# Memo to the Planning Commission HEARING DATE: DECEMBER 11, 2014 

| Date: | December 3, 2014 | Reception: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Case No.: | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3 . 1 5 9 0 D}$ | 415.558 .6378 |
| Project Address: | $\mathbf{4 6 1} 27^{\text {th }}$ STREET | Fax: |
| Permit Application: | 2013.11 .21 .2535 | 415558.6409 |
| Zoning: | RH-2 (Residential House, Two-Family) | Planning |
|  | 40-X Height and Bulk District | Information: |
| Block/Lot: | 6591/033 | 415.558 .6377 |
| Project Sponsor: | Ryan Knock |  |
|  | Knock Architecture and Design |  |
|  | 1405 Franklin Street |  |
| Staff Contact: | San Francisco, CA 94109 | Eiliesh Tuffy - (415) 575-9191 |
|  | eiliesh.tuffy@sfgov.org |  |
| Recommendation: | Do not take DR and approve as proposed |  |

## BACKGROUND

The project proposal is to expand the existing single family dwelling, which reads as a $11 / 2$-story cottage from $27^{\text {th }}$ Street, but is sited on a down-sloping lot that results in a taller mass at the rear elevation. The proposal includes raising the existing cottage 18 inches to create a full-height lower level with garage at $27^{\text {th }}$ Street, extensive interior remodeling, a new dormer on the west slope of the cottage roof, replacement in-kind of existing wood windows, wood siding repairs, and a new 3 -story horizontal addition at the rear of the cottage.

The depth of the proposed 3 -story rear addition extends to the $45 \%$ required rear yard setback. Beyond that, a 1 -story bump-out extends another 8 feet into the required rear yard as an allowable obstruction under Planning Code Section 136(c)(25). The roof of the 1 -story bump-out is proposed as an outdoor terrace. An additional deck with glass guardrails is proposed for the top roof of the horizontal addition.

## UPDATE

At the November 13, 2014 hearing, the Planning Commission continued the review to December 11, 2014 at the request of Supervisors Richards and Moore as well as concerned neighbors. This continuance was requested by the Commission after finding the architectural drawings lacking in detail to fully understand the project under review. Fully dimensioned drawings with building height information were requested in order to clarify the full scope of the project for the Commission.

The following events have taken place since the November 13, 2014 hearing:

- Revisions Submitted. On December 2, 2014, the Project Sponsor submitted clarifications to the original P.C. Sec. 311 drawings mailed out for neighborhood notification. The following modifications were made:

1. A $3^{\text {rd }}$ party survey company was hired to measure existing height elevations of the subject property and adjacent neighboring buildings. The surveyor's stamped drawing is included with the project sponsor's submittal. The findings regarding surveyed building height elevations and the slope of $27^{\text {th }}$ Street were incorporated into the project architect's drawing revisions.
2. Height Corrections: The $3^{\text {rd }}$ party survey resulted in the following height corrections, compared to the 311 drawings,

- The roof ridge of $46527^{\text {th }}$ Street is $11^{\prime \prime}$ lower than shown on the 311 set
- The roof ridge of $45527^{\text {th }}$ Street is $2^{\prime}-3^{\prime \prime}$ higher than shown on the 311 set

3. Slope Correction: The $3^{\text {rd }}$ party survey resulted in the following $27^{\text {th }}$ Street slope correction:

- The slope at the front of the property was amended from 22 percent on the 311 drawings to 16.5 percent following the survey

4. A cover sheet was added to the project architect's drawings outlining the overall scope of work and square footage calculations for both the existing and proposed structures.
5. A graphic scale and detailed building dimensions were added to the drawings of both existing and proposed site conditions.
6. The rear, 1-story bump out was verified to meet the Sec. 136 height limit of 10 -feet above grade.
7. Renderings of the proposed project, in relation to the directly adjacent buildings, were added to study the massing and setbacks.
8. Photos indicating the mid-block conditions, in relation to the proposed $45 \%$ rear yard setback for the project, were also illustrated for clarity.
9. Additional clarifications were made to the drawings, as listed in the sponsor's submittal.

- DR Filer Response:

The DR filer's response cited inconsistencies in:

1. rear elevation building heights, and
2. street slope
which have since been addressed by the project architect in the drawings dated 12.2.14.

Additional design modifications are desired by the DR filer, in the form of sculpting the building massing. These sentiments are echoed in the public comment letters included with this memo from Georgia Schuttish, a rear neighbor at 460 Duncan Street. Please refer to the November $13^{\text {th }}$ Commission packet to review the DR filer's original application materials and public comment.

## DEPARTMENT RESPONSE

After reviewing the project architect's revised drawings, the department has confirmed the following,

1. Height of the Building at Rear: The survey was conducted by a $3^{\text {rdd }}$-party licensed professional surveyor, Meridian Surveying Engineering, Inc. The project architect has confirmed that the revised drawings are in agreement with the surveyor's findings.
2. Street Slope: The survey was conducted by a $3^{\text {rd }}$-party licensed professional surveyor, Meridian Surveying Engineering, Inc. Slope of the street as shown on the revised plans appears consistent with the findings of the survey and those of the DR filer, who is also an architect.

## RECOMMENDATION

The Department's recommendation is to not take DR and approve the project as proposed based on the December 2, 2014 revised drawings, which should be reflected in final permit set revisions prior to Planning Department approval.

## Attachments:

Project Sponsor Submittal:

- List of Revisions
- Project Sponsor Team Supplemental Planning Commission Submittal
- Project Architect's Drawings, dated 12.2.14, including 3 $3^{\text {rd }}$-party Survey Findings by Meridian Surveying Engineering, Inc.
DR Filer's Submittal:
- Letter from M. Garavaglia to the Planning Commission, with 4 attachments
- Dec. 1, 2014 letter from rear neighbor, Georgia Schuttish, to the Planning Commission
- Dec. 3, 2014 letter from rear neighbor, Georgia Schuttish, to the Planning Commission, with March $26^{\text {th }}$ email attachment
from: Ryan Knock, Knock Architecture and Design
date: 11.26.2014
addendum: 12.02.14
Attn: Planning Department, Eilesh Tuffy, Delvin Washington

I've worked to add some notations as requested at the hearing.
List of additional notations since the 311 Set:

1) Have updated the drawings to show an accurate height limit dashed in on the elevations. See sheet 6.
2) Have added a graphic scale, north symbol to plans. See sheets $1,2,3,4,5,6$
3) Notes from the submitted $24 \times 36$ drawings added including site and room dimensions. New room dimensions added See sheets 1,2,3,4
4) Noted and called out adjacent property addresses on elevations. See sheets 5,6
5) Have added elevation points referenced to survey to elevations and roof plans. Noted raised floor line and roof line conditions on proposed elevations.Provided additional dimensions from ridge line and building height to top of curb at the center point of the property per planning code section 102.12See sheets 1,2,5,6 6) Have hatched outlines of adjacent properties on the floor plans for clarity and provided dimensions of the buildings. See sheets 1,2 3,4
6) Added wall type legends (existing, proposed, demo). Provided clarifications to demo and existing walls. See Sheets 3,4
7) Changed sequence of sheets/drawings on sheet 3 to make them read more naturally.
8) Updated the story count on site plan for adjacent and subject properties. Per CBC, ground floor is a story. So $21 / 2$ stories existing, 3 stories proposed. See 1,2.
9) Clarified the subject versus adjacent property tags. Added sloped roof tags to subject and adjacent properties. See 1, 2
10) Broken out the elevations into additional sheets.
11) Added square footage calculations and methods, and a cover sheet, see 0.0
12) Revised rear yard encroachment to be 10' above grade max, added two steps down to deck. See 2,3,6,7
13) Provided renderings of the proposal and adjacent properties, see sheets 9,10 , 11
14) Provided additional illustrations/viewpoints showing the conditions at adjacent properties. See sheets 12
15) Provide section detail through sample replacement window. See sheet 8.

List of revisions to how adjacent buildings were represented from the 311 Set:
A) Have updated the heights of the adjacent buildings and shown grade more accurately on all exterior elevations. See sheets 5,6
-The Ridge of 465 27th street is 11 " lower than shown on the 311 documents -The Ridge of 455 27th street is 2 '- 3 " higher than shown on the 311 documents. -Have provided 3rd party verification in the form of a survey.
B) Have updated the front and rear elevations to show the renovated facades at 455 27th street. See sheet 5,6

ADDENDUM 12.02.14
C) Slope verified with survey to be $16.5 \%$. Updated elevations shown on all sides, see sheet $5,6,7,8$. Grade update on front, side and rear elevations accordingly.
D) Floor elevation of 461 27th verified with survey, is 18 " lower to overall datum points. See sheets $5,6,7,8$. Existing second floor datum is -1 ' -6 ". Raised first floor is now at $0^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$. First floor is at $-10^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$
E) Back Elevation of 461 27th street is revised to show roof line in reference to front ridge. Front ridge is 36 " higher than back roof line parapet. See sheets 6,7,8, 10, 11, 12 Updated on rear elevation and side elevation dashing and renderings.

# REUBEN, JUNIUS \& ROSE, Lı 

December 3, 2014

## By Messenger

Cindy Wu
President
San Francisco Planning Commission
Chinatown CDC, Program Department
663 Clay Street
San Francisco, CA 94111
$R e: \frac{469}{\frac{40}{45027^{\text {th }}} \text { Street }}$
Hearing Date: December 11, 2014
Our file: 8602.01

## Dear President Wu:

The DR applicant has used an atypical formula for the area calculation for the proposed project that is not in accord with the SF Planning Code ("SFPC"). See sheet 0.0 for the square footage count per the SFPC. DR Applicant has used this exaggerated square footage to compare the Project with other properties in the neighborhood. He has included areas for roof deck space and space used for car parking to derive the area calculation. These areas are exempted from area calculation by SPFC 102.9, and add up to nearly 1000 square feet.

The proposed addition preserves the mid- block open space. In addition, there is a large setback to the property to the west, one of $5^{\prime}$ that is in addition to the $2^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ side setback on this property at 465 27th Street. The bulk is thus set back nearly $8^{\prime}$ from the property at 46527 th Street. Note that the 5 ' setback is often approved administratively by the Planning Department as a setback for upper stories. The proposed Project does a good job of bridging the deeper properties to the east that go back to the rear yard setback line, and the properties that do not go as deep as properties to the west. A 92 foot buffer zone of open space has been maintained between the Project and the building to the rear at grade, and 100 feet buffer is maintained at the second floor.

The sketches submitted by the DR applicant to the Planning Commission are rough hand sketches that do not accurately represent the proposed Project.

The DR applicant does not realize the implications of his proposal: it would remove two bedrooms from the top level by removing 12 ' from the rear. He ignores a compromise option that he rejected and the adjacent neighbors at 465 27th Street accepted prior to the DR. The DR


## Page 2

applicant's proposal would break up the family bedrooms and two children would be forced to sleep on the bottom level of the home. Parents do not normally sleep on different floors from small children. The impacts of the DR applicant's proposal would be devastating to the design of this home. The DR applicant ignores the very basic necessity to have a family sleep on one level. The DR Applicant's proposal is not just a "shift of the massing" as he has implied.

The DR applicant states that more than $90 \%$ of the homes on the block have this pattern that is present at his property. This is inaccurate. Less than $50 \%$ of the properties to the west of the Project site have this pattern. The properties to the west of 46127 th indeed do not go as far into their lot and step down, however, the properties to the east of 461 27th do not step down and actually go up to or into the rear yard at significant heights.

The DR applicant has failed to acknowledge the neighborhood outreach conducted by the project sponsor. The DR applicant authored a 10 point document that was issued around the time of the issuance of the Section 311 Notice that outlined his concerns with the plans. The Project Sponsor addressed all but one of the issues shortly thereafter, and offered a compromise option which the DR applicant rejected. The DR applicant lives four houses away from the Project Site, and is not directly impacted by the proposal, except for the view from his deck. The Project Sponsor presented a fair compromise which was accepted in writing by the adjacent neighbors and that reduced the square footage of the Project, yet at the 11 th hour the DR applicant requested additional large portions of the house at the rear to be removed, which he knew was not acceptable.

Very truly yours,


David H. Silverman
cc:
Michael Antonini, Commissioner
Kathrin Moore, Commissioner
Dennis Richards, Commissioner
Christine Johnson, Commissioner
Rodney Fong, Commissioner, Vice President
Rich Hillis, Commissioner
Eiliesh Tuffy, Planner
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RESIDENCE ADDITION

## RENDERING



AERIAL VIEW CENTERED ON 461 27TH STREET LOOKING NORTH


AERIAL VIEW CENTERED ON 461 27TH STREET LOOKING SOUTH

VIEW FROM BACK OF ROOF LOOKING EAST AT 455 27TH STREET
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Michael Garavaglia
479 27th Street
San Francisco, CA 94131
415.391.9633

President Cindy Wu and Members of the PLanning Commission
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

RE: 461 27th Street 2013.1121.2535 DR Hearing on December 11th
Dear Eiliesh,
Please place the following information into the online posting for the project.
We are in receipt of partially corrected drawings and other graphic materials dated 11.24.14. These plans were received late Wednesday afternoon (Noy. 26), a couple of hours before the Thanksgiving Day weekend began. These drawings have corrected the general building relationship so as to present a reasonably correct graphic configuration only on the front elevation. The configuration on the rear elevation is still not correct (it is what all the neighbors will use to evaluate the impacts on the mid-block open space impacts), the street slope has been misrepresented in a diagram and in a letter from the project architect, and the project sponsor has not responded to requests for settlement meetings.

1. The rear elevation, after transposing the front elevation configuration to the rear elevation drawing A 6.0, still shows the rear of 455-27th Street 3' higher than reality. This is the most important point of reference for the neighbors. The survey data to the top of the roof peak, 245.9 is noted. If one looks at the photograph of the actual physical configuration, it is clear the 3 ' high guardrail surrounding the deck aligns with the roof peak. The rear portion of 455 is thus in reality 3 " lower than the drawing. I have noted this error on the attached diagrams. The various perspective drawings provided by the developer show this error.
2. Street slope on drawings- The 311 front elevation showed the slope at $25 \%$. The corrected 11/25/14 drawing graphically shows the street sloping at an approximate $18 \%$ pitch, not $22 \%$ as stated on sheet. The survey data (which is probably most accurate) shows a slope of $16.5 \%$ slope. .
3. To date we have requested, multiple times since the Nov. 13th continuation hearing, a meeting with the project sponsor to discuss modifications of the design. As of Monday morning, December 1, they have not responded. There are only two days remaining before the board packet document submission cut-off.

Thanks you,
Michael Garavaglia
479 27th Street
4 attachments





December 1, 2014
President Cindy Wu and Members of the Planning Commission
Re: DR HEARING December 11, 2014 for 461 27th Street \#2013.11.21.2535
From: Georgia Schuttish

Dear President Wu and Commissioners:
I am an immediate neighbor to this project and I live at 460 Duncan Street. I am behind and one up the hill from this proposal. On November 1, 2014 I outlined my reasons for supporting the Request for DR in a three page letter with four elevations attached. As over 30 neighbors have expressed to you, this project is Extraordinary and Exceptional and deserves your discretion and your attention. Here is why:

1. The project does not match the prevailing pattern with regard to the rear yard mid block open space. It has no setbacks on the south facing wall. This creates an unsculpted structure that is block like and bears no relationship to the partner homes that are part of the potential historic district. These partner homes have rear facades that are characterized by a stepping pattern that is created by setbacks on both living levels with modest decks off the primary living space. The mass of this project is overwhelming when contrasted with the other homes uphill, which are the homes of the potential historic district.

Additionally in a March 26, 2014 email that is in the file, Staff suggested that the project sponsor use the averaging of the edge of rear walls of the adjacent properties. The architect rejected this in an email response instead contending that they could use the edge of the deck at the home at 465 27th Street. Staff's request was reasonable and much more in line with the Residential Design Guidelines. If this reasonable request as well as the continued request by myself and the other immediate neighbors and the DR Requestor, Mr. Garavaglia, to reduce the mass on the rear had been dealt with, there probably would have been no DR. The Request for DR proposes an alternative that would create setbacks that would be an average of the rear walls of the adjacent properties.
2. Contrary to the Categorical Exemption if this project is built as proposed the new construction will be more than minimally visible from the public way. It will be visible on Duncan Street, just as the adjacent property at 455 27th Street is extremely visible. This mass on the rear must be reduced to comply with the Categorical Exemption.
(As a reminder 455 is an adjacent property to the proposed project, but it is also the current residence of the project sponsors. And although they did not develop this property as I stated previously, this building had questionable elevations as determined by the Zoning Administrator in June of 2007 and in fact it is fairly obvious now how incorrect they were if you compare the four elevations that I attached to my November 1st comments).

## SUMMARY:

The Planning Commission should take DR because the project rises to Extraordinary and Exceptional.

1. It does not comply with the Residential Design Guidelines with regard to the Rear Yard Mid Block Open Space.
2. It does not preserve neighborhood character because it is so completely out of scale with the other homes on the block, particularly the homes of the potential historic district.
3. If built as proposed it will be more than minimally visible from the public way.
4. It relies for context on the adjacent property which is owned by the project sponsor and was determined by the Zoning Administrator to be inaccurately portrayed in elevations mistakenly approved by the Planning Commission 8 years ago.

I do not have scanning ability so I cannot send the March 26th email from Mr. Knock to Ms. Tuffy but it is in the file and I will send a copy of it with the hard copies of this for the packet. Additionally we just learned of your new system for the case file and the packets and the new Monday deadline due to the new reproduction system so there may be materially that will be in the packets that you will not receive on your computers. Sorry.

December 3, 2014
President Cindy Wu and
Members of the Planning Commission
1650 Mission Street Suite 400
San Francisco, California 94103

## RECEIVED

## DEC 032014

CITY \& COUNTY OF S.F. PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Re: 461 27th Street \# 2013.11.21.2535
Discretionary Review Hearing December 11, 2014
Dear President Wu and Commissioners:
Attached is the email from the file for this project that I referred to in my December 1, 2014 memo to you which you should have received in the case file (electronically and hard copy). I do not have scanning ability otherwise I would have included it in the memo I emailed to staff for Monday's deadline.

The attachment is a March 26, 2014 email from the architect of the project, Mr. Ryan Knock to Ms. Eiliesh Tuffy. In this email Mr. Knock rejects the staff's (RDT) request to create setbacks based on the rear walls of the immediately adjacent property at 465 27th Street. He responds that he will base it on the back of 465 's deck. The back of the deck is not a wall. 465 actually has two rear walls due to the setback on the bedroom level that creates the stepping effect that is the prevailing pattern for the Rear Yard Mid Block Open Space.

Because the staff's (RDT) suggestions were not accepted, this project requires Discretionary Review as it is Extraordinary and Exceptional as I explained in my December 1, 2014 memo and in my earlier November 1, 2014 letter to you and as presented by the DR Requestor, Mr. Garavaglia and all our many neighbors.

Thank you.
Sincerely,

attachment

| From: | Ryan Knock [ryan@knock-ad.com](mailto:ryan@knock-ad.com) <br> Sent: <br> To: <br> Cc: |
| :--- | :--- |
| Wubjednesday, March 26, 2014 9:03 PM |  |
| Tuffy, Eiliesh |  |

On Mar 26, 2014, at 5:50 PM, Tuffy, Eiliesh wrote:

Yes. RDT comments are as follows:
Note: All comments are subject to change pending environmental review and historic resource status.

- The top of the building should not be higher than the level of the existing ridge line.
(RDG, p11)
-In no place does it say on page 11 that the new ridge line cannot be higher than existing. Can you clarify the policy here? I haven't heard this one before.
-would this be in regards to the raised roof line I hope? So the new roofline peak starts at the new ridgeline?
- I can provide a street view perspective if this helps with determining that the proposal is suitable. In addition, we can consider an slightly increased setback?
- To ensure compatibility with the surrounding building forms and massing, the vertical addition should preserve the shape of the existing dormer on the east side of the building, a form which could be mirrored on the west side. The vertical addition should not project forward beyond the existing dormer. This shape can be extended towards the rear. (RDG, p23-25, 30)
-The existing dormer line does not even have legal ceiling height. I would hope some adjustment would be allowed in consideration.
-The proposal does not extend past the existing dormer line on either side. We would consider a slightly larger front setback to 15 ' in order to gain more ceiling height at the eaves and raise the ridge.

At the rear, the top two floors should not extend beyond the average of the adjacent properties' rear walls. (RDG, p25-27)
-The case here is not as the illustrations show on 25-27. There is a property on one side built to the rear setback line. On the other side, there is a deck built to near this property line. Could we consider averaging the back of the deck at 465 and the back of the wall at 455 since the deck at 465 encroaches?

- Eliminate the second story of the side infill addition on the east side of the property. (RDG, p15-16)

