# Memo to the Planning Commission 

HEARING DATE: JANUARY 16, 2014
Continued from the November 21, 2013 Hearing
1650 Mission St. Suite 400

Date:
January 9, 2014
Case No.:
Project Address:
Zoning:
2013.0740D

238 EUREKA STREET
RH-2 (Residential, House, Two-Family)
40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 2699/009
Project Sponsor:
Rick Brown
238 Eureka Street
San Francisco, CA 94114
Staff Contact: $\quad$ Michael Smith - (415) 558-6322
michael.e.smith@sfgov.org
Recommendation: Do not take DR and approve as proposed

## BACKGROUND

On November 21, 2013, the Commission voted +5-1 (Fong against) to continue the case to January 16, 2014 to allow the project architect to revise his plans to provide additional information pursuant to Commissioner Moore's comments.

## CURRENT PROPOSAL

The revised plans before you include the additional information that Commissioner Moore requested which includes additional dimensions on the site plan, floor plans, and elevations. In response to other commission concerns about the roof at the rear of the building and without input from staff, the sponsor has also provided a revised set of plans for consideration that indicate a 12:12 roof pitch for the last 10' of building depth.

## REQUIRED COMMISSION ACTION

The action before the Commission is whether or not to take Discretionary Review on the project.

## BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION

1. The addition would protect the pattern of gabled-roof structures stepping down the street because it would retain the existing gabled roof for the first $15^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ of the building.
2. The addition would respect the adjacent buildings' side setbacks by incorporating matching side setbacks. In general the addition tapers and gets shorter as it reaches into the rear yard.
3. Rear yard privacy is not protected by the RDGs.

For these reasons the project does not create any exceptional or extraordinary circumstances, and as such will be reviewed as an Abbreviated DR.

RECOMMENDATION: Approve with Conditions

Attachments:
Revised Plans

San Francisco Planning Department
Attn: Michael Smith
The following responses correspond with the original comments from Commissioner Moore.

1. The existing building's overall dimensions in relation to the existing and proposed building lengths are indicated on the Site Plans on Sheet A1.00. These dimensions are also referenced on the Proposed Exterior Elevations. The existing habitable square footage is also listed on each plan.
2. The proposed building's overall dimensions are also listed on the Proposed Floor Plans on Sheets A2.01 and A2.02, as well as the existing and proposed site plans on Sheet A1.00. The neighboring building also contain dimensions pertaining to the addition on each plan.
3. The north arrow is indicated on all plans.
4. The existing and proposed building heights are dimensioned at the centerline of the lot from the top of the curb to the midpoint of the existing and proposed roof slopes. The proposed ridge height is indicated by the elevation marker.
5. The building section marker is noted on each proposed floor plan. In the Section on Sheet A3.20, the dashed line outlines the adjacent neighbor's house and grade plane at the rear.

Regarding the alternate sheets (Alternate Roof Plan and Alternate Exterior Elevations), the rear 10'-0" of the roof addition will match the $12: 12$ pitch of the existing roof at the front $15^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ of the house. The impact of the alternate roof on the neighborhood as it is viewed from the street would remain minimal, as it is proposed almost $29^{\prime}-0$ " from the front façade of the existing house. The primary reason for increasing the rear portion to $12: 12$ is in response to Commissioner Antonini's comment. He explained he is "okay with the way that is", though the $3: 12$ roof pitch is not exactly reminiscent of the existing characteristics of the building. Although he was concerned that habitable space will be lost if a higher pitch were implemented, the $6^{\prime}-0$ " plate height at this roof portion will ensure that the third floor spaces will remain as they were originally designed. Commissioner Hollis also commented that the roof should "slope down more," but also acknowledges that an increased slope throughout the entire addition would potentially cause problems for the placement of the elevator and stairs. He also comments that "cutting back or reducing the dimensions" on the third floor is also not the best approach. Therefore, the idea of alternating the roof portions from a 3:12 slope to a $12: 12$ slope (to match the existing condition) is based on the proposed program of the third floor, as well as their comments in the Discretionary Review.
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