



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY Conditional USE

HEARING DATE: OCTOBER 28, 2021

Record No.: Project Address: Zoning:	2020-005729CUA 4 Seacliff Avenue RH-1(D) (Residential-House, One-Family - Detached) Zoning District 40-X Height and Bulk District
	Lobos Creek Conservation Area
Block/Lot:	1302/017
Project Sponsor:	Glenda Flaim, Butler Armsden Architects
	1420 Sutter Street
	San Francisco, CA 94109
Property Owner:	418 Ventures, LLC
	Burlingame, CA 94011
Staff Contact:	Christopher May – (628) 652-7359
	christopher.may@sfgov.org
Recommendation:	Approval with Conditions

Project Description

The Project includes the demolition of the existing three-story single-family dwelling measuring approximately 11,351 square feet and the construction of a new three-story single-family dwelling measuring approximately 9,341 gross square feet with one accessory dwelling unit (ADU) measuring approximately 799 square feet. The project also proposes two off-street parking spaces, two Class 1 bicycle parking spaces, and approximately 2,185 square feet of usable open space on several terraces for both the principally permitted unit and the ADU.

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 demolition of a dwelling unit within the RH-1(D) Zoning District.

Issues and Other Considerations

- Public Comment & Outreach.
 - Support/Opposition: The Department has received 1 letter in support of the Project.
 - **Outreach**: The Sponsor has hosted two meetings within the community, on May 22 and 26, 2020. The Planning Department also reached out to the National Parks Service, which has jurisdiction over the Presidio, immediately to the north of the subject property.
- Tenant History:
 - Are any units currently occupied by tenants: (N)
 - Have Any tenants been evicted within the past 10 years: (N)
 - Have there been any tenant buyouts within the past 10 years: (N)
 - See Exhibit H for Eviction History documentation.
- Lobos Creek Conservation Area: The project site is located within the Lobos Creek Conservation Area, which was established by the Planning Commission in March, 1996 (Resolution No. 14080) to protect the Lobos Creek from environmental degradation in association with new development. The project will employ the following best management practices (BMPs) in accordance with the
 - **Site Planning.** In order to avoid land disturbance, the project involves the construction of a smaller building within the existing building footprint. The project design includes stepped foundations, staggered floor levels that follow the site topography. The amount of impervious area will be reduced from 14,800 square feet to 9,000 square feet and replaced with pervious/permeable paving.
 - Water Distribution to the Creek. In order to avoid diverting existing water sources for groundwater and any Lobos Creek tributaries, the project will be supported on drilled piers and an erosion control plan for construction activities has been provided.
 - Design, Develop and Maintain Erosion Control Measures. In order to reduce erosion, an Erosion Control Plan has been submitted including: a silt fence to capture sediment runoff, fiber rolls, and a sedimentation pond to collect stormwater and allow sediment to settle before being discharged offsite by a drainage swale. In addition, the project is subject to both the city's Construction Site Runoff Ordinance (Public Works Code Section 146) and Stormwater Management Ordinance including a stormwater control plan (Public Works Code Section 147) to manage construction site runoff and stormwater flows with oversight by the SF Public Utilities Commission.
 - **Sewer Systems in Newly Constructed Homes.** The project will include a back-up catchment basin, as well as a pump to deliver sewage to the city system.
 - **Vegetation.** The project would remove and replace landscaping including the removal of three trees at the rear of the property. However, as noted above, the project is subject to the Stormwater Management Ordinance which requires the sponsor to implement and maintain a stormwater control plan consisting of low impact design and green infrastructure. The control plan must meet performance standards to protect water quality and reduce stormwater flows from new development and redevelopment projects.



• **Design Review Comments:** The project was reviewed by the Department's Design Review team on September 11, 2020. It was noted that the subject property is located within the eligible Sea Cliff Historic District and that the proposed facade treatment with vertical wood cladding and large expanses of glazing are not in keeping with the character-defining features of the district. The project sponsor was asked to revise their elevations accordingly but has not done so.

Environmental Review

The Project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") as 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 older, more naturally affordable single-family dwelling, the Project proposes the addition of an accessory dwelling unit (ADU), which will add to the City's housing stock. 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.

Attachments:

Draft Motion – Conditional Use Authorization with Conditions of Approval Exhibit B – Plans and Renderings Exhibit C – Environmental Determination Exhibit D – Lobos Creek Conservation Area – Standard Best Management Practices Exhibit E - Land Use Data Exhibit F – Maps and Context Photos Exhibit G - Project Sponsor Brief Exhibit H – Eviction History Documentation





PLANNING COMMISSION DRAFT MOTION

HEARING DATE: OCTOBER 28, 2021

Record No.:	2020-005729CUA
Project Address:	4 SEACLIFF AVENUE
Zoning:	RH-1(D) (Residential-House, One Family - Detached) Zoning District
	40-X Height and Bulk District
	Lobos Creek Conservation Area
Block/Lot:	1302/017
Project Sponsor:	Glenda Flaim, Butler Armsden Architects
	1420 Sutter Street
	San Francisco, CA 94109
Property Owner:	418 Ventures, LLC
	Burlingame, CA 94011
Staff Contact:	Christopher May – (628) 652-7359
	christopher.may@sfgov.org

ADOPTING FINDINGS RELATING TO A CONDITIONAL USE AUTHORIZATION PURSUANT TO PLANNING CODE SECTIONS 303 AND 317, TO PERMIT THE DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW THREE-STORY SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING WITH AN ADU ON THE SUBJECT PROPERTY LOCATED AT 4 SEACLIFF AVENUE, LOT 017 IN ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 1302, WITHIN THE RH-1(D) (RESIDENTIAL-HOUSE, ONE-FAMILY - DETACHED) ZONING DISTRICT AND A 40-X HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICT, AND ADOPTING FINDINGS UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT.

PREAMBLE

On June 23, 2020, Glenda Flaim of Butler Armsden Architects (hereinafter "Project Sponsor") filed Application No. 2020-005729CUA (hereinafter "Application") with the Planning Department (hereinafter "Department") for Conditional Use Authorization to permit the demolition of the existing single-family dwelling and the construction of a new three-story single-family dwelling with an ADU (hereinafter "Project") at 4 Seacliff Avenue, Block 1302 Lot 017 (hereinafter "Project Site").

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

On October 28, 2021, the Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting on Conditional Use Authorization Application No. 2020-005729CUA.

The Planning Department Commission Secretary is the Custodian of Records; the File for Record No. 2020-005729CUA is located at 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, 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. 2020-005729CUA, 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 demolition of the existing three-story single-family dwelling measuring approximately 11,351 square feet and the construction of a new three-story single-family dwelling measuring approximately 9,341 gross square feet with one accessory dwelling unit (ADU) measuring approximately 799 square feet. The project also proposes two off-street parking spaces, two Class 1 bicycle parking spaces, and approximately 2,185 square feet of usable open space on several terraces for both the principally permitted unit and the ADU.
- **3. Site Description and Present Use.** The project is located on a large, irregularly shaped lot at the north end of 25th Avenue, Lot 017 in Assessor's Block 1302. The property is located within the RH-1(D) (Residential-House, One-Family Detached) Zoning District, a 40-X Height and Bulk District and the Lobos Creek Conservation Area. The subject property has approximately 45 feet of frontage at the end of 25th Avenue and is approximately 26,432 square feet in size. The subject property is a steeply sloped lot with its side and rear lot lines abutting Lobos Creek and is currently occupied by a 11,35 square-foot, single-family dwelling constructed circa 1956. The existing building is one story when viewed from the street and is three stories at the rear due to the site's topography.
- **4. Surrounding Properties and Neighborhood.** The Project Site is located within the Sea Cliff neighborhood in the Richmond District. The immediate context is entirely residential in character with single-family dwellings on large lots. The project site is one of 43 properties within the Lobos Creek Conservation Area, which was established by the Planning Commission in March, 1996 (Resolution No. 14080) to protect the Lobos Creek from environmental degradation in association with new development. The surrounding neighborhood is within the RH-1(D) Zoning District, while the Presidio on the other side of the creek is zoned P (Public).
- **5. Public Outreach and Comments.** The Department has received correspondence from one neighbor, at 6 Seacliff Avenue, in support of the proposed project. Planning staff advised the National Parks Service, which has jurisdiction over the Presidio, about the proposed project, but did not receive a response.
- **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. Use. Planning Code Section 209.1 principally permits residential uses at a density of one dwelling unit per lot in the RH-1(D) Zoning District. Planning Code Section 207(c)(6) permits one accessory dwelling unit (ADU) to an existing or proposed single-family home without exceeding the allowable density for the lot.

The project proposes one principally permitted dwelling unit and one accessory dwelling unit (ADU).

B. Residential Demolition. Pursuant to Planning Code Section 317, Conditional Use Authorization is



required for applications proposing to demolish a residential unit in an RH-1(D) Zoning District. This Code Section establishes criteria that Planning Commission shall consider in the review of applications for Residential Demolition.

The project proposes the demolition of an existing single-family dwelling and therefore requires Conditional Use Authorization. The additional criteria specified under Section 317 have been incorporated as findings in Subsection 8 below.

C. Front Setback. Planning Code Section 132 states that the minimum front setback depth shall be based on the average of adjacent properties or a Legislated Setback.

The subject property is required to provide a front setback of approximately 9 feet 9 inches based on the front setbacks of the adjacent building to the south. The project proposes the required front setback of 9 feet 9 inches along the west lot line, which has been determined to be the front lot line.

D. Side Yards. Planning Code Section 133 states that for lots with a width of 50 feet or more, two side yards each of five feet are required.

The subject property is more than 50 feet in width; therefore it is required to provide two side yards of 5 feet each. The project proposes a side yard of approximately 23 feet along the south side lot line, and a side yard of approximately 5 feet along the north side lot line.

E. Rear Yard. Planning Code Section 134 requires a rear yard equal to 30 percent of the total depth, at grade and above, for properties containing dwelling units in the RH-1(D) Zoning District.

The subject property has an average lot depth of approximately 283 feet; therefore the 30 percent requirement is approximately 85 feet. The project provides a rear yard of approximately 170 feet.

F. Useable Open Space. Planning Code Section 135 requires 300 square feet of useable open space for each dwelling unit if all private. A 1.33 ratio of common usable open space may be substituted for private open space.

The Project includes approximately 2,185 square feet of usable open space on several terraces for both the principally permitted unit and the accessory dwelling unit.

G. Dwelling Unit Exposure. Planning Code Section 140 requires that at least one room of all dwelling units face onto a public street or public alley at least 30 feet in width, a side yard at least 25 feet in width, a rear yard meeting the requirements of the Code or other open area that meets minimum requirements for area and horizontal dimensions.

The principally permitted dwelling unit will have direct exposure onto both the public street and a Codecompliant rear yard, and the ADU will have direct exposure onto a Code-compliant rear yard.

H. Street Frontages. Section 144 of the Planning Code requires that no more than one-third of the width of the ground story along the front lot line, or along a street side lot line, or along a building wall that is setback from any such lot line, shall be devoted to entrances to off-street parking, except that in no



event shall a lot be limited by this requirement to a single such entrance of less than ten feet in width.

The Project proposes a Code-complying garage door width of 17 feet, representing less than 1/3 of the width of the street side lot line.

I. Off-Street Parking. Planning Code Section 151 does not require a minimum number of off-street parking spaces and permits a maximum of 1.5 parking space for each dwelling unit.

The Project proposes two (2) off-street parking spaces.

J. Bicycle Parking. Planning Code Section 155.2 requires at least one Class 1 bicycle parking space for each dwelling unit.

The project proposes two Class 1 bicycle parking spaces.

K. Height. Planning Code Section 260 requires that all structures be no taller than the height prescribed in the subject height and bulk district, which, in the RH-1(D) Zoning District is 35 feet.

The proposed three-story building will be 12 feet 4 inches as measured from curb level.

L. Child Care Requirements for Residential Projects. Planning Code Section 414A requires that any residential development project that results in at least one net new residential unit shall comply with the imposition of the Residential Child Care Impact Fee requirement.

The Project proposes new construction of a new residential building containing one principally permitted dwelling unit and one ADU. Therefore, the Project is subject to the Residential Child Care Impact Fee and must comply with the requirements outlined in Planning Code Section 414A.

7. Lobos Creek Conservation Area. The project site is located within the Lobos Creek Conservation Area, which was established by the Planning Commission in March, 1996 (Resolution No. 14080) to protect the Lobos Creek from environmental degradation in association with new development. The project site abuts the Presidio and Lobos Creek is located downslope of the rear of the parcel. The guidance document in Table 1, *Lobos Creek Permit Review List* (refer to Exhibit D) describes best management practices (BMPs) to protect water quality, flow, erosion control and slope protection and to be incorporated into projects within the designated conservation area to protect the creek.

The project sponsor has provided the required site survey, cross-sectional drawing, and geotechnical investigation prepared by a qualified engineer. The project complies with applicable BMPs as described below:

• *BMP 1 - Site Planning.* BMP 1 states that projects should avoid land disturbance and installation of impermeable surfaces. The project involves the construction of a smaller building within the existing building footprint. The project design includes stepped foundations, staggered floor levels that follow the site topography. Some impervious surfaces would be removed and replaced with pervious/permeable paving. As described in the Landscape Diagram on Sheet A0.4 and Grading Plan on Sheet C2.1, the amount of impervious area would be reduced from 14,800 sf to 9,000 sf.



- *BMP 2 Water Distribution to the Creek.* BMP 2 states that projects should avoid diverting existing water sources for groundwater and any Lobos Creek tributaries. The project improvements would be supported on drilled piers as recommended in the geotechnical investigation. The project does not involve the removal or redesign of water ways. As described below, an erosion control plan for construction activities has been provided.
- *BMP 3 Design, Develop and Maintain Erosion Control Measures.* BMP 3 requires standard erosion control measures be implemented. The project has shown on Sheet C4.1, an Erosion Control Plan including: a silt fence to capture sediment runoff, fiber rolls, and a sedimentation pond to collect stormwater and allow sediment to settle before being discharged offsite by a drainage swale. In addition, the project is subject to both the city's Construction Site Runoff Ordinance (Public Works Code Section 146) and Stormwater Management Ordinance including a stormwater control plan (Public Works Code Section 147) to manage construction site runoff and stormwater flows with oversight by the SF Public Utilities Commission. San Francisco Green Building Checklist Sheet A0.8 in the plan set includes these requirements.
- *BMP 4 Sewer Systems in Newly Constructed Homes.* To comply with BMP 4, the project must include a back-up catchment basin, as well as a pump to deliver sewage to the city system. According to the Utility Plan on Sheet C3.1 an ejector pump at the lowest level would be used to pump to the street level and connect to the sewer system.
- *BMP 5 Vegetation.* BMP 5 notes that vegetation is the most efficient form of erosion control. Whenever possible, naturally vegetated areas should be protected for soil stability. The project would remove and replace landscaping including the removal of three trees at the rear of the property. However, as noted above, the project is subject to the Stormwater Management Ordinance. The ordinance requires the sponsor to implement and maintain a stormwater control plan consisting of Low Impact Design and green infrastructure. The control plan must meet performance standards to protect water quality and reduce stormwater flows from new development and redevelopment projects.

As described above the project as designed incorporates relevant BMPs applicable to the site to protect slope stability, minimize erosion to the creek during construction and after construction is complete, and minimize run-off and other contaminants to the creek.

- 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 Project is necessary and desirable because it will replace a single-family home that is more than 60 years old and in need of structural and foundational improvements with a new single-family home and one naturally affordable accessory dwelling unit. The Project will reduce the footprint from approximately 30% lot coverage to 20% and locates the structure more appropriately on the site by increasing the setbacks on the eastern and western property lines and moving the home slightly farther



from the street. The height of the new structure will be 12 feet 4 inches when measured from the curb with a flatter roof, whereas the existing height exceeds 17 feet at its highest point, thereby better blending in with its surroundings when viewed from the street and nearby open spaces. Viewed from the street, the proposed home appears as a one-story home, with two additional stories provided below street grade on the downsloping lot. Its apparent size is considerably smaller than that of other homes in the neighborhood.

The Project is desirable because it is compatible with the intent and design of the residential neighborhood and Sea Cliff community which is characterized almost exclusively by single-family homes. The RH-1(D) zoning district has large units suitable for family occupancy and open space. The Project maximizes density with a single-family residence and an ADU.

- 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 is appropriate in both size and shape for the site. It will be smaller in footprint and overall square footage than the existing structure to be demolished. The Project will provide all required setbacks from the property lines, and will be consistent with the height and setbacks of adjoining properties.

The Project will increase privacy and increase access to light and air by increasing setbacks and reducing the height of the structure. The structure will be an average of 51 feet from the required setback on the east. On the west, the structure is an average of 8 feet 6 inches from the required setback on the ground floor, and set back further on upper floors. The new structure will replace the 17-foot structure with one that is 12 feet 4 inches, measured from curb level.

(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 Project will have little impact on street parking and traffic because it is a residential home consistent with other homes in the neighborhood. The Project preserves on-street parking because it provides vehicle and bicycle parking for residents on-site. The existing driveway is narrow and vehicles reverse into the street with limited visibility. The Project improves vehicle access and a driver's visibility by relocating the driveway. The Property is on a cul-de-sac and vehicular traffic for the Project is expected to be low and similar to that of the surrounding neighborhood. The Project site is in close proximity to public open spaces, trails, and beaches, reducing the need for vehicular travel. Residents can access the walking and biking paths nearby without needing to drive.

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



The Project is not expected to contribute noxious or offensive emissions as it is residential in character. The Project will comply with all applicable regulations regarding construction noise and dust, and will not produce, or include, any permanent uses that will generate noxious or offensive emissions, such as excessive noise, glare, dust, and odor.

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

Project features such as landscaping, screening, and open space that will benefit the natural topography of the surrounding properties, parks, and beach. The Project will provide open space in the form of yards, decks, and private outdoor areas. The Project will be landscaped and planted with material that respect the natural topography of the site and are complementary to the vegetation in the community and parks nearby. The Project proposes new trees along the southern property line and a garden in the eastern yard along the slope. Parking spaces are provided within an enclosed garage. The driveway and garbage area are screened from view. The Project will have 11% more usable open space than what currently exists and will meet all relevant design guidelines, including the Residential Design Guidelines.

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 in Subsection 9 below.

D. That use or feature as proposed will provide development that is in conformity with the stated purpose of the applicable Use District.

The proposed project is consistent with the stated purposed of RH-1(D) Zoning District in that it proposes a single-family dwelling and an ADU with usable open space provided at ground-level.

- 8. Dwelling Unit Removal Findings. Section 317 of the Planning Code establishes criteria for the Planning Commission to consider when reviewing applications to demolish or convert residential buildings. In addition to the criteria of Section 303(c) of this Code, the Commission shall consider the extent to which the following criteria are met:
 - A. Whether the property is free of a history of serious, continuing code violations;

A review of the Department of Building Inspection and the Planning Department databases showed no enforcement cases or notices of violation for the subject property.

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

The existing dwelling appears to be in decent, safe, and sanitary condition with no recent Code violations.

C. Whether the property is an "historical resource" under CEQA;



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

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

The structure is not an historical resource and its removal will not have a substantial adverse impact.

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

The existing single-family dwelling is vacant. The Project Sponsor has indicated that the proposed single-family dwelling will be owner-occupied.

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

The Planning Department cannot definitively determine whether or not the single-family home is subject to the Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance; this being under the purview of the Rent Board.

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

Although the project proposes the demolition of an existing dwelling, the new construction project will result in a new family-sized dwelling unit plus an ADU containing more bedrooms.

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

The Project will conserve neighborhood character with appropriate scale, design, and materials, and improves cultural and economic diversity by constructing a new residential building that is consistent with the provisions of the RH-1(D) Zoning District and surrounding eligible Sea Cliff Historic District.

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

The project removes an older dwelling unit, which is generally considered more affordable than more recently constructed units. However, the project also results in an ADU and more bedrooms that contribute positively to the City's housing stock.

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 fewer than ten units.

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

The Project represents the redevelopment of an underutilized parcel within an established neighborhood at a dwelling unit density consistent with the requirements of the RH-1(D) Zoning District.



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

The Project proposes a new family-sized dwelling unit to replace the existing single-family dwelling.

M. Whether the Project creates new supportive housing;

The Project does not create supportive housing.

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

On balance, the overall scale, design, and materials of the proposed buildings will be consistent with the block face and compliment the neighborhood character with traditional building materials and a contemporary design.

O. Whether the Project increases the number of on-site dwelling units;

The Project would add one net new ADU to the site.

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

The existing dwelling contains five bedrooms. The proposal includes a five-bedroom dwelling unit and a one-bedroom ADU, representing a net increase of one bedroom.

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

The project will maximize the allowed density on-site by providing one dwelling unit and an ADU.

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

The Planning Department cannot definitively determine whether or not the single-family home is subject to the Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance; this being under the purview of the Rent Board. The new project will replace the existing five-bedroom single-family dwelling with a five-bedroom unit and a one-bedroom ADU.

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 1

IDENTIFY AND MAKE AVAILABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT ADEQUATE SITES TO MEET THE CITY'S HOUSING NEEDS, ESPECIALLY PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING.



Policy 1.1

Plan for the full range of housing needs in the City and County of San Francisco, especially affordable housing.

Policy 1.10

Support new housing projects, especially affordable housing, where households can easily rely on public transportation, walking and bicycling for the majority of daily trips.

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.

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.

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.

Policy 4.4

Encourage sufficient and suitable rental housing opportunities, emphasizing permanently affordable rental units wherever possible.

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 11.6

Foster a sense of community through architectural design, using features that promote community interaction.

Policy 11.8

Consider a neighborhood's character when integrating new uses, and minimize disruption caused by expansion of institutions into residential areas.

OBJECTIVE 12

BALANCE HOUSING GROWTH WITH ADEQUATE INFRASTRUCTURE THAT SERVES THE CITY'S GROWING POPULATION.

Policy 12.2

Consider the proximity of quality of life elements such as open space, child care, and neighborhood services, when developing new housing units.

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 topography.

Policy 1.3

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



OBJECTIVE 3:

MODERATION OF MAJOR NEW DEVELOPMENT TO COMPLEMENT THE CITY PATTERN, THE RESOURCES TO BE CONSERVED, AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD ENVIRONMENT.

Policy 3.1

Promote harmony in the visual relations and transitions between new and older buildings.

The project proposes demolition of a sound residential structure containing a five-bedroom single-family dwelling. However, the new building will contain an ADU thereby resulting in a net increase of housing. The proposed new construction will conform to the Residential Design Guidelines and is appropriate in terms of material, scale, proportions and massing for the surrounding neighborhood. The project proposes new construction that will reinforce the existing street pattern as the building scale is appropriate for the subject block's street frontage. Furthermore, the proposal maximizes the dwelling unit density and will be in full compliance with the requirements of the Planning Code.

- **9. Planning Code Section 101.1(b)** establishes eight priority-planning policies and requires review of permits for consistency with said policies. On balance, the project complies with said policies in that:
 - A. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses be enhanced.

Existing neighborhood-serving retail uses would not be displaced or otherwise adversely affected by the proposal, as the existing building does not contain commercial 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 existing single-family dwelling is proposed to be demolished, the project will provide an additional ADU. The project proposes a height and scale compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and is consistent with the Planning Code.

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

The Project does not currently possess nor propose any affordable housing.

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

The Project replaces a single-family residence with one single-family residence and an ADU which will not generate significant commuter traffic or excess demand for parking that would impede transit or overburden neighborhood parking.

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 will not displace any service or industry establishment.

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 constructed to conform to the structural and seismic safety requirements of the Building Code. As such, this Project will improve the property's ability to withstand an earthquake.

G. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved.

The Project site is not occupied by 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 have no negative impact on existing parks and open spaces.

- **10.** 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.
- **11.** 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. 2020-005729CUA** subject to the following conditions attached hereto as "EXHIBIT A" in general conformance with plans on file, dated July 16, 2021, 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 October 28, 2021.

Jonas P. Ionin Commission Secretary

AYES:

NAYS:

ABSENT:

RECUSE:

ADOPTED: October 28, 2021



EXHIBIT A

Authorization

This authorization is for a conditional use to allow the demolition of the existing three-story single-family dwelling and the construction of a new three-story single-family dwelling with one accessory dwelling unit (ADU) located at 4 Seacliff Avenue, Block 1302, and Lot 017, pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 317 within the RH-1(D) Zoning District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District; in general conformance with plans, dated July 16, 2021, and stamped "EXHIBIT B" included in the docket for Record No. 2020-005729CUA and subject to conditions of approval reviewed and approved by the Commission on October 28, 2021 under Motion No XXXXX. 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 October 28, 2021 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 628.652.7463, <u>www.sfplanning.org</u>

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 628.652.7463, <u>www.sfplanning.org</u>

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 628.652.7463, <u>www.sfplanning.org</u>

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 628.652.7463, <u>www.sfplanning.org</u>

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 628.652.7463,



www.sfplanning.org

Design – Compliance at Plan Stage

6. Final Materials. The Project Sponsor shall continue to work with Planning Department on the building design to ensure compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood. Final materials, glazing, color, texture, landscaping, and detailing shall be subject to Department staff review and approval. The architectural addenda shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department prior to issuance.

For information about compliance, contact the Case Planner, Planning Department at 628.652.7359, <u>www.sfplanning.org</u>

Parking and Traffic

7. Bicycle Parking. The Project shall provide no fewer than two (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 628.652.7463, <u>www.sfplanning.org</u>

8. Parking Maximum. Pursuant to Planning Code Section 151, the Project shall provide no more than three (3) off-street parking spaces.

For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 628.652.7463, <u>www.sfplanning.org</u>

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 628.652.7359, <u>www.sfplanning.org</u>

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 628.652.7463, <u>www.sfplanning.org</u>

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 628.652.7463, <u>www.sfplanning.org</u>

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 628.652.7463, <u>www.sfplanning.org</u>



Exhibit B: Plans and Renderings

Conditional Use Hearing **Case Number 2020-005729CUA** 4 Seacliff Avenue



			and the second se	
OJ	ECT DA	ТА		
<:	1302 017	ZONED: HEIGHT LIMIT:	RH-1(D) 40-X (30' PER SITE CONDITION)	
IZE:	26,432 SQFT.	OCCUPANCY:	R-3	
NDITIO	ONED SPACE		PROPOSED	
EVEL F	FLOOR FLOOR FL FLOOR		790 SQFT. 965 SQFT. 44 SQFT.	
TOTAL:			1,799 SQFT.	_
ITION	ED SPACE		PROPOSED	
EVEL F	FLOOR FLOOR FLOOR (NOT INC	LUDING ADU)	2,988 SQFT. 3,504 SQFT. 2,849 SQFT.	
			PROPOSED	
WER LE	EVEL FLOOR		799 SQFT.	
TOTAL:			10,140 SQFT.	
			PROPOSED	
LING U	JNITS		1 + ADU	
			PROPOSED	
STRUCT			V-B	
51. ICA			PROPOSED	
SPRINK	(LER		YES	



BUTLER ARMSDEN RCHITECTS

1420 SUTTER STREET 1ST FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109 BUTLERARMSDEN.COM

E INFO@BUTLERARMSDEN.COM T 415-674-5554

IFF 94121 С С S ò SC ۷ ш 5 RAN S 4 u. z SA щ ENU Ş LIFF D SEA 4

SITE PERMIT

REVISIONS:		BY:
REVISION 1	5/26/2021	SK & AM
2 REVISION 2	7/16/2021	АМ

JOB#:	1920
DATE:	5/29/2020
DRAWN:	JW, SK, AM
CHECKED:	GF, JW
SCALE:	AS NOTED













1420 SUTTER STREET 1ST FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109 BUTLERARMSDEN.COM

E INFO@BUTLERARMSDEN.COM T 415-674-5554

r.	OH PA PGE RF RF TD TST TW TX UM WV	OVERHEAD PLANTER PATH EDGEL PACIFIC BELL PACIFIC BELL PACIFIC BELL PACIFIC BELL PACIFIC BELL FOR OF ENLES TOP OF ENLESS TOP OF ENLESS TOP OF DRAIN TOP OF DRAIN TOP OF DRAIN TOP OF OF WALL TOP OF OF WALL TOP OF WALL TOP OF WALL WATER METER WATER METER WATER METER WATER METER
	• <i>co</i>	SANITARY SEWER CLEANOUT
NG	DI DI	DRAIN INLET
ALL	🖂 GV	GAS VALVE
ALL	PAC	PAC BOX
RAILING	PGE	PGE BOX
The second	CATV	CABLE TELEVISION BOX
	UB	UNKNOWN UTILITY BOX
	,×	SPOT ELEVATION
	pt.pt 🖄 xxx	SURVEY CONTROL POINT
	Жк х"	TREE (TRUNK DIAMETER IN INCHES)
	WM I	WATER METER
	N WV	WATER VALVE





SITE PERMIT

REVISIONS:		BY:
REVISION 1	5/26/2021	SK & AM
		ļ

JOB#:	1920
DATE:	5/29/2020
DRAWN:	JW, SK, AM
CHECKED:	GF, JW
SCALE:	AS NOTED
	STREED ARCHITCO





.TFF 94121 S **SEA** C SAN FI ш AVENUI CLIFF

CLI

4

SEA 4

A0.2





1420 SUTTER STREET 1ST FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109 BUTLERARMSDEN.COM

E INFO@BUTLERARMSDEN.COM T 415-674-5554

CLIFF 0, CA 94121 RANCISCO, EA S 4 щ SAN щ ENU Ş CLI SEA 4

DEMO PERMIT

REVISIONS:		BY:
T REVISION 1	5/26/2021	SK & AM

1920
5/29/2020
JW, SK, AM
GF, JW
AS NOTED













SITE PERMIT

REVISIONS:





A0.5



1420 SUTTER STREET 1ST FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109 BUTLERARMSDEN.COM E INFO@BUTLERARMSDEN.COM T 415-674-5554







90 SEA CLIFF AVE

78 SEA CLIFF AVE

70 SEA CLIFF AVE

164 SEA CLIFF AVE 160 SEA CLIFF AVE



130 SEA CLIFF AVE

148 SEA CLIFF AVE

3 55 25TH AVENUE TO 15 SEA CLIFF AVENUE

66 SEA CLIFF AVE

5 25TH AV



60 SEA CLIFF AVE





OFCAL

STREET VIEWS





SITE PERMIT



50 SEA CLIFF AVE

40 SEA CLIFF AVE

45 25TH AVE 15 SEA CLIFF AVE

SEA CLIFF AV

CLIFF 0, CA 94121 4 SEA CLIFF AVENUE, SAN FRANCISCO,

1420 SUTTER STREET 1ST FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109 BUTLERARMSDEN.COM E INFO@BUTLERARMSDEN.COM T 415-674-5554





VIEW FROM 25TH AVENUE - EXISTING 2

VIEW FROM 25TH AVENUE - PROPOSED 1





1420 SUTTER STREET 1ST FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109 BUTLERARMSDEN.COM

E INFO@BUTLERARMSDEN.COM T 415-674-5554

TFF 94121 CLIFI S 4 SEA C щ AVENUI CLIFF 4 SEA





SITE PERMIT

REVISIONS:		BY:
1 REVISION 1	5/26/2021	SK & AM

JOB#:	1920
DATE:	5/29/2020
DRAWN:	JW, SK, AM
CHECKED:	GF, JW
SCALE:	AS NOTED
SCALE:	AS NOTED









GENERAL DEMOLITION NOTES

ALL DEMOLITION WORK TO BE CONDUCTED IN SUCH A MANNER AS TO PROTECT ADJACENT IT AND LANDSLAFE THANITING ID REMAIN. SOS CONTAINING MATERIALS IN EXISTING BUILDINGS TO BE IDENTIFIED AND REMOVED J. ANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE REGULATIONS. UNTED MATERIAS IN EXISTING BUILDINGS TO BE IDENTIFIED AND REMOVED IN ANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE REGULATIONS. IS ALL REQUNDANT HAVE EQUIPMENT, INCLUDING PIPING,

RK, RADIANT PANELS, AND BASEBOARD HEATERS. SAVE AND CATALOGUE DECORATIVE FOR STORAGE AND RE-USE. DANT PLUMBING IN WALL OR FLOOR CAVITIES OPENED FOR CONSTRUCTION. NDONED INTERIOR FLECTRICAL THEOLIGHCUIT REMOVE WINDOW HARDWARE ALL WINDOW COVERINGS AND RELATED

ORS TO BE DEMOLISHED OR REMOVED, REMOVE DOOR, HARDWARE, AND FRAME, U.O.N. AT DOORS TO BE DEMOLISHED OR REMOVED, REMOVE DOOR, HARDWARE, AND FRAME, U.O. AND SANES FOR RELEX. IN THE RELEX. REMAIN, U.O.N. PROTECT DURING CONSTRUCTION. DEMOLISH ALL ABANDONED GAS LINES TO MAIN POINT OF ENTRY, U.O.N. CONTRACTOR TO VERITY BEARING AND NON-BEARING STATUS OF EXISTING CONSTRUCTION TO BE DEMOLISHED BEFORE FRACEEDING WITH WORK.



1420 SUTTER STREET 1ST FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109 BUTLERARMSDEN.COM

E INFO@BUTLERARMSDEN.COM T 415-674-5554

4'-11 1/8" 2 A1.9 A1.6

CLIFF 0, CA 94121 4 SEA C щ AVENUI CLIFF SEA

4

DEMO PERMIT

REVISIONS:		BY:
REVISION 1	5/26/2021	SK & AM

JOB#:	1920
DATE:	5/29/2020
DRAWN:	JW, SK, AM
CHECKED:	GF, JW
SCALE:	AS NOTED

SED APCRIT GLENBA ILAM TC 33433



N

 (\uparrow)





1420 SUTTER STREET 1ST FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109 BUTLERARMSDEN.COM

E INFO@BUTLERARMSDEN.COM T 415-674-5554

A1.2

CLIFF 0, CA 94121 SAN FRANCISCO, SEA 4 щ AVENUI CLIFF SEA 4

DEMO PERMIT

REVISIONS:	BY:

JOB#:	1920
DATE:	5/29/2020
DRAWN:	JW, SK, AM
CHECKED:	GF, JW
SCALE:	AS NOTED







щ AVENUI CLIFF SEA

REVISIONS:	BY:

1920
5/29/2020
JW, SK, AM
GF, JW
AS NOTED







1420 SUTTER STREET 1ST FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109 BUTLERARMSDEN.COM

E INFO@BUTLERARMSDEN.COM T 415-674-5554

CLIFF 0, CA 94121 4 SEA C щ ENU **A** CLI SEA 4

DEMO PERMIT

REVISIONS:	BY:

5/29/2020
5/25/2020
JW, SK, AM
GF, JW
AS NOTED











REVISIONS:	BY:
	ы.

JOB#:	1920	
DATE:	5/29/2020	
DRAWN:	JW, SK, AM	
CHECKED:	GF, JW	
SCALE:	AS NOTED	
	STATED ARCENT	






REVISIONS:	BY:



4 SEA CLIFF SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121 4 SEA CLIFF AVENUE,

1420 SUTTER STREET 1ST FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109 BUTLERARMSDEN.COM E INFO@BUTLERARMSDEN.COM T 415-674-5554





DEMO PERMIT

REVISIONS:	BY:
-	

JOB#:	1920	
DATE:	5/29/2020	
DRAWN:	JW, SK, AM	
CHECKED:	GF, JW	
SCALE:	AS NOTED	
(SUBCOASCART	









E INFO@BUTLERARMSDEN.COM T 415-674-5554

CLIFF 20, CA 94121 4 SEA CLIFF AVENUE, SAN FRANCISCO,

DEMO PERMIT

REVISIONS:	BY:

JOB#:	1920
DATE:	5/29/2020
DRAWN:	JW, SK, AM
CHECKED:	GF, JW
SCALE:	AS NOTED
	A BED APCRITA



















REVISIONS:		BY:
T REVISION 1	5/26/2021	SK & AM
2 REVISION 2	7/16/2021	АМ
-		







E INFO@BUTLERARMSDEN.COM T 415-674-5554

CLIFF 0, CA 94121 4 SEA C AVENUE, CLIFF SEA 4

SIONS:		BY:
REVISION 1	5/26/2021	SK & AM
REVISION 2	7/16/2021	АМ
	REVISION 1	REVISION 1 5/26/2021









REVISIONS:		BY:
REVISION 1	5/26/2021	SK & AM
2 REVISION 2	7/16/2021	АМ
<u> </u>		
		_
		_

JOB#:	1920
DATE:	5/29/2020
DRAWN:	JW, SK, AM
CHECKED:	GF, JW
SCALE:	AS NOTED
	WED ARCHITS







E INFO@BUTLERARMSDEN.COM T 415-674-5554

CLIFF 0, CA 94121

4 SEA C

4 SEA CLIFF AVENUE,

SK & AM





E INFO@BUTLERARMSDEN.COM T 415-674-5554

4 SEA CLIFF AVENUE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121

SITE PERMIT

REVISIONS:		BY:
A REVISION 1	5/26/2021	SK & AM
2 REVISION 2	7/16/2021	AM
·		
-		

JOB#:	1920
DATE:	5/29/2020
DRAWN:	JW, SK, AM
CHECKED:	GF, JW
SCALE:	AS NOTED
	SEED ARCON













E INFO@BUTLERARMSDEN.COM T 415-674-5554

4 SEA CLIFF AVENUE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121

SITE PERMIT

REVISIONS:		BY:
REVISION 1	5/26/2021	SK & AM
2 REVISION 2	7/16/2021	АМ
<u> </u>		
		_
		_

JOB#:	1920
DATE:	5/29/2020
DRAWN:	JW, SK, AM
CHECKED:	GF, JW
SCALE:	AS NOTED









E INFO@BUTLERARMSDEN.COM T 415-674-5554

4 SEA CLIFF AVENUE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121

SITE PERMIT

VISIONS:		BY:
REVISION 1	5/26/2021	SK & AM
REVISION 2	7/16/2021	AM

JOB#:	1920
DATE:	5/29/2020
DRAWN:	JW, SK, AM
CHECKED:	GF, JW
SCALE:	AS NOTED





Exhibit C:

Environmental Determination

Conditional Use Hearing **Case Number 2020-005729CUA** 4 Seacliff Avenue





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

CEQA Exemption Determination

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Address		Block/Lot(s)	Block/Lot(s)	
4 SEACLIFF AVE		1302017		
Case No.		Permit No.		
2020-005729ENV				
Addition/ Alteration	Demolition (requires HRE for Category B Building)	New Construction		

Project description for Planning Department approval.

The 26,432-square-foot (sf) irregularly-shaped project site is located in the Seacliff neighborhood and abuts the Presidio and Lobos Creek. The site is located on a down-sloping parcel and is bounded by the Golden Gate National Recreation Area land (GGNRA - the Presidio) and Lobos Creek to the north, and adjacent properties to the south, east and west. Site access is provided from the north terminus of 25th Avenue. According to the project plans, there is an area of title overlap with GGNRA property. No work is proposed within that area. The project consists of the demolition of an existing 15-foot tall, 11,351 sf single-family home and its associated landscaping, and the construction of a 3-story building and associated landscaping, which would be 13-feet 5 inches above the street grade. The new building would be a 9,321 sf single family residence with an 822-sf accessory dwelling unit (ADU) at the lowest floor, and 858 sf for parking . The residential area would decrease from 11,351 sf to 9,321 sf. Usable open space would increase from 18,261 to 21,148 sf.The new structure would be constructed within the footprint of the existing structure and follow the topography of the site. The project would increase the pervious/permeable area at the site. The building and retaining walls would be supported on drilled piers extending FULL PROJECT DESCRIPTION ATTACHED

STEP 1: EXEMPTION TYPE

The project has been determined to be 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. 		
	Other		
	Common Sense Exemption (CEQA Guidelines section 15061(b)(3)). It can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility of a significant effect on the environment.		

STEP 2: ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING ASSESSMENT TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

	Air Quality: Would the project add new sensitive receptors (specifically, schools, day care facilities, hospitals, residential dwellings, and senior-care facilities within an Air Pollution Exposure Zone? Does the project have the potential to emit substantial pollutant concentrations (e.g. use of diesel construction equipment, backup diesel generators, heavy industry, diesel trucks, etc.)? (<i>refer to the Environmental</i>		
	Hazardous Materials: Maher or Cortese Is the project site located within the Maher area or on a site containing potential subsurface soil or groundwater contamination and would it involve ground disturbance of at least 50 cubic yards or a change of use from an industrial use to a residential or institutional use? Is the project site located on a Cortese site or would the project involve work on a site with an existing or former gas station, parking lot, auto repair, dry cleaners, or heavy manufacturing use, or a site with current or former underground storage tanks? <i>if Maher box is checked, note below whether the applicant has enrolled in or received a waiver from the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) Maher program, or if Environmental Planning staff has determined that hazardous material effects would be less than significant.</i> Note that a categorical exemption shall not be issued for a project located on the Cortese List		
	Transportation: Does the project involve a child care facility or school with 30 or more students, or a location 1,500 sq. ft. or greater? Does the project have the potential to adversely affect transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle safety (hazards) or the adequacy of nearby transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities? Would the project involve the intensification of or a substantial increase in vehicle trips at the project site or elsewhere in the region due to autonomous vehicle or for-hire vehicle fleet maintenance, operations or		
	Archeological Resources: Would the project result in soil disturbance/modification greater than two (2) feet below grade in an archeological sensitive area or eight (8) feet in a non-archeological sensitive area? If yes, archeology review is required.		
	Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment: Does the project site involve a subdivision or lot line adjustment on a lot with a slope average of 20% or more? (<i>refer to the Environmental Information tab on</i> https://sfplanninggis.org/PIM/) If box is checked, Environmental Planning must issue the exemption.		
	Average Slope of Parcel = or > 25%, or site is in Edgehill Slope Protection Area or Northwest Mt. Sutro Slope Protection Area: Does the project involve any of the following: (1) New building construction, except one-story storage or utility occupancy, (2) horizontal additions, if the footprint area increases more than 50%, or (3) horizontal and vertical additions increase more than 500 square feet of new projected roof area? (refer to the Environmental Information tab on https://sfplanninggis.org/PIM/) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is likely required and Environmental Planning must issue the exemption.		
	Seismic Hazard: Landslide or Liquefaction Hazard Zone: Does the project involve any of the following: (1) New building construction, except one-story storage or utility occupancy, (2) horizontal additions, if the footprint area increases more than 50%, (3) horizontal and vertical additions increase more than 500 square feet of new projected roof area, or (4) grading performed at a site in the landslide hazard zone? (refer to the Environmental Information tab on https://sfplanninggis.org/PIM/) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required and Environmental Planning must issue the exemption.		
Com	Comments and Planner Signature (optional): Benjamin Lamb		
PLE	PLEASE SEE ATTACHED		

STEP 3: PROPERTY STATUS - HISTORIC RESOURCE TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

PROPERTY IS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING: (refer to Property Information Map)		
	Category A: Known Historical Resource. GO TO STEP 5.	
	Category B: Potential Historical Resource (over 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 4.	
	Category C: Not a Historical Resource or Not Age Eligible (under 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 6.	

STEP 4: PROPOSED WORK CHECKLIST

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

Check all that apply to the project.			
	1. Change of use and new construction. Tenant improvements not included.		
	2. Regular maintenance or repair to correct or repair deterioration, decay, or damage to building.		
	3. Window replacement that meets the Department's Window Replacement Standards. Does not include storefront window alterations.		
	4. Garage work. A new opening that meets the <i>Guidelines for Adding Garages and Curb Cuts</i> , and/or replacement of a garage door in an existing opening that meets the Residential Design Guidelines.		
	5. Deck, terrace construction, or fences not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.		
	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 <i>Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 3: Dormer Windows</i> .		
	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: ADVANCED HISTORICAL REVIEW

TO BE COMPLETED BY PRESERVATION PLANNER

Check all that apply to the project.		
	1. Reclassification of property status. (Attach HRER Part I)	
	Reclassify to Category A Reclassify to Category C a. Per HRER (No further historic review) b. Other (specify): (No further historic review)	
	2. Project involves a known historical resource (CEQA Category A) as determined by Step 3 and conforms entirely to proposed work checklist in Step 4.	
	 Interior alterations to publicly accessible spaces that do not remove, alter, or obscure character defining features. 	
	4. Window replacement of original/historic windows that are not "in-kind" but are consistent with existing historic character.	
	5. Façade/storefront alterations that do not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.	

	 Raising the building in a manner that does not rem features. 	ove, alter, or obscure character-defining	
	7. Restoration based upon documented evidence of a photographs, plans, physical evidence, or similar build	-	
	8. Work consistent with the Secretary of the Interior S (Analysis required):	tandards for the Treatment of Historic Properties	
	9. Work compatible with a historic district (Analysis re	quired):	
	10. Work that would not materially impair a historic r	esource (Attach HRER Part II).	
	Note: If ANY box in STEP 5 above is checked	d, a Preservation Planner MUST sign below.	
	Project can proceed with exemption review . The project has been reviewed by the Preservation Planner and can proceed with exemption review. GO TO STEP 6 .		
Comments (optional): PLEASE SEE ATTACHED			
Preser	vation Planner Signature: Michelle A Taylor		
STE	P 6: EXEMPTION DETERMINATION		
-	E COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER		
	No further environmental review is required. The pro unusual circumstances that would result in a reasor		
	Project Approval Action:	Signature:	
	Planning Commission Hearing	Benjamin Lamb	
		10/20/2021	
	Supporting documents are available for review on the San Francisco Property Information Map, which can be accessed at https://sfplanninggis.org/PIM/. Individual files can be viewed by clicking on the Planning Applications link, clicking the "More Details" link under the project's environmental record number (ENV) and then clicking on the "Related Documents" link. Once signed or stamped and dated, this document constitutes an exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code.		
	In accordance with Chapter 21 of the Cap Francisco Administrative (

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

Full Project Description

The 26,432-square-foot (sf) irregularly-shaped project site is located in the Seacliff neighborhood and abuts the Presidio and Lobos Creek. The site is located on a down-sloping parcel and is bounded by the Golden Gate National Recreation Area land (GGNRA - the Presidio) and Lobos Creek to the north, and adjacent properties to the south, east and west. Site access is provided from the north terminus of 25th Avenue. According to the project plans, there is an area of title overlap with GGNRA property. No work is proposed within that area.

The project consists of the demolition of an existing 15-foot tall, 11,351 sf single-family home and its associated landscaping, and the construction of a 3-story building and associated landscaping, which would be 13-feet 5 inches above the street grade. The new building would be a 9,321 sf single family residence with an 822-sf accessory dwelling unit (ADU) at the lowest floor, and 858 sf for parking . The residential area would decrease from 11,351 sf to 9,321 sf. Usable open space would increase from 18,261 to 21,148 sf.

The new structure would be constructed within the footprint of the existing structure and follow the topography of the site. The project would increase the pervious/permeable area at the site. The building and retaining walls would be supported on drilled piers extending into the competent Colma Formation or bedrock. Excavations of up to 10 to 15 feet are anticipated.

Step 2: Environmental Screening Comments

Geology and Soils: A preliminary geotechnical report was prepared by Rollo and Ridley (qualified geotechnical engineers) on 05/01/2020. The project site includes area that is identified as a liquefaction hazard zone and as having 25% slope, may be subject to city's Slope and Seismic Hazard Zone Protection Act as determined by the building department. The report concludes that the site can be developed as proposed with the incorporation of geotechnical recommendations into the final design. During the building department review of the building permit, the project's structural construction documents would be reviewed by the building department for conformance with the recommendations in the geotechnical report as well as compliance with building code requirements for adequate site drainage. The building department would determine if further geotechnical review and technical reports are required. An erosion and sediment control plan during construction is provided.

Archeological Resources: Preliminary archeological review 12/14/2020 determined that no CEQA-significant archeological resources are expected within project-affected soils.

Lobos Creek Management Area: The project site is located in the Lobos Creek Conservation Area established by San Francisco City Planning Commission Resolution No. 14080 (March 14, 1996) and is therefore subject to permit review procedures as outlined in the Lobos Creek Conservation Area Standard Best Management Practices (BMPs) (guidance document). The guidance document provides BMPS to protect water quality, flow, erosion control and slope protection that must be incorporated into projects within the designated conservation area. The project as designed incorporates BMPs (an erosion control plan) to protect slope stability and minimize erosion to the creek during construction and after construction is complete. The project is also subject to the Construction Site Runoff Ordinance (Public Works Code Sec 146). The erosion and sediment control plan and excavation plan provided include the use of fiber rolls, a silt fence, XXX. According to the Utility Plan (drawing C3.1), an ejector pump at the lowest level would be used to pump to the street level and connect to the city sewer system and all downspouts from the proposed structure would drain into an infiltration system. The project is also subject to the Stormwater Management Ordinance (Public Works Code, Article 4.2 Sections 147-147.6), which requires the project incorporate a stormwater control plan meeting performance standards that would be reviewed and approved by the SFPUC. The project would reduce impervious surface at the site by using permeable paving and an infiltration system as described in the project plan set. Therefore, the project complies with best management practices of the conservation area resolution and is subject to further review by the building department and the SFPUC under state and local ordinances.

Step 5: Advanced Historical Review Comments

The existing building is not an individual resource and does not contribute to the CA-Register Sea Cliff Historic District. Demolition of the existing building and new construction of new SFH with ADU will not result in a material impairment of the historic district. See HRER Part 2 for analysis.

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

MODIFIED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Modified Project Description:

DETERMINATION IF PROJECT CONSTITUTES SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

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

DETERMINATION OF NO SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

Plan	Planner Name: Date:		
approv Depart	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		
If this box is checked, the proposed modifications are exempt under CEQA, in accordance with prior project			
	The proposed modification wo	uld not result in any of the above changes.	

Exhibit D:

Lobos Creek Conservation Area – Standard Best Management Practices

Lobos Creek Conservation Area Standard Best Management Practices

(pursuant to March 14, 1996 Planning Commission Resolution No. 14080)

Lobos Creek Conservation Area Permit Review Procedures

The Planning Department has prepared this document to guide building permit applicants through the permit submittal process for properties included within the Lobos Creek Conservation Area, designated as such by the Planning Commission on March 14, 1996 by Resolution No. 14080. The 43 properties included within the Lobos Creek Conservation Area are zoned residential and would be required to comply with the residential zoning standards of the City Planning Code, including Section 311 which defines neighborhood notification procedures. The Lobos Creek Conservation Area permit review procedures do not supersede those regulation, but, rather, require further information needed to review permits for construction on the slopes of those 43 properties.

Application Materials

In addition to the materials required for Residential Building Permit Applications, described in the February 28, 1996 "Building Permit Application Packet" available at the Planning Information Counter, First Floor, 1660 Mission Street, San Francisco, the following information will be required for Planning Department permit review of applications for the following properties:

Assessor's Blocks and Lots

1301/Lots 14 and 20; 1302/Lots 1A, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7,17,19, 21; 1335/Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9A,10,11,12,14; 1337/Lots 1, 22; 1338/Lots 1, 21; 1339/Lots 1, 2; 1340/Lots 1, 14, 15; 1341/Lots 14, 20, 22, 23, 24; 1342/Lots 1,16, 17; and 1343/Lot 13.

1. Site Survey

Site surveys are required for submittals of new construction and horizontal additions in Residential neighborhoods. The site surveys for the Lobos Creek Conservation Area differ somewhat in that they require specific information about construction to take place on the slopes of the property. For the 43 properties subject to the Lobos Creek DR policy, site surveys will be required for all development on land not currently developed with a structure. The site survey must be signed by a licensed surveyor or engineer. The following must be included:

- a. Clear dimensional delineation of the lot property lines.
- b. Clear dimensional delineation of all structures on the lot and on adjacent abutting lots.
- c. Contour lines at five foot intervals in relation to adjacent lots, including the creekbed.

Lobos Greek Conservation Area

Best Management Practices

- d. Curb elevation in line with the mid-point of the subject building and those on adjacent lots.
- e. For new construction or additions of structures, roof elevations including the elevation of eaves and peaks of pitched roofs.
- f. Utility lines, major designations of vegetation, retaining walls, etc. on the site.

2. Soil Report

A soil report shall be required for all development on slopes greater than 30 percent, on flat portions of the property which are close to the slope, and where there would be any piles or piers installed, pursuant to the attached January 3, 1996 Department of Building Inspection Memorandum regarding soil report requirements, particularly item numbers 3 and 4.

3. Cross-Section Drawing

A cross-sectional drawing of the property with the proposed development shown in relation to the slope shall be required.

4. Best Management Practices

Planning Commission Resolution No. 14080 states that the Commission would consider exercise of its Discretionary Review (DR) power over any permit application for construction on a slope greater than 30 percent which:

- (1) Proposes construction of any structure which constitutes an expansion of building site coverage and would normally be reviewed by the Planning Department under current Residential zoning controls applicable to the specific property or to those in effect at the time of permit application, exclusive of vertical additions or repair, restoration or maintenance of any structure in existence at the time of adoption of the DR policy (see Table 1), and "Act of God" replacement provisions of Section 181(d) of the Planning Code; and
- (2) Proposes construction of any structure, deck or fence on any portion of the property with a slope greater than 30 percent or for which, during construction, construction machinery, equipment or materials would significantly alter any portion of the property with a slope greater than 30 percent (see Tables 2a, 2b and 2c); and
- (3) Which does not include construction management practices, called Best Management Practices (BMPs), which, in the opinion of the Zoning Administrator upon joint review with the Department of Building Inspection (DBI), does not (a) adequately protect slope stability, (b) minimize erosion to the creek during construction and after construction is complete, (c) protect seeps, springs and underground water channels feeding the creek, and (d) minimize run-off and other contaminants to the creek (see Table 3).

Should the Zoning Administrator determine that the permit application and BMPs adequately address concerns for riparian water quality, flow, erosion control and slope protection, the permit would be approved administratively. However, should

2

the Zoning Administrator determine that the permit application does not include adequate BMPs, the Zoning Administrator will calendar the permit for Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission with the recommendation that the Planning Commission review the permit with the intent of requiring inclusion of adequate BMPs or disapproval of the permit application.

3

-Best-Management Practices

Things that need a Permit	Bidg Dept	Ping Dept.	If in slope area, things that need BMP
Remove vegetation	no	no	no
Plant vegetation	no	no	no
New structures	У	у	y, BMP #'s 1,2,3,4,5
Repair existing structures	У		no
Building additions	у	у	y, BMP #'s 1,2,3
Fence <u>under 4 ft</u> over 4 ft	¥	<u>no</u> y	<u>no</u> y, BMP #2
Retaining wall <u>under 4 ft</u> over 4 ft	<u>no</u> y	no no	no no
Decks <u>under 3 ft</u> over 3 ft	<u> </u>	no y	<u>no</u> y, BMP #'s 2,3,5
Interior Alterations	у	у	no
Roof Repair	у	no	no
Foundation Repair	у	по	no
Driveway	у	no	no
Curb Cut over 10 ft	· y	У	no
Grading	у	n	no

Table 1: Lobos Creek Permit Review List

Lobos Creek Conservation Area

Best Management Practices

Table 2a: Generalized description of the Lobos Creek Conservation Area within a typical "upstream" property where the side yard of an RH-1 zoned property faces the creekbank/NPS property line.



Table 2b: Generalized description of the Lobos Creek Conservation Area within a typical "upstream" property where the rear yard of an RH-1 (D) property faces the creekbank/NPS property line.

Site Characteristics: The property entered from West Clay Street.



Lobos Creek Conservation Area

Best Management Practices

Table 2c: Generalized description of the Lobos Creek Conservation Area within a typical "downstream" property where the rear yard meets the centerline of the creekbed.



March 14, 1996 Lobos Creek Best Management Practices

1. Site Planning. The Site Planning BMP for development of lots abutting a waterway is generally to locate structures and driveways on lots in such a way as to minimize land disturbance, particularly of sloped land, and minimize impervious surfaces. It is a good practice to minimize earth movement and avoid steep slopes. If possible, fit development to the terrain. Design and locate houses, garages and driveways to minimize cuts and fills. Cutting into slopes not only makes them steeper and thus more erodible, but may damage important aquifer water channelling systems and plant root systems. Placing fill on slopes creates loose soil prone to erosion and covers root system infiltration areas. Stepped foundations, staggered floor levels and stairs or walkway entrances also reduce slope cutting and erosion potential. Erosion potential is closely related to slope steepness and slope length. The longer and steeper a slope is, the greater the erosion potential. Vegetation is much more difficult to establish on steep slopes. The more natural "upstream" area of the creek (east of Lincoln Blvd.) features steep slopes which are extremely difficult to revegetate.

Construction within the southern creekbank slope would remove protective vegetation and could destabilize vulnerable slopes, causing erosion and disturbing wildlife habitat. Measures to (1) minimize impermeable surfaces; (2) stabilize slopes; (3) channel to sewers run-off from roofs, paved areas and other impermeable surfaces; and (4) re-vegetate with natural vegetation or other vegetation of similar qualities should be implemented.

2. Water Distribution to the Creek. Avoid diverting water from groundwater or natural surface sources which feed the creek. Subsurface structures such as footings, posts, piers, piles, poles, foundations, retaining walls, basements, or pipes can alter the underground aquifer and groundwater distribution system for the creek, particularly for properties near the natural springs from 17th to 22nd Avenues. Care must be taken to avoid such alteration, or if necessary, to re-direct the creek's natural groundwater channeling/distribution system.

Design, Develop and Maintain Erosion Control Measures. Schedule grading and 3. construction activities to minimize soil exposure during the rainy season. Trap sediment onsite during construction by installing straw bales, filter fences or sandbags below disturbed areas at the base of exposed slopes or along streets, curbs and property lines (below disturbed areas). Minimize length and steepness of slopes. Retain and protect natural vegetation on-site. Seed and mulch cleared areas after grading is completed and install slope netting. The mulch will protect the soil until the vegetation gets established. Whenever possible, filter runoff from impervious surfaces such as driveways, roofs and decks and direct these to the City sewer system. Keep runoff velocities low by preserving site vegetation, dividing runoff into several channels rather than one, by constructing flow barriers at frequent intervals, and by lining channels with rough materials such as rocks. Slopes that are cut for building construction are sometimes so steep that vegetation cannot adequately protect them. Runoff from these oversteepened slopes often erodes the toe of the slope, causing continued slope slippage. In these situations, retaining walls can be constructed using rocks, redwood or treated wood, rock-filled baskets, ties, concrete or steel.

8

Best Management Practices

4. Sewer Systems in newly constructed homes. In new construction of homes where sewer lines lie at lower elevations from the City's sewer lines, pumps and ejector systems are required to pump sewerage up to the City's system. Should such systems be installed outdoors, developers should also install leak detection monitoring and warning systems on on-site sewer systems, including a secondary, "back-up" catchment basin to contain sewer in the event of a break or other system failure. This is to protect the groundwater from contamination.

Generally, natural vegetation is the most efficient form of erosion Vegetation. 5. control. Whenever possible, naturally vegetated areas should be protected for soil stability. The natural plant-soil complex can treat runoff better than any artificial infiltration system. Vegetation stabilizes soil, reduces raindrop impact, reduces velocity of surface runoff, prevents wind and water erosion, and enhances natural beauty. The use of native plants is a BMP because those species require less fertilizer and irrigation than other species and often "hug" and stabilize steep slopes best. Avoid "improving" the creekside area by clearing or stripping vegetation unnecessarily. Remove only non-native vegetation and only if you immediately revegetate with native species or other vegetation of similar qualities. A healthy creekbank needs undisturbed soil and vegetation. Creekside trees, vines, shrubs, grasses, and reeds are an essential part of the stream ecology. Native riparian plants not only provide critical wildlife habitat, they also directly affect living conditions in the creek itself. Creekside plants provide shade, lowering water temperatures and creating hiding cover for fish and other organisms. Leaves and insects droppings from nearby trees and bushes supply food for many creek dwellers, while plant roots stabilize the bank, preventing erosion.

6. **Fertilizers and Pesticides.** Many yard and garden chemicals are extremely toxic to aquatic organisms and inhabitants of the riparian community, such as birds. Even small amounts of these compounds entering creeks in airborne droplets as you spray or in irrigation runoff or percolation to the groundwater can affect stream life. Never apply herbicides or pesticides within the steep slope creekside zone and exercise caution when applying them on adjacent areas as well, taking care to minimize any possible wind drift, percolation to the groundwater or washing to the creek.

7. Creekside Visitors. Domestic animals and human visitors can easily disrupt the creek environment. If uncontrolled, visitors can frighten wildlife in the riparian corridor, harvest native vegetation, trample vegetation, leave trash, and contaminate local water supplies. Fecal waste from pets, humans and wildlife can cause excessive coliform levels, degrading water quality of the Presidio's main drinking water source. Measures should be taken to eliminate direct access to the creek from abutting properties.

8. Creek Channel Conditions. Woody debris, such as fallen leaves and branches, provide an important source of cover, food, and shelter for fish and other creek dwellers. Such debris can also provide natural protection for creek banks. In general, do not remove these materials unless they have or will cause a problem or unless you would immediately replace them with native vegetation or vegetation with similar qualities.

9

DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION



City & County of San Francisco 1660 Mission Street, San Francisco, California 94103-2414

MEMORANDUM

To: William Wong, Deputy Director

From: Hanson Tom, Manager of PCSD

Date: January 3, 1996

Subject: Soil Report Requirements

In the past years, the Plan Check Service Division (PCSD) has adopted the following criteria of requesting for a Soil Report:

- (1) All new buildings and all horizontal additions to buildings that increase the ground floor area more than 50% or 2500 square feet that are within the boundaries of the areas of the landslide map identified by "Blume Report". The landslide map is available in PCSD.
- (2) Design that exceeds the limitation of Section 1805, 1995 SFBC (Section 2906, 1992 SFBC).
- (3) Where the total cut either exceeds 10 feet in vertical height, or where the cut slope is steeper than 2 horizontal to 1 vertical, or where the top of the cut-bank is less horizontal distance from any structure than the depth to the bank height.

(4) Any special foundation design such as piles, piers, base isolation will require a soil report .

(5) All structures that use Dynamic Lateral-Force Procedure, Section 1629, 1995 SFBC, (Section 2335, 1992 SFBC).

All soil reports must be stamped and signed by a licensed Geotechnical Engineer or Civil Engineer who has experience in soil engineering.

Approximately 99.5% of all soil reports submitted are reviewed by the licensed engineers in Plan Check Service Division. Special or complex designs such as Dynamic Lateral-Force Procedure, base isolation system, which usually beyond the capacity of the engineering service of the Plan Check Division, then a structural advisory committee will be established to advice the Department on matters pertaining to the design and construction of building with special features.

cc: · W. Lau J. Ma



Lobos Creek Conservation Area

Planning Department

Best Management Practices

SAN FRANCISCO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 14080

WHEREAS, Lobos Creek is one of the last two remaining free-flowing natural creeks in the City and the Environmental Protection Element of the City's Master Plan seeks to "Conserve and protect the natural resources of San Francisco" [Policy 1], "Improve the quality of natural resources" [Policy 2], and "Restore and replenish the supply of natural resources" [Policy 3]"; and

WHEREAS, Lobos Creek has been designated by the National Parks Service as the principal supply of drinking water for the Presidio; and

WHEREAS, Lobos Creek, as a naturally-flowing fresh water supply, may be called upon as an emergency or supplemental drinking water supply in the event of a major earthquake or another disaster that disables or limits Lake Merced as an emergency water supply; and

WHEREAS, The National Parks Service is preparing a Lobos Creek Restoration Plan which would restore much of the creek and creekbank areas which have been disturbed in previous years; and

WHEREAS, The Department of Building Inspection is concerned about development of property on slopes steeper than 2 horizontal to 1 vertical (greater than 30 percent slopes) and other potential soil stability problems; and

WHEREAS, Forty-three (43) private properties within the City and County of San Francisco lie in close proximity to the Presidio Park southwestern boundary and Lobos Creek and portions of these properties feature slopes greater than 30 percent on moist and sandy soil; and

WHEREAS, Certain types of construction activities which are permitted by Residential zoning controls for these properties [RH-1 and RH-1 (D)] and which could take place on slopes greater than 30 percent on these properties, may pose problems of erosion or interference with ground water flow which could diminish the water quality and/or quantity of creek flow and/or could adversely affect wildlife habitat of the creek's riparian habitat, or could diminish slope stability such that homes built on or above the slope could be harmed; and

WHEREAS, Certain types of construction activities which may take place on the slopes of these forty-three properties could increase urban run-off and contaminants flowing to the creek; and

WHEREAS, Certain construction design and construction management practices, called Best Management Practices (BMPs), can mitigate potential harm to the Creek from erosion, damage to groundwater channels, springs or seeps, or from contamination from increased run-off; and

Lobos Creek Conservation Area

Best Management Practices

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission has determined that a discretionary review process for certain construction activities proposed for slopes greater than 30 percent on properties in close proximity to the Lobos Creek southbank may adequately protect Lobos Creek because it will allow the evaluation of individual permit applications on a case-by-case basis; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission has determined that implementation of BMPs or equivalent construction management practices for structures, such as new buildings, horizontal building additions, and decks over three feet in height, on certain properties with slopes greater than 30 percent near the Lobos Creek southbank could minimize potential harm to the Creek from erosion, damage to groundwater channels, springs or seeps, of from contamination from increased run-off; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission finds that construction of fences over four feet and certain decks over three feet within the slopes exceeding 30 percent of properties near Lobos Creek may have an adverse impact on erosion, groundwater channels, springs or seeps, and contamination from increased runoff, and, therefore, applications for these construction activities should require neighborhood notification to allow abutting property owners, other interested organizations, and the Planning Department to review the proposed activities on a case-by-case basis; and

WHEREAS, These Best Management Practices (BMPs) or equivalent construction management practices are not required standards within the Planning Code for the RH-1 or RH-1 (D) Districts; and

WHEREAS, The 43 properties in close proximity to Lobos Creek and which feature slopes greater than 30 percent lie within the RH-1 or RH-1(D) Districts and require thirty day neighborhood notification pursuant to Section 311 of the City Planning Code for permit applications for new construction or certain building additions in Residential Districts; and

WHEREAS, Section 311 does not require neighborhood notification for fences, certain decks or other permitted obstructions in side or rear yards which may take place within the slopes greater than 30 percent on properties which are in close proximity to Lobos Creek and which may be of concern to abutting property owners, including the National Park Service, and other interested organizations.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the Planning Commission intends to exercise its power of discretionary review over any permit application for construction of a structure, fence, deck, addition or any other feature which the Planning Department would normally review if the construction would take place on or construction equipment would significantly alter land with slopes steeper than 2 horizontal to 1 vertical (greater than 30 percent slope) and the permit application does not incorporate construction management practices, called Best Management Practices or equivalent practices, which, in the opinion of the Zoning Administrator, after consultation with the Department of Building Inspection, satisfies the goals of (1) protecting the stability of the slope, (2) minimizing erosion during construction, (3) minimizing erosion of the slope after construction by conducting appropriate re-vegetation

13
Planning Department

Best Management Practices

and/or landscaping, (4) mitigating any potential damage to the natural groundwater distribution system to the creek including springs and seeps that feed the creek in the area from 17th to 22nd Avenues; and (5) minimizing run-off and other contamination to the creek's water supply; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Planning Department will

(1) establish a permit review procedure which will inform potential applicants of the recommended Best Management Practices to be included with permit applications;

(2) recommend to the Planning Commission for adoption, refinement or amendments to the Best Management Practices (BMPs) as site specific experience by both private property owners, City Agencies and the National Park Service identify efficient and effective measures to protect the creek and slope. The Department will provide handouts describing the current BMPs and permit review procedures at the Planning Information Counter, or its equivalent, to prospective applicants;

(3) establish a joint review procedure with the Department of Building Inspection and any other City agency as necessary to review permits for construction on the slopes of these 43 properties;

(4) prior to Department action on a permit application, notify abutting property owners, the National Park Service, and other interested organizations of permit applications for structures within the slope area as provided by the Planning Code, provided, however, that this public review period shall run no longer than the notification required pursuant to Section 311 of the Planning Code and an application may be denied if continuance or delay of action on the application would result in an application being deemed approved pursuant to Government Code Sections 65920 et seq.; and

(5) review permit applications for consistency with the City Planning Code, for consistency with the Master Plan, for consistency with any applicable California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) provisions, and review measures taken to implement BMPs or equivalent construction management practices for adequacy regarding the goals of protection of slope stability, water quality and quantity of flow, and riparian habitat protection; if the Zoning Administrator deems that the proposed permit application does not include BMPs or that the BMPs do not adequately fulfill the previously described creek protection goals, the Zoning Administrator will calendar a Discretionary Review public hearing before the Planning Commission to review the permit application for consideration of imposition of BMPs or equivalent construction management practices to mitigate potential harm to the creek bank slopes, water quality or supply, or riparian habitat or for disapproval of the permit application; and Planning Department

Lobos Creek Conservation Area

Boot Management Practices

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That this permit review procedure for the 43 properties lying in close proximity to Lobos Creek southbank does not supersede any permit review procedures or any zoning requirements or regulations currently required by the City Planning Code for the applicable residential zoning district or required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That this permit review procedure shall not apply to permit applications for repair, restoration or maintenance of any legally existing structures on the forty-three subject properties, including replacement structures subject to the `Act of God' provisions of Section 181(d) of the Planning Code, nor will it apply to any interior remodeling work or vertical additions to existing structures which do not extend beyond the current "footprint" of the property; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the 43 properties to be included within the "Lobos Creek Conservation Area", which is the subject of this Discretionary Review Policy, are as follows:

Assessor's Blocks and Lots 1301/Lots 14 and 20; 1302/Lots 1A, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7,17,19, 21; 1335/Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9A,10,11,12,14; 1337/Lots 1, 22; 1338/Lots 1, 21; 1339/Lots 1, 2; 1340/Lots 1, 14, 15; 1341/Lots 14, 20, 22, 23, 24; 1342/Lots 1,16, 17; and 1343/Lot 13.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED by the City Planning Commission at its regular meeting of March 14, 1996.

> Linda Avery, Commission Secretary

AYES: Commissioners Chincilla, Hayden, Lowenberg, Marks, Martin and Mills NOES: None ABSENT: Commissioner Levine

Exhibit E: Land Use Data





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

LAND USE INFORMATION

PROJECT ADDRESS: 4 SEACLIFF AVE RECORD NO.: 2020-005729CUA

	EXISTING	PROPOSED	NET NEW		
GROSS SQUARE FOOTAGE (GSF)					
Parking GSF	510	790	790		
Residential GSF	11,351	10,140	10,140		
Usable Open Space	18,261	22,797	22,797		
Other ()					
TOTAL GSF	11,861	10,930	10,930		
	EXISTING	NET NEW	TOTALS		
PROJECT FEATURES (Units or Amounts)					
Dwelling Units - Affordable	0	0	0		
Dwelling Units - Market Rate	1	2			
Dwelling Units - Total	1	2	2		
Number of Buildings 1		1	1		
Number of Stories 3		3	3		
Parking Spaces	2	2	2		
Bicycle Spaces	0	2	2		

	EXISTING	PROPOSED	NET NEW		
LAND USE - RESIDENTIAL					
Studio Units	0	0	0		
One Bedroom Units	0	0	0		
Two Bedroom Units	0	0	0		
Three Bedroom (or +) Units	1	1	1		
Accessory Dwelling Units	0	1	1		

Exhibit F:

Maps and Context Photos

Parcel Map



Sanborn Map*



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



Zoning Map



 \mathbf{k}

Height & Bulk Map



SUBJECT PROPERTY

 $\mathbf{\Theta}$

Aerial Photo

(facing north)



SUBJECT PROPERTY



Aerial Photo

(facing south)







Street Photo

(facing north)







Exhibit G: Project Sponsor Brief

REUBEN, JUNIUS & ROSE, LLP

Daniel A. Frattin dfrattin@reubenlaw.com

October 19, 2021

Delivered Via Email

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

> Re: 4 Sea Cliff Avenue Project Sponsor Submittal Planning Department Case No. 2020-005729CUA Hearing Date: October 28, 2021 Our File No.: 11604.01

Dear President Koppel and Commissioners:

Our office is working with 418 Ventures LLC, the property owner and sponsor of the proposed project at 4 Sea Cliff Avenue (the "Property"), in a neighborhood noted for its larger properties and larger homes. At approximately 26,432 square feet in lot area, the Property is larger than average. It is perched on the edge of the Sea Cliff neighborhood, above Baker Beach, and adjacent to the Presidio National Park. The Property is located in the City's lowest density residential Zoning District, RH-1(D).

The proposed project would demolish the existing 11,351 square-foot, three-story, single-family home at the Property and construct a new 9,341 square-foot, three-story, single-family residence with a 799 square-foot accessory dwelling unit ("ADU"). The Project will replace the existing home with a new design that better incorporates the home in the landscape and improves the siting on the Property, making it more compatible with the neighborhood, more sensitive to the surrounding environment, and more environmentally sustainable. Due to the downslope of the Property, the new home would appear to be one story as seen from the street.

The Project requires a Conditional Use Authorization ("CUA") pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 317(g)(6) for the residential demolition. We respectfully request that the Planning Commission approve the CUA and the Project as proposed for the following reasons:

• The Project is a rare example of a replacement home in San Francisco that has a smaller floor area, reduced lot coverage, reduced height, and increased setbacks, even with the ADU. (Exhibits A and B.) The existing home was built in 1956 and is outdated in its functionality, siting, neighborhood character, and the environment. The home requires significant structural improvements. The new home acknowledges its location with a

Planning Commission October 19, 2021 Page 2

> design that is compatible with the neighborhood and its topography. It will blend better with its surroundings when viewed from the street and nearby open spaces. Siting the garage closer to the street and shortening the length of the driveway will improve vehicle access and traffic flow. The number of bedrooms will remain the same in the new home, and one additional bedroom will be added with the ADU.

- The Project's design in part derives from and reinforces other nearby homes such as 890 El Camino Del Mar, 535 El Camino Del Mar, and 12 25th Ave. Given the presence of the Presidio to the east and north, the design resonates in particular with 890 El Camino Del Mar, which has Lincoln Park to its west. Both properties are architecturally addressing a different context than the more typical Sea Cliff neighborhood lot: they provide a transition between parkland and residential streets. The Project emulates the vertical wood siding from the street front of 890 El Camino Del Mar, with its quiet and modest appearance that blends into the surroundings. (Exhibit C.) The Project also draws from 535 El Camino Del Mar and the simplicity of the facades mostly cladded in stained horizontal wood siding, the large opening, and the lack of ornamentation. (Exhibit D.) The low one-story street façade of the Project enhances the view of the Golden Gate Bridge and the Marin Headlands for anyone walking down 25th Avenue (Exhibit E), and improves the appearance of the Project from both 25th Avenue (Exhibit F) and Baker Beach (Exhibit G).
- The existing home is not a historic resource. (Exhibit H.) Preservation staff found that the building represents an unexceptional example of ranch-style architecture that has undergone several alterations. The architects were not notable, and the building is not an example of a rare construction type. The building was constructed outside of the period of significance of the Sea Cliff Historic District.
- We know of no neighborhood opposition to the Project, and the Project is strongly supported by the three adjacent neighbors.

Staff recommends approval of the Project as proposed and we respectfully request the Planning Commission adopt Staff's recommendation.

I. THE FINDINGS OF PLANNING CODE SECTIONS 303 AND 317 ARE MET

A. Section 303

Under Planning Code section 303(c), the City Planning Commission shall approve the application and authorize a conditional use if the facts presented establish the following:

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

The Project is necessary and desirable because it will replace a single-family home that is more than 60 years old and in need of structural improvements with a new single-family home and one naturally affordable accessory dwelling unit. The Project will reduce not only the floor area and greatly minimize lot coverage and locate the structure more appropriately on the Property by increasing the setbacks on the eastern and western property lines and moving the home slightly farther from the street. It will also reduce the height and blend better with its surroundings when viewed from the street and nearby open spaces. Siting the garage closer to the street and shortening the length of the driveway will improve vehicle access and traffic flow. The Project has been carefully designed to be compatible with the surrounding properties and overall neighborhood character and more sensitive to the environment.

The Project will provide a structurally sound building, replacing one that was built in 1956 and needs significant structural improvements. –The Project will reduce the size, height, and intensity of the structure and improve its location on the hillside. Viewed from the street, the proposed home appears as a one story home, with two additional stories provided below street grade on the down-sloping lot. Its apparent size is considerably smaller than that of other homes in the neighborhood, and its reduced height will improve views of the Golden Gate Bridge from 25th Avenue.

The Project is desirable because it is compatible with the intent and design of the residential neighborhood and Sea Cliff community. It is compatible with the RH-1(D) zoning district, which is characterized almost exclusively by single-family homes. The RH-1(D) zoning district has large units suitable for family occupancy and open space.

The Project size is desirable because it improves the Property's compatibility with the neighborhood. The Project reduces the height of the structure and the overall floor area. The Project reduces the footprint from 31% lot coverage to 22%. The height of the new structure will be 13'5", when measured from the curb, with a much flatter roof, whereas the existing height exceeds 17 at its highest point.

In summary, the Project is necessary, desirable, and compatible with the neighborhood and community because it revitalizes the outdated, structurally deficient, and awkward development of the Property. The Project sites the structure more appropriately in the hillside, away from Property boundaries, and reduces its size. It also increases dwelling units while decreasing height, floor area, and lot coverage.

- 2. That such use or feature as proposed will not be detrimental to the health, safety, convenience or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity, or injurious to property, improvements or potential development in the vicinity, with respect to aspects including but not limited to the following:
 - (a) The nature of the proposed site, including its size and shape, and the proposed size, shape and arrangement of the structure.

The Project will result in a residential structure that is appropriate in both size and shape for the site. The Project will be smaller in footprint and overall square footage than the existing structure. The Project will provide all required setbacks from the property lines and will be consistent with the height and setbacks of adjoining properties.

The Project design better incorporates the structure into the size, shape, and location on the site. The Project will increase privacy and increase access to light and air by increasing setbacks and reducing the height of the structure. The structure will be an average of 46 feet from the required setback on the east. On the west, the structure is an average of 4 feet from the required setback on the ground floor, and set back further on upper floors. The new structure will replace the 17-foot tall structure with one that is 13'-5", measured from curb level.

The Project features such as landscaping, screening, and open space benefit the natural topography of the surrounding properties, parks, and beach. The Project will provide open space in the form of yards, decks, and private outdoor areas. The Project will be landscaped and planted with material that respect the natural topography of the site and are complementary to the vegetation in the community and parks nearby. The Project will meet all relevant design guidelines, including the Residential Design Guidelines.

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

The Project will have little impact on street parking and traffic because it is a residential home consistent with other homes in the neighborhood. The Project preserves on-street parking because it provides vehicle and bicycle parking for residents on-site. The existing driveway is narrow, and vehicles reverse into the street with limited visibility. The Project improves vehicle access and a driver's visibility by relocating the driveway. The Property is on a cul-de-sac and vehicle traffic for the Project will be low and similar to that of the neighborhood.

The Project site is located near the 1 and 29 bus lines, allowing for easy public transit when needed. The 1 line provides east/west movement across the City, while the 29 proves north/south movement along the coast.

The Project site is in close proximity to public open spaces, trails, and beaches, reducing the need for vehicular travel. Residents can access the walking and biking paths nearby without a need to drive.

REUBEN, JUNIUS & ROSE, LLP

Planning Commission October 19, 2021 Page 5

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

The residential structure naturally will not contribute noxious or offensive emissions. The Project will comply with all applicable regulations regarding construction noise and dust, and will not produce, or include, any permanent uses that will generate noxious or offensive emissions, such as excessive noise, glare, dust, and odor.

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

The Project will give particular attention to landscaping, screening, open space, parking, and lighting, to be compatible with the neighborhood. The Project proposes new trees along the southern property line and a garden in the eastern yard along the slope. Parking spaces are provided within an enclosed garage. The driveway and garbage area are screened from view. The Project will have 11% more usable open space than what currently exists.

The Project will meet all relevant design guidelines, including the Residential Design Guidelines. It does not include loading and service areas.

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:

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:

General Plan

HOUSING

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

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

The Project is consistent with this policy because it proposes to demolish a single-family home with structural deficiencies and replace it with a structurally sound single-family building and an ADU.

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

REUBEN, JUNIUS & ROSE, LLP

Planning Commission October 19, 2021 Page 6

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

The Project proposes to replace a five-bedroom single-family home with an updated, more functional five-bedroom single-family home that is appropriate for families with children and an ADU.

- **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.

The Project meets this policy because it improves the property with a contemporary design that respects the neighborhood character by promoting open space and setbacks. The Project is more sensitive to the natural topography than the existing building. The Project also provides a needed update to the Property to keep it consistent with other improvements in the neighborhood.

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

The Project meets this policy because the residential building is compatible with the adjacent properties, while providing an additional much-needed unit in the RH-1(D) zoning district.

OBJECTIVE 12 BALANCE HOUSING GROWTH WITH ADEQUATE INFRASTRUCTURE THAT SERVES THE CITY'S GROWING POPULATION

- **Policy 12.1** Encourage new housing that relies on transit use and environmentally sustainable patterns of movement.
- **Policy 12.3** Ensure new housing is sustainably supported by the City's public infrastructure systems.

The Project meets this objective and these policies. The Project site is located near the 1 and 29 bus lines. The 1 line provides east/west movement across the City, while the 29 proves north/south movement along the coast. In addition, the Project would provide two off-street parking spaces and two Class 1 bicycle parking space.

4. Such use or feature as proposed will provide development that is in conformity with the stated purpose of the applicable Use District;

The Project's residential uses are in conformity with the stated purpose of the RH-1(D)Zoning District, which is to provide large dwelling units suitable for family occupancy, considerable open space, and limited nonresidential uses. (Plan. Code Sec. 209.1.)

5. The use or features satisfies any criteria specific to the use of features listed in *Planning Code Section 303(g), et seq.*

None of the criteria is relevant to the Project.

B. Section 317

Under Planning Code Section 317(g)(6), The Planning Commission shall consider the following additional criteria in the review of applications for Residential Demolition:

1. Whether the value of the existing land and structure of the single-family dwelling is affordable or financially accessible housing (below 80% average price of single-family homes in San Francisco, as determined by a credible appraisal within 6 months);

Pursuant to recent legislation, this criterion is no longer applicable. However, a recent appraisal shows that this single-family residence is demonstrably not affordable or financially accessible housing because the appraised value of the Property is \$16,000,000 and has a value of greater than 80% of single-family homes in San Francisco. The Zoning Administrator has determined that 80% of single-family homes in San Francisco have a value of less than \$2,000,000.

2. Whether the housing has been found to be unsound at the 50% threshold;

The house has not been found to be unsound at the 50% threshold. However, the structure on the Property needs significant rehabilitation. The house has structural deficiencies that need to be addressed.

3. Whether the property is free of a history of serious, continuing Code violations;

There is no history of serious or continuing Code violations at the Project site.

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

The existing house is in a sanitary condition. However, the structure has naturally deteriorated after many decades.

5. Whether the property is an "historical resource" under CEQA;

Planning has issued a "Historic Resource Evaluation Response" that concluded the Property is not a resource.

6. Whether the project converts rental housing to other forms of tenure or occupancy;

The Project does not convert or eliminate any rental housing. The Project increases rental housing because it adds an ADU that may be used as rental housing.

7. Whether the project removes rental units subject to the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance or affordable housing;

The Project does not convert or eliminate any rental housing or affordable housing.

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

The Project enhances the neighborhood's cultural and economic diversity by replacing a large single-family residence with a smaller single-family home with an attached accessory dwelling unit. Although the single-family home will be smaller, the number of bedrooms will be preserved and an ADU will be added, further enhancing the neighborhood's economic diversity.

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

The Project will conserve neighborhood character by providing a contextual, yet modern, structurally sound residential building that respects nearby views and open space. In addition, the Project will replace a deteriorated and outdated single family home with one that is more appropriate for the neighborhood while reducing the floor area and footprint of the home. The number of bedrooms will be preserved to maintain the neighborhood culture and the Project adds an ADU to enhance the economic diversity of the neighborhood.

10. Whether the project protects the relative affordability of existing housing;

The existing home was appraised at \$16 million. The Project protects the relative affordability of existing housing by replacing the existing home with a smaller one and by adding an ADU.

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

The Project is not subject to the City's inclusionary housing program.

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

The Project would appropriately provide a single-family home suitable for a family in an established neighborhood in-fill location, while also adding an ADU.

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

The Project proposes to maintain the number of family-size units on-site by maintaining the existing bedroom count in the single-family home. It would add a new ADU that is designed to be more affordable and suitable for individuals and couples.

14. Whether the project creates new supportive housing;

The Project does not involve supportive housing.

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

The Project has a superb contemporary architectural design that is minimally visible from the street, sloping down the hill to a minimal apparent height. The new structure will have increased setbacks compared to the existing structure. The Project incorporates landscaping, open space, and screening to help it blend into the natural topography. The architecture integrates wood and stone materials that resemble the cliffs of the California coast, and uses the adjacent natural elements as a reference for the Project design. The Project meets all relevant design guidelines, including the Residential Design Guidelines, to enhance existing neighborhood character.

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

The Project increases the number of units on-site by one net new unit in the form of an *ADU*, while replacing the single-family dwelling unit with a new one.

17. Whether the project increases the number of on-site bedrooms;

The Project maintains the number of bedrooms in the five-bedroom single-family unit, ideal for a family with children. The Project also provides an additional new one-bedroom ADU on the ground floor, thereby adding a single on-site bedroom.

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

The replacement Project will maximize density. The Project site is zoned RH-1(D), where one dwelling unit is permitted on each lot. The Project meets this density limit and will provide an ADU.

Planning Commission October 19, 2021 Page 10

19. 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 replaces an 11,351 square-foot five-bedroom home with a 9,341 square-foot one-bedroom home and a 799 square-foot ADU. It will not eliminate any affordable housing. It will maintain family-sized housing and add a naturally affordable ADU.

II. CONCLUSION

For all of the foregoing reasons, we respectfully request that the Planning Commission approve the Project as proposed.

Very truly yours,

REUBEN, JUNIUS & ROSE, LLP

Daniel a. Frattini

Daniel A. Frattin

Enclosures

cc: Christopher May, Planning Department 418 Ventures LLC Butler Armsden Architects

EXHIBIT A





4 SEA CLIFF AVENUE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121





EXHIBIT B

EXHIBIT B



BUILDABLE AREA DIAGRAM - ELEVATION (NTS)





EXHIBIT C



RENDERING OF 4 SEA CLIFF FROM 25TH AVENUE



890 EL CAMINO DEL MAR (1963/RENOVATED 2003)

HISTORICAL PRECEDENTS

4 SEA CLIFF 4 SEA CLIFF AVENUE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121



KEY MAP

4 Sea Cliff Avenue facades' articulation, detailing and materials selection draws close parallels to the residence at 890 El Camino Del Mar, designed by Joseph Esherick in 1963. Both the residence at 890 El Camino Del Mar and the project at 4 Sea Cliff Avenue implement a quiet and unimposing appearance that blends into the surroundings; both residences occupy similar siting by embodying the transitional properties to the adjacent parks. 4 Sea Cliff's design resonates with the surrounding context of the Presidio on the east and the north while 890 El Camino Del Mar relates to Lincoln Park to its west. Both properties bookend the neighborhood and are architecturally addressing a different context than the more typical Sea Cliff neighborhood lot.

Additionally, the low one-story street façade of 4 Sea Cliff enhances the view of the Golden Gate Bridge for anyone walking or driving down 25th Avenue.



BUTLER ARMSDEN ARCHITECTS

EXHIBIT D



RENDERING OF 4 SEA CLIFF FROM BAKER BEACH



535 EL CAMINO DEL MAR (1951/RENOVATED 2014)

HISTORICAL PRECEDENTS

4 SEA CLIFF 4 SEA CLIFF AVENUE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121



KEY MAP

The massing, the rhythm of the openings within the facades and the meticulous detailing of the exterior materials of the project at 4 Sea Cliff Avenue resemble the Modern aesthetic of the residence at 535 El Camino Del Mar, designed by J. Lloyd Conrich in 1951. 535 El Camino Del Mar is primarily characterized by the simplicity of the facades, mostly cladded in stained horizontal

wood siding, the large openings, and the lack of ornamentation. In spite of being surrounded by many historical residences, both 535 El Camino Del Mar and 4 Sea Cliff Avenue create a natural presence that fits appropriately in the context of the Sea Cliff neighborhood.



EXHIBIT E



4 SEA CLIFF FROM 25TH AVENUE - PROPOSED



4 SEA CLIFF FROM 25TH AVENUE - EXISTING

COMPARISON BETWEEN EXISTING AND PROPOSED



KEY MAP



EXHIBIT F



4 SEA CLIFF FROM 25TH AVENUE - PROPOSED



4 SEA CLIFF FROM 25TH AVENUE - EXISTING

COMPARISON BETWEEN EXISTING AND PROPOSED

4 SEA CLIFF 4 SEA CLIFF AVENUE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121



KEY MAP



EXHIBIT G





4 SEA CLIFF FROM BAKER BEACH - EXISTING

COMPARISON BETWEEN EXISTING AND PROPOSED

4 SEA CLIFF 4 SEA CLIFF AVENUE, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121



KEY MAP



EXHIBIT H



PART I HISTORIC RESOURCE EVALUATION RESPONSE

Record No.:	2020-005729ENV
Project Address:	4 SEACLIFF AVE
Zoning:	P,RH-1(D) PUBLIC,RESIDENTIAL- HOUSE, ONE FAMILY- DETACHED Zoning District
	40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot:	1302/017
Staff Contact:	Michelle Taylor – 628-652-7352
	Michelle.taylor@sfgov.ofg

PART I: Historic Resource Evaluation

PROJECT SPONSOR SUBMITTAL

To assist in the evaluation of the proposed project, the Project Sponsor has submitted a:

Supplemental Information for Historic Resource Determination Form (HRD)
Consultant-prepared Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE)
Prepared by: Architectural Resources Group (ARG), *Historic Resource Evaluation* (June, 2020)

Staff consensus with Consultant's HRE report: 🛛 Agree 🗌 Disagree

Additional Comments: Planning Staff concurs with Historic Resource Evaluation provided by ARG.

BUILDINGS AND PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

Neighborhood: Seacliff Date of Construction: 1956 Construction Type: Wood-Frame Architect: Porter & Steinwedell Builder: Jacks & Irvine Stories: 3 Roof Form: Cross-gable; gable Cladding: Stucco Primary Façade: 25th Avenue (South) Visible Facades: South (25th Avenue); North (Presidio of San Francisco)

EXISTING PROPERTY PHOTO / CURRENT CONDITION



Sources: ARG Report

PRE-EXISTING HISTORIC RATING / SURVEY

Category A – Known Historic Resource: <u>Subject property within the boundaries of the California Register-Eligible</u> <u>Sea Cliff Historic District</u>

🗌 Category B – Age Eligible/Historic Status Unknown

□ Category C – Not Age Eligible / No Historic Resource Present, per: ____

Adjacent or Nearby Historic Resources: <u>No</u> No Ses: <u>Adjacent to Presidio of San Francisco National Historic</u> <u>Landmark District</u>

CEQA HISTORICAL RESOURCE(S) EVALUATION

Step A: Significance

Individual Significance		Historic District / Context Significance		
Property is individually eligible for inclusion in a California Register under one or more of the following Criteria:		Property is eligible for inclusion in a California Register Historic District/Context under one or more of the following Criteria:		
Criterion 1 - Event:	🗆 Yes 🖾 No	Criterion 1 - Event:	🛛 Yes 🛛 No	
Criterion 2 - Persons:	🗆 Yes 🖾 No	Criterion 2 - Persons:	🗆 Yes 🖾 No	
Criterion 3 - Architecture:	🗆 Yes 🖾 No	Criterion 3 - Architecture:	🖾 Yes 🛛 No	
Criterion 4 - Info. Potential:	🗆 Yes 🖾 No	Criterion 4 - Info. Potential:	🗆 Yes 🖾 No	
		Period of Significance:191	<u>.3- 1935 CA Register- Eligible</u>	
Period of Significance:		Sea Cliff Historic District		
		🗆 Contributor 🛛 Non-Contributor 🖓 N/A		



Analysis:

According to the Historic Resource Evaluation and information found in the Planning Department files, the subject property contains a three-story, wood-frame, single-family residence constructed in 1954 and designed by architects Porter & Steinwedell. Although originally a one-story over basement, 3,800 square foot home, today the building is approximately 11,300 square feet. The subject property is sited on an irregularly shaped that borders the Presidio of San Francisco to the north and east. Although largely obscured behind a high concrete wall, from the street the building presents as an unusually wide, single-story Ranch style home. The front (south) elevation features stucco cladding, low-slung hip and gable roofs, and windows of varying sizes and operations. A concrete drive runs parallel to the front of the property and terminates at a garage at the southeast corner of the building. The rear of the building hugs the steeply sloping lot at the edge of the Presidio. Expansive rear decks that look out upon the San Francisco Bay are partially visible from the heavily vegetated banks of Lobos Creek. Known alterations that have taken place include the following: construction of new stairway and new sun deck, renovation of basement (1969); construction of a horizontal addition (1997); new foundation (1998); and numerous interior alterations.

The property was built for original owners Russell Werner, a retired owner of a shoe store chain, and his wife Rana. The Werner's lived at the home from 1954 until 1958. Wells Fargo's Senior Vice President Robert Smith and Marjorie Smith owned and occupied the property from 1968 until 1976, when it was sold to a trust held by members of the Auchucks family (1976-2019).

No known historic events occurred at the subject property and the property was constructed outside of the period of significance of the Sea Cliff Historic District (Criterion 1). None of the owners or occupants have been identified as important to history (Criterion 2) Refer to the HRE for more information about the owners. Architecturally, the subject building represents an unexceptional example of Ranch style architecture that has undergone several alterations. Additionally, architects Porter & Steinwedell do not appear to be a master architects; therefore, the property is not significant under Criterion 3. Based upon a review of information in the Department's records, the subject building is not significant under Criterion 4 since this significance criterion typically applies to rare construction types when involving the built environment. The subject building is not an example of a rare construction type. Assessment of archeological sensitivity is undertaken through the Department's Preliminary Archeological Review process and is outside the scope of this review.

The subject property is located within the boundaries of the identified-eligible Seacliff Historic District, which was identified through 26 25th Avenue Historic Resource Evaluation Response, Case No. 2005.0229E, dated May 1, 2007 and 330 Sea Cliff Avenue Historic Resource Evaluation Response, Case No. 2010.0967E, dated May 4, 2011. The district is eligible for listing on the California Register under Criterion 1 (Events) for its association with early twentieth century residential park planning and under Criterion 3 (Architecture) as a an excellent example or residential park design and a cohesive collection of highly ornamental single-family homes in the French/Mediterranean, Spanish Revival, Edwardian, and hybrid Arts & Crafts/Tudor styles. The Historic District's period of significance is 1913 to 1935. The subject property is not considered to be a contributor to the Sea Cliff Historic District because it was constructed outside of district's period of significance.

Step B: Integrity

The subject property has retained or lacks integrity from the period of significance noted in Step A:					
Location:	□ Retains	Lacks	Setting:	□ Retains	🗆 Lacks
Association:	Retains	🗆 Lacks	Feeling:	Retains	🗆 Lacks
Design:	Retains	🗆 Lacks	Materials:	Retains	Lacks
Workmanship:	□ Retains	□ Lacks			



Analysis:

Since 4 Seacliff Avenue was determined not to meet any of the criteria that would identify it as eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources, this analysis was not conducted.

Step C: Character Defining Features

The character-defining features of the Sea Cliff Historic District include the following:

The character-defining features of the eligible district include:

- Bluff-top location in Sea Cliff neighborhood;
- Two- to three-story massing with side setbacks;
- Landscaped front setbacks;
- Mediterranean Revival style features including stucco cladding, gabled and hipped roofs with
- Spanish clay tiles, exterior chimneys;
- Rich Eclectic Revival detailing such as faux quoins, wood shutters, cartouches and balconettes;
- Multi-light wood-sash windows, often with arched openings.

CEQA HISTORIC RESOURCE DETERMINATION

- □ Individually-eligible Historical Resource Present
- Contributor to an eligible Historical District / Contextual Resource Present
- 🛛 Non-contributor to an eligible Historic District / Context / Cultural District
- □ No Historical Resource Present

NEXT STEPS

- ⊠ HRER Part II Review Required
- □ Historic Design Review Comments provided
- \Box No further historic resource review, consult:
 - Current Planner
 - \Box Environmental Planner

PART I: Approval

Signature: Allison Van du

Date: <u>1/29/2021</u>

Allison Vanderslice, *Principal Preservation Planner* CEQA Cultural Resources Team Manager, Environmental Planning Division

CC: Christopher May, Senior Planner, Northwest Team - Current Planning Division Florentina Craciun, Environmental Planning



Exhibit H:

Eviction History Documentation

Rent Board Response to Request for Planning Department Records Search

Re:

This confirms that the undersigned employee of the San Francisco Rent Board has reviewed its database records pertaining to the above-referenced unit(s) to provide records that may demonstrate evidence of residential use. All searches are based on upon the street addresses provided.

No database records were identified.

There are no Rent Board records in our database related to your search request for the property address requested. However, it is important to note that the absence of records for some or all of the residential units at a property does not mean there is or has been no residential use. Property owners are not required by law to provide any information or file any documents with the Rent Board, unless they are seeking to take a certain action such as an eviction, a rent increase, or a buyout. Thus, there are many properties and many residential units for which the Rent Board has no records.

Yes, the following records were identified:

o See attached documents

Pursuant to your request, we have searched the Rent Board's database for records related to the property requested. Attached are some Rent Board records resulting from our search. These records can be used as evidence of prior and/or current residential use of the property. However, it is important to note that the absence of records for some or all of the residential units at a property does not mean there is or has been no residential use. Property owners are not required by law to provide any information or file any documents with the Rent Board, unless they are seeking to take a certain action such as an eviction, a rent increase, or a buyout. Thus, there are many properties and many residential units for which the Rent Board has no records.

Regarding the records provided, please note that the data in the "# of units" field was imported from another department's database in 2002 and might not be accurate. It does not represent a determination by the Rent Board of the number of units at the property.

Signed:

Dated: 10-13-21

Van Lam

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