DR requestor in red, Murdoch property in blue)

Proposed 3rd floor setback is balanced with nearby properties, including those immediately downhill

N.B., DR requestor has overhanging parapet
Summary

- **Both these complaints ultimately relate to private views**
- Despite this, we have already made significant changes and concessions to these neighbors, and it seems inappropriate to make further changes
- Other neighbors are highly supportive of the project
- We are a young growing family, and the proposed project enables us to continue living in the city
Appendix
Setback of Mr Chiang’s home does not match that to his West
Neighbors Opposing Project at 4363 26th St
Upper 26th - Levels from Street

3* = 3rd floor setback
1* = entire house setback
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Square Footage of Current Homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,710</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
David,

We are planning to bring updated plans to you this week. We would like to speak tomorrow.

Since we met, we sought legal advice given the strong inconsistencies between what the RDAT requested of us previously (i.e., move the 2nd floor forward and get rid of the front deck), and what you suggested subsequently in the mediation meeting. Ryan Patterson provided an thorough consultation and suggested that the assertion from the DRs that our plans were inconsistent with the neighborhood doesn’t hold muster.

In the meeting with the DR requestors, you suggested there was some error may have been made on the part of RDAT. I find this very hard to believe given how in depth the review of our plans were - with multiple requests for edits to the facade that we complied with (and that Gabriela can confirm) to ensure that it was in keeping with the neighborhood. I found it peculiar that Gabriela didn’t join that mediation meeting since she has the most experience with this project.

If you plan to bring such a claim to the commission, I want to see the documentation of how such an ‘error’ was made, despite the thorough review. Obviously, this would represent significant sloppiness and unprofessionalism on the part of the planning department. This would be an opportunity for me to highlight to the commission how unacceptable this is. I would want Gabriela and the RDAT architect who did the full review of our plans to join the commission hearing as well.

This is not a development project, but creating a larger home for our family. I’d like to point out the significant economic impact and stress this delay has created for our family - not only in legal, architectural costs, carrying the mortgage. We’ve had to delay having another child, and since we don’t have space for my parents yet, have had to pay for external childcare.

Look forward to speaking,
Travis

---
Travis Murdoch, MD FRCP(C)
Mobile: (408) 583-7970
Office: (587) 316-6604
Fax: (587) 316-6606
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adina Pearson</td>
<td></td>
<td>1145 Douglass St</td>
<td>8-18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amir Finder</td>
<td></td>
<td>1333 Douglass</td>
<td>8-18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Jue</td>
<td></td>
<td>1111 Douglass</td>
<td>8-18-19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Neighbors Opposing Project at 4363 26th St - Diamond St

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide Johnson</td>
<td>Adelaide Johnson</td>
<td>1228 Diamond</td>
<td>8-20-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Barbieri</td>
<td>Peggy Barbieri</td>
<td>1241 Diamond</td>
<td>8-20-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Nashworth</td>
<td></td>
<td>1301 Diamond</td>
<td>8-20-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roz Itelson</td>
<td>Roz Itelson</td>
<td>1309 Diamond</td>
<td>8-20-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Itelson</td>
<td>Steve Itelson</td>
<td>1309 Diamond</td>
<td>8-20-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash Shah</td>
<td></td>
<td>1333 Diamond St</td>
<td>8-20-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Brene</td>
<td>Melanie Brene</td>
<td>1339 Diamond St</td>
<td>8-20-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trynae Miller</td>
<td>Trynae Miller</td>
<td>1220 Diamond St</td>
<td>8-24-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Thomas</td>
<td>Marshall Thomas</td>
<td>1223 Diamond St</td>
<td>8-26-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Genie</td>
<td>PF Genie</td>
<td>4341 26th St</td>
<td>8/17/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yem Weber</td>
<td>Yem Weber</td>
<td>4386 26th St</td>
<td>8/18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason Varner</td>
<td>M varner</td>
<td>4376 26th</td>
<td>8/21/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Bryant</td>
<td>J bryant</td>
<td>4344 26th St</td>
<td>8/22/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Grand</td>
<td>B grand</td>
<td>4317 26th</td>
<td>8/23/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Moran</td>
<td>J moran</td>
<td>4343 26th St</td>
<td>8/24/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andria Spere</td>
<td>A spere</td>
<td>4381 26th</td>
<td>8/25/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Spere</td>
<td>J spere</td>
<td>4361 26th St</td>
<td>8/26/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Spousa</td>
<td>T spousa</td>
<td>4381 26th St</td>
<td>8/26/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magurn Eichmann</td>
<td>M eichmann</td>
<td>4385 26th St</td>
<td>8/26/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Gruel</td>
<td>D gruel</td>
<td>4371 26th St</td>
<td>8/26/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joannna Lynch</td>
<td>J lynch</td>
<td>4366 26th St</td>
<td>8/26/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Becker</td>
<td>D Becker</td>
<td>4346 26th</td>
<td>8/26/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren Torre</td>
<td>L torre</td>
<td>4394 26th St</td>
<td>8/28/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Mitchell</td>
<td></td>
<td>4342 Cesar Chavez</td>
<td>8/18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Parker</td>
<td></td>
<td>4331 Cesar Chavez</td>
<td>8/18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Branth</td>
<td></td>
<td>4335 Cesar Chavez</td>
<td>8/18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cara Brand</td>
<td></td>
<td>4335 Cesar Chavez</td>
<td>8/18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Heath</td>
<td></td>
<td>4341 Cesar Chavez</td>
<td>8/18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack DNAve</td>
<td></td>
<td>4349 Cesar Chavez</td>
<td>8/18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustav Lames</td>
<td></td>
<td>4361 Cesar Chavez</td>
<td>8/18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam Chissabo</td>
<td></td>
<td>4377 Cesar Chavez</td>
<td>8/18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Mkhobodhay</td>
<td></td>
<td>4350 Cesar Chavez</td>
<td>8/24/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can Kapsoglu</td>
<td></td>
<td>4352 Cesar Chavez</td>
<td>8/24/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay More</td>
<td></td>
<td>4352 Cesar Chavez</td>
<td>8/24/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Sacket</td>
<td></td>
<td>4344 Cesar Chavez</td>
<td>8/24/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becca Mizzan</td>
<td></td>
<td>4318 Cesar Chavez</td>
<td>8/24/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teddi Silverman</td>
<td></td>
<td>4317 Cesar Chavez</td>
<td>8/24/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gur Doitel</td>
<td></td>
<td>4312 Cesar Chavez</td>
<td>8/24/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa White</td>
<td></td>
<td>4334 Cesar Chavez</td>
<td>8/25/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda O'connor</td>
<td></td>
<td>4342 Cesar Chavez</td>
<td>8/27/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ens Schroeder</td>
<td></td>
<td>4350 Cesar Chavez</td>
<td>8/27/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 28, 2019

Lauren Koch
4394 26th St
SF, CA 94131

Re: Proposed Project at 4363 26th St

Dear Commissioners:

I have serious concerns about the proposed project at 4363 26th St, which is excessive in height and scale and not in keeping with the established pattern of houses. This portion of the block has 2-story and 3-story houses with 3rd floor setbacks. I'm concerned this design will set a precedent that will negatively impact the neighborhood.

Please reconsider this project.

Thank you,

Lauren Koch
Re: Proposed Project at 4363 26th St

Dear Planning Commission:

I live at 4357 26th St adjacent to the project at 4363 26th St. This proposed 4-story house seems excessive in size, scale and height relative surrounding properties along 26th St and would negatively impact the air, light, and privacy to adjacent property.

Please reconsider these proposed plans.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
August 29, 2019

Dear Members of the San Francisco Planning Commission,

I feel it necessary to write to you in opposition to the Project being proposed at 4363 26th Street. I am a 23 year resident of Noe Valley and see this project as an example of a disturbing trend that pushes the limits of height, overall size in relation to surrounding homes, and design guidelines.

The existing home is probably less than 1000 square feet. While I cannot determine the square footage on the proposed home, I would guess that it is close to 4 times that size, making it much larger than most of the surrounding homes. The impact to light, air and green space and privacy is considerable.

There are no surrounding homes that are 4 levels. This is not a precedent that should be set in this neighborhood, for the sake of a second family room. Indeed, there is precedent for not allowing the 4th level to be built.

While I understand the property owners right to demolish the existing small but beautiful 1920’s home, and build a new modern building, I would hope that this can be done with respect for the surrounding neighbors and the larger neighborhood in which the intend to live. (?)

I urge the planning commission to take Discretionary Review not allow the 4th floor of this project to be built.

Sincerely,
Lorraine Aiken
1424 Diamond Street
San Francisco, CA 94131