Memo to the Planning Commission

HEARING DATE: MAY 21, 2020
CONTINUED FROM: APRIL 23, 2020

DATE: May 21, 2020
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Bridget Hicks, Planner
RE: 4118 21st Street Update (Case No. 2020-000215CUA)

BACKGROUND

The Project includes the legalization of the demolition of a 3,025 square foot, two-story over basement single-family home and the construction of a 4,481 square foot, three-story over basement two-family home within the RH-2 (Residential-House, Two Family) Zoning District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District. Unit 1 will be located at the basement level and first floor and will contain two bedrooms and two full bathrooms, one bicycle parking space, and a 213 square foot deck. Unit 2 will be located on the second and third levels and will contain three bedrooms and 2.5 bathrooms, one vehicle parking space and one bicycle parking space, and a 140 square foot deck.

On April 23, 2020, the Planning Commission heard and continued the Conditional Use Authorization for 4118 21st Street to the public hearing on May 21, 2020, with direction to meet with the neighbors through the facilitation of the Supervisor Mandelman’s office.

Since the last hearing, the Sponsors have held a series of meetings with the Supervisor’s office and the neighbors to discuss the neighbors’ concerns. During those meetings, the neighbors requested a reduction in the glazing at the rear of the building and the removal of the east window on the rear bay to address privacy concerns. The neighbors also noted concerns of potential construction over the property line at 4124 21st Street and requested a new site survey.

The Project Sponsors have since submitted revised plans with the following changes:

- The east window on the rear bay has been removed in response to privacy concerns
- The Sponsors have reduced the amount of glazing at the rear (north) of the building in response to privacy concerns

Since the last hearing, the Department has received 10 follow-up letters of opposition from members of the public who had written letters of opposition for the first hearings. The concerns in these letters note
the request for an updated site survey (previous survey conducted September 2019) and the claim that the existing home was a two-family dwelling.

In addition, the Department has received comments from the public concerning the relative affordability of the Project. It is noted that according to records from the Assessor’s Office the existing home transacted at $2.2 million dollars in 2018, thus there is no loss of affordable housing stock as a result of the Project.

Exhibit D of the attached Draft Motion has been corrected to remove the typo that noted there was commercial square footage in the Project.

Attachments:
- Revised Plans
## GS2: San Francisco Green Building Submittal Form for LEED or GreenPoint Rated Projects

### INSTRUCTIONS:
1. check the one column that best describes your project.

#### CHECK THE ONE COLUMN THAT BEST DESCRIBES YOUR PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW CONSTRUCTION</th>
<th>ALTERATIONS + ADDITIONS</th>
<th>REFERENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOOKING OUT</td>
<td>HIGH-RISE</td>
<td>LARGE 50%+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>PER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LEED PROJECT RECORD for the LEED Project Team:
- Project: [Project Name]
- LEED Rating System: [LEED Rating System]
- LEED Consultant: [LEED Consultant]
- LEED Certification Status: [LEED Certification Status]
- LEED Green Building Project:
  - Project Status: [Project Status]
  - LEED Certified: [LEED Certified]
  - LEED Platinum: [LEED Platinum]
  - LEED Gold: [LEED Gold]
  - LEED Silver: [LEED Silver]
  - LEED Certified: [LEED Certified]

### MATERIALS & ENERGY:

#### MATERIALS & ENERGY:
- [Material 1]
- [Material 2]
- [Material 3]

### WATER:

#### WATER:
- [Water Type 1]
- [Water Type 2]
- [Water Type 3]

### LIGHTING:

#### LIGHTING:
- [Light Type 1]
- [Light Type 2]
- [Light Type 3]

### WATER-USE REDUCTION:

#### WATER-USE REDUCTION:
- [Water Use Reduction 1]
- [Water Use Reduction 2]
- [Water Use Reduction 3]

### APPLIANCES:

#### APPLIANCES:
- [Appliance Type 1]
- [Appliance Type 2]
- [Appliance Type 3]

### COMMISSIONING:

#### COMMISSIONING:
- [Commissioning Procedure 1]
- [Commissioning Procedure 2]
- [Commissioning Procedure 3]

### RECIRCULATING PUMP:

#### RECIRCULATING PUMP:
- [Recirculating Pump Type 1]
- [Recirculating Pump Type 2]
- [Recirculating Pump Type 3]

### ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS:

#### ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS:
- [Electrical System Type 1]
- [Electrical System Type 2]
- [Electrical System Type 3]

### TRASH & RECYCLING:

#### TRASH & RECYCLING:
- [Trash Type 1]
- [Trash Type 2]
- [Trash Type 3]

### STORAGE:

#### STORAGE:
- [Storage Type 1]
- [Storage Type 2]
- [Storage Type 3]

### VAPOR BARriers:

#### VAPOR BARriers:
- [Vapor Barrier Type 1]
- [Vapor Barrier Type 2]
- [Vapor Barrier Type 3]

### COCOMMISSIONING:

#### COCOMMISSIONING:
- [Commissioning Procedure 1]
- [Commissioning Procedure 2]
- [Commissioning Procedure 3]

### THE ENFORCEMENT:

#### THE ENFORCEMENT:
- [Enforcement Type 1]
- [Enforcement Type 2]
- [Enforcement Type 3]

### PERMITS:

#### PERMITS:
- [Permit Type 1]
- [Permit Type 2]
- [Permit Type 3]

### COMPLIANCE:

#### COMPLIANCE:
- [Compliance Type 1]
- [Compliance Type 2]
- [Compliance Type 3]

### ARCHITECTURE:

#### ARCHITECTURE:
- [Architecture Type 1]
- [Architecture Type 2]
- [Architecture Type 3]

### ENRICHMENT:

#### ENRICHMENT:
- [Enrichment Type 1]
- [Enrichment Type 2]
- [Enrichment Type 3]

### SOFTWARE:

#### SOFTWARE:
- [Software Type 1]
- [Software Type 2]
- [Software Type 3]

### RESEARCH:

#### RESEARCH:
- [Research Type 1]
- [Research Type 2]
- [Research Type 3]

### SECURITY:

#### SECURITY:
- [Security Type 1]
- [Security Type 2]
- [Security Type 3]

### RISK MANAGEMENT:

#### RISK MANAGEMENT:
- [Risk Management Type 1]
- [Risk Management Type 2]
- [Risk Management Type 3]

### INCREASING:

#### INCREASING:
- [Increasing Type 1]
- [Increasing Type 2]
- [Increasing Type 3]
The project is tantamount to demolition.

The Applicant must demonstrate that the proposed project is in conformity with a preponderance of other General Plan policies to preserve the fabric of the existing neighborhood. In addition to the criteria listed in the Code, the Hearing Officer determines these criteria for consideration, in addition to buildingSoundness:

(i) whether the property is free of a history of serious, continuing Code violations;
(ii) whether the property is free of Code violations;
(iii) whether the property is an "historical resource" under CEQA;
(iv) whether the removal of the resource will have a substantial adverse impact under CEQA;
(v) whether the project conserves neighborhood character to preserve neighborhood cultural and economic diversity;
(vi) whether the project conserves neighborhood character to preserve neighborhood cultural and economic diversity to preserve neighborhood diversity;
(vii) whether the project conserves neighborhood culture and economic diversity;
(viii) whether the project conserves the cultural and economic neighborhood diversity by replacing an aging single-family home with a tw-family home in an RH-2 district;
(ix) whether the property is free of a history of serious, continuing Code violations;
(x) whether the project increases the number of permanently affordable units as governed by 20th-century San Francisco housing from the time that this neighborhood was first developed.

The project is tantamount to demolition.

The project removes significant massing in the rear yard.

The existing building is not currently rental housing so there is no connection to other neighborhoods.

The project enhances the neighborhood character by replacing a non-descript, vaguely Mediterranean 2-story house with a new 3-story building that is evocative of classic, early 20th-century San Francisco residential design with its brick and shingle cladding and dark painted details.

The project removes significant massing in the rear yard.

The proposed project is in conformance with a preponderance of these criteria.
**Title:** Karamanos Residence

**Address:** 4118 21st Street, San Francisco, CA 94114

**Scale:** 1/4" = 1'-0"

**Window Detail:**
- Smooth Finish Stucco
- Wood Windows
- Composite Siding
- Aluminum Clad Wood Frame Windows
- Painted Wood Trim
- Painted MDO Overhead Garage Door w/ Min. 200 sq. in Venting
- English Bond Face Brick
- Board-Formed Concrete Planter
- Painted MDO Trim
- Aluminum Clad Wood Door
- Hardie Board and Batten Siding
- T.O. Parapet
- 2 1/2" Tyvek Flexwrap Lap Over Tyvek Building Wrap - Run Flexwrap
- Up Jams 6" Min.
- Fasten Corners Using Mechanical Fasteners
- Composite Shims
- Aluminum Clad Wood Door
- Set in continuous bead of sealant at back of sill
- Beveled Clapboard
- 3/8"
- Cedar Trim
- Stained Cedar Shingles
- Over Drainage Mat
- Over Tyvek Building Wrap
- Over 5/8" Type 'X' DensGlass Gold Sheathing Over 1/2" CDX Plywood Sheathing
- Wrap Edge of Drainage Mat
- Continuous Insect Screen DRIP WINDOW DETAIL

**Existing South Elevation:**

- PL
- PTD. Metal Cap
- Painted MDO Trim
- Aluminum Clad Wood Frame
- Set in continuous bead of sealant at back of sill
- Beveled Clapboard
- 3/8"
- Cedar Trim
- Stained Cedar Shingles
- Over Drainage Mat
- Over Tyvek Building Wrap
- Over 5/8" Type 'X' DensGlass Gold Sheathing Over 1/2" CDX Plywood Sheathing
- Wrap Edge of Drainage Mat
- Continuous Insect Screen

**West Elevation:**

- PL
- PTD. Metal Cap
- Painted MDO Trim
- Aluminum Clad Wood Frame
- Set in continuous bead of sealant at back of sill
- Beveled Clapboard
- 3/8"
- Cedar Trim
- Stained Cedar Shingles
- Over Drainage Mat
- Over Tyvek Building Wrap
- Over 5/8" Type 'X' DensGlass Gold Sheathing Over 1/2" CDX Plywood Sheathing
- Wrap Edge of Drainage Mat
- Continuous Insect Screen
NOTE:
WINDOWS WERE REVISED AT REQUEST OF NEIGHBORS
GLASS AREA:
BEFORE: 333.88 SQ. FT.
AFTER: 271.25 SQ. FT.
DIFFERENCE: -62.63 SQ. FT.
19% LESS GLASS AREA

DOORS AND WINDOWS SHOWN ARE MARVIN SIGNATURE ULTIMATE COLLECTION

THIS WINDOW IS AT THE KITCHEN OF 4124 21ST STREET
Executive Summary
Conditional Use Authorization

HEARING DATE: APRIL 23, 2020

Record No.: 2020-000215CUA
Project Address: 4118 21st Street
Zoning: RH-2 (Residential-House, Two-Family) Zoning District
40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 2750 / 017
Project Sponsor: Amy Lee
3S Consulting
318 29th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94121
Property Owner: George Karamanos
32 Newburg Street
San Francisco, CA 94131
Staff Contact: Bridget Hicks–(415) 575-9054
Bridget.Hicks@sfgov.org
Recommendation: Approval with Conditions

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The Project includes the legalization of the demolition of an existing 3,025 square foot, two-story over
basement single-family home and the construction of a 4,481 square foot, three-story over basement two-
family home within the RH-2 (Residential-House, Two-Family) Zoning District and a 40-X Height and Bulk
District. Unit 1 will be located at the basement level and first floor and will contain two bedrooms and two
full bathrooms, one bicycle parking space, and a 213 square foot deck. Unit 2 will be located on the second
and third levels and will contain three bedrooms and 2.5 bathrooms, one vehicle parking space and one
bicycle parking space, and a 140 square foot deck.

REQUIRED COMMISSION ACTION
In order for the Project to proceed, the Commission must grant a Conditional Use Authorization, pursuant
to Planning Code Sections 303 and 317 to allow the legalization of the demolition of the existing single-
family home within the RH-2 Zoning District.

ISSUES AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
• Public Comment & Outreach.
  ○ Support/Opposition:
    • The Department has received 4 letters of support which describe the benefits of
      adding a second unit to the City’s housing stock and providing an upgraded
building structure. The support also notes that the proposal will not extend as far into the rear yard as the previous structure did, thereby increasing the mid-block open space.

- The Department has received one letter requesting the item to be heard at a later date due to the online requirements of the current Shelter-In-Place City order.
  - Outreach: The Sponsors sent their initial submittal of the plan set to the neighbors on January 13, 2020.

- Existing Tenant & Eviction History: The existing single-family home was most recently owner occupied. There was a buyout agreement in 2017, however the records did not specify if it was for a separate unit or the entire tenancy. See Exhibit F for Eviction History documentation.

- Project History:
  - A complaint was filed with the Planning Department on December 31, 2018 that the Project exceeded the scope of Building Permit # 201802272279 and demolished the existing single-family home.
  - In response, a Conditional Use Application (2018-002602CUA) and Variance Application (2018-002602VAR) were heard on August 29, 2019 and continued to September 19, 2019 to legalize the demolition of the existing single-family home and construction of a 3,840 square foot, three-story over basement, single-family home. That 2018-002602CUA Conditional Use Application was denied on September 19, 2019.
  - The Project Sponsors are able to proceed with a new Conditional Use Application within one year of the previous denial because the new application contains a substantially different Project per Planning Code Section 305.
  - Concerns were raised at the past hearings about the potential of an Unauthorized Dwelling Unit (UDU). A UDU search had been completed and the Department determined that there was no UDU.
  - Design Review Comments: The project has changed in the following significant ways since the original submittal to the Department:
    - The building has been re-designed to not require a variance
    - A second unit has been added to the proposal
    - Removal of rooftop stair penthouse and roofdeck;
    - Decrease in ceiling heights;

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The Project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) as a Class 1 and a Class 3 categorical exemption.

BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION

The Department finds that the Project is, on balance, consistent with the Objectives and Policies of the General Plan. Although the Project results in the demolition of an existing single-family home, the proposal includes 2 residential dwelling units, resulting in one additional unit added to the housing stock, which is a goal for the City’s. The Department also finds the project to be necessary, desirable, and compatible with the surrounding neighborhood, and not to be detrimental to persons or adjacent properties in the vicinity.
Executive Summary
Hearing Date: April 23, 2020

ATTACHMENTS:

Draft Motion – Conditional Use Authorization with Conditions of Approval
Exhibit B – Plans and Renderings
Exhibit C – Environmental Determination
Exhibit D – Land Use Data
Exhibit E – Maps and Context Photos
Exhibit F – Eviction History Documentation
Exhibit G - Project Sponsor Brief
Exhibit H – Structural Report
ADOPTING FINDINGS RELATING TO A CONDITIONAL USE AUTHORIZATION PURSUANT TO PLANNING CODE SECTIONS 303 AND 317, TO LEGALIZE THE DEMOLITION OF AN EXISTING 3,025 SQUARE FOOT, TWO-STORY OVER BASEMENT, SINGLE-FAMILY HOME AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW 4,481 SQUARE FOOT, 29 FOOT 9 INCH TALL, THREE-STORY OVER BASEMENT, TWO-FAMILY HOME WITH ONE VEHICLE PARKING SPACE AND TWO BICYCLE PARKING SPACES LOCATED AT 4118 21ST STREET, LOT 017 IN ASSESSOR’S BLOCK 2750, WITHIN THE RH-2 (RESIDENTIAL, HOUSE, TWO-FAMILY) ZONING DISTRICT AND A 40-X HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICT, AND ADOPTING FINDINGS UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT.

PREAMBLE

On December 17, 2018, the Department of Building Inspection (hereinafter “DBI”) opened Complaint Case No. 201813931 regarding the detached single-family home at 4118 21st Street, Assessor’s Block 2750, Lot 017 (hereinafter “Project Site”). The complaint stated that construction on site exceeded the scope approved under Building Permit Application No. 2018.02.27.2279. The referenced permit approved first floor interior remodeling and basement-level excavation/infill under a legal nonconforming enclosed projection within the required rear yard; the permit specifically noted that no alterations to the façade or work visible from the street were proposed. Upon site inspection, DBI documented that the entire front façade was removed.

On January 10, 2019, the Planning Department (hereinafter “Department”) opened Code Enforcement Case No. 2018-017368ENF based on a complaint that significant demolition of the structure had occurred. The Department subsequently confirmed that the structure was demolished without authorization.
On March 19, 2019, Ryan Knock filed Application No. 2018-002602CUA within the Department for Conditional Use Authorization to legalize the demolition of the detached single-family home at the Project Site and construct a replacement single-family dwelling.

On August 29, 2019, the Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting on Conditional Use Authorization Application No. 2018-002602CUAVAR and continued the item to September 19, 2019.

On September 19, 2019, the Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting on Conditional Use Authorization Application No. 2018-002602CUAVAR and disapproved the item.

On January 7, 2020, Amy Lee of 3S Consulting (hereinafter “Project Sponsor”) filed Application No. 2020-000215CUA (hereinafter “Application”) with the Planning Department (hereinafter “Department”) for a Conditional Use Authorization to construct a new 4,481 square foot, 29 foot 9 inch tall, three-story over basement, two-family home (hereinafter “Project”) at 4118 21st Street, Block 2750 Lot 017 (hereinafter “Project Site”).

The Project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) as a Class 1 and Class 3 categorical exemption.

On April 23, 2020, the Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting on Conditional Use Project Authorization Application No. 2020-000215CUA.

The Planning Department Commission Secretary is the custodian of records; the File for Record No. 2020-000215CUA is located at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California.

The Commission has heard and considered the testimony presented to it at the public hearing and has further considered written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of the applicant, Department staff, and other interested parties.

MOVED, that the Commission hereby authorizes the Conditional Use Authorization as requested in Application No. 2020-000215CUA, subject to the conditions contained in “EXHIBIT A” of this motion, based on the following findings:

**FINDINGS**

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

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

2. **Project Description.** The Project includes the legalization of the demolition of an existing 3,025 square foot, two-story over basement single-family home and the construction of a 4,481 square foot, three-story over basement two-family home within the RH-2 (Residential-House, Two Family) Zoning District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District. Unit 1 will be located at the basement...
level and first floor and will contain two bedrooms and two full bathrooms, one bicycle parking space, and a 213 square foot deck. Unit 2 will be located on the second and third levels and will contain three bedrooms and 2.5 bathrooms, one vehicle parking space and one bicycle parking space, and a 140 square foot deck.

3. **Site Description and Present Use.** The Project site is located on the north side of 21st Street, between Eureka and Diamond Streets, Lot 017 in Assessor’s Block 2750 and in the RH-2 (Residential-House, Two-Family) Zoning District with a 40-X Height and Bulk designation. The approximately 2,435 square foot downward and lateral sloping lot has 25’ of frontage and a depth of 97’ 6”. The lot contains a mostly demolished single-family, two-story over basement residential building constructed circa 1908. The subject building is not subject to rent control as it is considered a single-family detached residence.

4. **Surrounding Properties and Neighborhood.** The subject property is located in the southern portion of Castro/Upper Market bordering Noe Valley and within District 8. Parcels within the immediate vicinity consist of residential single-, two- and multi-family dwellings of varied design and construction dates. The block-face is characterized by two- to three-story buildings of mixed architectural style. The buildings on the block vary in density from single-family residences to small multi-unit buildings.

5. **Public Outreach and Comments.** The Department has received four letters of support from neighbors referencing the benefits of adding a new unit to the housing stock, building an updated and modern structure, and how the Project will increase the amount of mid-block open space. The Department has received one letter requesting the item to be heard at a later date due to the online requirements of the current Shelter-In-Place City order.

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

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

   The Project proposes a building that will be approximately 29 feet 9 inches tall and, therefore complies with Planning Code Section 260.

   B. **Front Setback Requirement.** Planning Code Section 132 requires, in RH-2 Districts, a front setback that complies to legislated setbacks (if any) or a front back based on the average of adjacent properties (15 foot maximum).

   The Project will construct a dwelling unit with a front setback of 2 feet 6 inches which is the average of adjacent front setbacks. Therefore, the Project complies with Planning Code Section 132.
C. **Rear Yard.** Planning Code Section 134 requires a minimum rear yard depth of 45 percent of the total lot depth on which the building is situated, except to the extent that a reduction is permitted using the average between the depths of the rear building walls of the two adjacent buildings.

*The Project proposes a rear yard of 43 feet 10 ½ inches, which is 45% of the lot depth and therefore complies with Planning Code Section 134.*

D. **Front Setback Landscaping and Permeability Requirements.** Planning Code Section 132 requires that the required front setback be at least 20% unpaved and devoted to plant material and at least 50% permeable to increase storm water infiltration.

*The Project complies with Section 132 as it provides approximately 17 square feet of landscaping and approximately 37 square feet of permeable surface in the required front setback area.*

E. **Street Frontage Requirement.** Planning Code Section 144 requires that off-street parking entrances be limited to one-third of the ground story width along the front lot line and no less than one-third be devoted to windows, entrances to dwelling units, landscaping and other architectural features that provide visual relief and interest for the street frontage.

*The Project complies with the street frontage requirement as it exceeds the visual relief minimum and adheres to the off-street entrance maximum.*

F. **Street Frontage, Parking and Loading Access Restrictions.** Off-street parking shall meet the standards set forth in Planning Code Section 155 with respect to location, ingress/egress, arrangement, dimensions, etc.

*Proposed off-street parking for one vehicle will be located wholly within the property, comply with access, arrangement and street frontage dimensional standards. Therefore, the Project complies with Planning Code Section 155.*

G. **Usable Open Space.** Planning Code Section 135 requires, in RH-2 Districts, usable open space that is accessible by each dwelling (125 square feet per unit if private, or 166 square if shared).

*The Project provides over 1,000 square feet of usable open space for Unit 1 and 140 square feet of private usable open space for Unit 2, exceeding the minimum amount required.*

H. **Off-Street Parking.** Planning Code Section 151 does not require off-street parking, and permits 1.5 parking spaces for every dwelling unit provided.

*The Project proposes one off-street vehicle parking space and thus, complies with Planning Code Section 151.*

I. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Section 155.2 requires one weather-protected bicycle parking space per dwelling unit. The requirements apply when constructing a new building.
The Project proposes two bicycle parking spaces, one per dwelling unit and, therefore complies with Planning Code Section 155.2.

J. **Residential Density, Dwelling Units.** Per Planning Code Section 209.1, up to two units per lot are principally permitted in RH-2 Districts and up to one unit per 1,500 square feet of lot area is allowed with Conditional Use Authorization.

The Project proposes demolition of the existing single-family residence and the construction of two dwelling units. Therefore, the Project complies with Planning Code Section 209.1.

7. **Loss of Residential Unit through Demolition.** Planning Code Section 317(g)(5) establishes additional criteria for the Planning Commission to consider when reviewing applications for the loss of a residential unit as the result of a demolition. The Planning Commission shall consider the following:

A. **Whether the property is free of a history of serious, continuing Code violations.**
   The Project Site has serious, continuing Code violations. In 2018, DBI determined that the subject single-family dwelling exceeded the scope of work approved and required proper documentation and permitting. Following a site visit in 2019, Planning determined that the Project violated Planning Code Section 174 (Unpermitted Alterations), Section 311 (Permit Review Procedures), and Section 317 (Demolition) without authorization. The proposed Project would abate all violations.

B. **Whether the housing has been maintained in a decent, safe, and sanitary condition.**
   A February 2019 Structural Inspection Report prepared by Enertia Designs (Exhibit F) documented dry rot, termite damage and non-continuous framing on site. The structural engineer determined that much of the structure could not be salvaged or reinforced and recommended removal/replacement. Planning was unable to verify whether the structure was in decent condition due to the substantial amount of demolition and replacement already performed.

C. **Whether the property is an “historical resource” under CEQA.**
   The Planning Department reviewed the Historic Resource Evaluation submitted and provided a historic resource determination in a Preservation Team Review (PTR) Form. The historic resource determination concluded that the subject property is not eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) individually or as a contributor to a historic district. Therefore, the existing structure is not a historic resource under CEQA.

D. **Whether the removal of the resource will have a substantial adverse impact under CEQA.**
   The Planning Department determined that the existing structure is not a historic resource. Therefore, the removal of the structure would not result in a significant adverse impact on historic resources under CEQA.

E. **Whether the project converts rental housing to other forms of tenure or occupancy.**
   The existing single-family residence is presently owner-occupied. There are no restrictions on whether the constructed units will be rental or ownership.
F. Whether the project removes rental units subject to the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance or affordable housing.

The Project proposes to demolish an existing single-family dwelling, which is generally not subject to the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance. Definitive determinations on the applicability of the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance are the purview of the Rent Board. The existing dwelling unit is not an affordable housing unit. Planning staff requested the eviction history from the Rent Board and there was evidence of a buy-out in 2017. The records did not indicate if there was separate unit or if the buy-out was for the entire residence. The existing single-family home is presently owner-occupied.

G. Whether the project conserves existing housing to preserve cultural and economic neighborhood diversity.

Although the Project proposes the demolition of an existing single-family dwelling unit, the existing unit is not habitable and the reconstruction would restore the dwelling unit and add one net new dwelling unit to the site.

H. Whether the project conserves neighborhood character to preserve neighborhood cultural and economic diversity.

The Project will improve cultural and economic diversity by increasing the number of dwelling units in the neighborhood. The Project design meets the Residential Design Guidelines. The Project conserves neighborhood character with appropriate scale, design, and materials, and improves cultural and economic diversity by constructing two dwelling units that are consistent with the RH-2 Zoning District. The proposed residential development is characteristic of other existing residential buildings located along 21st Street; one net new dwelling unit would be added to the City’s Housing Stock.

I. Whether the project protects the relative affordability of existing housing.

The Project removes an older dwelling unit and replaces it with two newly constructed dwelling units. Older dwelling units are generally considered to be more affordable than recently constructed units. However, the existing dwelling unit is not habitable, making the effect reconstruction has on affordability difficult to quantify.

J. Whether the project increases the number of permanently affordable units as governed by Section 415.

The Project is not subject to the provisions of Planning Code Section 415, as the Project proposes less than 10 dwelling units.

K. Whether the project locates in-fill housing on appropriate sites in established neighborhoods.

The Project proposes in-fill housing, by reconstructing a dwelling unit and adding a new dwelling unit in the same general area as it was previously, in keeping with the established topography of the site.

L. Whether the project increases the number of family-sized units on-site.

The Project proposes an opportunity for family-sized housing by constructing two units, one with 2 bedrooms and one with 3 bedrooms, to replace the previous two bedroom unit.

M. Whether the project creates new supportive housing.
The Project does not create new supportive housing.

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

The Planning Department determined that the replacement building is keeping with the overall scale, massing and design of the immediately surrounding development and meets all relevant design guidelines to enhance existing neighborhood character.

O. Whether the project increases the number of on-site Dwelling Units.

The Project will increase the number of on-site dwelling units, with the addition of one net new dwelling unit for a total of two dwelling units proposed.

P. Whether the project increases the number of on-site bedrooms.

The existing dwelling unit contained two bedrooms, while the proposed reconstruction proposes two units one with two bedrooms and one with three bedrooms, resulting in an increase of 3 bedrooms.

Q. Whether or not the replacement project would maximize density on the subject lot.

The Project proposes to maximize density with 2 units in the RH-2 Zoning District.

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

The Project proposes to replace the existing dwelling unit and add one net new dwelling unit. The existing unit is not subject to the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance and contained two bedrooms. The proposed units will be of a larger size than the existing unit and will contain 2 bedrooms and 3 bedrooms.

8. Conditional Use Findings. Planning Code Section 303 establishes criteria for the Planning Commission to consider when reviewing applications for Conditional Use authorization. On balance, the project complies with said criteria in that:

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

The size of the proposed use is in keeping with other homes on the block face. The proposed two-family home will be 29 feet 9 inches tall at the street, in keeping with the neighboring two- and three-story buildings. The new home will be larger than the existing home, but will contain two family sized dwelling units and result in a smaller building depth. The building will be in conformity with the Residential Design Guidelines. Overall, the reconstruction of an unhabitable dwelling unit is necessary and desirable for the surrounding community.

B. The proposed project will not be detrimental to the health, safety, convenience or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity. There are no features of the project that could be detrimental to the health, safety or convenience of those residing or working the area, in that:
(1) Nature of proposed site, including its size and shape, and the proposed size, shape and arrangement of structures;

The height and bulk of the proposed Project will be larger than the existing single-family home but will not be detrimental to the health, safety, convenience or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity.

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

The Planning Code does not require off-street vehicle parking for a two-family home. The Project proposes adequate off-street parking with one off-street vehicle parking space and two bicycle parking spaces.

(3) The safeguards afforded to prevent noxious or offensive emissions such as noise, glare, dust and odor;

The proposed residential use is not considered to have the potential to create noxious or offensive emissions.

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

The Project is residential and will be landscaped accordingly.

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

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

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

HOUSING ELEMENT

Objectives and Policies

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

Policy 2.1:
Discourage the demolition of sound existing housing, unless the demolition results in a net increase in affordable housing.
Policy 2.5:
Encourage and support the seismic retrofitting of the existing housing stock.

The proposal, though a demolition, is necessary for the repair and rehabilitation of the subject building. The Project will add a new dwelling unit and restore a unit of housing that was found to have dry rot, termite damage and non-continuous framing, as documented in a February 2019 Structural Inspection Report. The proposal includes seismic upgrades that will bring the subject building up to current Building Code standards.

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

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

Policy 3.3:
Maintain balance in affordability of existing housing stock by supporting affordable moderate ownership opportunities.

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

While the Project will demolish an existing single-family dwelling, the new construction will result in an increase in the density of the property and contributes one net new dwelling units, a net addition of five bedrooms, to the existing housing stock.

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

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

The proposal will demolish an existing two-bedroom dwelling unit and construct two family sized dwelling units, one with two bedrooms and one with three bedrooms.

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

Policy 11.1
Promote the construction and rehabilitation of well-designed housing that emphasizes beauty, flexibility, and innovative design, and respects existing neighborhood character.
Policy 11.2
Ensure implementation of accepted design standards in project approvals.

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

Policy 11.4:
Continue to utilize zoning districts which conform to a generalized residential land use and density plan and the General Plan.

Policy 11.5
Ensure densities in established residential areas promote compatibility with prevailing neighborhood character.

The Project will meet the intent of the RH-2 (Residential-House, Two Family) Zoning District by constructing a two-family home in a neighborhood consisting of two- to three-story single- and multi-family dwellings. Furthermore, the proposed new construction conforms to the Residential Design Guidelines and is appropriate in terms of material, scale, proportions and massing for the surrounding neighborhood.

URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT

Objectives and Policies

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

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

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

The proposed replacement building reflects the existing mixed architectural character, varying heights along the block face and with further design modifications recommended by the Planning Department, the Project would be in keeping with the neighborhood development pattern. The proposed façade and massing are compatible with the existing neighborhood character and development pattern, particularly because the proposed building is of a similar massing, width and height to the existing structures in the neighborhood. The proposed façade and massing of the new building reflects the existing mixed architectural character, varying heights along the block face and will be in keeping with the neighborhood development pattern.

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

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

The replacement buildings has been designed to be compatible with the prevailing street wall heights and building depths. Although interpreted in a contemporary architectural style, the proposed building proportions and exterior materials have been selected to be compatible with the adjacent buildings and the immediate neighborhood character.

10. Planning Code Section 101.1(b) establishes eight priority-planning policies and requires review of permits for consistency with said policies. On balance, the project complies with said policies in that:

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

The Project site does not possess nor will it affect any neighborhood-serving retail uses.

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

While the Project will demolish an existing single-family home, it will also construct a new two-family home which will increase the amount of housing units on site. In addition, the Project has been designed to integrate with the existing neighborhood to preserve the character of the street.

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

The Project does not possess any existing nor propose any affordable housing. The Project will add one net new dwelling unit to increase the City's supply of housing.

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

The Project Site is served by nearby public transportation options. The Project is located within walking distance of the 24 and MUNI bus lines and the K, L, and M Muni subway lines. The Project also provides one off-street vehicle parking space and two bicycle parking spaces.

E. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced.
The Project does not include commercial office development nor should it affect industrial and service sectors.

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

The Project will be designed and will be constructed to conform to the structural and seismic safety requirements of the Building Code.

G. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved.

The Project Site does not contain any City Landmarks or historic buildings.

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

The project will not affect access to sunlight and vistas of nearby parks and open space. The height of the proposed structure is compatible with the established neighborhood development.

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

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

That based upon the Record, the submissions by the Applicant, the staff of the Department and other interested parties, the oral testimony presented to this Commission at the public hearings, and all other written materials submitted by all parties, the Commission hereby APPROVES Conditional Use Authorization Application No. 2020-000215CUA subject to the following conditions attached hereto as “EXHIBIT A” in general conformance with plans on file, dated March 2, 2020, and stamped “EXHIBIT B”, which is incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth.

APPEAL AND EFFECTIVE DATE OF MOTION: Any aggrieved person may appeal this Conditional Use Authorization to the Board of Supervisors within thirty (30) days after the date of this Motion. The effective date of this Motion shall be the date of this Motion if not appealed (after the 30-day period has expired) OR the date of the decision of the Board of Supervisors if appealed to the Board of Supervisors. For further information, please contact the Board of Supervisors at (415) 554-5184, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102.

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

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

I hereby certify that the Planning Commission ADOPTED the foregoing Motion on April 23, 2020.

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES:
NAYS:
ABSENT:
ADOPTED: April 23, 2020
EXHIBIT A

AUTHORIZATION

This authorization is for a conditional use to legalize the demolition of an existing 3,025 square foot, two-story over basement single-family home and the construction of a 4,481, three-story over basement, two-family home located at 4118 21st Street, Block 2750, and Lot 017 pursuant to Planning Code Section(s) 303 and 317 within the RH-2 Zoning District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District; in general conformance with plans, dated March 2, 2020, and stamped “EXHIBIT B” included in the docket for Record No. 2020-000215CUAand subject to conditions of approval reviewed and approved by the Commission on April 23, 2020 under Motion No XXXXXX. This authorization and the conditions contained herein run with the property and not with a particular Project Sponsor, business, or operator.

RECORDATION OF CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Prior to the issuance of the building permit or commencement of use for the Project the Zoning Administrator shall approve and order the recordation of a Notice in the Official Records of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco for the subject property. This Notice shall state that the project is subject to the conditions of approval contained herein and reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission on April 23, 2020 under Motion No XXXXXX.

PRINTING OF CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL ON PLANS

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

SEVERABILITY

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

CHANGES AND MODIFICATIONS

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

PERFORMANCE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

DESIGN – COMPLIANCE AT PLAN STAGE
6. **Garbage, Composting and Recycling Storage.** Space for the collection and storage of garbage, composting, and recycling shall be provided within enclosed areas on the property and clearly labeled and illustrated on the building permit plans. Space for the collection and storage of recyclable and compostable materials that meets the size, location, accessibility and other standards specified by the San Francisco Recycling Program shall be provided at the ground level of the buildings.

   *For information about compliance, contact the Case Planner, Planning Department at 415-558-6378, [www.sf-planning.org](http://www.sf-planning.org)*

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

   *For information about compliance, contact the Case Planner, Planning Department at 415-558-6378, [www.sf-planning.org](http://www.sf-planning.org)*

**PARKING AND TRAFFIC**

8. **Bicycle Parking.** The Project shall provide no fewer than 2 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces as required by Planning Code Sections 155.1 and 155.2.

   *For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, [www.sf-planning.org](http://www.sf-planning.org)*

**PROVISIONS**

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

   *For information about compliance, contact the Case Planner, Planning Department at 415-558-6378, [www.sf-planning.org](http://www.sf-planning.org)*

**MONITORING - AFTER ENTITLEMENT**

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

   *For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, [www.sf-planning.org](http://www.sf-planning.org)*

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

*For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, [www.sf-planning.org](http://www.sf-planning.org)*

**OPERATION**

12. **Community Liaison.** Prior to issuance of a building permit to construct the project and implement the approved use, the Project Sponsor shall appoint a community liaison officer to deal with the issues of concern to owners and occupants of nearby properties. The Project Sponsor shall provide the Zoning Administrator and all registered neighborhood groups for the area with written notice of the name, business address, and telephone number of the community liaison. Should the contact information change, the Zoning Administrator and registered neighborhood groups shall be made aware of such change. The community liaison shall report to the Zoning Administrator what issues, if any, are of concern to the community and what issues have not been resolved by the Project Sponsor.

*For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, [www.sf-planning.org](http://www.sf-planning.org)*
GENERAL NOTES
1. THESE DRAWINGS CONSTITUTE A PORTION OF THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS AND ARE INTENDED TO BE READ AND INTERPRETED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE PROJECT MANUAL.
2. ON-SITE WORK IS CONTRACTOR’S RESPONSIBILITY. CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE SAFETY AND SECURITY OF THE WORK SITE, INCLUDING THE PROTECTION OF ALL PERSONS AND PROPERTY AT THE WORK SITE. CONTRACTOR SHALL ALSO BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PROTECTION OF EXISTING UTILITY LINES AND OTHER EXISTING STRUCTURES.
3. CONTRACTOR SHALL MAINTAIN THE INTEGRITY AND SAFETY OF THE EXISTING STRUCTURE AND REPAIR ANY DAMAGE CAUSED BY CONTRACTOR’S WORK. CONTRACTOR SHALL REPORT ANY HAZARDS, INCIDENTS, OR DAMAGES TO THE JOB SITE SUPERVISOR.
4. ALL WORK SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ALL FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL BUILDING CODES.
5. CONTRACTOR SHALL TAKE APPROPRIATE STEPS THROUGHOUT THE PROJECT TO ENSURE THAT THE WORK SITE IS SAFE AND FREE FROM HAZARDS.
6. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL ENSURE THAT ALL MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT ARE PROPERLY MAINTAINED AND OPERATED.
7. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL COMPLY WITH ALL SAFETY REQUIREMENTS STATED IN THE PROJECT MANUAL.
8. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PROTECTION OF ALL EXISTING UTILITY LINES AND OTHER EXISTING STRUCTURES.
9. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE EXISTING BUILDING.
10. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE EXISTING INTEGRITY.
11. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE EXISTING SAFETY.
12. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE EXISTING HAZARDS.
13. IT IS THE INTENT OF THESE DRAWINGS TO FULLY COMPLY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE PROJECT MANUAL.
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## GS2: San Francisco Green Building Submittal Form for LEED or GreenPoint Rated Projects

### Overview

**Title:** Karamanos Residence 4118 21st Street

**Address:** San Francisco, CA 94114

**Contact:** 415.537.1125

**Website:** www.elevationarchitects.com

**Scale:** 1/8" = 1'-0"

**Date:** 12.16.19

---

### New Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy Use</td>
<td>USGBC LEED v4</td>
<td>See LEED for Energy Use Calculations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Use</td>
<td>USGBC LEED v4</td>
<td>See LEED for Water Use Calculations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Air Quality</td>
<td>USGBC LEED v4</td>
<td>See LEED for Indoor Air Quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Resources</td>
<td>USGBC LEED v4</td>
<td>See LEED for Materials &amp; Resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Alterations + Additions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy Use</td>
<td>USGBC LEED v4</td>
<td>See LEED for Energy Use Calculations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Use</td>
<td>USGBC LEED v4</td>
<td>See LEED for Water Use Calculations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Air Quality</td>
<td>USGBC LEED v4</td>
<td>See LEED for Indoor Air Quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Resources</td>
<td>USGBC LEED v4</td>
<td>See LEED for Materials &amp; Resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### References

- LEED v4
- GreenPoint v4
- GBCI

---

### Verification

**Project Name:** Karamanos Residence

**Address:** 4118 21st Street

**Architect:** Elevation Architects

**Construction:** Green Building Projects

---

### Option 1: LEED GCBCR

Great Building Compliance Professional of record and project stamp.

**Firm:** TFA

**Architectural or Engineering License:** Yes

**LEED Accredited Professionals:**

- 1, 2 LEED Accredited Professionals

---

### Option 2: GreenPoint Rated GBCCR

Great Building Compliance Professional of record and project stamp.

**Firm:** TFA

**Architectural or Engineering License:** Yes

**LEED Accredited Professionals:**

- 1, 2 LEED Accredited Professionals

---

### Acknowledgements

**Project Team:**

- Project: [Details]
- Drawn by: [Details]
- Checked by: [Details]
- Date: 12.16.19

---

### Additional Information

- **Waste:** Compliant with SF Recycling Ordinance.
- **Walls:** Compliant with SF Building Code.
- **Windows:** Compliant with SF Building Code.
- **HVAC:** Compliant with SF Building Code.
- **Electrical:** Compliant with SF Building Code.
- **Plumbing:** Compliant with SF Building Code.
- **Insulation:** Compliant with SF Building Code.
- **Energy:** Compliant with SF Energy Code.
- **Water:** Compliant with SF Water Code.
- **Indoor Air Quality:** Compliant with SF Indoor Air Quality Code.
- **Materials & Resources:** Compliant with SF Materials & Resources Code.
The project is a replacement two-story residential building. The new building will be located on the lot currently occupied by the existing house. The existing house has an assessed value of $2.2 million, so it is not considered affordable.

The proposed project is in conformance with a preponderance of these criteria:

(i) whether the property is free of a history of serious, continuing Code violations;
   Yes, the property is free of Code violations.

(ii) whether the property has been maintained in a decent, safe, and sanitary condition;
   Yes, the property has been maintained in a decent, safe, and sanitary condition.

(iii) whether the property is an "historical resource" under CEQA;
   Yes, the project is not an "historical resource" under CEQA.

(iv) whether the removal of the resource will have a substantial adverse impact under CEQA;
   Yes, the removal will have a substantial adverse impact since the project will not be permanently affordable.

(v) whether the project converts rental housing to other forms of tenure or occupancy;
   No, the project does not convert rental housing to other forms of tenure or occupancy.

(vi) whether the project removes rental units subject to the Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance or affordable housing;
   No, there are no rental units on the site.

(vii) whether the project conserves existing housing to preserve cultural and economic neighborhood diversity;
   Yes, the project conserves existing housing to preserve cultural and economic neighborhood diversity.

(viii) whether the project conserves neighborhood character to preserve neighborhood cultural and economic diversity;
   Yes, the project conserves neighborhood character to preserve neighborhood cultural and economic diversity.

(ix) whether the project protects the relative affordability of existing housing;
   Yes, the project adds one family-sized units to the site with a 2-bedroom, 3-bath unit.

(x) whether the project removes rental units subject to the Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance or affordable housing;
   Yes, the property has been maintained in a decent, safe and sanitary condition.

(xi) whether the project conserves neighborhood character to preserve neighborhood cultural and economic diversity;
   Yes, the project conserves neighborhood character to preserve neighborhood cultural and economic diversity.

(xii) whether the project conserves existing housing to preserve cultural and economic neighborhood diversity;
   Yes, the project conserves existing housing to preserve cultural and economic neighborhood diversity.

(xiii) whether the project adds new supportive housing;
   Yes, the project adds new supportive housing.

(xiv) whether the project is of superb architectural and urban design, meeting all relevant design guidelines, to enhance existing neighborhood character;
   Yes, the project enhances the neighborhood character by replacing a non-descript, vaguely Mediterranean 2-story house with a new 3-story building that is evocative of classic early 20th-century San Francisco residential design with its brick and shingle cladding and dark painted horizontal elements.

(xv) whether the project increases the number of family-sized units on-site;
   Yes, the project increases the number of family-sized units on-site from two to five.

(xvi) whether the project increases the number of on-site bedrooms.
   Yes, the project increases the number of bedrooms on site from two to five.

The project is a replacement two-story residential building. The new building will be located on the lot currently occupied by the existing house. The existing house has an assessed value of $2.2 million, so it is not considered affordable.

The proposed project is in conformance with a preponderance of these criteria:

(i) whether the property is free of a history of serious, continuing Code violations;
   Yes, the property is free of Code violations.

(ii) whether the property has been maintained in a decent, safe, and sanitary condition;
   Yes, the property has been maintained in a decent, safe, and sanitary condition.

(iii) whether the property is an "historical resource" under CEQA;
   Yes, the property is not an "historical resource" under CEQA.

(iv) whether the removal of the resource will have a substantial adverse impact under CEQA;
   Yes, the removal will have a substantial adverse impact since the project will not be permanently affordable.

(v) whether the project converts rental housing to other forms of tenure or occupancy;
   No, the project does not convert rental housing to other forms of tenure or occupancy.

(vi) whether the project removes rental units subject to the Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance or affordable housing;
   No, there are no rental units on the site.

(vii) whether the project conserves existing housing to preserve cultural and economic neighborhood diversity;
   Yes, the project conserves existing housing to preserve cultural and economic neighborhood diversity.

(viii) whether the project conserves neighborhood character to preserve neighborhood cultural and economic diversity;
   Yes, the project conserves neighborhood character to preserve neighborhood cultural and economic diversity.

(ix) whether the project protects the relative affordability of existing housing;
   Yes, the project adds one family-sized units to the site with a 2-bedroom, 3-bath unit.

(x) whether the project removes rental units subject to the Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance or affordable housing;
   Yes, the property has been maintained in a decent, safe and sanitary condition.

(xi) whether the project conserves neighborhood character to preserve neighborhood cultural and economic diversity;
   Yes, the project conserves neighborhood character to preserve neighborhood cultural and economic diversity.

(xii) whether the project adds new supportive housing;
   Yes, the project adds new supportive housing.

(xiii) whether the project is of superb architectural and urban design, meeting all relevant design guidelines, to enhance existing neighborhood character;
   Yes, the project enhances the neighborhood character by replacing a non-descript, vaguely Mediterranean 2-story house with a new 3-story building that is evocative of classic early 20th-century San Francisco residential design with its brick and shingle cladding and dark painted horizontal elements.

(xiv) whether the project increases the number of family-sized units on-site;
   Yes, the project increases the number of family-sized units on-site from two to five.

(xv) whether the project increases the number of on-site bedrooms.
   Yes, the project increases the number of bedrooms on site from two to five.

The proposed project is in conformance with a preponderance of these criteria:
Karamanos Residence
4118 21st Street
San Francisco, CA 94114

3.3.20        RDT RESPONSE

PROPOSED NORTH ELEVATION
Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0"

EXISTING NORTH ELEVATION
Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0"

3'-6"  MIN.

EXISTING NORTH ELEVATION

1'-1"  9'-0"

EXISTING NORTH ELEVATION

3'-6"  MIN.

EXISTING NORTH ELEVATION

3'-6"  MIN.

EXISTING NORTH ELEVATION

3'-6"  MIN.

EXISTING NORTH ELEVATION

3'-6"  MIN.

EXISTING NORTH ELEVATION

3'-6"  MIN.

EXISTING NORTH ELEVATION

3'-6"  MIN.

EXISTING NORTH ELEVATION

3'-6"  MIN.

EXISTING NORTH ELEVATION

3'-6"  MIN.
**Karamanos Residence**

4118 21st Street
San Francisco, CA 94114

3.3.20        RDT RESPONSE

A-3.4

---

**EXISTING WEST ELEVATION**

**PROPOSED WEST ELEVATION**

- Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0"

### West Elevation

- Existing West Elevation
- Proposed West Elevation

- Profile of 4124 21st Street

---

**Dimensions and Measurements**

- Front Yard Setback: 11'-2" (E) 1st Floor Rear Yard Setback: 11'-2"
- Rear Yard Setback: 15'-0" Side Walk: 15'-0" Side Walk: 15'-0"
- Property Line: 53'-7 1/2" Side Walk: 15'-0"
- Existing West Elevation
- Proposed West Elevation

---

**Materials and Finishes**

- ENGLISH BOND FACE BRICK
- STAINED WOOD SHINGLES
- PTD. WOOD TRIM
- PTD. METAL CAP FLASHING
- PAINTED MDO TRIM
- SMOOTH FINISH STUCCO
- POWDER COATED GUARDRAIL, TYP.
- ALUM CLAD WOOD FRAME WINDOWS
- WOOD WINDOWS

---

**Notes**

- PROPOSED WEST ELEVATION
- SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"
NOTE:
1 HOUR FIRE RATING SEPARATION BETWEEN UNITS
AND BETWEEN GARAGE AND LIVING SPACE.
CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Address</th>
<th>Block/Lot(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4118 21ST ST</td>
<td>2750017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Permit No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020-000215ENV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Project description for Planning Department approval.
The project entails demolition of the existing two-story over basement, 3,025-square-foot, single-family residence and construction of a three-story over basement, 4,517-square-foot, two-unit residential building. The project would add a roof deck.

STEP 1: EXEMPTION CLASS

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

- **Class 1 - Existing Facilities.** Interior and exterior alterations; additions under 10,000 sq. ft.
- **Class 3 - New Construction.** Up to three new single-family residences or six dwelling units in one building; commercial/office structures; utility extensions; change of use under 10,000 sq. ft. if principally permitted or with a CU.

- **Class 32 - In-Fill Development.** New Construction of seven or more units or additions greater than 10,000 sq. ft. and meets the conditions described below:
  - (a) The project is consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations.
  - (b) The proposed development occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than 5 acres substantially surrounded by urban uses.
  - (c) The project site has no value as habitat for endangered rare or threatened species.
  - (d) Approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.
  - (e) The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.

FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING USE ONLY

- **Class ____**
## STEP 2: CEQA IMPACTS
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality</strong></td>
<td>Would the project add new sensitive receptors (specifically, schools, day care facilities, hospitals, residential dwellings, and senior-care facilities within an Air Pollution Exposure Zone)? Does the project have the potential to emit substantial pollutant concentrations (e.g., backup diesel generators, heavy industry, diesel trucks, etc.)? (refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Air Pollution Exposure Zone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hazardous Materials</strong></td>
<td>If the project site is located on the Maher map or is suspected of containing hazardous materials (based on a previous use such as gas station, auto repair, dry cleaners, or heavy manufacturing, or a site with underground storage tanks): Would the project involve 50 cubic yards or more of soil disturbance - or a change of use from industrial to residential? If the applicant presents documentation of enrollment in the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) Maher program, a DPH waiver from the Maher program, or other documentation from Environmental Planning staff that hazardous material effects would be less than significant (refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; Maher layer).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation</strong></td>
<td>Does the project involve a child care facility or school with 30 or more students, or a location 1,500 sq. ft. or greater? Does the project have the potential to adversely affect transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle safety (hazards) or the adequacy of nearby transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archaeological Resources</strong></td>
<td>Would the project result in soil disturbance/modification greater than two (2) feet below grade in an archeological sensitive area or eight (8) feet in a non-archeological sensitive area? If yes, archeo review is required (refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Archeological Sensitive Area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment</strong></td>
<td>Does the project site involve a subdivision or lot line adjustment on a lot with a slope average of 20% or more? (refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Topography). If yes, Environmental Planning must issue the exemption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Slope = or &gt; 25%</strong></td>
<td>Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 500 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Topography) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required and Environmental Planning must issue the exemption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seismic: Landslide Zone</strong></td>
<td>Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 500 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Seismic Hazard Zones) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required and Environmental Planning must issue the exemption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seismic: Liquefaction Zone</strong></td>
<td>Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 500 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Seismic Hazard Zones) If box is checked, a geotechnical report will likely be required and Environmental Planning must issue the exemption.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property is one of the following: (refer to Property Information Map)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Category A: Known Historical Resource. GO TO STEP 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Category B: Potential Historical Resource (over 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Category C: Not a Historical Resource or Not Age Eligible (under 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Check all that apply to the project.

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

Note: Project Planner must check box below before proceeding.

- ☐ Project is not listed. GO TO STEP 5.
- ☐ Project does not conform to the scopes of work. GO TO STEP 5.
- ☐ Project involves four or more work descriptions. GO TO STEP 5.
- ☐ Project involves less than four work descriptions. GO TO STEP 6.

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

Check all that apply to the project.

- ☐ 1. Project involves a known historical resource (CEQA Category A) as determined by Step 3 and conforms entirely to proposed work checklist in Step 4.
- ☐ 2. Interior alterations to publicly accessible spaces.
- ☐ 3. Window replacement of original/historic windows that are not “in-kind” but are consistent with existing historic character.
- ☐ 4. Façade/storefront alterations that do not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.
- ☐ 5. Raising the building in a manner that does not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.
- ☐ 6. Restoration based upon documented evidence of a building’s historic condition, such as historic photographs, plans, physical evidence, or similar buildings.
7. **Addition(s)**, including mechanical equipment that are minimally visible from a public right-of-way and meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

8. **Other work consistent** with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties *(specify or add comments)*:

9. **Other work** that would not materially impair a historic district *(specify or add comments)*:

*(Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator)*

10. **Reclassification of property status** *(Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator)*

    - [ ] Reclassify to Category A
    - [ ] Reclassify to Category C

    a. Per HRER or PTR dated
    b. Other *(specify)*:

    *(attach HRER or PTR)*

Note: If ANY box in STEP 5 above is checked, a Preservation Planner MUST sign below.

- Project can proceed with categorical exemption review. The project has been reviewed by the Preservation Planner and can proceed with categorical exemption review. **GO TO STEP 6.**

Comments *(optional)*:

Preservation Planner Signature: Don Lewis

**STEP 6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION**

**TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

- No further environmental review is required. The project is categorically exempt under CEQA. There are no unusual circumstances that would result in a reasonable possibility of a significant effect.

**Project Approval Action:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Commission Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Signature:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Don Lewis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/16/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once signed or stamped and dated, this document constitutes a categorical exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code.

In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, an appeal of an exemption determination can only be filed within 30 days of the project receiving the approval action.

Please note that other approval actions may be required for the project. Please contact the assigned planner for these approvals.
STEP 7: MODIFICATION OF A CEQA EXEMPT PROJECT
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

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

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Address (If different than front page)</th>
<th>Block/Lot(s) (If different than front page)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4118 21ST ST</td>
<td>2750/017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Previous Building Permit No.</th>
<th>New Building Permit No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020-000215PRJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans Dated</th>
<th>Previous Approval Action</th>
<th>New Approval Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Commission Hearing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Modified Project Description:

DETERMINATION IF PROJECT CONSTITUTES SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

Compared to the approved project, would the modified project:

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

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

DETERMINATION OF NO SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

- [ ] The proposed modification would not result in any of the above changes.

If this box is checked, the proposed modifications are categorically exempt under CEQA, in accordance with prior project approval and no additional environmental review is required. This determination shall be posted on the Planning Department website and office and mailed to the applicant, City approving entities, and anyone requesting written notice. In accordance with Chapter 31, Sec 31.08j of the San Francisco Administrative Code, an appeal of this determination can be filed within 10 days of posting of this determination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planner Name:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land Use Information

Project Address: 4118 21st St
Record No.: 2020-000215PRJ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
<th>NET NEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXISTING NET NEW TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking GSF</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential GSF</td>
<td>3,025</td>
<td>4,481</td>
<td>1,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office GSF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial/PDR GSF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical GSF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor GSF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIE GSF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable Open Space</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL GSF</strong></td>
<td>EXISTING</td>
<td>NET NEW</td>
<td>TOTALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units - Affordable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units - Market Rate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units - Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Buildings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Stories</td>
<td>2 over basement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 over basement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loading Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Spaces</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Share Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND USE - RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td>EXISTING</td>
<td>PROPOSED</td>
<td>NET NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Bedroom Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Bedroom Units</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Bedroom (or +)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Housing - Rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Sanborn Maps in San Francisco have not been updated since 1998, and this map may not accurately reflect existing conditions.

Sanborn Map

Conditional Use Authorization
Case Number 2020-000215CUA
4118 21st Street
Aerial Photo – Views 1 & 2
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Conditional Use Authorization
Case Number 2020-000215CUA
4118 21st Street
Planning Department Request for Eviction History Documentation

(Date) 8/8/19

ATTN: Van Lam
Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 320
San Francisco, CA 94102-6033

RE: Address of Permit Work: 4118 21st St
Assessor’s Block/Lot: 2750/017
BPA # / Case #: 2018.04.26.7433

Project Type
☐ Merger – Planning Code Section 317
☐ Enlargement / Alteration / Reconstruction – Planning Code Section 181
☐ Legalization of Existing Dwelling Unit – Planning Code Section 207.3
☐ Accessory Dwelling Unit Planning – Planning Code Section 207(c)(4)

Pursuant to the Planning Code Section indicated above, please provide information from the Rent Board’s records regarding possible evictions at the above referenced unit(s) on or after:

☐ 12/10/13: for projects subject to Planning code 317(e)4 or 181(c)3
(Scroll records for eviction notices under 37.9(a)(8) through (14))

☐ 3/13/14: for projects subject to Planning Code Section 207.3
(Scroll records for evictions notices under 37.9(a)(8) through (14))

☐ 10 years prior to the following date: ______________________
(Scroll records for eviction notices under 37.9(a)(9) through (14) (10 years) and under
37.9(a)(8) (5 years)

Sincerely,
Planner

cc: Jennifer Rakowski- Rent Board Supervisor

www.sfplanning.org
Rent Board Response to Request from Planning Department for Eviction History Documentation

4118 21st Street

Re: ____________________________

This confirms that the undersigned employee of the San Francisco Rent Board has reviewed its records pertaining to the above-referenced unit(s) to determine whether there is any evidence of evictions on or after the date specified. All searches are based upon the street addresses provided.

No related eviction notices were filed at the Rent Board after:

☐ 12/10/13
☐ 03/13/14
☐ 10 years prior to the following date: ________________

Yes, an eviction notice was filed at the Rent Board after:

☐ 12/10/13
☐ 03/13/14
☐ 10 years prior to the following date: ________________
  ☐ See attached documents.

There are no other Rent Board records evidencing an eviction after:

☐ 12/10/13
☐ 03/13/14
☐ 10 years prior to the following date: ________________

Yes, there are other Rent Board records evidencing an eviction after:

☐ 12/10/13
☐ 03/13/14
☐ 10 years prior to the following date: ________________
  ☐ See attached documents.

Signed: ____________________________  Dated: 8-8-19

Van Lam
Citizens Complaint Officer

The Rent Board is the originating custodian of these records; the applicability of these records to Planning permit decisions resides with the Planning Department.
**Buyouts B172367**

**Property Address**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Unit#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4118</td>
<td>21st Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Buyout ID**

- **Date Filed**: 9/13/17
- **Filed**: Decl. re Service of Disclosure Form

- **Date Filed**: 11/17/17
- **Filed**: Buyout Agreement - Entire Tenancy

**Building/Complex**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Complex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4118</td>
<td>21st Street, LLC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Buyout Agreement: Tenant Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenant</th>
<th>Senior / Disabled / Catastrophically Ill</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I Prefer Not To Say</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Tenants in Buyout Agreement</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Players**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First, Ml, Last)</th>
<th>Primary Phone</th>
<th>Other Phone</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Sft #</th>
<th>Unit #</th>
<th>Active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Howard Epstein, Managing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Landlord's Agent/Atty/Rep</td>
<td>4118</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew R. Catterall</td>
<td>(415) 956-8100</td>
<td></td>
<td>Landlord's Agent/Atty/Rep</td>
<td>4118</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4118 21st Street, LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Landlord</td>
<td>4118</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solveig Rose</td>
<td>(415) 552-9060</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenant Attorney</td>
<td>4118</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>By</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/13/17</td>
<td>Declaration re Service of Disclosure Form filed</td>
<td>Candy Cheung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/17</td>
<td>Buyout Amount is $50,000 plus waiver of rent for Sept. &amp; Oct. 2017</td>
<td>Cathy Helton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/17</td>
<td>Buyout Agreement filed</td>
<td>Candy Cheung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
April 3, 2020

Via Email

President Joel Koppel and Commissioners
San Francisco Planning Commission
1650 Mission Street, 4th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94107

Re: Case No. 2020-000215CUA
Conditional Use Authorization for 4118 21st Street

Dear President Koppel:

Our office represents George and Jenna Karamanos ("Applicants"), the owners of 4118 21st Street ("Property"). The Applicants are seeking a Conditional Use Authorization ("CU") that would allow for the renovation, vertical expansion, and removal of the lawful non-complying rear yard portion of the existing two-story single-family home into a three-story two-unit building ("Project"). A CU is required pursuant to Planning Code Section 317 for a de facto demolition and replacement of the existing structure.

The current Project before the Commission has been revised from a design that was previously presented at the Planning Commission ("Commission"). The prior design was the renovation and expansion of the existing single-family home that required both a variance and a CU. The current Project does not require a variance and will add an additional housing unit to the City’s housing stock.

THE APPLICANTS AND PROJECT HISTORY

The Applicants purchased the Property in January 2018, with the intention of renovating the building to provide a home for their family. The Applicants have one daughter, who is two years old and hope to add to their family. After purchasing the Property, the Applicants met with
their architect to explore renovation of the existing building entirely within its existing envelope. The Applicants submitted Permit No. 201802272279 for renovation of the existing building, which was approved by the Planning Department and a building permit was issued in June 2018. The renovation of the Applicant’s home began in July 2018.

After the interior finishes were demolished, the contractor discovered that overwhelming majority of the existing wall studs and floor joists in the home were extensively damaged by dry rot and termites and needed to be replaced. The district building inspector agreed during an inspection that the damaged wood needed to be replaced. The contractor was unaware, and the building inspector did not inform the contractor, that demolishing and replacing the damaged dry rot wood structural elements would require an alteration permit. After removal of the dry rotted structural members, only the west exterior wall was left intact; the contractor began the task of replacing the joist and studs. During this process, the district building inspector inspected and approved the contractor’s work on five separate occasions1 but never informed the contractor that he was working in excess of the scope of the issued permit. Pursuant to a letter of request from the Planning Department dated January 16, 2019, more than six months after removal of the three dry rotted exterior walls and replacement had started, the Department of Building Inspection ("DBI") issued a notice of violation for work in excess of the scope of the issued permit and stopped all construction at the site. A copy of the Permit Detail Record for Permit Application No. 201802272279 is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

After construction work ceased, the Applicants began working with the Planning Department regarding the process to obtain permission to resume construction. The Applicants were informed by the Planning Department staff that they needed to apply for a conditional use permit. At the pre-application project review meeting, the Department stated that the non-conforming portion of the existing building that encroached into the required rear yard could not be rebuilt without a variance and that the building should be redesigned to reduce the building's depth and to recap the lost square footage by adding a third floor. The Applicants submitted a CU application (No. 2018-002602CUA) and a Variance application for deviation from the front setback requirements on March 14, 2019. The Variance Application was amended on July 2, 2019 and again on August 2, 2019.

On August 29, 2019, the Commission conducted a public hearing on the conditional use application, which was continued to September 19, 2019 at the suggestion of one of the Commissioners to allow the Applicants to revise the project to add an ADU. The Applicants continued to work with the Planning Department to make design revisions to the project. A revised design was provided to the Commission with a small second unit. The Applicants sought to continue the hearing in order to continue to work with the Department on additional design

---

1 The dates and type of inspection were: August 14, 2018 - Rough Frame - Start Work; September 20, 2018 - Reinforcing Steel - OK to pour; September 27, 2018 - Reinforcing Steel - OK to pour; October 3, 2018 - Reinforcing Steel - Ok to pour; November 15, 2018 - Rough Frame, Partial.
modifications, but the motion to continue the hearing failed by a vote of 2-2 resulting in disapproval.

Following the denial of the prior project, the Applicants engaged the service of a new architect, and submitted a new CU application (No. 2020-000215CUA) with a revised design for a three-story over basement two-unit building in December 2019. This is the Project that will be before the Commission on April 23, 2020.

**PROJECT BEFORE THE COMMISSION**

The Project site ("Site") is a 2,435 square foot ("sf. ft.") lot (Assessor’s Block 2750, Lot 017) measuring 25' x 97.5'. The Site is on the north side of 21st Street, between Eureka and Diamond Streets and in an RH-2 Zoning District, which allows for the development of two dwelling units on the Site. The block map is attached hereto as Exhibit 2. The Site is developed with a three-bedroom, two-story, 20'-1" tall, 3,025 sq. ft. single-family home that was constructed prior to 1928, and that intrudes into the required rear yard. The Site slopes downhill from east to west, and from south to north.

The immediate neighborhood is developed with both single-family homes and multi-family residential buildings that are either two- or three-stories tall. The adjacent building to the west is two stories high, while a new three-story single-family home immediately to the east of the site has been approved by the City. Other existing buildings in the project vicinity have no uniform nor prevailing architectural vocabulary with the roof forms ranging from flat to sloped roofs of varying pitches. See the existing and proposed plans attached hereto as Exhibit 3. See also photographs of the site and Site vicinity photographs, attached as Exhibit 4.

The proposed Project is a de facto demolition, renovation and vertical expansion of the existing non-conforming single-family home into a code compliant, 29'-9" tall three-story two-unit, 4,481 sq. ft., inclusive of garage, building. The lower unit is a 1,473 sq. ft. two-bedroom townhouse located within the basement and first floor levels and the upper unit is a 2,614 sq. ft. three-bedroom townhouse on the second and third floors that will be occupied by the Applicants and their daughter. The Project provides the required front setback of 2'-6", which is the average of the two adjacent buildings.

The ground floor will contain a 300 sq. ft. garage suitable for the parking of one car and two bicycles, 94 sq. ft. of common circulation including the entry foyer, two bedrooms for the lower unit, and a 213 sq. ft. deck. The basement level consists of the kitchen, living and dining area and direct access to a code-conforming 795 sq. ft. year yard. The rear of the basement level will be located, in part, in the permissible 12' intrusion into the rear yard. The rear yard and the first floor roof deck will be the private usable open space for the lower unit.

The upper unit will have a living room, dining/kitchen/family area, and a powder room on the third floor with a second floor consisting of two bedrooms, one bathroom, a laundry room, and
an *en suite* master bedroom. Private usable open space for the upper unit will be a 140 sq. ft. deck at the rear of the third floor. Two The second and third floors will include a matching light well to preserve the light to the light well windows of the eastern neighbor (See Exhibit 2). A side setback on the third floor is incorporated to match the side set back of the building to the west to preserve the light access to the window next door.

**THE PROPOSED PROJECT MEETS THE CONDITIONAL USE CRITERIA**

The Project requires a Conditional Use Authorization for demolition of an existing dwelling unit pursuant to Planning Code Section 303 and Section 317. The Project meets the applicable criteria set forth in Planning Code Section 303(c), as follows:

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

   The use, scale and massing of the proposed Project is compatible with the immediate neighborhood. The neighborhood is developed with a mix of single-family homes and apartment buildings that are two- to four-stories in height. The Project proposes a two-unit building that removes the encroachment of the existing building into the required rear yard and has a code complying front setback. (See Exhibit 5, showing the massing removed from the existing building that encroached into the required rear yard).

   The massing and height of the proposed project is compatible with the existing two, three and four-story buildings in the Project vicinity (as shown in Exhibit 4) and is similar to the approved three-story building to be constructed in the adjacent lot east of the Site at 4112 21st Street (See Exhibit 5). The Project will add a new two-bedroom unit to the City's housing stock. Therefore, the proposed Project is necessary and desirable for, and compatible with the neighborhood.

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

   A. *The nature of the proposed site, including its size and shape, and the proposed size, shape and arrangement of structures.*

   As stated above, the Project will be similar to the scale and massing of existing and proposed buildings in the neighborhood and will remove the lawful non-complying portion of the existing building that encroaches into the required rear yard area. A two-unit

2 The roof deck was removed at the request of a neighbor.
building in a RH-2 district is a principally permitted use.

B. The accessibility and traffic patterns for persons and vehicles, the type and volume of such traffic, and the adequacy of proposed off-street parking and loading and of proposed alternatives to off-street parking, including provisions of car-share parking spaces, as defined in Section 166 of this Code.

Similar to the existing building, the Project will provide one off-street parking space and will provide two bicycle parking spaces in the garage. Thus, the Project will not alter existing traffic patterns.

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

As a residential use, the Project will not generate noxious or offensive noise, glare, dust or odor. The off-street parking space will be in an enclosed garage. All exterior lighting will be down lighting to avoid glare into the windows of the adjacent neighbors.

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

Private usable open space for the lower unit of the Project will be in the rear yard and the 213 sq. ft. first floor roof deck. The upper unit will have a 140 sq. ft. third floor deck overlooking the rear yard as the private usable open space. The Project architect will submit landscaping plans to the Planning Department for review and approval. The Project will maintain the existing curb cut in the same location and the existing street tree will be maintained in place. The front setback will be landscaped. The private open space for each unit exceeds the code required 125 sq. ft.

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

Please refer to the case report and the draft motion of approval for the Project's compliance with all applicable provisions of the Planning Code, the applicable Objectives and Policies of the General Plan elements. See also Applicant’s CU application for compliance with General Plan objectives and policies.
When considering a CU for an application for demolition of a dwelling unit, the Planning Commission must, in addition to the Conditional Use criteria set forth above, consider the criteria from Planning Code Section 317(g)(5).

A. **Whether the property is free of a history of serious, continuing Code violations.**

Other than the inadvertent de facto demolition that led to the need for this CU application, there is no history of Code violations related to the building on the Site.

B. **Whether the housing has been maintained in a decent, safe, and sanitary condition.**

There is no history of complaints to DBI related to maintenance of the building on the Site. During construction under the originally approved permit, significant dry-rot and termite damage was discovered, leading to the additional demolition and issuance of the stop-work order.

(C) **Whether the property is an "historical resource" under CEQA.**

The Applicants submitted a Historic Resource Evaluation ("HRE") with the original environmental review application. The property is rated “C” and is not located in a designated or an identified potential historic district. Therefore, the existing building is not historic resource under CEQA.

(D) **Whether the removal of the resource will have a substantial adverse impact under CEQA.**

Inasmuch as the building on the Site is not a historic resource, demolition of the existing building will not have an adverse impact under CEQA.

(E) **Whether the project converts rental housing to other forms of tenure or occupancy.**

(F) **Whether the project removes rental units subject to the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance or affordable housing.**

According to rent board records, the prior owner of the Property entered into a tenant buyout agreement with a tenant in September 2017. At the Planning Commission hearing for the previous design of the project, certain neighbors and project opponents presented materials suggesting that an illegal second unit existed at the Property at some point before the Applicants purchased the home. However, the Applicants purchased the Property with the understanding that it is was a single-family home and was unaware of the buyout agreement. The Applicants had no knowledge of any illegal unit. The title report and other disclosure always states that the Property was a single-family home. See Page 5 of the Title Report used for the purchase of the property, attached as Exhibit 6.
Whether the project conserves existing housing to preserve cultural and economic neighborhood diversity.

The Project conserves the cultural and economic neighborhood diversity by replacing an aging dry rot damaged single-family home with a two-unit building suitable for families in an RH-2 district. The Project will add an additional family sized unit to the City's housing stock. The Project conserves neighborhood character with a design that is evocative of the early 20th-century San Francisco housing from when this neighborhood was first developed.

Whether the project protects the relative affordability of existing housing.

The existing house has an assessed value of $2.2 million, which is not considered affordable. Therefore, the Project does not adversely impact any existing affordable housing. See Exhibit 7 for a copy of the appraisal report.

Whether the project increases the number of permanently affordable units as governed by Section 415.

The Project will add one family sized unit to the City's housing stock. The Project is not subject to the requirements of Section 415 because it is a two-unit building.

Whether the project locates in-fill housing on appropriate sites in established neighborhoods.

Yes, the Project is an in-fill project in an RH-2 zoned well-established neighborhood.

Whether the project increases the number of family-sized units on-site.

The Project will increase the number of family sized units on the Site from one to two, with the addition of a 2-bedroom, 2-bath unit.

Whether the project creates new supportive housing.

Similar to the existing building, there will be no supportive housing on the Site. However, the lower unit of the Project is designed to accommodate the life cycle of the Applicants’ aging parents, which will allow them to live independently with the assistance of the Applicants.
(N)  **Whether the project is of superb architectural and urban design, meeting all relevant design guidelines, to enhance existing neighborhood character.**

This Project enhances the neighborhood character by replacing a non-descript, vaguely Mediterranean two-story house with a new three-story building that is evocative of the classic, early 20th-century California Shingle Style residential design with brick and shingle cladding and dark painted classically-derived trim. The new building will enhance the mid-block open space by removing the rear portion of the existing building in the required rear yard and replacing it with a code-complying design. The projects design will remove significant massing in the rear yard when compared with the existing structure.

(O)  **Whether the project increases the number of on-site Dwelling Units.**

The Project adds one family-sized two-bedroom, two-bath unit to the Site.

(P)  **Whether the project increases the number of on-site bedrooms.**

The Project increases the number of on-site bedrooms from three to five.

(Q)  **Whether or not the replacement project would maximize density on the subject lot.**

The Project maximizes the allowable density under the Planning Code. The Site is zoned RH-2, and the Project proposed two units.

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

The Project proposes to replace the existing 3,025 sq. ft. three-bedroom single family home (including a 300 sq. ft. garage) with a new 2,614 sq. ft. three-bedroom unit and add a 1,473 sq. ft. two-bedroom unit and retain a single car garage.

Based on the above, the Project is consistent with these criteria from Section 317(g)(5).

**CONCLUSION**

The Project before the Commission is an excellent example of rehabilitation an existing, and old and damaged single-family residence. The Project improve the City’s existing housing stock by replacing the existing structure with a well-designed building that is consistent with the scale and development pattern of the neighborhood, and also increases the number of dwelling units from one to two and the total bedrooms from three to five. Moreover, the Project is well-
supported in the neighborhood, as demonstrated by the letters of support attached hereto as Exhibit 8.

For all these reasons, we respectfully request that the Commission approve this Project as proposed.

Very truly yours,

Duane Morris LLP

William Fleishhacker

WMF/dm

Enclosures

cc: Commissioner Kathrin Moore, Vice President
Commissioner Sue Diamond
Commission Frank Fung
Commission Milicent Johnson
Commission Theresa Imperial
Rich Hillis, Planning Director
Corey Teague
Bridget Hicks
George and Jenna Karamanos
Jonathan Pearlman
Amy Lee
Alice Barkley
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Application Number: 201802272279
Form Number: 3
Address(es): 2750/017/0 4118 21ST ST
Description: BASEMENT: EXCAVATE SPACE TO GAIN MORE CEILING HEIGHT, INFILL UNDER (E) FLOOR ABOVE, RECONFIGURE STAIR CONNECTION TO 1ST FLR, NEW DOOR OPENING TO YARD, NEW LIVING ROOM, BATHROOM, WETBAR. 1ST FLR - RECONFIGURE (E) SPACES, ADD 2 NEW BEDRMS, 2 BATHS, LAUNDRY NO FACADE WORK, NO WORK VISIBLE FROM ST
Cost: $310,000.00
Occupancy Code: R-3
Building Use: 27 - 1 FAMILY DWELLING

Disposition / Stage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Date</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/27/2018</td>
<td>TRIAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/27/2018</td>
<td>FILING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/27/2018</td>
<td>FILED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/1/2018</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/28/2018</td>
<td>ISSUED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/15/2019</td>
<td>SUSPEND</td>
<td>Suspend per letter of request from DCP dated January 16, 2019. O'Riordan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact Details:

Contractor Details:

License Number: 778837
Name: BENONI MOCANU
Company Name: M B DEVELOPMENT
Address: 4646 CROW CANYON PL * CASTRO VALLEY CA 94552-0000
Phone:

Addenda Details:

Description:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Arrive</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>In Hold</th>
<th>Out Hold</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Checked By</th>
<th>Hold Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>INTAKE</td>
<td>2/27/18</td>
<td>2/27/18</td>
<td>2/27/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>CHAPMAN MARLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CP-ZOC</td>
<td>3/16/18</td>
<td>3/16/18</td>
<td>3/16/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>BANAE5 JULIAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MECH</td>
<td>3/16/18</td>
<td>3/16/18</td>
<td>3/16/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>LAI JEFF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>BLDG</td>
<td>4/3/18</td>
<td>5/2/18</td>
<td>5/3/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>PANG DAVID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SFUC</td>
<td>5/3/18</td>
<td>5/11/18</td>
<td>5/11/18</td>
<td>5/16/18</td>
<td>CHUNG DIANA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Permit has been assessed a Capacity Charge. DBI will collect charges. See Invoice attached to application. Route to PPC - 05/16/18. Requested documents and information</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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inspections:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Date</th>
<th>Inspector</th>
<th>Inspection Description</th>
<th>Inspection Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/15/2018</td>
<td>William Walsh</td>
<td>ROUGH FRAME, PARTIAL</td>
<td>ROUGH FRAME, PARTIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/3/2018</td>
<td>William Walsh</td>
<td>REINFORCING STEEL</td>
<td>OK TO POUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/27/2018</td>
<td>William Walsh</td>
<td>REINFORCING STEEL</td>
<td>OK TO POUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/20/2018</td>
<td>William Walsh</td>
<td>REINFORCING STEEL</td>
<td>OK TO POUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/14/2018</td>
<td>William Walsh</td>
<td>ROUGH FRAME</td>
<td>START WORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1 2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Special Inspections:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addenda No.</th>
<th>Completed Date</th>
<th>Inspected By</th>
<th>Inspection Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CONCRETE (PLACEMENT &amp; SAMPLING)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IP5</td>
<td>CF2R-PLB-02-E - SINGLE DWELLING UNIT HOT WATER SYSTEM DISTRIBUTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5A6</td>
<td>REINFORCING STEEL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18A</td>
<td>BOLTS INSTALLED IN EXISTING CONCRETE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>SHEAR WALLS AND FLOOR SYSTEMS USED AS SHEAR DIAPHRAGMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>HOLDOWNDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24A</td>
<td>FOUNDATIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>24B</td>
<td>STEEL FRAMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>24C</td>
<td>CONCRETE CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>24E</td>
<td>WOOD FRAMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IB1</td>
<td>CF2R-ENV-01-E - FENESTRATION INSTALLATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IB3</td>
<td>CF2R-ENV-03-E - INSULATION INSTALLATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IB63</td>
<td>CF2R-MCH-27-H - INDOOR AIR QUALITY AND MECHANICAL VENTILATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VB54</td>
<td>CF3R-MCH-27-H - INDOOR AIR QUALITY AND MECHANICAL VENTILATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IE1</td>
<td>CF2R-LTG-01-E - LIGHTING - SINGLE FAMILY DWELLINGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>BOLTS INSTALLED IN CONCRETE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Sanborn Maps in San Francisco have not been updated since 1998, and this map may not accurately reflect existing conditions.
GENERAL NOTES


2. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE COMPLETION OF THE WORK AND SHALL ASSUME THE RISK OF LOSS FROM THE WORK IN PROGRESS.

3. ALL EXISTING WALLS, FLOORS AND CEILINGS AT REMOVED, NEW OR MODIFIED.

4. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL REPORT, AT ADVANCE OF CONSTRUCTION, ANY ERROR, INCONSISTENCY OR OMISSION THAT MAY BE DISCOVERED AND CORRECT AS DIRECTED, IN WRITING, BY THE ARCHITECT.

5. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL DEFEND, INDEMNIFY AND HOLD HARMLESS THE ARCHITECT, THE OWNER AND THEIR SUCCESSORS AND ASSIGNS FROM ANY CLAIMS, CAUSES OF ACTION, SUITS AND JUDGMENTS, INCLUDING COSTS AND ATTORNEYS' FEES, THAT MAY BE ASSERTED AGAINST THEM IN CONNECTION WITH THE PERFORMANCE OF THE WORK.

6. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL INDEMNIFY AND HOLD HARMLESS THE ARCHITECT FROM ANY CLAIMS, CAUSES OF ACTION, SUITS AND JUDGMENTS, INCLUDING COSTS AND ATTORNEYS' FEES, THAT MAY BE ASSERTED AGAINST THE ARCHITECT IN CONNECTION WITH THE PERFORMANCE OF THE WORK.

7. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL COMPLY WITH ALL LAWS AND REGULATIONS GOVERNING THE PERFORMANCE OF THE WORK.

8. CONTRACTOR SHALL REPORT, AT ADVANCE OF CONSTRUCTION, ANY ERROR, INCONSISTENCY OR OMISSION THAT MAY BE DISCOVERED AND CORRECT AS DIRECTED, IN WRITING, BY THE ARCHITECT.

9. THE DRAWINGS CONSTITUTE A PORTION OF THE CONTRACT FOR CONSTRUCTION. REFER TO PROJECT SPECIFICATIONS FOR COMPLETE DESCRIPTION OF THE WORK.

10. CONTRACTOR SHALL REPORT, AT ADVANCE OF CONSTRUCTION, ANY ERROR, INCONSISTENCY OR OMISSION THAT MAY BE DISCOVERED AND CORRECT AS DIRECTED, IN WRITING, BY THE ARCHITECT.

11. CONTRACTOR SHALL REPORT, AT ADVANCE OF CONSTRUCTION, ANY ERROR, INCONSISTENCY OR OMISSION THAT MAY BE DISCOVERED AND CORRECT AS DIRECTED, IN WRITING, BY THE ARCHITECT.

12. CONTRACTOR SHALL REPORT, AT ADVANCE OF CONSTRUCTION, ANY ERROR, INCONSISTENCY OR OMISSION THAT MAY BE DISCOVERED AND CORRECT AS DIRECTED, IN WRITING, BY THE ARCHITECT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOR REFERENCE: LEED OR GREEN POINT Rating System</td>
<td>CHECK ONE: IS THIS PROJECT NEW CONSTRUCTION OR ALTERATIONS + ADDITIONS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHEET</td>
<td>IS THIS THE REVIEWED SHEET?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NEW CONSTRUCTION**

| IS THIS THE REVIEWED SHEET? | IS THIS THE CHECKED SHEET? | IS THIS THE APPROVED SHEET? | IS THE SIGNATURE SENT? |

**ALTERATIONS + ADDITIONS**

| IS THIS THE REVIEWED SHEET? | IS THIS THE CHECKED SHEET? | IS THIS THE APPROVED SHEET? | IS THE SIGNATURE SENT? |

**REFERENCES**

| IS THIS THE REVIEWED SHEET? | IS THIS THE CHECKED SHEET? | IS THIS THE APPROVED SHEET? | IS THE SIGNATURE SENT? |

---

# 3.2.20 RDT RESPONSE

ELEVATION Architects

Karamanos Residence

4118 21st Street

San Francisco, CA 94114

3.2.20 RDT RESPONSE
The existing house has an assessed value of $2.2 million so is not considered affordable, whether the project increases the number of permanently affordable units as governed by 20th-century San Francisco housing from the time that this neighborhood was first developed.

The project conserves neighborhood character with a design that is evocative of early Mediterranean 2-story house with 3-story building that is evocative of classic early 20th-century San Francisco residential design with its brick and shingle cladding and dark painted classically-derived trim. In addition, the new building enhances the mid-block open space by replacing a non-descript, vaguely classically-derived trim with an updated facade that is sensitive and respectful of the neighborhood context.

The project removes significant massing in the rear yard.

The project is tantamount to demolition work exceeds these thresholds.

1. Whether the property is free of a history of serious, continuing Code violations;
   - Yes, this property has a clear history.
2. Whether the property has been maintained in a decent, safe and sanitary condition;
   - Yes, the property has been maintained.
3. Whether the property is an "historical resource" under CEQA;
   - No, the property is not a historical resource.
4. Whether the property is rated as "C", not a historical resource;
   - Yes, the property is rated as "C", not a historical resource.
5. Whether the project conserves existing housing to preserve cultural and economic neighborhood diversity;
   - Yes, the project conserves the cultural and economic neighborhood diversity by replacing an aging single-family home with a two-family home in an RH-2 district.
6. Whether the project conserves neighborhood character to preserve neighborhood cultural and economic diversity;
   - Yes, the project conserves neighborhood character to preserve neighborhood cultural and economic diversity.
7. Whether the project conserves neighborhood character with a design that is evocative of early 20th-century San Francisco housing from the time that this neighborhood was first developed;
   - No, the project does not add supportive housing to the site.
8. Whether the project removes rental units subject to the Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance or affordable housing;
   - No, there are no rental units on the site.
9. Whether the project conserves the cultural and economic neighborhood diversity by replacing an aging single-family home with a two-family home in an RH-2 district;
   - Yes, the project conserves the cultural and economic neighborhood diversity.
10. Whether the project removes more than 50% of the sum of the Front Façade and Rear Façade, and also Removal of more than 50% of the above-grade Vertical Envelope Elements and more than 50% of the Horizontal Elements of the existing building as measured in square feet of actual surface area;
    - No, the project does not exceed these thresholds.
11. Whether the project removes significant massing in the rear yard;
    - Yes, the project removes significant massing in the rear yard.
12. Whether the project converts rental housing to other forms of tenure or occupancy;
    - No, there are no rental units on this site.
13. Whether the project removes more than 65% of the sum of all exterior walls, measured in lineal feet at the foundation level, or Removal of more than 50% of the sum of all exterior walls, measured in square feet of actual surface area;
    - No, the project does not exceed these thresholds.
14. Whether the project conserves existing housing to preserve cultural and economic neighborhood diversity;
    - Yes, the project conserves existing housing to preserve cultural and economic neighborhood diversity.
15. Whether the project conserves neighborhood character to preserve neighborhood cultural and economic diversity;
    - Yes, the project conserves neighborhood character to preserve neighborhood cultural and economic diversity.
16. Whether the project conserves neighborhood character with a design that is evocative of early 20th-century San Francisco housing from the time that this neighborhood was first developed;
    - Yes, the project conserves neighborhood character with a design that is evocative of early 20th-century San Francisco housing from the time that this neighborhood was first developed.
THIS WINDOW IS AT THE KITCHEN OF 4124 21ST STREET
NOTE:
1 HOUR FIRE RATING SEPARATION BETWEEN UNITS
AND BETWEEN GARAGE AND LIVING SPACE
EXHIBIT 4
Aerial Photo – Views 1 & 2

SUBJECT PROPERTY
Aerial Photo – Views 3 & 4

SUBJECT PROPERTY
EXHIBIT 5
EXHIBIT A

The land referred to is situated in the County of San Francisco, City of San Francisco, State of California, and is described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the Northerly line of 21st Street, distant thereon 75 feet Westerly from the Westerly line of Diamond Street; running thence Westerly along said line of 21st Street 25 feet; thence at a right angle Northerly 97 feet, 6 inches; thence at a right angle Easterly 25 feet; thence at a right angle Southerly 97 feet, 6 inches to the point of beginning.

Being a portion of Horner's Addition Block No. 211

Lot 017 Block 2750
PRELIMINARY REPORT

VANGUARD PROPERTIES
2501 Mission St.
San Francisco, CA 94110

Attention: KEVIN K. HO

Buyer: GEORGE KARAMANOS
JENNA KARAMANOS

Property Address: 4118 21st Street, San Francisco, CA 94114

When Replying Please Contact: Nick Shanta
NShanta@ortc.com
(415) 421-9770

In response to the above referenced application for a policy of title insurance, OLD REPUBLIC TITLE COMPANY, as issuing Agent of Old Republic National Title Insurance Company, hereby reports that it is prepared to issue, or cause to be issued, as of the date hereof, a Policy or Policies of Title Insurance describing the land and the estate or interest therein hereinafter set forth, insuring against loss which may be sustained by reason of any defect, lien or encumbrance not shown or referred to as an Exception below or not excluded from coverage pursuant to the printed Schedules, Conditions and Stipulations of said policy forms.

The printed Exceptions and Exclusions from the coverage and Limitations on Covered Risks of said Policy or Policies are set forth in Exhibit I attached. The policy to be issued may contain an arbitration clause. When the Amount of Insurance is less than that set forth in the arbitration clause, all arbitrable matters shall be arbitrated at the option of either the Company or the Insured as the exclusive remedy of the parties. Limitations on Covered Risks applicable to the Homeowner’s Policy of Title Insurance which establish a Deductible Amount and a Maximum Dollar Limit of Liability for certain coverages are also set forth in Exhibit I. Copies of the Policy forms should be read. They are available from the office which issued this report.

Please read the exceptions shown or referred to below and the exceptions and exclusions set forth in Exhibit I of this report carefully. The exceptions and exclusions are meant to provide you with notice of matters which are not covered under the terms of the title insurance policy and should be carefully considered. It is important to note that this preliminary report is not a written representation as to the condition of title and may not list all liens, defects, and encumbrances affecting title to the land.

This report (and any supplements or amendments hereto) is issued solely for the purpose of facilitating the issuance of a policy of title insurance and no liability is assumed hereby. If it is desired that liability be assumed prior to the issuance of a policy of title insurance, a Binder or Commitment should be requested.

Dated as of October 5, 2017, at 7:30 AM

Buyers have read and now understand, acknowledge, and approve of this document.

GEORGE KARAMANOS, husband
JENNA KARAMANOS, wife

1/10/2018

This Document is Read & Understood; Approved as a True & Correct Copy

1/10/2018

Buyer: ___________________________________ Date: _____________

1/10/2018

DocuSign Envelope ID: CE5BEE45-65DD-49E9-B6A3-05F0D75BBFDB
The form of policy of title insurance contemplated by this report is:

Homeowner's Policy of Title Insurance - 2013; and ALTA Loan Policy - 2006. A specific request should be made if another form or additional coverage is desired.

The estate or interest in the land hereinafter described or referred or covered by this Report is:

Fee

Title to said estate or interest at the date hereof is vested in:

4118 21st Street LLC, a California limited liability company

The land referred to in this Report is situated in the County of San Francisco, City of San Francisco, State of California, and is described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the Northerly line of 21st Street, distant thereon 75 feet Westerly from the Westerly line of Diamond Street; running thence Westerly along said line of 21st Street 25 feet; thence at a right angle Northerly 97 feet, 6 inches; thence at a right angle Easterly 25 feet; thence at a right angle Southerly 97 feet, 6 inches to the point of beginning.

Being a portion of Horner's Addition Block No. 211

Lot 017 Block 2750

At the date hereof exceptions to coverage in addition to the Exceptions and Exclusions in said policy form would be as follows:

1. Taxes and assessments, general and special, for the fiscal year 2017 - 2018, as follows:

   Assessor's Parcel No. : LOT 017; BLOCK 2750
   Bill No. : 100562
   Code No. : 01-000 - CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO
   1st Installment : $3,161.37 NOT Marked Paid
   2nd Installment : $3,161.37 NOT Marked Paid
   Land Value : $293,426.00
   Imp. Value : $200,378.00

2. The lien of supplemental taxes, if any, assessed pursuant to the provisions of Section 75, et seq., of the Revenue and Taxation Code of the State of California.

3. Any supplemental taxes due to change of ownership.

   The affirmative coverage set forth in the Covered Risks is not being provided by the policy.
4. Any special tax which is now a lien and that may be levied within the City of San Francisco Unified School District Community Facilities District No. 90-1, notice(s) for which having been recorded.

NOTE: Among other things, there are provisions in said notice(s) for a special tax to be levied annually, the amounts of which are to be added to and collected with the property taxes.

NOTE: The current annual amount levied against this land is $36.78.

NOTE: Further information on said assessment or special tax can be obtained by contacting:

Name : San Francisco Unified School District
Telephone No. : (415) 241-6480

5. The herein described property lying within the proposed boundaries of the City and County of San Francisco Special Tax District No. 2009-1 (San Francisco Sustainable Financing), as follows:

District No. : 2009-1
For : San Francisco Sustainable Financing

6. Deed of Trust to secure an indebtedness of the amount stated below and any other amounts payable under the terms thereof,

Amount : $1,085,000.00
Trustor/Borrower : 4118 21st Street, LLC, a California limited liability company
Trustee : Fidelity National Title Insurance Company
Beneficiary/Lender : First Republic Bank
Dated : August 30, 2017
Recorded : September 6, 2017 in Official Records under Recorder's Serial Number 2017-K510989
Loan No. : 22-595517-4
Prior to the issuance of any policy of title insurance, the Company requires the following with respect to 4118 21st Street LLC, a California Limited Liability Company:

1. A copy of any management or operating agreements and any amendments thereto, together with a current list of all members of said LLC.

2. A certified copy of its Articles of Organization (LLC-1), any Certificate of Correction (LLC-11), Certificate of Amendment (LLC-2), or Restatement of Articles of Organization (LLC-10).

3. Recording a Certified copy of said LLC-1 and any “amendments thereto”.

------------ Informational Notes -------------

A. The applicable rate(s) for the policy(s) being offered by this report or commitment appears to be section(s) 1.1 and 2.1.

B. The above numbered report (including any supplements or amendments thereto) is hereby modified and/or supplemented to reflect the following additional items relating to the issuance of an American Land Title Association loan form policy:

NONE

NOTE: Our investigation has been completed and there is located on said land a single family residence known as 4118 21st Street, San Francisco, CA 94114.

The ALTA loan policy, when issued, will contain the CLTA 100 Endorsement and 116 series Endorsement.

Unless shown elsewhere in the body of this report, there appear of record no transfers or agreements to transfer the land described herein within the last three years prior to the date hereof, except as follows:

Grant Deed executed by Susan B. Southwick, Trustee or Successor in Trust under the Susan B. Southwick Living Trust, dated June 25, 2008 and any amendments thereto and Jeanne Reinheimer, Trustee or Successor in Trust under the Jeanne Reinheimer Trust, dated August 23, 2001, and any amendments thereto to 4118 21st Street LLC, a California limited liability company recorded September 6, 2017 in Official Records under Recorder's Serial Number 2017-K510988.
C. All transactions that close on or after March 1, 2015 will include a $20.00 minimum recording service fee, plus actual charges required by the County Recorder.

D. **NOTICE: FinCEN COMPLIANCE**

Closing the residential purchase and/or issuing title insurance contemplated by this Preliminary Report may be subject to compliance with the recently issued Geographic Targeting Order (GTO) from the US Treasury's Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN) requiring Old Republic National Title Insurance Company to report information about certain transactions involving residential property in the counties of Los Angeles, San Diego, San Francisco, San Mateo and Santa Clara.

FinCEN has the authority to compel this reporting under the USA PATRIOT Act. The reporting requirement only applies to so-called “Covered Transactions.” Click on link to view the entire GTO promulgated by FinCEN.


The failure and/or refusal of a party to provide information for a "covered transaction" will preclude Old Republic from closing the transaction and/or issuing title insurance.

ON
AT
In addition to the Exceptions in Schedule B, You are not insured against loss, costs, attorneys' fees, and expenses resulting from:

1. Governmental police power, and the existence or violation of those portions of any law or government regulation concerning:
   a. building;
   b. zoning;
   c. land use;
   d. improvements on the Land;
   e. land division; and
   f. environmental protection.

   This Exclusion does not limit the coverage described in Covered Risk 8.a., 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 23 or 27.

2. The failure of Your existing structures, or any part of them, to be constructed in accordance with applicable building codes. This Exclusion does not limit the coverage described in Covered Risk 14 or 15.

3. The right to take the Land by condemning it. This Exclusion does not limit the coverage described in Covered Risk 17.

4. Risks:
   a. that are created, allowed, or agreed to by You, whether or not they are recorded in the Public Records;
   b. that are Known to You at the Policy Date, but not to Us, unless they are recorded in the Public Records at the Policy Date;
   c. that result in no loss to You; or
   d. that first occur after the Policy Date - this does not limit the coverage described in Covered Risk 7, 8.e., 25, 26, 27 or 28.

5. Failure to pay value for Your Title.

6. Lack of a right:
   a. to any land outside the area specifically described and referred to in paragraph 3 of Schedule A; and
   b. in streets, alleys, or waterways that touch the Land.

   This Exclusion does not limit the coverage described in Covered Risk 11 or 21.

7. The transfer of the Title to You is invalid as a preferential transfer or as a fraudulent transfer or conveyance under federal bankruptcy, state insolvency, or similar creditors' rights laws.

8. Contamination, explosion, fire, flooding, vibration, fracturing, earthquake or subsidence.

9. Negligence by a person or an Entity exercising a right to extract or develop minerals, water, or any other substances.

**LIMITATIONS ON COVERED RISKS**

Your insurance for the following Covered Risks is limited on the Owner's Coverage Statement as follows:

For Covered Risk 16, 18, 19, and 21 Your Deductible Amount and Our Maximum Dollar Limit of Liability shown in Schedule A.

The deductible amounts and maximum dollar limits shown on Schedule A are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covered Risk</th>
<th>Your Deductible Amount</th>
<th>Our Maximum Dollar Limit of Liability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covered Risk 16:</td>
<td>1.00% of Policy Amount or $5,000.00 (whichever is less)</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered Risk 18:</td>
<td>1.00% of Policy Amount or $5,000.00 (whichever is less)</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered Risk 19:</td>
<td>1.00% of Policy Amount or $5,000.00 (whichever is less)</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered Risk 21:</td>
<td>1.00% of Policy Amount or $5,000.00 (whichever is less)</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following matters are expressly excluded from the coverage of this policy, and the Company will not pay loss or damage, costs, attorneys' fees, or expenses that arise by reason of:

1. (a) Any law, ordinance, permit, or governmental regulation (including those relating to building and zoning) restricting, regulating, prohibiting, or relating to
   (i) the occupancy, use, or enjoyment of the Land;
   (ii) the character, dimensions, or location of any improvement erected on the Land;
   (iii) the subdivision of land; or
   (iv) environmental protection; or the effect of any violation of these laws, ordinances, or governmental regulations.
   This Exclusion 1(a) does not modify or limit the coverage provided under Covered Risk 5.
   (b) Any governmental police power. This Exclusion 1(b) does not modify or limit the coverage provided under Covered Risk 6.

2. Rights of eminent domain. This Exclusion does not modify or limit the coverage provided under Covered Risk 7 or 8.

3. Defects, liens, encumbrances, adverse claims, or other matters
   (a) created, suffered, assumed, or agreed to by the Insured Claimant;
   (b) not known to the Company, not recorded in the Public Records at Date of Policy, but known to the Insured Claimant
      and not disclosed in writing to the Company by the Insured Claimant prior to the date the Insured Claimant became an
      Insured under this policy;
   (c) resulting in no loss or damage to the Insured Claimant;
   (d) attaching or created subsequent to Date of Policy (however, this does not modify or limit the coverage provided under
      Covered Risk 11, 13, or 14); or
   (e) resulting in loss or damage that would not have been sustained if the Insured Claimant had paid value for the Insured
      Mortgage.

4. Unenforceability of the lien of the Insured Mortgage because of the inability or failure of an Insured to comply with applicable
doing-business laws of the state where the Land is situated.

5. Invalidity or unenforceability in whole or in part of the lien of the Insured Mortgage that arises out of the transaction
evidenced by the Insured Mortgage and is based upon usury or any consumer credit protection or truth-in-lending law.

6. Any claim, by reason of the operation of federal bankruptcy, state insolvency, or similar creditors' rights laws, that the
   transaction creating the lien of the Insured Mortgage, is
   (a) a fraudulent conveyance or fraudulent transfer, or
   (b) a preferential transfer for any reason not stated in Covered Risk 13(b) of this policy.

7. Any lien on the Title for real estate taxes or assessments imposed by governmental authority and created or attaching
   between Date of Policy and the date of recording of the Insured Mortgage in the Public Records. This Exclusion does not
   modify or limit the coverage provided under Covered Risk 11(b).

**EXCEPTIONS FROM COVERAGE - SCHEDULE B, PART 1, SECTION ONE**

This policy does not insure against loss or damage (and the Company will not pay costs, attorneys' fees or expenses) that arise by reason of:

1. (a) Taxes or assessments that are not shown as existing liens by the records of any taxing authority that levies taxes or
   assessments on real property or by the Public Records; (b) proceedings by a public agency that may result in taxes or
   assessments, or notices of such proceedings, whether or not shown by the records of such agency or by the Public Records.

2. Any facts, rights, interests, or claims that are not shown by the Public Records but that could beascertained by an inspection
   of the Land or that may be asserted by persons in possession of the Land.

3. Easements, liens or encumbrances, or claims thereof, not shown by the Public Records.

4. Any encroachment, encumbrance, violation, variation, or adverse circumstance affecting the Title that would be disclosed by
   an accurate and complete land survey of the Land and not shown by the Public Records.

5. (a) Unpatented mining claims; (b) reservations or exceptions in patents or in Acts authorizing the issuance thereof; (c) water
   rights, claims or title to water, whether or not the matters excepted under (a), (b), or (c) are shown by the Public Records.
# WHAT DOES OLD REPUBLIC TITLE DO WITH YOUR PERSONAL INFORMATION?

## Why?
Financial companies choose how they share your personal information. Federal law gives consumers the right to limit some but not all sharing. Federal law also requires us to tell you how we collect, share, and protect your personal information. Please read this notice carefully to understand what we do.

## What?
The types of personal information we collect and share depend on the product or service you have with us. This information can include:
- Social Security number and employment information
- Mortgage rates and payments and account balances
- Checking account information and wire transfer instructions

When you are no longer our customer, we continue to share your information as described in this notice.

## How?
All financial companies need to share customers' personal information to run their everyday business. In the section below, we list the reasons financial companies can share their customers' personal information; the reasons Old Republic Title chooses to share; and whether you can limit this sharing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons we can share your personal information</th>
<th>Does Old Republic Title share?</th>
<th>Can you limit this sharing?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>For our everyday business purposes</strong> — such as to process your transactions, maintain your account(s), or respond to court orders and legal investigations, or report to credit bureaus</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For our marketing purposes</strong> — to offer our products and services to you</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>We don't share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For joint marketing with other financial companies</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>We don't share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For our affiliates’ everyday business purposes</strong> — information about your transactions and experiences</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For our affiliates’ everyday business purposes</strong> — information about your creditworthiness</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>We don’t share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For our affiliates to market to you</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>We don’t share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For non-affiliates to market to you</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>We don’t share</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Go to [www.oldrepublictitle.com](http://www.oldrepublictitle.com) (Contact Us)
Who we are

Who is providing this notice?  Companies with an Old Republic Title name and other affiliates. Please see below for a list of affiliates.

What we do

How does Old Republic Title protect my personal information?  To protect your personal information from unauthorized access and use, we use security measures that comply with federal law. These measures include computer safeguards and secured files and buildings. For more information, visit http://www.OldRepublicTitle.com/newnational/Contact/privacy.

How does Old Republic Title collect my personal information?  We collect your personal information, for example, when you:
• Give us your contact information or show your driver’s license
• Show your government-issued ID or provide your mortgage information
• Make a wire transfer
We also collect your personal information from others, such as credit bureaus, affiliates, or other companies.

Why can’t I limit all sharing?  Federal law gives you the right to limit only:
• Sharing for affiliates’ everyday business purposes - information about your creditworthiness
• Affiliates from using your information to market to you
• Sharing for non-affiliates to market to you
State laws and individual companies may give you additional rights to limit sharing. See the "Other important information" section below for your rights under state law.

Definitions

Affiliates  Companies related by common ownership or control. They can be financial and nonfinancial companies.
• Our affiliates include companies with an Old Republic Title name, and financial companies such as Attorneys’ Title Fund Services, LLC, Lex Terrae National Title Services, Inc., Mississippi Valley Title Services Company, and The Title Company of North Carolina.

Non-affiliates  Companies not related by common ownership or control. They can be financial and non-financial companies.
• Old Republic Title does not share with non-affiliates so they can market to you

Joint marketing  A formal agreement between non-affiliated financial companies that together market financial products or services to you.
• Old Republic Title doesn’t jointly market.
Other Important Information

Oregon residents only: We are providing you this notice under state law. We may share your personal information (described on page one) obtained from you or others with non-affiliate service providers with whom we contract, such as notaries and delivery services, in order to process your transactions. You may see what personal information we have collected about you in connection with your transaction (other than personal information related to a claim or legal proceeding). To see your information, please click on “Contact Us” at www.oldrepublictitle.com and submit your written request to the Legal Department. You may see and copy the information at our office or ask us to mail you a copy for a reasonable fee. If you think any information is wrong, you may submit a written request online to correct or delete it. We will let you know what actions we take. If you do not agree with our actions, you may send us a statement.

Affiliates Who May be Delivering This Notice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American First Abstract, LLC</th>
<th>American First Title &amp; Trust Company</th>
<th>American Guaranty Title Insurance Company</th>
<th>Attorneys’ Title Fund Services, LLC</th>
<th>Compass Abstract, Inc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eRecording Partners Network, LLC</td>
<td>Genesis Abstract, LLC</td>
<td>Kansas City Management Group, LLC</td>
<td>L.T. Service Corp.</td>
<td>Lenders Inspection Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lex Terrae National Title Services, Inc.</td>
<td>Lex Terrae, Ltd.</td>
<td>Mara Escrow Company</td>
<td>Mississippi Valley Title Services Company</td>
<td>National Title Agent’s Services Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Republic Branch Information Services, Inc.</td>
<td>Old Republic Diversified Services, Inc.</td>
<td>Old Republic Exchange Company</td>
<td>Old Republic National Title Insurance Company</td>
<td>Old Republic Title and Escrow of Hawaii, Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Republic Title Co.</td>
<td>Old Republic Title Company of Conroe</td>
<td>Old Republic Title Company of Indiana</td>
<td>Old Republic Title Company of Nevada</td>
<td>Old Republic Title Company of Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Republic Title Company of Oregon</td>
<td>Old Republic Title Company of St. Louis</td>
<td>Old Republic Title Company of Tennessee</td>
<td>Old Republic Title Information Concepts</td>
<td>Old Republic Title Insurance Agency, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Republic Title, Ltd.</td>
<td>Republic Abstract &amp; Settlement, LLC</td>
<td>Sentry Abstract Company</td>
<td>The Title Company of North Carolina</td>
<td>Title Services, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trident Land Transfer Company, LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
November 17, 2017

George Karamanos, Jenna Karamanos
32 Newburg St
San Francisco, CA 94131

Re 4118 21ST STREET, San Francisco, CA 94114
Loan No 004775921150

Dear George Karamanos and Jenna Karamanos

Enclosed is a copy of the appraisal report that Citibank, N.A has received in connection with your mortgage loan application. Please be aware that Citibank may not have yet reviewed the Report and that it may change prior to closing. Should a material change occur, you will be provided with a copy of the revised report.

Should you identify significant errors in your report, please contact your original Sales or Processing Representative for help in resolving the issue.

Sincerely,

Citibank, N.A

Enclosures
APPRAISAL OF

SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE

LOCATED AT:

4118 21ST STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114

FOR:

CITIBANK
1000 TECHNOLOGY DRIVE
O'FALLON, MO 63368-2240

AS OF:

November 14, 2017

BY:

STEVEN L. YARON
AL010049
11/15/2017

SOLIDIFI
CITIBANK
1000 TECHNOLOGY DRIVE
O FALLON, MO 63368-2240

File Number: 171118

To Whom it May Concern:

In accordance with your request, I have appraised the real property at:

4118 21ST STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114

The purpose of this appraisal is to develop an opinion of the market value of the subject property, as improved. The property rights appraised are the fee simple interest in the site and improvements.

In my opinion, the market value of the property as of November 14, 2017 is:

$2,260,000
Two Million Two Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars

The attached report contains the description, analysis and supportive data for the conclusions, final opinion of value, descriptive photographs, limiting conditions and appropriate certifications.

This complete appraisal is presented in a summary form report. It is prepared for use by Citibank N.A., their successors and assigns in a mortgage lending decision. The intended Use is to evaluate the property that is the subject of this appraisal for a mortgage finance transaction, subject to the stated scope of work, purpose of the appraisal, reporting requirements of this appraisal report form and definition of market value. To the best of my knowledge it has been completed in conformity with the USPAP and the Code of Professional Ethics and Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice of the Appraisal Institute.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

STEVEN I. VARON
AR010909
**Uniform Residential Appraisal Report**

**Property Address:** 4118 21ST STREET  
**City:** SAN FRANCISCO  
**State:** CA  
**Zip Code:** 94114

**Owner:** GEORGE/JENA KARAMANOS  
**Owner of Record:** 4118 21ST ST LLC  
**County:** SAN FRANCISCO

**Legal Description:** LOT 11 BLOCK 270 HORNERS ADDN BLK 211  
**Assessor's Parcel:** 2150-017  
**Assessor Year:** 2018  
**Tax Year:** 2019  
**Property Taxes:** $25880

**Neighborhood:** EUREKA VALLEY  
**Map Reference:** 667C-03  
**Census Tract:** 205.00

**Occupants:**  
**Owner:**  
**Tenant:**  
**Vacant:**  
**Special Assessments:** $0  
**PUD HOA:** 0  
**per year**  
**per month**

**Property Rights:**  
**Appraised:**  
**Condition:**  
**Lessee:**  
**Other:** (describe)

**Assignment Type:**  
**Purchase Transaction:**  
**Reference Transaction:**  
**Other (describe):**

**Lender/Credit Reference:**  
**Address:** 1000 TECHNOLOGY DRIVE, O FALLON, MO 63368 2240

**Note:** The race and the racial composition of the neighborhood are not appraisal factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Characteristics</th>
<th>One-Unit Housing Trends</th>
<th>One-Unit Housing</th>
<th>Present Land Use %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>PRICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>AGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Built Up</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Declining</td>
<td>One-Unit Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>20-25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>25-35%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Market Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Attached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The highest and best use of the subject property as improved (as proposed) or as improved (as purchased) is the present use.*  
**PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE**  
**Utilities**  
**Public**  
**Other (describe):**  
**Street:** ASPHALT  
**Sanitary Sewer:**  
**Alley:** NONE

**FEMA Special Flood Hazard Area:**  
**Yes**  
**No**  
**FEMA Map #:**  
**FEMA Map Date:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Other (describe)</th>
<th>Off-site Improvements</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Description**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>One with Accessory Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** The condition of the property, including needed repairs, deterioration, renovation, remodeling, etc., at the time of the appraisal is GOOD.

**AVERAGE CONDITION:**

**Neighborhood:** EUREKA VALLEY

**Notes:** The physical condition of the property, including needed repairs, deterioration, renovation, remodeling, etc., at the time of the appraisal is GOOD.

**AVERAGE CONDITION:**

**Neighborhood:** EUREKA VALLEY

**Notes:** The physical condition of the property, including needed repairs, deterioration, renovation, remodeling, etc., at the time of the appraisal is GOOD.

**AVERAGE CONDITION:**

**Neighborhood:** EUREKA VALLEY

**Notes:** The physical condition of the property, including needed repairs, deterioration, renovation, remodeling, etc., at the time of the appraisal is GOOD.

**AVERAGE CONDITION:**

**Neighborhood:** EUREKA VALLEY

**Notes:** The physical condition of the property, including needed repairs, deterioration, renovation, remodeling, etc., at the time of the appraisal is GOOD.

**AVERAGE CONDITION:**
March 29, 2020

Dear Commissioners,

My name is David Roth. My family and I reside at 4130 21st Street, which is two houses over to the west (on the same block) of the project before the Commission. After reviewing the proposed plans for 4118 21st Street, we support the project submitted by George and Jenna Karamanos.

The proposed project will renovate an existing home that was in disrepair and will even add a new family sized two-bedroom unit to the City’s housing stock. This project will upgrade the existing home to current fire and seismic safety standards making it safer for the whole neighborhood instead of its current condition when the City stopped the construction.

While the proposed project adds a partial third floor over basement, it considerably reduces the depth of the pre-existing building (by more than 12 feet), restoring a rear yard that complies with the Planning Code. Importantly, it also adds a much-needed new second unit to the neighborhood. This compromise will improve the neighborhood’s interior open space formed by the rear yards.

We urge this Commission to approve the project so that the Karamanos family can enjoy their home and continue living in San Francisco.

Regards,

David Roth
Owner of 4130 21st Street
dxr@dxr.org
March 30, 2020

Dear Commissioners,

My name is Richard Craddock. I reside at 373 Eureka Street, overlooking the rear yard of the project before the Commission. After reviewing the proposed plans for 4118 21st Street, we support the project submitted by George and Jenna Karamanos.

The proposed project will renovate an existing home that was in disrepair and will even add a much-needed, new family sized two-bedroom unit to the City’s housing stock.

Importantly, the proposed project significantly decreases the depth of the pre-existing building, removing more than 12 feet from multiple floors of the pre-existing building. The home’s proposed design will thereby improve the neighborhood’s interior open space formed by the rear yards, while also complementing the other buildings in the neighborhood from an architectural perspective.

We urge this Commission to approve the project so that the Karamanos family can enjoy their property and join our neighborhood.

Regards,

Richard Craddock
Owner of 373 Eureka Street
crad@cradworld.com
April 1, 2020

Dear Commissioners,

Our names are Jeff Baker and Bill O’Rourke. We reside at 396 Diamond Street, which is the second house to the east (on the same block) of the project before the Commission. After reviewing the proposed plans for 4118 21st Street, we support the project submitted by George and Jenna Karamanos.

The Karamanos family are trying to upgrade their home that was built in 1907, more than 100 years ago. The proposed project will renovate an existing home that was in disrepair and will add a much-needed, new family sized two-bedroom unit to the City’s housing stock.

While the proposed project adds a partial third floor over basement, it reduces the depth of the pre-existing building by over 12 feet, restoring a rear yard that complies with the Planning Code. Importantly, it also adds a much-needed new second unit to the neighborhood. Further, George and Jenna have been very reasonable during this difficult process – when we raised a concern regarding the impact of a proposed roof deck on my views to Sutro Tower, they removed the roof deck in its entirety, which we very much appreciated. The compromises that the Karamanos family have been willing to make will be a substantial improvement to the existing home.

We urge this Commission to approve the project so that the Karamanos family can enjoy their home and continue living in San Francisco.

Regards,

Jeff Baker and Bill O’Rourke
Owners of 394-396 Diamond Street
jeffreywbaker@aol.com
Dear Mr. and Mrs. Karamanos

Enertia Designs has furnished this report upon your request to document conditions that were observed by Enertia Designs during the demolition and construction process at your home at 4118 21st Street in San Francisco, California in July of 2018 and in November 2018.

A request for a site visit was made by the contractor MB development upon completion of removal of the existing wall finishes in July of 2018 in regards to the work related to BPA # 201802272279. For the subject building permit application, Enertia Designs was the Structural Engineer of Record for, and completed all of the drawings, details, specifications and calculations for regarding the structural design.

Enertia Designs engineer Gerry Chen visited the site at the time of finish removal but prior to demolition of any floors or walls to review the conditions, answer questions regarding the existing framing and discuss remediation due to existing conditions.

The estimated date of construction for the property per records is 1908, and the majority of the framing found was redwood 3x4 framing.

The following conditions were encountered during the engineer’s walk through in July 2018:

1) Dry Rot

Dry rot was noticed throughout the structure. The most significant locations of the rot noticed at this visit were

a) Along the entire first floor foundation at the east, north and west walls. Much of the structure was painted/primed at some point to assist in preserving the framing, but the rot was still exposed at the foundation entirely due to water intrusion.

b) A large portion of the second floor framing at the back of the property was dry rotted due to equipment and plumbing being located in this area. Large portions of the facade were dry rotted, including the entire first floor, and the rim joist above that and sill plate and the bottom portion of the framing above that.

c) The Lightwell facing the east was nearly entirely rotted due to exposure and all of the windows. The sill plate at the garage and storage space on the east side was rotted and required removal of the studs above.

d) At the roof level, dry rot was encountered over the entry stair (where an access hatch was located) and around all of the skylights.

In addition under and adjacent to each window opening dry rot was encountered.

The dry rotted material could not be salvaged or additionally reinforced. Enertia recommended removal of all dry rotted material of any kind to prevent the spread of such material, and removal of such material immediately from the property to prevent spread.
2) Termite Damage

Termite damage was encountered in select locations through the structure. The most significant locations noticed during this visit were at the northwest and northeast corner of the house. The framing at the floor, rim joist and corners had to be removed in this area.

3) Non-Continuous Framing

Non-Continuous, not re-usable framing was encountered above the third floor on the east and west of the property for the entire extent of the addition north of the lightwells. This framing could not be safely reinforced or removed since it was two stud wood walls stacked on top of each other and breaking the plate would have compromised the wall. The west side was very rotted in addition. Enertia designs recommended this area be completely removed and replaced in the same location with a conventionally framed stud wall with platform framing for the roof above.

It also should be noted that during the design phase, it was discovered that the existing joists above the garage at the second floor were too insubstantial to be sistered and reused with new framing since they were 2x6’s. 2x8 minimums would be required for the sistering of the new joists in this case.

The following conditions were encountered during the engineer’s walk through in November 2018:

1) Dry Rot

Dry rot was noticed along the entire rim joist above the first floor, the entire facade below the second floor, and the sill plate above the second floor. The removal of this area entirely was required as the wall above could not be properly supported. In addition, some of the rotting turned the corner to the southwest corner of the house around/below the window.

2) Termite Damage

Termite damage was encountered at the rim joist and also encountered along the east facing wall, though to a lesser extent here.

Sincerely

Jefferson Chen
Enertia Designs

Cc: SF DBI Inspector, Bill Walsh
Cc: SF Planning Department, Chaska Berger
Cc: Benonim Mocanu, MB Development
Cc: Ryan Knock, Knock Architecture and Design