



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Discretionary Review Analysis Residential Demolition/New Construction

HEARING DATE: SEPTEMBER 30, 2010

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Date: September 23, 2010
Case No.: 2008.1405D/2008.1406DV
Project Address: 448 Diamond Street
Zoning: RH-2 (Residential House, Two-Family)
 40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 2768/008
Project Sponsor: Maura Abernathy
 3298 Pierce Street
 San Francisco, CA 94123
Staff Contact: Sophie Hayward – (415) 558-6372
 sophie.hayward@sfgov.org
Recommendation: **Do not take DR and approve demolition and new construction as proposed. Approve the request for the Variance**

DEMOLITION APPLICATION		NEW BUILDING APPLICATION	
Demolition Case Number	2008.1405D	New Building Case Number	2008.1406DV
Recommendation	Do Not Take DR	Recommendation	Do Not Take DR
Demolition Application Number	2010.07.13.6495	New Building Application Number	2010.07.13.6485
Number Of Existing Units	1	Number Of New Units	1
Existing Parking	1	New Parking	2
Number Of Existing Bedrooms	3	Number Of New Bedrooms	5
Existing Building Area	±2,600 Sq. Ft.	New Building Area	±3,875 Sq. Ft.
Public DR Also Filed?	No	Public DR Also Filed?	No
311 Expiration Date	09/08/2010	Date Time & Materials Fees Paid	N/A

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Project is to demolish an existing two-story-over-garage single-family dwelling and construct a new three-story, single-family dwelling. The demolition and new construction project is the subject of a Mandatory Discretionary Review by the Planning Commission; no member of the public has filed an additional Request for Discretionary Review.

VARIANCE

As proposed, the project requires a Variance from the Front Setback requirement of the Planning Code. Pursuant to Section 132 of the Planning Code, the proposed project is required to maintain a front setback that measures 14' in length, which is the average depth of the two adjacent front setbacks. As proposed, the new building would provide a 2' front setback, and thus requires a Variance from Planning Code Section 132.

Two factors of note characterize the immediate area: the adjacent building to the north has the only deep (approximately 23') front setback on the block face, and the same adjacent building to the north has approved building permits on file to construct a one-story garage within the front setback that extends to the front property line.

SITE DESCRIPTION AND PRESENT USE

The existing single-family home located at 448 Diamond Street, constructed in 1908, is located on the west side of Diamond Street between 21st and 22nd Streets. The Property has approximately 25' of lot frontage along Diamond Street with a lot depth of approximately 115'. The down sloping lot contains a two-story-over-garage, one-family detached dwelling of approximately 2,600 gross square-feet. The existing dwelling is setback approximately 4 feet from the front property line. The property is within a RH-2 (Residential, House, Two-Family) Zoning District with a 40-X Height and Bulk designation.

SURROUNDING PROPERTIES & NEIGHBORHOOD

The surrounding neighborhood consists of a mixture of one-, two-, and three-story buildings, containing mostly one- or two- residential dwelling-units. While the subject building is located within an RH-2 Zoning District, there is a small portion of the opposite side of the street that is zoned RH-3 (Residential, House, Three-Family). The residential neighborhood contains dwellings of varying heights and depths. The adjacent property to the north has a deep front setback; however, building permits for a project that includes adding a one-story garage within the existing front setback as well as a rear horizontal addition were approved by the Planning Department and the Building Department in 2008 (Building Permit Application 2007.09.11.2337). The adjacent building to the south, like most of the buildings on both sides of the subject block, extends to the front property line.

The subject building is located on the west side of Diamond Street in the block between 21st and 22nd Street, within an RH-2 Zoning District in the Noe Valley Neighborhood. The subject building is located on a block characterized by a range of architectural styles (including buildings constructed in Edwardian, modified Queen Anne, and contemporary architectural styles) and dates of construction.¹

HEARING NOTIFICATION

TYPE	REQUIRED PERIOD	REQUIRED NOTICE DATE	ACTUAL NOTICE DATE	ACTUAL PERIOD
Posted Notice	10 days	September 20, 2010	September 17, 2010	13 days

¹ Memorandum from Sophie Hayward, Historic Preservation Technical Specialist, Historic Resource Evaluation Response for 448 Diamond Street, May, 2010 (attached).

Mailed Notice	10 days	September 20, 2010	September 17, 2010	13 days
---------------	---------	--------------------	--------------------	---------

PUBLIC COMMENT

	SUPPORT	OPPOSED	NO POSITION
Adjacent neighbor(s)	0	0	2
Other neighbors on the block or directly across the street	0	0	34
Neighborhood groups	0	0	7

REPLACEMENT STRUCTURE

The replacement structure will provide a single-family home with a two-car garage, and would rise to approximately 33’ in height. The ground floor will contain a two-car garage, a den, a bedroom, and a full bathroom, as well as a mechanical room. The second floor will provide a living room/dining room, half bathroom, and an eat-in kitchen that opens onto a rear deck. The upper story contains four bedrooms and two full bathrooms.

The Project proposes a rear yard of approximately 52’, which is the requirement for the Subject Property. The overall scale, design, and materials of the proposed replacement structure are very contemporary, while maintaining compatibility with the Diamond Street at this location and are complementary to the residential neighborhood character. The wood siding for the front façade is traditional in material and contemporary in style, and the street facing elevation features aluminum-clad windows and a living, vegetated wall on the north side of the front elevation. The roof slopes up from the south to the north, and will support a maximum coverage of solar panels.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The Project has completed the Section 311 and Mandatory DR notification. Staff has received no public comment on the proposed project. No separate Discretionary Review was filed.

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:

TO PROVIDE NEW HOUSING, ESPECIALLY PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING, IN APPROPRIATE LOCATIONS WHICH MEETS IDENTIFIED HOUSING NEEDS AND TAKES INTO ACCOUNT THE DEMAND FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING CREATED BY EMPLOYMENT DEMAND

Policy 1.7:

Encourage and support the construction of quality, new family housing.

The proposal provides a new, single-family structure with five bedrooms. As shown in the architectural plans, the proposed new building will provide quality family housing.

OBJECTIVE 11

IN INCREASING THE SUPPLY OF HOUSING, PURSUE PLACE MAKING AND NEIGHBORHOOD BUILDING PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES TO MAINTAIN SAN FRANCISCO'S DESIRABLE URBAN FABRIC AND ENHANCE LIVABILITY IN ALL NEIGHBORHOODS.

Policy 11.5

Promote the construction of well-designed housing that enhances existing neighborhood character.

The proposal will enhance the existing neighborhood character and will provide well constructed and well-designed housing.

Policy 11.10

Include energy efficient features in new residential development and encourage weatherization in existing housing to reduce overall housing costs and the long-range cost of maintenance.

The proposed new structure will maximize to the extent possible the use of solar panels and sustainable, energy efficient materials in order to the overall, long-range cost of maintenance.

SECTION 101.1 PRIORITY POLICIES

Planning Code Section 101.1 establishes eight priority policies and requires review of permits for consistency, on balance, with these policies. The Project complies with these policies as follows:

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

The proposal includes demolishing one single-family home and constructing a replacement single-family home, and thus will not impact existing opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of neighborhood-serving retail uses.

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

The Project is to demolish the existing dwelling on the subject lot. Nonetheless, the Project results in the construction of a quality new dwelling unit that is consistent with the overall character of the neighborhood.

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

The proposal will not impact the City's supply of affordable housing. The existing structure is not defined as an "affordable dwelling-unit" by the Mayor's Office of Housing, and therefore its demolition and replacement will not impact the City's supply of affordable housing.

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

The proposed project includes the replacement of one single-family home with a new single-family home. It is unlikely that commuter traffic will be increased significantly enough to impede MUNI transit service or overburden streets or neighborhood parking as a result of the proposed project.

5. 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 proposal will not impact industrial and service sectors.

6. The City achieves the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.

The proposed replacement structure will be constructed in order to be consistent with all current, relevant building codes in order to assure preparedness against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.

7. Landmarks and historic buildings be preserved.

The proposal for the demolition and new construction will not impact landmarks or historic structures. As noted above, the existing building has been evaluated, and it was determined that the existing building on the subject lot is not an historic resource.

8. Parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

The proposal is a replacement structure that will have no significant impact on open space or parks or their access to sunlight and vistas.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The Project was issued a Categorical Exemption, Classes 1 and 3 [State CEQA Guidelines Section 15301(1)(1) and 15303(b)] on May 24, 2010. As noted above, the Historic Resource Evaluation Response (HRER) in which the existing building on the lot is evaluated is attached to this case report.

RESIDENTIAL DESIGN TEAM REVIEW

The proposed project has been reviewed on three occasions by the Department's Residential Design Team (RDT). As a result of the RDT's review of the proposed project, a number of specific changes have been made to the original proposal, including:

- The elimination of the deep roof eave at the rear and side elevations in order to reduce shadow impacts to adjacent neighbors;
- A reduction in the width of the garage door, such that the width is now limited to 10';
- The addition of a 2' front setback for the proposed new building;
- The introduction of an angled roof rather than a flat roof;
- A reduction in the building's massing at the south and west elevations, including the provision of a 5' side setback along the south property line.

The RDT supports the project as currently proposed.

BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION

The Department recommends that the demolition of the existing single-family dwelling and the construction of a new single-family dwelling be approved. The Project is consistent with the Objectives and Policies of the General Plan and complies with the Residential Design Guidelines and Planning Code. The Project meets the criteria set forth in Section 101.1 of the Planning Code in that:

- The Project will replace one, three bedroom family-sized dwelling-unit with a new, five bedroom family-sized single-family home.
- No tenants will be displaced as a result of this Project.
- Given the scale of the Project, there will be no significant impact on the existing capacity of the local street system or MUNI.
- Although the structure is more than 50-years old, a review of the Historic Resource Evaluation resulted in a determination that the existing building is not an historic resource or landmark.

RECOMMENDATION:

Case No. 2008.1405D – Do not take DR and approve the demolition.

Case No. 2008.1406DV – Do not take DR and approve the new construction as proposed.

DEMOLITION CRITERIA - ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW

Existing Value and Soundness

1. Whether the Project Sponsor has demonstrated that the value of the existing land and structure of a single-family dwelling is not affordable or financially accessible housing (above the 80% average price of single-family homes in San Francisco, as determined by a credible appraisal within six months);

Project Does Not Meet Criterion

The Project Sponsor does not claim that the property is valued at or above 80% of the median single-family home prices in San Francisco. As such, the property is considered relatively affordable and financially accessible housing for the purposes of this report and Planning Code Section 317.

2. Whether the housing has been found to be unsound at the 50% threshold (applicable to one- and two-family dwellings);

Project Does Not Meet Criterion

The Project Sponsor does not claim that the existing home is unsound.

DEMOLITION CRITERIA

Existing Building

1. Whether the property is free of a history of serious, continuing code violations;

Project Meets Criterion

A review of the databases for the Department of Building Inspection and the Planning Department did not show any enforcement cases or notices of violation.

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

Project Meets Criterion

The housing is free of Housing Code violations and appears to have been maintained in a decent, safe, and sanitary condition.

3. Whether the property is a "historical resource" under CEQA;

Project Meets Criterion

Although the structure is more than 50-years old, a review of the Historic Resource Evaluation resulted in a determination that it is not an historic resource for the purposes of CEQA.

4. If the property is a historical resource, whether the removal of the resource will have a substantial adverse impact under CEQA;

Criterion Not Applicable to Project

The property is not a historical resource.

Rental Protection

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

Criterion Not Applicable to Project

The existing unit is currently vacant and thus not rental housing.

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

Project Meets Criterion

According to the Project Sponsor, the building is not subject to rent control because it is a single-family dwelling that is currently vacant.

Priority Policies

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

Project Does Not Meet Criterion

The Project does not meet this criterion because the existing dwelling will be demolished. Nonetheless, the Project results in the construction of a quality new dwelling unit and thus preserves the quantity of housing in the neighborhood.

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

Project Meets Criterion

The Project will conserve the neighborhood character by constructing a replacement building that is compatible with regard to materials, massing, glazing pattern, and roofline with the dwellings in the

surrounding neighborhood. By creating a compatible new building in a neighborhood defined by one- and two- family units, the neighborhood's cultural and economic diversity will be preserved.

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

Project Does Not Meet Criterion

Although the existing dwelling proposed for demolition is not above the 80% average price of a single-family home and thus considered "relatively affordable and financially accessible" housing, the dwelling is not defined as an "affordable dwelling-unit" by the Mayor's Office of Housing. By replacing an existing three bedroom single-family home with a five bedroom single-family home, it is likely that the relative affordability of existing housing will be decreased as the value of the home on the subject lot will likely increase in value.

10. Whether the Project increases the number of permanently affordable units as governed by Section 415 (formerly Planning Code Section 315);

Project Does Not Meet Criterion

The Project does not include any permanently affordable units, as the construction of a single-family home does not trigger Section 415 review.

Replacement Structure

11. Whether the Project located in-fill housing on appropriate sites in established neighborhoods;

Project Meets Criterion

The Project replaces one single-family dwelling with a larger, single-family unit in a neighborhood characterized by one- and two-family dwellings.

12. Whether the Project creates quality, new family housing;

Project Meets Criterion

The Project will replace a three bedroom, two-story single-family home with a new five bedroom, three-story single-family home. The floor plans reflect that the proposed new structure will provide new quality, family housing.

13. Whether the Project creates new supportive housing;

Project Does Not Meet Criterion

The Project is not specifically designed to accommodate any particular Special Population Group as defined in the Housing Element.

14. Whether the Project promotes construction of well-designed housing to enhance existing neighborhood character;

Project Meets Criterion

The Project is in scale with the surrounding neighborhood and constructed of high-quality materials.

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

Project Does Not Meet Criterion

The Project does not increase the number of dwelling units on the site.

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

Project Meets Criterion

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

Design Review Checklist

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER (PAGES 7-10)

QUESTION	
The visual character is: (check one)	
Defined	
Mixed	X

Comments: The surrounding neighborhood consists of a mixture of one-, two-, and three-story buildings, containing mostly one or two residential units. The two sides of the block face include a wide variety of architectural styles, including Edwardian and modified revival styles, as well as contemporary modern structures.

SITE DESIGN (PAGES 11 - 21)

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A
Topography (page 11)			
Does the building respect the topography of the site and the surrounding area?	X		
Is the building placed on its site so it responds to its position on the block and to the placement of surrounding buildings?	X		
Front Setback (pages 12 - 15)			
Does the front setback provide a pedestrian scale and enhance the street?	X		
In areas with varied front setbacks, is the building designed to act as transition between adjacent buildings and to unify the overall streetscape?	X		
Does the building provide landscaping in the front setback?	X		
Side Spacing (page 15)			
Does the building respect the existing pattern of side spacing?			X
Rear Yard (pages 16 - 17)			
Is the building articulated to minimize impacts on light to adjacent properties?	X		
Is the building articulated to minimize impacts on privacy to adjacent properties?	X		
Views (page 18)			
Does the project protect major public views from public spaces?			X
Special Building Locations (pages 19 - 21)			
Is greater visual emphasis provided for corner buildings?			X
Is the building facade designed to enhance and complement adjacent public spaces?			X
Is the building articulated to minimize impacts on light to adjacent cottages?			X

Comments: The new building respects the existing block pattern by not impeding into the established mid-block open space and by taking advantage of the down sloping lot. Currently, the adjacent house to the north has an unusually deep front set back; however, there are approved permits on file with the Department to enlarge the adjacent structure including a front expansion that extends to the front property line. As proposed, the green wall along the north elevation of the street-facing façade of the subject building softens the existing transition to the deep front setback to the north by providing a

vegetated “buffer zone.” At the rear, the proposed project extends to a distance that is approximately equal to the depth of the adjacent building to the north, and provides a 5’ side setback on the south side along the property line in order to protect access to light, air, and privacy for the adjacent residential structure to the south.

BUILDING SCALE AND FORM (PAGES 23 - 30)

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A
Building Scale (pages 23 - 27)			
Is the building’s height and depth compatible with the existing building scale at the street?	X		
Is the building’s height and depth compatible with the existing building scale at the mid-block open space?	X		
Building Form (pages 28 - 30)			
Is the building’s form compatible with that of surrounding buildings?	X		
Is the building’s facade width compatible with those found on surrounding buildings?	X		
Are the building’s proportions compatible with those found on surrounding buildings?	X		
Is the building’s roofline compatible with those found on surrounding buildings?	X		

Comments: The height and depth of the building are compatible with the existing mid-block open space, as most buildings on the block extend up to or close to the 45% required rear yard. The building’s form, façade width, proportions, and roofline are compatible with the mixed neighborhood context.

ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES (PAGES 31 - 41)

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A
Building Entrances (pages 31 - 33)			
Does the building entrance enhance the connection between the public realm of the street and sidewalk and the private realm of the building?	X		
Does the location of the building entrance respect the existing pattern of building entrances?	X		
Is the building’s front porch compatible with existing porches of surrounding buildings?			X
Are utility panels located so they are not visible on the front building wall or on the sidewalk?	X		
Bay Windows (page 34)			
Are the length, height and type of bay windows compatible with those found on surrounding buildings?	X		
Garages (pages 34 - 37)			
Is the garage structure detailed to create a visually interesting street frontage?	X		
Are the design and placement of the garage entrance and door compatible with the building and the surrounding area?	X		
Is the width of the garage entrance minimized?	X		
Is the placement of the curb cut coordinated to maximize on-street parking?	X		

Rooftop Architectural Features (pages 38 - 41)			
Is the stair penthouse designed to minimize its visibility from the street?			X
Are the parapets compatible with the overall building proportions and other building elements?	X		
Are the dormers compatible with the architectural character of surrounding buildings?			X
Are the windscreens designed to minimize impacts on the building's design and on light to adjacent buildings?			X

Comments: The location of the entrance is consistent with the predominant pattern of elevated entrances found of the west side of Diamond Street. The length and type of the rectangular bay window along the northern portion of the façade is compatible with the style of bay windows found throughout the neighborhood, particularly on the buildings that face the subject building on the opposite side of the street. The garage door is recessed from the front façade and limited to a width of 10 feet.

BUILDING DETAILS (PAGES 43 - 48)

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A
Architectural Details (pages 43 - 44)			
Are the placement and scale of architectural details compatible with the building and the surrounding area?	X		
Windows (pages 44 - 46)			
Do the windows contribute to the architectural character of the building and the neighborhood?	X		
Are the proportion and size of the windows related to that of existing buildings in the neighborhood?	X		
Are the window features designed to be compatible with the building's architectural character, as well as other buildings in the neighborhood?	X		
Are the window materials compatible with those found on surrounding buildings, especially on facades visible from the street?	X		
Exterior Materials (pages 47 - 48)			
Are the type, finish and quality of the building's materials compatible with those used in the surrounding area?	X		
Are the building's exposed walls covered and finished with quality materials that are compatible with the front facade and adjacent buildings?	X		
Are the building's materials properly detailed and appropriately applied?	X		

Comments: The placement and scale of the architectural details are compatible with the mixed residential character of this neighborhood. The aluminum-clad windows are residential in character and compatible with the window patterns found on neighboring buildings. The wood siding is compatible with the existing buildings in the neighborhood. The living, green wall on the north side of the proposed new building is a contemporary feature that is intended to soften the front elevation while highlighting the sustainable features of the proposed new building.

SPECIAL GUIDELINES FOR ALTERATIONS TO BUILDINGS OF POTENTIAL HISTORIC OR ARCHITECTURAL MERIT (PAGES 49 – 54)

QUESTION	YES	NO	N/A
Is the building subject to these Special Guidelines for Alterations to Buildings of Potential Historic or Architectural Merit?		X	
Are the character-defining features of the historic building maintained?			X
Are the character-defining building form and materials of the historic building maintained?			X
Are the character-defining building components of the historic building maintained?			X
Are the character-defining windows of the historic building maintained?			X
Are the character-defining garages of the historic building maintained?			X


Comments: The Project is not an alteration, and the dwelling that will be demolished has been determined not to be an historical resource for the purposes of CEQA.

Attachments:

- Design Review Checklist for replacement building
- Block Book Map
- Sanborn Map
- Zoning Map
- Aerial Photographs
- Section 311 Notice
- DR/Variance Notice
- Residential Demolition Application
- Prop M findings
- Environmental Evaluation / Historic Resources Information
- Sponsor’s Brief
- Reduced Plans
- Context Photos
- Color Rendering

* All page numbers refer to the Residential Design Guidelines


Parcel Map



SUBJECT PROPERTY



Sanborn Map*



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



Discretionary Review Hearing
Case Number 2008.1405D, 2008.1406DV
448 Diamond Street

Aerial Photo



Discretionary Review Hearing
Case Number 2008.1405D, 2008.1406DV
448 Diamond Street


Aerial Photo



SUBJECT PROPERTY

Discretionary Review Hearing
Case Number 2009.0365DV
4209 24th Street

Zoning Map



ZONING DISTRICTS INCLUDED IN THIS MAP:

- RH-1, RH-1(S), RH-1(D), RH-2, RH-3
- RM-1, RM-2, RM-3, RM-4
- UMU, RTO-M, RED, RC-3, RC-4
- NC-1, NC-2, NC-3, NCD
- NCT, NCT-3
- SLR, SLI
- C-3-S, C-3-G
- PDR-1-G
- P

SUBJECT PROPERTY

Discretionary Review Hearing
 Case Number 2008.1405D, 2008.1406DV
 448 Diamond Street

Site Photo



Discretionary Review Hearing
Case Number 2008.1405D, 2008.1406DV
448 Diamond Street



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1650 Mission Street Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

NOTICE OF BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION (SECTION 311)

On **July 13, 2010**, the Applicant named below filed Building Permit Application Nos. **2010.07.13.6495** (Demolition) and **2010.07.13.6485** (New Construction) with the City and County of San Francisco.

CONTACT INFORMATION		PROJECT SITE INFORMATION	
Applicant:	Maura Abernathy	Project Address:	448 Diamond Street
Address:	3298 Pierce Street	Cross Streets:	21st and 22nd Streets
City, State:	San Francisco, CA 94123	Assessor's Block /Lot No.:	2768/008
Telephone:	(415) 730-5811	Zoning Districts:	RH-2 /40-X

Under San Francisco Planning Code Section 311, you, as a property owner or resident within 150 feet of this proposed project, are being notified of this Building Permit Application. You are not obligated to take any action. For more information regarding the proposed work, or to express concerns about the project, please contact the Applicant above or the Planner named below as soon as possible. If your concerns are unresolved, you can request the Planning Commission to use its discretionary powers to review this application at a public hearing. Applications requesting a Discretionary Review hearing must be filed during the 30-day review period, prior to the close of business on the Expiration Date shown below, or the next business day if that date is on a week-end or a legal holiday. If no Requests for Discretionary Review are filed, this project will be approved by the Planning Department after the Expiration Date.

PROJECT SCOPE		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DEMOLITION	and/or	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEW CONSTRUCTION or <input type="checkbox"/> ALTERATION
<input type="checkbox"/> VERTICAL EXTENSION		<input type="checkbox"/> CHANGE # OF DWELLING UNITS <input type="checkbox"/> FACADE ALTERATION(S)
<input type="checkbox"/> HORIZ. EXTENSION (FRONT)		<input type="checkbox"/> HORIZ. EXTENSION (SIDE) <input type="checkbox"/> HORIZ. EXTENSION (REAR)

PROJECT FEATURES	EXISTING CONDITION	PROPOSED CONDITION
BUILDING USE	Single-Family Dwelling.....	No Change
FRONT SETBACK (including proposed front bay)	4'.....	2'
SIDE SETBACKS	None.....	No Change
BUILDING DEPTH (including proposed rear deck)	41'.....	71'
REAR YARD (measured to the rear deck)	71'6".....	40'
HEIGHT OF BUILDING	±31'.....	±33'
NUMBER OF STORIES	2 over garage.....	No Change
NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS	1.....	No Change
NUMBER OF OFF-STREET PARKING SPACES	1.....	2

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposal is to demolish the existing single-family home and to construct a new single-family home. The proposal includes the demolition of the existing single-family dwelling on the subject property, and is therefore subject to Mandatory Discretionary Review (Case Numbers 2008.1405 and 2008.1406) per Planning Code Section 317. The D.R. hearing will be noticed separately. The proposed project also requires a Variance; the Variance hearing will be held with the D.R. Should you have any questions, please call the planner at the number listed below.

PLANNER'S NAME: **Sophie Hayward**

PHONE NUMBER: **(415) 558-6372**

DATE OF THIS NOTICE:

EMAIL: **sophie.hayward@sfgov.org**

EXPIRATION DATE: _____



**SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 • San Francisco, CA 94103 • Fax (415) 558-6409

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Hearing Date: **Thursday, September 30, 2010**
 Time: **Beginning at 1:30 PM**
 Location: **City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 400**
 Case Type: **Variance (Front Setback) and Discretionary Review**
 Hearing Body: **Zoning Administrator and Planning Commission**

PROPERTY INFORMATION		APPLICATION INFORMATION	
Project Address:	448 Diamond Street	Case No.:	2008.1405D & 2008.1406DV
Cross Street(s):	21st and 22nd Streets	Building Permit:	2010.07.13.6485
Block /Lot No.:	2768/008	Applicant/Agent:	Maura Abernathy
Zoning District(s):	RH-2/40-X	Telephone:	(415) 474-1367
Area Plan:	N/A	E-Mail:	maura@mfa-design.com

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposal is to demolish the existing single-family home and to construct a new single-family home. The proposed new building will measure two-stories above grade at the street level, and will provide two off-street parking spaces. As proposed, the new building would provide a front setback that measures 2' in length, and includes a front bay window that measures approximately 12' in length.

The proposed residential demolition and new construction project will be the subject of a **mandatory** Discretionary Review by the Planning Commission in addition to the Variance Hearing by the Zoning Administrator. Both the Variance request and the Discretionary Review will be heard at the regularly scheduled Planning Commission hearing on Thursday, September 30, 2010, beginning at 1:30pm.

PER SECTION 132 OF THE PLANNING CODE the subject property is required to maintain a front setback that measures at least 14' in length. As proposed, the new building would provide a 2' front setback, as measured from the proposed bay window, which measures 12' in length.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

ARCHITECTURAL PLANS: The site plan and elevations for the proposed project are available upon request to the planner listed below. The plans will be included in the electronic copy of the case report, which will be posted at <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2248> by September 24, 2010.

FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE CONTACT PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF:

Planner: **Sophie Hayward** Telephone: **(415) 558-6372** E-Mail: sophie.hayward@sfgov.org

中文詢問請電: 558.6378

Para información en Español llamar al: 558.6378



Historic Resource Evaluation Response

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Project Address: **448 Diamond**
Block/Lot: 2768/008
Case No.: **2010.0353E**
Date of Review: May 21, 2010
Planning Dept. Reviewer: Sophie Hayward
(415) 558-6372 | sophie.hayward@sfgov.org

PROPOSED PROJECT Demolition Alteration

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project includes the demolition of the existing single-family home, and the construction of a new, single-family home. According to the information submitted by the Project Sponsor, the existing subject building includes approximately 2,600 square feet, including one off-street parking space. As proposed, the new building will measure approximately 4,800 square feet including two off-street parking spaces.

PRE-EXISTING HISTORIC RATING / SURVEY

The County Assessor’s records indicate that the building was constructed in 1908, which is consistent with information submitted by the Project Sponsor. Although the subject building is not included on any historic surveys and is not included on the National or the California Registers, its recorded date of construction makes it a “Category B” building for the purposes of CEQA review by the Planning Department.¹ It does not appear that the subject building is an historic resource for the purposes of CEQA review.

HISTORIC DISTRICT / NEIGHBORHOOD CONTEXT

The subject building is located on the west side of Diamond Street in the block between 21st and 22nd Street, within an RH-2 Zoning District in the Noe Valley Neighborhood. The subject building is located on a block characterized by a range of architectural styles (including buildings constructed in Edwardian, modified Queen Anne, and contemporary architectural styles) and dates of construction. It does not appear that the subject property is located within a potential historic district for the purposes of CEQA.

- 1. California Register Criteria of Significance:** Note, a building may be an historical resource if it meets any of the California Register criteria listed below. If more information is needed to make such a determination please specify what information is needed. *(This determination for California Register Eligibility is made based on existing data and research provided to the Planning Department by the above*

¹ Please see “Preservation Bulletin #16,” available online at:
http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/planning/projects_reports/PresBulletin16CEQA10_8_04.PDF (November 2, 2007)

named preparer / consultant and other parties. Key pages of report and a photograph of the subject building are attached.)

- Event: or Yes No Unable to determine
Persons: or Yes No Unable to determine
Architecture: or Yes No Unable to determine
Information Potential: Further investigation recommended.
District or Context: Yes, may contribute to a potential district or significant context

If Yes; Period of significance:

Notes: Below is an evaluation of the subject property against the criteria for inclusion on the California Register; it does not appear that the subject property is eligible for the California Register. The Project Sponsor submitted an Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE), prepared by Tim Kelly of Kelly and VerPlanck, dated November, 2007. The report finds that the subject property is neither individually eligible for the California Register, nor that the subject building is located within a potential historic district. Staff concurs with the submitted report.²

Criterion 1: It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States;

Based on a review of historic Sanborn Fire Insurance Survey maps, it appears that the existing pattern of neighborhood development on Diamond Street at this location occurred after the 1906 Earthquake and fire. Both the 1886 and the 1900 Sanborn Maps show that the subject block was very sparsely populated immediately preceding the earthquake, which is likely because, as noted in the submitted HRE, "Collingwood and Diamond Streets south of 20th Street were not paved, therefore access to the subject block would have been difficult."³ It does not appear that the subject building is associated with a specific event that has made a significant contribution to broad patterns of local or regional history, and that the subject building is not eligible for listing on the California Register under Criterion 1.

Criterion 2: It is associated with the lives of persons important in our local, regional, or national past;

There is no known association between the subject property and persons important in our local, regional, or national past. The first known owners and occupants of the subject lot were Scottish immigrants Donald and Jane Munroe. It does not appear that the subject building is eligible for listing on the California Register under Criterion 2.

Criterion 3: It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values;

² "Historic Resource Evaluation Report," Kelly and VerPlanck (November, 2007). The report is included in the case docket (Case No. 2010.0353E) for the proposed project, and is available for viewing by request at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, 4th Floor, San Francisco, CA, 94103.

³ Ibid., Page 11.

The subject building is rectangular in plan with a gabled roof, and is a two-story-over-basement, wood-frame, single-family dwelling designed in a modified Queen Anne architectural style. The subject building is clad in vinyl siding and supported by a concrete foundation. The street-facing elevation has two bays; the south bay features a bay window with aluminum slider windows with a garage centered below. The north bay features the primary entrance, accessed by concrete steps from grade that lead to an enclosed porch.

While the subject building is similar in style to many buildings in the Noe Valley, Glen Park, Bernal Heights, and Excelsior neighborhoods, it does not appear to be individually eligible for the California Register, nor does it appear to be architecturally distinctive. Staff concurs with the summary statement included in the submitted HRE, which notes that the subject building can not be "demonstrated to contribute to the evolution of 'an important phase of the architectural development of the area or community...'"

It does not appear that the subject building is representative of a type, period, region, or method of construction. It does not appear that the subject building is significant based on Criterion 3.

Criterion 4: It yields, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history;

It does not appear that the subject property is likely to yield information important to a better understanding of prehistory or history.

-
2. **Integrity** is the ability of a property to convey its significance. To be a resource for the purposes of CEQA, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the California Register criteria, but it also must have integrity. To retain historic integrity a property will always possess several, and usually most, of the aspects. The subject property has retained or lacks integrity from the period of significance noted above:

Location:	<input type="checkbox"/> Retains	<input type="checkbox"/> Lacks	Setting:	<input type="checkbox"/> Retains	<input type="checkbox"/> Lacks
Association:	<input type="checkbox"/> Retains	<input type="checkbox"/> Lacks	Feeling:	<input type="checkbox"/> Retains	<input type="checkbox"/> Lacks
Design:	<input type="checkbox"/> Retains	<input type="checkbox"/> Lacks	Materials:	<input type="checkbox"/> Retains	<input type="checkbox"/> Lacks
Workmanship:	<input type="checkbox"/> Retains	<input type="checkbox"/> Lacks			

Notes: Evaluation of integrity is not applicable as the subject building has not been shown to be significant under California Register criteria.

-
3. **Determination Whether the property is an "historical resource" for purposes of CEQA**

No Resource Present (*Go to 6. below*) Historical Resource Present (*Continue to 4.*)

4. If the property appears to be an historical resource, whether the proposed project would materially impair the resource (i.e. alter in an adverse manner those physical characteristics which justify the property's inclusion in any registry to which it belongs).

The project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the resource such that the significance of the resource would be materially impaired. (Continue to 5. if the project is an alteration).

The project is a significant impact as proposed. (Continue to 5. if the project is an alteration)


5. Character-defining features of the building to be retained or respected in order to avoid a significant adverse effect by the project, presently or cumulatively.

6. Whether the proposed project may have an adverse effect on off-site historical resources, such as adjacent historic properties.

Yes No Unable to determine

Notes: As noted above, the subject building does not appear to be an historic resource, nor does it appear to be located within a potential historic district. It does not appear that the proposed project would have an adverse effect on off-site historical resources.

PRESERVATION COORDINATOR REVIEW

Signature: 
Tim Frye, Acting Preservation Coordinator

Date: 5/24/10

CC:

Linda Avery, Commission Secretary, Historic Preservation Commission
Viraliza Byrd / Historic Resource Impact Review File

G:\DOCUMENTS\historic\448 Diamond Street.doc



Maura Fernández Abernethy DESIGN

3298 Pierce St.
San Francisco CA 94123
T 415 474 1367
F 415 4748696
www.mfa-design.com

September 20, 2010

448 DIAMOND STREET- PROJECT SPONSOR BRIEF

At 448 Diamond Street in Noe Valley, my husband and I are proposing a new ground up single family home, built to the highest green standards available to us. I am a designer and my husband is a structural engineer and the proposed project is a home that we have designed for ourselves, and our two young daughters. We are both the owners and the project designers for 448 Diamond street.

Presently at 448 Diamond Street is a single-family residence that has been abandoned for over ten years. We purchased the home over three years ago with the intention of renovating it. As we investigated renovating the existing structure, we soon realized that there was so little worth saving that it did not make sense to save the structure, bring it up to the new building codes, and also built it in a green manner. It was simply building a new building with the old one in the way, and as building professionals; this did not make sense to us. The most effective choice was to simply start from scratch.

Order of events

Environmental Report

In November of 2007, an Environmental Report was written by Kelly and VerPlank, Historical consultants, to determine if the existing residence had any historical significance. The conclusion was that the home was not found to be a historic resource. "The home is one of several Transitional Queen Ann's located thought out Noe Valley and surrounding neighborhoods and does not represent a good example of this style. The building is not listed in any local register of historic resources and does not have a CHRIS status code, and has diminished integrity. The demolition of the existing building will not disrupt a cohesive block face due to the range in architectural styles, heights, massing and period of construction that is evident on Diamond Street between 21st and 22nd streets."

Pre-Application Meeting with neighbors- Held January 22nd at 7pm at 448 Diamond Street.

Two neighbors came to the meeting. The first neighbor was Gary Kaplan at 445 Diamond #3, across the street. Gary inquired about the project and wanted to know what he would be seeing from his property. I shared drawings of the proposed project and he was in support. The second neighbor was Elaine Felter, who lives directly to the south. Elaine inquired about the front façade material and the location of the entrance relative to her entrance. The proposed designs were shown and I explained that the material on the front façade would be a horizontal wood siding. Elaine Felter was supportive. The neighbor to the north, Deborah Reabock did not come to the meeting, but I have been in constant contact with her to



keep her abreast of our progress. Deborah Reabock is also in support of our project.

Historic Resource Evaluation Response- San Francisco Planning Department – May 21, 2010

On May 21, 2010, the San Francisco Planning Department performed a Historic Evaluation and found that the existing building is NOT a historic resource. The report was completed by Tim Frye, the Acting Preservation Coordinator.

San Francisco Planning Department Residential Design Team Review Findings:

On May 27, 2010 the San Francisco Planning Department Residential Design Team reviewed the proposed residence and requested several changes. The changes were the following: Responding to the adjacent roof patterns by slanting the roof, making the garage door smaller, maintaining a bay window at the front façade and providing a side setback on all floors at the back of the home. All the changes were made, 3-D renderings were created, and resubmitted for final review. Upon a second review the Residential Design Team asked that the roof be pulled back on the south side of the building so as not to create a large shadow, this roof line was pulled back to the building. The residential design team review process was a very collaborative and fruitful one, where both parties are very happy with the results and the building design is supported by the Planning Department and the Residential Design Team.

Our goal in working with the Planning Department is to do the right thing and to honor the residential design guidelines put forward by the Planning Department of San Francisco. We are both building professionals with our own businesses and two young daughters who attend school in San Francisco. We are committed to living in the city of San Francisco long term and we hope to be an example of what can be done when all parties work together.

448 DIAMOND STREET
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114

SIDEWALK DIAMOND STREET

S C A L L E

D R A W N B Y
 MFA, JAB, ELS

D A T E
 JUNE 16, 2010


F O R
 SITE PERMIT SUBMITTAL

J O B N U M B E R




R E V I S I O N S

PROPOSED BUILDING SECTION

A3.5




1 PROPOSED NEW BUILDING SECTION
A3.4 SCALE 1/4" = 1'-0"


-  SHORT DASHED LINE INDICATES OUTLINE OF EXIST. ADJACENT BUILDING BEYOND (456 DIAMOND ST.)
-  LONG DASHED LINE INDICATES OUTLINE OF EXIST. ADJACENT BUILDING BEHIND (446 DIAMOND ST.)
-  LONG DASH DOT LINE INDICATES OUTLINE OF 446 DIAMOND ST. WITH FUTURE ADDITION AS PER PENDING PERMIT #200709112337

PROPERTY LINE

PROPERTY LINE



1 SOUTH SIDE ELEVATION - PROPOSED
A3.4 0 5 10 15 20 FT SCALE 1/4" = 1'-0"



2 SOUTH / WEST / NORTH AT ENTRY ELEVATION - PROPOSED
A3.4 0 5 10 15 20 FT SCALE 1/4" = 1'-0"

S _ C _ A _ L _ L _ E

D R A W N B Y
MFAJABIELS

D A T E
JUNE 16, 2010

F O R
SITE PERMIT SUBMITTAL

J O B N U M B E R

R E V I S I O N S

JULY 16, 2010

PROPOSED BUILDING SECTION

A3.4

448 DIAMOND STREET
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114

FIRE RATED PROPERTY LINE WINDOWS.
 NOTIFICATION TO NEIGHBOR

EL 367.2
 T.O. FIN. ROOF @ FRONT-HIGH

EL 363.8
 T.O. FIN. ROOF @ FRONT-LOW


EL 354.6
 3RD FLR. FIN. FLR.

EL 342
 2ND FLR. FIN. FLR.

1ST FLR. FIN. CLG.

EL 332.2
 GRADE @
 FRONT CURB SIDEWALK

EL 367.2
 T.O. FIN. ROOF @ REAR



1 NORTH SIDE ELEVATION - PROPOSED
 A3.3

SCALE 1/4" = 1'-0"



S C A L E

D R A W N B Y
 MFAJAB/ELS

D A T E
 JUNE 16, 2010



F O R
 SITE PERMIT SUBMITTAL



J O B N U M B E R

R E V I S I O N S

PROPOSED BUILDING SECTION

A3.3



 SHORT BLACK DASHED LINE INDICATES EXISTING ADJACENT BUILDING OUTLINE (446 & 456 DIAMOND)
 LONG BLUE DASHED LINE INDICATES FUTURE BUILDING OUTLINE (446 DIAMOND ST.) AS PER PENDING PERMIT #200709112337

1
A3.2
WEST (REAR) ELEVATION - PROPOSED
 Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0"
 0 5 10 15 20 25 FT

2
A3.2
WEST (REAR) ELEVATION - EXISTING
 Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0"
 0 5 10 15 20 25 FT

S C A L L E



D R A W N B Y
JAB/ELS


D A T E
JUNE 16, 2010

F O R
SITE PERMIT SUBMITTAL


J O B N U M B E R

R E V I S I O N S
JULY 16, 2010

 SHORT BLACK DASHED LINE INDICATES EXISTING ADJACENT BUILDING OUTLINE (446 & 456 DIAMOND)
 LONG BLUE DASHED LINE INDICATES FUTURE BUILDING OUTLINE (446 DIAMOND ST.) AS PER PENDING PERMIT #200709112337



1 EAST (FRONT) ELEVATION - PROPOSED
 A3.1 0 5 10 15 20 25 FT SCALE 1/4" = 1'-0"



2 EAST (FRONT) ELEVATION - EXISTING
 A3.1 0 5 10 15 20 25 FT SCALE 1/4" = 1'-0"

S C A L L E


D R A W N B Y
MFAJAB/ELS

D A T E
JUNE 16, 2010

F O R
SITE PERMIT SUBMITTAL

J O B N U M B E R


R E V I S I O N S



2 ROOF PLAN - PROPOSED
A2.2




SCALE 1/4" = 1'-0"




1 THIRD FLOOR PLAN - PROPOSED
A2.2



SCALE 1/4" = 1'-0"






2 SECOND FLOOR PLAN - PROPOSED
A2.1




SCALE 1/4" = 1'-0"



1 FIRST FLOOR PLAN - PROPOSED
A2.1



SCALE 1/4" = 1'-0"



S C A L E



D R A W N B Y
MFA/JAB/ELS

D A T E
JUNE 16, 2010

F O R
SITE PERMIT SUBMITTAL

J O B N U M B E R

R E V I S I O N S



NOTES

1. SURVEYED IN ACCORDANCE WITH FIRST AMERICAN TITLE COMPANY PRELIMINARY REPORT NO. 3807-2876848, DATED AUGUST 08, 2007.
2. ALL PROPERTY LINE ANGLES ARE 90°.
3. FOR THE PURPOSE OF CLARITY, DETAILS NEAR BOUNDARY LINES ARE NOT NECESSARILY SHOWN TO SCALE.

LEGEND

BW --- BACK OF WALK
 CL --- CENTERLINE
 CLR --- CLEAR OF PROPERTY LINE (MEASUREMENT TAKEN PERPENDICULAR OR RADIAL TO PROPERTY LINE - IMPROVEMENT OWNERSHIP NOT DETERMINED BY THE SURVEYOR)
 CONC --- CONCRETE
 FND --- FOUNDATION
 FF --- FINISH FLOOR
 FL --- FLOW LINE
 GRD --- GROUND
 OR --- OFFICIAL RECORDS CITY AND COUNTY SAN FRANCISCO
 OVR --- OVER PROPERTY LINE (MEASUREMENT TAKEN PERPENDICULAR OR RADIAL TO PROPERTY LINE - IMPROVEMENT OWNERSHIP NOT DETERMINED BY THE SURVEYOR)
 R/W --- RIGHT OF WAY
 TC --- TOP OF CURB
 TW --- TOP OF WALL
 W/ --- WITH

SYMBOLS

--- BUILDING LINE
 x x x --- FENCE
 --- MONUMENT LINE
 --- PROPERTY LINE
 o --- DIMENSION POINT
 + --- SET CHISELED CROSS


UTILITY SYMBOLS

CO --- CLEANOUT
 GV --- GAS VALVE BOX
 HB --- HOSE BIB
 OHE --- OVERHEAD ELECTRIC WIRE
 OHT --- OVERHEAD TELEPHONE WIRE
 S --- SEWER MANHOLE
 WM --- WATER METER BOX

SURVEY OF
 NO. 448 DIAMOND STREET
 ASSESSOR'S LOT 8, BLOCK 2768
 BEING A PORTION OF HORNER'S ADDITION BLOCK NO. 214
 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA
 PREPARED FOR
MAURA F. AND STEVEN D. ABERNETHY
 BY
TRONOFF ASSOCIATES - LAND SURVEYORS
 (510) 428-1515
 SCALE 1" = 8' FEBRUARY 25, 2010
 SURVEY NO. 7457



BRUCE T. TRONOFF, LAND SURVEYOR NO. 6415 (RENEWAL DATE 12/31/10)
 NOTE: ONLY COPIES OF THIS DOCUMENT BEARING A "WET" SIGNATURE AND SEAL IN BLUE INK ARE TO BE CONSIDERED AS THE ORIGINAL AND UNMODIFIED WORK PRODUCT OF TRONOFF ASSOCIATES.




ADJACENT PROPERTY
 456 DIAMOND ST.
 (THREE STORY BUILDING)

SUBJECT PROPERTY
 448 DIAMOND ST.
 BLOCK/LOT: 2768/008
 (THREE STORY BUILDING)

ADJACENT PROPERTY
 446 DIAMOND ST.
 (THREE STORY BUILDING)

DIAMOND STREET

1
 A1.2 PROPOSED SITE PLAN W/ FUTURE RENOVATION @ ADJ. PROPERTY
 Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"




448 DIAMOND STREET
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114


S _ _ _ C _ _ _ A _ _ _ L _ _ _ E
 AS NOTED
 D _ _ _ R _ _ _ A _ _ _ W _ _ _ N _ _ _ B _ _ _ Y
 J _ _ _ A _ _ _ B _ _ _ , _ _ _ E _ _ _ L _ _ _ S
 D _ _ _ A _ _ _ T _ _ _ E
 J _ _ _ U _ _ _ N _ _ _ E 16, 2010
 F _ _ _ O _ _ _ R
 S _ _ _ I _ _ _ T _ _ _ E P _ _ _ E _ _ _ R _ _ _ I _ _ _ T S _ _ _ U _ _ _ B _ _ _ M _ _ _ I _ _ _ T _ _ _ T _ _ _ A _ _ _ L
 J _ _ _ O _ _ _ B _ _ _ N _ _ _ U _ _ _ M _ _ _ B _ _ _ E _ _ _ R

R _ _ _ E _ _ _ V _ _ _ I _ _ _ S _ _ _ I _ _ _ O _ _ _ N _ _ _ S
 J _ _ _ U _ _ _ L _ _ _ Y 16, 2010


SITE PLAN



2 PROPOSED SITE PLAN
Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"



1 EXISTING SITE PLAN
Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"



448 DIAMOND STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114

S C A L L E
AS NOTED


D R A W N B Y
MFA, JAB, ELS

D A T T E
JUNE 16, 2010

F O R
SITE PERMIT SUBMITTAL

J O B N U M B E R

R E V I S I O N S
JULY 16, 2010



SUBJECT PROPERTY WITH TWO ADJACENT PROPERTIES



CLOSE UP OF EXISTING PROPERTY



PROPERTIES DIRECTLY ACROSS THE STREET



CLOSE UP OF PROPERTY DIRECTLY ACROSS THE STREET



2
A0.2 DIAMOND STREET EAST SIDE - PROPERTIES FACING SUBJECT PROPERTY



SUBJECT PROPERTY
448 DIAMOND ST.

1
A0.2 DIAMOND STREET WEST SIDE - SUBJECT & ADJACENT PROPERTIES

S C A L L E
AS NOTED
D R A W N B Y
JAB/LS/AA
D A T E
JUNE 16, 2010
F O R
SITE PERMIT SUBMITTAL
J O B N U M B E R

R E V I S I O N S

PROJECT INFO /
STREET PHOTOS


448 DIAMOND STREET

PLANS SHALL COMPLY WITH TITLE 24 ENERGY EFFICIENCY REQUIREMENTS AND ALL MANDATORY MEASURES.



5 LOCATION MAP
A0.1

NOT TO SCALE



4 DIAMOND STREET RENDERING
A0.1

PROPERTY OWNER:
MAURA & STEVEN ABERNETHY
432A AMATURY LOOP
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94129
TEL. 415.730.5811
CONTACT: MAURA ABERNETHY

STRUCTURAL ENGINEER
T.B.D.
GENERAL CONTRACTOR
T.B.D.

DESIGNER
MFA DESIGN
3298 PIERCE ST.
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94123
TEL. 415.730.5811
CONTACT: MAURA ABERNETHY

AGENCIES
PLANNING & BUILDING DEPTS.
CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO
1650 & 1660 MISSION STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103
TEL. PLANNING 415.558.6372
CONTACT: SOPHIE MIDDLEBROOK
TEL. BLDG: 415.558.6070
CONTACT: T.B.D.

3 PROJECT DIRECTORY
A0.1

PROJECT ADDRESS: 448 DIAMOND STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114

BLOCK/LOT: 2768/008

TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION: V

OCCUPANCY CLASS: R-3

PLANNING DISTRICT: 7 (SOUTHWEST QUADRANT)

ZONING: RH-2 40-X HEIGHT LIMIT
NOT IN RDA PROJECT AREA

NUMBER OF LEVELS: 3 (EXISTING & PROPOSED)

FIRE SPRINKLERS REQUIRED: NO

SCOPE OF WORK: DEMOLISH (E) 3-LEVEL BUILDING. REPLACE
W/ (N) 3-LEVEL SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING W/
GARAGE.

APPLICABLE CODES: 2007 CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE

AREA

LOT AREA: 2894 S.F.

EXIST. HOUSE 1ST FLR: 80 S.F.
EXIST. HOUSE 2ND FLR: 986 S.F.
EXIST. HOUSE 3RD FLR: 781 S.F.
1847 S.F.

EXIST. HOUSE GARAGE/STORAGE: 751 S.F.

EXIST. HOUSE TOTAL FLOOR AREA (INCLUDING GARAGE): 2598 S.F.

PROPOSED HOUSE 1ST FLR: 924 S.F.
PROPOSED HOUSE 2ND FLR: 1242 S.F.
PROPOSED HOUSE 3RD FLR: 1296 S.F.
3462 S.F.

PROPOSED HOUSE GARAGE/UTILITY: 413 S.F.

TOTAL FLOOR AREA (INCLUDING GARAGE) : 3875 S.F.

2 PROJECT INFORMATION
A0.1

ARCHITECTURAL

- A0.1 PROJECT INFO / COVER SHEET
- A0.2 PROJECT INFO
- A0.3 PROJECT INFO
- A0.4 3-D RENDERINGS
- A1.1 EXISTING & PROPOSED SITE PLAN
- A1.2 PROPOSED SITE PLAN (W/ FUTURE ADJ. PROPERTY)
- SURVEY SURVEY
- A2.1 1ST & 2ND FLOOR PLANS PROPOSED
- A2.2 3RD & ROOF FLOOR PLANS PROPOSED
- A3.1 FRONT ELEVATION EXIST. & PROPOSED
- A3.2 REAR ELEVATION EXIST. & PROPOSED
- A3.3 NORTH SIDE ELEVATION
- A3.4 SOUTH SIDE ELEVATION
- A3.5 PROPOSED BUILDING SECTION (W/ EXIST. ADJ. PROPERTY)
- EXD1 GARAGE/BSMT & 1ST FLOOR - EXISTING AND PROPOSED DEMO
- EXD2 2ND FLOOR & ROOF - EXISTING AND PROPOSED DEMO
- EXD3 FRONT, SIDE, AND REAR ELEVATIONS - EXIST AND PROPOSED DEMO
- EXD4 SECTION - EXIST AND PROPOSED DEMO

1 DRAWING INDEX
A0.1

DESIGN
MFA
MAURA FERNÁNDEZ ABERNETHY

448 DIAMOND STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114

S C A L E
AS NOTED

D R A W N B Y
JAB/ELS

D A T E
JUNE 16, 2010

F O R
SITE PERMIT SUBMITTAL


J O B N U M B E R

R E V I S I O N S

PROJECT INFO /
COVER SHEET


A0.1

3298 PIERCE ST SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94123
C. 415 730-5811 O. 415 474-1367 F. 415 474-8696
maura_abernethy@comcast.net




2
EXD1 FIRST FLOOR PLAN - EXISTING PROPOSED FOR DEMOLITION

SCALE 1/4" = 1'-0"



1
EXD1 GARAGE / BASEMENT FLOOR PLAN - EXISTING PROPOSED FOR DEMOLITION

SCALE 1/4" = 1'-0"



448 DIAMOND STREET
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114

S C A L E

D R A W N B Y
 JAB/MFA/ELS

D A T E
 APRIL 16, 2010


F O R
 SITE PERMIT SUBMITTAL

J O B N U M B E R

R E V I S I O N S


EXISTING AND
 DEMOLITION PLANS

EXD 1





2 ROOF PLAN - EXISTING PROPOSED FOR DEMOLITION
EXD2

SCALE 1/4" = 1'-0"



1 SECOND FLOOR PLAN - EXISTING PROPOSED FOR DEMOLITION
EXD2

SCALE 1/4" = 1'-0"



S_C_A_L_L_E


D_R_A_W_N_B_Y
MFA/JABELS

D_A_T_E
APRIL 16, 2010


F_O_O_R
SITE PERMIT SUBMITTAL

J_O_B_N_U_M_B_E_R


R_E_V_I_S_I_O_N_S




2 EXISTING SIDE ELEVATION
EXD3 Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0"



4 EXISTING SIDE ELEVATION
EXD3 Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0"



1 EXISTING FRONT ELEVATION
EXD3 Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0"



3 EXISTING REAR ELEVATION
EXD3 Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0"



S C A L E


D R A W N B Y
JAB/MA/ELS

D A T E
APRIL 16, 2010


F O R
SITE PERMIT SUBMITTAL

J O B N U M B E R

R E V I S I O N S



1 EXISTING BUILDING SECTION
EXD4 SCALE 1/4" = 1'-0"



S _ C _ A _ L _ L _ E

D R A W N _ B Y
 MFA/JAB/ELS

D _ A _ T _ E
 APRIL 16, 2010

F _ O _ R
 SITE PERMIT SUBMITTAL

J O B _ N U M B E R

R E V I S I O N S
