



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.: 2009.0368D / 2010.0851D
Project Address: 673 BRUSSELS STREET
 RH-1 (Residential House, One-Family)
 40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 6120 / 016
Project Sponsor: Adolpho Alano
 144 Princeton Street
 San Francisco, CA 94112
Staff Contact: Edgar Oropeza – (415) 588-6381
 edgar.oropeza@sfgov.org
Recommendation: **Disapproval. Take DR and disapprove the proposed demolition and new construction.**

DEMOLITION APPLICATION		NEW BUILDING APPLICATION	
Demolition Case Number	2009.0368D	New Building Case Number	2010.0851D
Recommendation	Take DR Disapprove	Recommendation	Take DR Disapprove
Demolition Application Number	2010.0308.7713	New Building Application Number	2010.0308.7714
Number Of Existing Units	1	Number Of New Units	1
Existing Parking	0	New Parking	2
Number Of Existing Bedrooms	2	Number Of New Bedrooms	3
Existing Building Area	± 1,200 Sq. Ft.	New Building Area	± 3,000 Sq. Ft.
Public DR Also Filed?	No	Public DR Also Filed?	No
311 Expiration Date	9/8/2010	Date Time & Materials Fees Paid	N/A

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Project is to demolish an existing one-story single-family dwelling and construct a new two-story, single-family dwelling.

SITE DESCRIPTION AND PRESENT USE

The subject property, 673 Brussels Street is a one-story single family dwelling built in 1908 located on the east side of Brussels Street. This section of Brussels Street has a 13% down-slope north towards Woosley Street and the property itself slopes down from the front to the rear. This allows for crawl space underneath most of the building and a basement at the rear of the building. The architectural features of the house are similar to its immediate two-story neighbor to the north with a combination of hip and gable roof with asphalt shingles and corbels along the underside of the roof's overhang. The façade is made up of stucco and wood trim and the material used on the sides of the house are mainly wood siding. A walkway from the sidewalk and four exterior stairs lead to the entry gate and foyer (building set back approximately 14 feet). The home lacks a garage opening.

SURROUNDING PROPERTIES & NEIGHBORHOOD

The project site is located on the border of the Excelsior and Visitacion Valley neighborhoods, two blocks west of commercially vibrant San Bruno Avenue. The immediate and surrounding residential neighborhood consists of a mixture of one-, two-, and three-story buildings, containing mostly single family residential buildings of varying heights and depths. The architectural styles exhibited on the subject block face and surrounding area primarily include Mediterranean, Mid-century Minimal Traditional and Arts and Crafts style residential buildings.

HEARING NOTIFICATION

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

	SUPPORT	OPPOSED	NO POSITION
Adjacent neighbor(s)	3	0	0
Other neighbors on the block or directly across the street	18	0	0
Neighborhood groups	0	0	0

REPLACEMENT STRUCTURE

The replacement structure will provide one dwelling-unit with a two-car garage, and would rise to approximately 21'-6" in height (Section 102.12 for down sloping lots) with two-stories. The ground floor will contain a two-car garage, the kitchen, living room, dining room and a half bath. The second floor contains three bedrooms, two full baths, a family room and a laundry room.

The Project proposes a rear yard of approximately 38'-0", which was requested by the Department's Residential Design Team (RDT). The overall scale, design, and materials of the proposed replacement structure are compatible with the block-face and are complementary with the residential neighborhood

character. The materials for the front façade are traditional in style, with stucco siding and paintable fiberglass windows.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The Project has completed the Section 311 and Mandatory DR notification. Staff has received 21 letters in support for the project of which are from residents of the immediate area. Opposition of any type was not received. No publically initiated Discretionary Review was filed.

GENERAL PLAN COMPLIANCE

The Project is not consistent with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan:

HOUSING ELEMENT **Objectives and Policies**

OBJECTIVE 2 **RETAIN THE EXISTING SUPPLY OF HOUSING**

Policy 2.1:

Discourage the demolition of sound existing housing.

Demolition of existing housing often results in the loss of lower-cost housing units. Even if the existing housing is replaced, the new units are generally more costly.

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 does not affect existing neighborhood serving retail uses as the project is located in a residential district and is a residential project.

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

The proposal is to demolish the existing residential building located at 673 Brussels Street and therefore does not seek to preserve or protect the existing building. However, the proposed single family building is in character with the existing building scale of the immediate neighborhood.

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

The project does not preserve or enhance the existing single family dwelling, which is considered affordable.

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

The project seeks to demolish the existing single family dwelling and replace it with a new single family dwelling. The project is not expected to impede transit service or overburden streets or neighborhood parking.

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 project does not affect existing industrial operations or buildings nor does it detract from existing service sector operations. The project is strictly residential in character.

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

If approved, the replacement building would be built in compliance with San Francisco's current Building Code Standards and would meet all earthquake safety requirements.

7. Landmarks and historic buildings be preserved.

The project proposes to demolish a structure built in 1908, however it has been determined by preservation staff that a Landmark or historic building does not occupy the Project site.

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

The project's height is proposed to be approximately 22 feet tall. It was determined that no new shadows would be created as a result of the proposed construction on existing parks owned by the Park and Recreation Department.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The Project was issued a Categorical Exemption, Class 1 [State CEQA Guidelines Section 15301(1) (1)] on October 26, 2009.

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 disapproved. The Project is not consistent with the Objectives and Policies of the General Plan and does not meet the criteria set forth in Section 101.1 of the Planning Code in that:

- The Project will not result in a net gain of dwelling-units.
- The condition of the existing building was a result of deferred maintenance.

- The existing housing stock is the City's major source of relatively affordable housing. It is very difficult to replace given the cost of new construction. Priority should be given to the retention of existing units as a primary means to provide affordable housing.

RECOMMENDATION:

Case No. 2009.0368D / 2010.0851D –Take DR and disapprove the demolition and proposed new construction.

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 Meets Criteria

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 Criteria

Based on Planning staff's review of the Soundness Report prepared by "ACS Consulting Engineers" – an independent third party for this Project – the existing structure cannot be considered unsound housing. The major soundness issue in this case is severe differential settlement that occurred between the central, longitudinal post-and-beam spine, and the two side perimeter footings. Inadequate foundation support by the spread footings seems to be a cause. As this is an original construction deficiency, all costs associated with its remediation can be counted toward the upgrade. The house also has severe mold/mildew growth, and holes in the roof that have allowed direct water infiltration, warping the floor finishes and degrading the plaster ceiling and wall finishes. Only a partial allowance for repair of those latter items qualifies as an upgrade, to the estimated extent necessary for repair of the structural settlement, not a total replacement necessitated by neglect and deferred maintenance.

The following spread sheet used by staff to evaluate soundness demonstrates that the building does not meet or exceed the threshold for soundness as defined per Section 317 of the Planning Code.

CASE: 2009.0368D
/ 2010.0851D
ADDRESS: 673 BRUSSELS
PLANNER: Edgar Oropeza

REPLACEMENT COST:	UNIT COST	AREA	ITEM COST
FINISHED, HABITABLE	\$240	925	\$222,000
UNFINISHED OCCUPIED	\$110	0	\$0
ATTIC, HIGH CRAWLSP	\$60	912	\$54,720
NO HEADROOM, >30" HI	\$15	0	\$0
ILLEGAL/UNPERMITTED	\$0	0	\$0

TOTAL: **\$276,720**

SOUNDNESS THRESHOLD (50%) **\$138,360**

UPGRADE COSTS

FOUNDATION REPAIR/REPLCMT	\$28,380
CRIBBING & LEVELING FLOOR	\$12,000
FLOOR FRAMING & FINISH	\$10,800
CLG FINISH REPAIR	\$5,250
WALL FRAMING & REPAIR	\$5,250
PAINTING & FINISHES	\$10,000
HEATING SYSTEM	\$12,000

TOTAL: **\$83,680**

EXCEEDS SOUNDNESS THRESHOLD? **FALSE**

DEMOLITION CRITERIA

Existing Building

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

Project Meets Criteria

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.

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

Project Does Not Meet the Criteria

The housing is free of Housing Code violations. However, it has not been occupied for the past ten years and has not been maintained in a decent, safe, and sanitary condition.

- Whether the property is a "historical resource" under CEQA;

Project Meets Criteria

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;

Criteria 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;

Criteria 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 Criteria

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 Criteria

The Project does not meet this criterion because the existing dwelling will be demolished.

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

Project Meets Criteria

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.

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

Project Does Not Meet Criteria

The project proposed to demolish the existing single family dwelling and therefore does not protect the relative affordability of the existing house.

10. Whether the Project increases the number of permanently affordable units as governed by Section 315;

Project Does Not Meet Criteria

The Project does not include any permanently affordable units, as the construction of the unit does not trigger Section 315 review.

Replacement Structure

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

Project Meets Criteria

The Project replaces one single-family dwelling with a new single family dwelling in a neighborhood characterized by single -family dwellings.

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

Project Meets Criteria

The Project will create a family-sized unit. The floor plans reflect such new quality, family housing.

13. Whether the Project creates new supportive housing;

Project Does Not Meet Criteria

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 Criteria

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 the Criteria

The project does not increase the total number of dwellings on-site.

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

Project Meets Criteria

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

Design Review Checklist

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER (PAGES 7-10)

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

Comments: The project site is located on the border of the Excelsior and Visitacion Valley neighborhoods, two blocks west of commercially vibrant San Bruno Avenue. The immediate and surrounding residential neighborhood consists of a mixture of one-, two-, and three-story buildings, containing mostly single family residential buildings of varying heights and depths. The architectural styles exhibited on the subject block face and surrounding area primarily include Mediterranean, Mid-century Minimal Traditional and Arts and Crafts style residential buildings.

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 providing a recess at the rear along the southern side property line so to respect the pattern of southern side spacing. The overall scale of the proposed replacement structure is consistent with the block face and is complementary to the neighborhood character

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 replacement building is compatible with the established building scale at the street, as it maintains and supports the subject block's existing street wall. 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 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 mixed pattern of ground and elevated entrances found of the east side of Brussels Street. The length and type of rectangular bay window along the façade is compatible with the style of bay windows found throughout the neighborhood. The garage door is slightly recessed from the front façade and limited to a width of 10 feet. The rooftop parapets are standard in size and compatible with the parapets found on other flat-roofed buildings in the neighborhood.

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 stucco wall finish with wood trim and detailing are compatible with the existing buildings in the neighborhood.

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
- Prop M findings
- Environmental Evaluation / Historic Resources Information
- Soundness Report
- Reduced Plans
- Context Photos

* All page numbers refer to the Residential Design Guidelines

Parcel Map

WOOLSEY




DWIGHT

Discretionary Review
Case Number 2009.0368D / 2010.0851D
Residential Demolition
673 Brussels Street



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
Case Number 2009.0368D / 2010.0851D
Residential Demolition
673 Brussels Street



Zoning Map



ZONING USE DISTRICTS

- Zoning Districts
 - Residential, House Districts
 - RH-1(D) One Unit per Lot, Detached
 - RH-1 One Unit per Lot
 - RH-1(S) One Unit per Lot with Minor
 - RH-2 Two Units per Lot
 - RH-3 Three Units per Lot
 - Residential, Mixed (Apartments & Homes)
 - RM-1 Low Density (1 Unit per 800)
 - RM-2 Moderate Density (1 Unit per 400)
 - RM-3 Medium Density (1 Unit per 200)
 - RM-4 High Density (1 Unit per 100)
 - Neighborhood Commercial Districts
 - NC-1 Cluster (1 Commercial Story)
 - NC-2 Small-Scale (2 Commercial Stories)
 - NC-3 Moderate-Scale (3+ Commercial Stories)
 - NCD Individual (Named, Controls)
 - NC-5 Shopping Center (2 Commercial Stories)
 - Mixed Use Districts

Discretionary Review
 Case Number 2009.0368D / 2010.0851D
 Residential Demolition
 673 Brussels Street



Aerial Photo



SUBJECT PROPERTY



Discretionary Review
Case Number 2009.0368D / 2010.0851D
Residential Demolition
673 Brussels Street

Photos of Subject Site




Discretionary Review
Case Number 2009.0368D / 2010.0851D
Residential Demolition
673 Brussels Street

673 Brussels Street




The City and County of San Francisco does not guarantee the accuracy, reliability, completeness or usefulness of any information provided on this information as a basis without warranty for any kind, including but not limited to warranties of merchantability, fitness for a particular purpose, and assumes no responsibility for any use of the information.




Printed: 21 September, 2010


673 Brussels Street. Height and Bulk




The City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) does not guarantee the accuracy, adequacy, completeness or usefulness of any information. CCSF provides this information on an "as is" basis without warranty of any kind, including but not limited to warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose, and assumes no responsibility for anyone's use of the information.




673 Brussels Street. Topography



673 Brussels Street. Zoning Districts



The City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) does not guarantee the accuracy, adequacy, completeness or usefulness of any information. CCSF provides this information on an "as is" basis without warranty of any kind, including but not limited to warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose, and assumes no responsibility for anyone's use of the information.



San Francisco Planning Commission
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: Application Nos. 2010.0308.7714 & 2010.0308.7713
Case No. 2009.0368D

Dear San Francisco Planning Commission,

Thank you for taking the time to review the application and the related materials attached herewith.


In addition, we present to you personal background information for your insights to better comprehend why we strongly believe that the demolition soundness report, pertaining to the existing one single dwelling on 673 Brussels Street, should have been *pro* administrative approval.

We are kindly requesting for your full consideration of these personal matters which will explain why we are adamant for the demolition and construction of the new two-story home on this specific project site.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us at your earliest convenience.

We respectfully look forward to meeting with you.

Cordially,



Prudence Beverly Caldito
673 Brussels Street
San Francisco, CA 94134

Enclosures:

Personal Background of Property
Timeline
Petition of Support from Neighbors
Historical Evaluation Results
Soundness Report
Photos of the Neighborhood
Proposed Plans

September 20, 2010

Dear San Francisco Planning Commissioners,

I am reaching out in writing in hopes to enlighten you to better understand why I am wholeheartedly pursuing this case and why the condition of the dwelling at 673 Brussels is at the state it is in.

The house on 673 Brussels have many emotional history to the Caldito family because it is the first and only house my parents had purchased and ever owned since we immigrated from the Philippines in the summer of 1979. Indeed, it is not a luxurious dwelling like the other residences you see on Portola District. In fact, it is not even big enough to raise a family with three children who had to share a small room growing up. But my parents made it a loving home and took care of the property with their hard earned living, with the same care they had given their children. For eight years, it was a very joyous household with many good memories established, until 1988 when my mother was diagnosed with cancer.

As the youngest of the three, I was oblivious with her struggles and battle with the illness for almost four years. Although I knew something was not quite right, the details of her illness were kept by my father. Looking back, perhaps he was protecting his children from the emotional reality of it all, or he, himself, was in denial. Mom passed away in 1991.

I lived with my dad momentarily after my mom's passing. Shortly after, while still attending college, I moved in with my oldest sister, Jane, to help babysit her children. My father became the sole resident of 673 Brussels, until his unexpected death in August 2000 from cardiac arrest. Because of his sudden passing, he did not have an opportunity to leave a written will. The house/property then went through the probate process and it has been vacant ever since.

Losing a parent was merely disheartening. But to have lost them both was beyond devastating. During this time, because of legal matters, and my sisters and my own financial situation, we could not do anything with the house itself, other than start what have turned out to be an overwhelming clean-up tasks of my father's belongings.

The tedious clean-up, from discarding debris from the yards and inside the house, to sorting through everything that my father obsessively kept, continued over the years. The tasks became overwhelming and emotionally draining because not only does it bring back many memories of what my father had become after the passing of my mother, but the image of my father's body lying helplessly the house resonates in our minds.

In 2007, I got married to a wonderful and supporting husband, Jason Gee (a San Francisco native). He has helped me cope and deal with my emotions of the death of my parents. With his support, I was able to gain the strength to return to my parents' house to continue the tasks of cleaning their belongings. Because of my sisters' own family matters, and my sister's health issues, both my husband and I have ended up taking on these erroneous responsibilities on our own-- trying to keep the property clean as much as we can by driving to the area, even after long hours from work to clean-up.


My husband and I both love living in San Francisco and it is our dream to own a house in this City. Now that we are able, I have discussed the idea with him to take on the ownership of my parents' house (with the blessings of my sisters), rather than selling the property to someone outside the family. Because Jason and I also want to start and raise a family, the extension of the existing house is much needed, and in order to work within our budget, we proceeded with the remodeling plan. Thus, the remodeling application was submitted to City Planning Department in November 2009. However, after our architect, Mr. Alano's meeting with Mr. Oropeza, we were notified that our proposed plan did not meet the remodeling criteria, but rather a *de facto* demolition. A rework of the original plan was needed, and soon after, the application for the demolition was submitted to the City Planning in March 2010.

As you see on the attached timeline, my husband and I, along with our architect, have been diligently communicating and working with the City Planning Department and timely providing them the requested materials to get this process through and the project completed, for we, too, are working on time-constraint.

By providing you history and personal background, significant related materials, and signatures from neighbors supporting the proposed plans, we request and seek for your full consideration to approve the demolition and construction of the new 2-story house at 673 Brussels Street, so that my husband and I can finally live our dream of being a first-time home owner, and start and raise a family in the City of San Francisco.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Prudence Beverly Caldito

September 20, 2010

Dear San Francisco Planning Commissioner,

My name is Jane Caldito. I am the eldest of the three children of the deceased (Prudencio and Lydia Caldito) then owners of the property which is the subject of this petition. I am writing this letter in support of the demolition of the debilitated residential structure located at 673 Brussels Street in San Francisco and the reconstruction of a new home on the same site.

Owning 673 Brussels was a dream come true for our parents. It was a tiny house but to us, it was our HOME. It was their pride and joy. It was their diamond that was to last forever. We were blessed with such wonderful parents. They provided and loved us the best they knew how. We had a good life but our lives were never without its share of trials. Our family has weathered a roller coaster of storms, but our passion and determination in pursuit of the right things enable us to persevere.

My mom was diagnosed with cancer and died in 1991 leaving us with insurmountable medical bills to pay. Her death weighted heavily on my dad who had lost a wife and first love. He became emotionally and financially drained as a result of the tragedy. After losing my mom to cancer, he began to treasure things. ALL things as we had later come to unravel. It was an unbecoming behavior but, at the time, we thought that it was simply a coping mechanism for the death and/or the beginning of old age.

The loss took a toll. In 2000, he died suddenly of a massive coronary stroke with multiple complications. His death was instantaneous. None of us, his children, or grandkids ever had the chance to say our goodbyes. It was upon the discovery of his cold remains in his house where we uncovered the massive effects of his dysfunction. Piles and piles of newspapers and other junk lined his narrow hall way which led from his front door to the bathroom where he laid. The coroner and paramedics surely had to be creative in order to maneuver and wheel his body and their way out of there.

My mom's passing had left my father with unsettled medical bills. When my dad passed on, he left nothing but a home full of junk and one that needed a lot of intensive care. My sisters and I took turns cleaning the house as much as we could. The house was moldy and stuffy which made breathing difficult and cleaning a challenge. We had breathing masks on in order to avoid getting sick. Each week, we went back and carefully sifted through his things one room at a time. It was a very slow process. There were so many things that need to be disposed of. As we embarked on the massive clean-up effort, more trials came our way.

A few months following my dad's death, my then husband was laid off. He was out of the work for nearly five years, leaving me to be the sole supporter of my family. While unemployed, he became addicted to gambling. Four years passed before I discovered his addiction, but by then it was already too late. I and my three children were already financially ruined. My dilemma did not end there. As this was going on, one of my children was assessed with a cognitive development issue. His expensive therapies plus my legal fees made us even more financially strapped. My situation called for an immediate redirection of efforts from Brussels to my own home. Divorce and custody battles consumed me for years to come. Unfortunately, this left my two sisters in charge of cleaning our parents' home.


In the midst of my divorce proceedings, came another heartbreaking news. My second sister, Lily Beth, had been diagnosed with cancer. From this, her course of priorities and efforts had to change towards her surgery, her road to recovery and own family. With my personal issues and Lily Beth's, this left my youngest sister, Beverly, handling the clean-up at Brussels alone.

Seven years after my father had passed away, Beverly got married to Jason. Together they have spent countless years, months, days and hours cleaning Brussels and managing all numerous related issues. The existing structure is run down. It is no longer safe or sound. Its stability raises major safety concerns for future dwellers and neighboring properties and residents.

Beverly and Jason are committed to a dream – a dream to build a life and start a family of their own in a place that they can call home. To them, 673 Brussels is HOME. Their vision is sound and they are committed to seeing this project to fruition. Their intentions are pure, their minds and hearts committed.

In closing, I hereby fully give my support and humbly request permission to grant the demolition and permission to let the new construction begin.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jane Grace Caldito', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Jane Grace Caldito
219 Lakeshire Drive
Daly City, CA 94105
Phone: 650-225-6061

September 18, 2010

Dear San Francisco Planning Commissioners,

This letter is in support for the demolition of the existing one single dwelling on 673 Brussels Street and for the construction of the new two-story home on this project site.

In 1979, my parents and I, along with my two sisters came to San Francisco as immigrants from the Philippines. With hard work and pure determination, our parents were able to take part in the American dream of purchasing a house and creating a loving home for the family. But several years later, in 1988, our mother was diagnosed with cancer. After years of struggle, she finally lost her battle with the disease in 1991. The loss of our beloved and loving mother not only left a huge void in our hearts, but her medical bills and funeral expenses had left my father and the family in financial burden.

Dad lived all alone in their home after Mom had passed and to the day until a massive heart attack had taken his life in the year 2000. We did not realize how much the loss of our mother had affected and impacted his life, until we started cleaning up his house. He kept just about anything and everything (such as broken electronics and furnitures, buckets full of bottle caps, bowls of used staples, old newspapers, mom's old clothes, and anything with our mother's handwriting on it -- he kept). Everything had the word "SAVE" written on it, with his initials and date. At that point, we realized that not only we were dealing with the overwhelming clean-up, but also a loved one who had become a hoarder. We realized that Dad saved everything he could because he could not physically save Mom from cancer. To go through the clean-up of his house was not easy, and never did it ever become, over the years. It was very heartbreaking and emotionally draining as we have had to thoroughly go through his belongings -- deciding what paperwork and items we needed to keep, and preserving pictures we could find. Any salvageable items from their house have been donated through several drop-offs and neighborhood donations pick-up. There were plenty.

I, with my own family, had relocated to Placer County soon after our father's passing. Because of my living situation and also because of a serious health condition, I was not able to help my sisters and my brother-in-law as much with the clean-up as I should have. It took many clean-ups on their part, inside and out, including the front and back yards throughout these years. Inside the house, they literally had to clean one small space at a time since there was no or very little room to move. In addition, there were also many safety issues and health concerns they have had to consider and deal with every time they went to clean-up. The house is in such bad condition that it can collapse at anytime.

The marriage of my sister Prudence Beverly to her then fiancé, Jason, has been a great blessing to our family. By spending countless hours, long days, many months, and even several years taking on this gruesome clean-up of what our father had left behind, undeniably demonstrates that Jason and my sister have nothing but the sincerest and most genuine intentions of taking care of what our parents had worked hard for.

If I could have afforded it, I would have fixed my parents' house without any hesitation to keep the house within our family. However, just like my mother, I, too, was diagnosed and stricken with the debilitating cancer in 2006. Within the years, I have survived the grueling treatment and for now, in remission and grateful to be alive. It is still a long road to recovery, however, as my medical treatment continues.


Jason and Prudence Beverly are a young couple who both love San Francisco and hope to start and raise a family of their own. But they have to put these dreams on-hold as they take on building a new house on 673 Brussels. A history of their many meetings with their architect, Mr. Alano, and Mr. Edgar Oropeza, and their unceasing willingness to work with the San Francisco Building and City Planning Department are clearly indicative of their great efforts, responsibilities and commitment toward their goals of obtaining approval and the required legal permits for the needed demolition, construction and completion of this project.

I am asking for your tremendous support and to grant them approval to demolish the existing unsafe single dwelling at 673 Brussels and construct their two-story new home in San Francisco.

I am more than appreciative of you for evaluating their application which would hopefully enable them to start their project soon.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Lily Beth Caldito".

Lily Beth Caldito
7173 Liverpool Lane
Roseville, CA 95747
(916) 771-7173

Timeline

Date	Activity
2009 – March 24	Mr. Alano presented plans to the San Francisco Building Department.
2009 – April 2	Sent letter and copy of plans to immediate neighbors
2009 – April 14	out reach meeting at Mr. Alano's residence at 144 Princeton Street, San Francisco. Mr. Leon Van Steen attended and presented his concerns.
2009 – April 15	Mr. Alano reached out to Mr. Van Steen to schedule meeting to discuss and address his concerns with owner.
2009 – April 18	Met with Mr. Van Steen at the Alano's residence to discuss remodeling plans.
2009 – May 8	Submitted Historical Evaluation Application.
2009 – August 2/3	Received letter dated July 30, 2009 from Mr. Ben Fu requesting to owner to provide supporting research and documentation for historical evaluation.
2009 – August 19	Delivered Historical Evaluation Application to Ben Fu, per his request.
2009 – October 26	Received email from Mr. Brett Bollinger "signing off" on the project (PAN #2009.0368E), clearing of needing any further environmental review.
2009 – November 6	Sent, via certified mail, copy of revised plans to Mr. Van Steen (addressing his concerns) and sent him follow-up action item, via email.
2009 – November 10	Submitted Remodel Application
2010 – January	Mr. Edgar Oropeza informed Mr. Alano that the submitted project/proposal does not meet the remodeling requirements, but rather a <i>de facto</i> demolition.
2010 – January 26	Accompanied by Mr. Alano to met with Mr. Oropeza to discuss requirements needed to proceed.
2010 – February 3	Received letter from Mr. Oropeza providing us the information needed for demolition.
2010 – March 11	Mr. Alano submitted demolition application to Mr. Orepeza.
2010 – April 5	Mr. Oropez and Mr. Craig Nikitas. visited site and investigated building.
2010 – June 23	Informed by Mr. Alano through communication with Mr. Oropeza that Mr. Craig Nikitas made a "soft recommendation for disapproval" for demolition.
2010 – July 22	Accompanied by Mr. Alano met with Mr. Orepeza to discuss necessary steps to proceed.
2010 – August 4	Submitted all payment to proceed with process.

Dear San Francisco Planning Commission,


I, hereby, support the new owner Prudence Beverly Caldito in petition to demolish the existing one-unit dwelling for the construction of a new 2-story home, with garage, on 673 Brussels, San Francisco, California 94134.

I believe the construction of this new family home will beautify and improve the property values of our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Virgilio BASALTA

(Print name)



(Signature)

673 - Brussels St.

(Residence)

9/11/10

(Date)

Dear San Francisco Planning Commission,


I, hereby, support the new owner Prudence Beverly Caldito in petition to demolish the existing one-unit dwelling for the construction of a new 2-story home, with garage, on 673 Brussels, San Francisco, California 94134.

I believe the construction of this new family home will beautify and improve the property values of our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Ha

(Print name)



(Signature)

620 BRUSSELS ST.

(Residence)

9/14/2010

(Date)

Dear San Francisco Planning Commission,

I, hereby, support the new owner Prudence Beverly Caldito in petition to demolish the existing one-unit dwelling for the construction of a new 2-story home, with garage, on 673 Brussels, San Francisco, California 94134.

I believe the construction of this new family home will beautify and improve the property values of our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

JOHN MINEIL

(Print name)

John Mineil

(Signature)

625 BRUSSELS ST

(Residence)

9-11-2010

(Date)

Dear San Francisco Planning Commission,


I, hereby, support the new owner Prudence Beverly Caldito in petition to demolish the existing one-unit dwelling for the construction of a new 2-story home, with garage, on 673 Brussels, San Francisco, California 94134.

I believe the construction of this new family home will beautify and improve the property values of our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Guang Jun Huang

(Print name)



(Signature)

673 BRUSSELS ST.

(Residence)

9-11-16

(Date)

Dear San Francisco Planning Commission,

I, hereby, support the new owner Prudence Beverly Caldito in petition to demolish the existing one-unit dwelling for the construction of a new 2-story home, with garage, on 673 Brussels, San Francisco, California 94134.

I believe the construction of this new family home will beautify and improve the property values of our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Laura Serrano
(Print name)

Laura Serrano
(Signature)

630 Brussels St.
(Residence)

09/11/2010
(Date)


Dear San Francisco Planning Commission,

I, hereby, support the new owner Prudence Beverly Caldito in petition to demolish the existing one-unit dwelling for the construction of a new 2-story home, with garage, on 673 Brussels, San Francisco, California 94134.

I believe the construction of this new family home will beautify and improve the property values of our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Seth Chastain
(Print name)


(Signature)

636 Brussels St
(Residence)

9/14/10
(Date)

Dear San Francisco Planning Commission,

I, hereby, support the new owner Prudence Beverly Caldito in petition to demolish the existing one-unit dwelling for the construction of a new 2-story home, with garage, on 673 Brussels, San Francisco, California 94134.

I believe the construction of this new family home will beautify and improve the property values of our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

FRANK J. STRAZZARINO
(Print name)

Frank J. Strazzarino
(Signature)

637 BRUSSELS ST
(Residence)

9-16-50
(Date)

Dear San Francisco Planning Commission,


I, hereby, support the new owner Prudence Beverly Caldito in petition to demolish the existing one-unit dwelling for the construction of a new 2-story home, with garage, on 673 Brussels, San Francisco, California 94134.

I believe the construction of this new family home will beautify and improve the property values of our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Tommy T.

(Print name)



(Signature)

642 Brussels St.

(Residence)

9/14/2010

(Date)

Dear San Francisco Planning Commission,

I, hereby, support the new owner Prudence Beverly Caldito in petition to demolish the existing one-unit dwelling for the construction of a new 2-story home, with garage, on 673 Brussels, San Francisco, California 94134.

I believe the construction of this new family home will beautify and improve the property values of our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

VITO DEVERA
(Print name)

Vito P. De Vera
(Signature)

655 BRUSSELS ST. SF., CA. 94134
(Residence)

9/11/10
(Date)


Dear San Francisco Planning Commission,

I, hereby, support the new owner Prudence Beverly Caldito in petition to demolish the existing one-unit dwelling for the construction of a new 2-story home, with garage, on 673 Brussels, San Francisco, California 94134.

I believe the construction of this new family home will beautify and improve the property values of our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL SHINDLER
(Print name)


(Signature)

656 BRUSSELS ST. 94134
(Residence)

SEPT 14 2010
(Date)

Dear San Francisco Planning Commission,

I, hereby, support the new owner Prudence Beverly Caldito in petition to demolish the existing one-unit dwelling for the construction of a new 2-story home, with garage, on 673 Brussels, San Francisco, California 94134.

I believe the construction of this new family home will beautify and improve the property values of our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Juanita Anderson
(Print name)

Juanita Anderson
(Signature)

661 Brussels Street
(Residence)

Sept. 11, 2010
(Date)

Dear San Francisco Planning Commission,

I, hereby, support the new owner Prudence Beverly Caldito in petition to demolish the existing one-unit dwelling for the construction of a new 2-story home, with garage, on 673 Brussels, San Francisco, California 94134.

I believe the construction of this new family home will beautify and improve the property values of our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Scott R Shonk

(Print name)

SR Shonk

(Signature)

664 Brussels St

(Residence)

9/11/10

(Date)

Dear San Francisco Planning Commission,

I, hereby, support the new owner Prudence Beverly Caldito in petition to demolish the existing one-unit dwelling for the construction of a new 2-story home, with garage, on 673 Brussels, San Francisco, California 94134.

I believe the construction of this new family home will beautify and improve the property values of our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

GILDO D. MANALO
(Print name)

Gildo D. Manalo
(Signature)

667 BRUSSELS St
(Residence) SF Ca 94134

9-11-2010
(Date)

The Manalo family residence requests that our house will be entirely covered when construction begins, and that no debris falls over the property line.

Dear San Francisco Planning Commission,

I, hereby, support the new owner Prudence Beverly Caldito in petition to demolish the existing one-unit dwelling for the construction of a new 2-story home, with garage, on 673 Brussels, San Francisco, California 94134.

I believe the construction of this new family home will beautify and improve the property values of our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

HUA ZHU LIU
(Print name)

HUA ZHU LIU
(Signature)

673 BRUSSELS ST
(Residence)

9-9-10
(Date)

Dear San Francisco Planning Commission,

I, hereby, support the new owner Prudence Beverly Caldito in petition to demolish the existing one-unit dwelling for the construction of a new 2-story home, with garage, on 673 Brussels, San Francisco, California 94134.

I believe the construction of this new family home will beautify and improve the property values of our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

THANETTE HOLL
(Print name)

Thanne
(Signature)

684 Brussels St.
(Residence)

9/11/11
(Date)

Dear San Francisco Planning Commission,

I, hereby, support the new owner Prudence Beverly Caldito in petition to demolish the existing one-unit dwelling for the construction of a new 2-story home, with garage, on 673 Brussels, San Francisco, California 94134.

I believe the construction of this new family home will beautify and improve the property values of our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Linda Washington
(Print name)

Linda Washington
(Signature)

124 Dwight St.
(Residence)

9/11/10
(Date)

Dear San Francisco Planning Commission,

I, hereby, support the new owner Prudence Beverly Caldito in petition to demolish the existing one-unit dwelling for the construction of a new 2-story home, with garage, on 673 Brussels, San Francisco, California 94134.

I believe the construction of this new family home will beautify and improve the property values of our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

LANH VAN NGUYEN
(Print name)

Lanh
(Signature)

140 Dwight
(Residence)

SEP 11 2010
(Date)

Dear San Francisco Planning Commission,

I, hereby, support the new owner Prudence Beverly Caldito in petition to demolish the existing one-unit dwelling for the construction of a new 2-story home, with garage, on 673 Brussels, San Francisco, California 94134.

I believe the construction of this new family home will beautify and improve the property values of our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Qian Jiao Lin
(Print name)

Qian Jiao Lin
(Signature)

660 GIRARD ST
(Residence)

9/16/10
(Date)

Dear San Francisco Planning Commission,

I, hereby, support the new owner Prudence Beverly Caldito in petition to demolish the existing one-unit dwelling for the construction of a new 2-story home, with garage, on 673 Brussels, San Francisco, California 94134.

I believe the construction of this new family home will beautify and improve the property values of our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

ALEJANDRO ORTIZ
(Print name)

Alejandro Ortiz
(Signature)

672 BRASSL
(Residence)

9/16/10
(Date)

Dear San Francisco Planning Commission,

I, hereby, support the new owner Prudence Beverly Caldito in petition to demolish the existing one-unit dwelling for the construction of a new 2-story home, with garage, on 673 Brussels, San Francisco, California 94134.

I believe the construction of this new family home will beautify and improve the property values of our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

AUREA ALDON
(Print name)


(Signature)

684 GIRARD ST.
(Residence)

9-16-10
(Date)

Dear San Francisco Planning Commission,

I, hereby, support the new owner Prudence Beverly Caldito in petition to demolish the existing one-unit dwelling for the construction of a new 2-story home, with garage, on 673 Brussels, San Francisco, California 94134.

I believe the construction of this new family home will beautify and improve the property values of our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

NORMA G. MANGON

(Print name)

Norma G. Mangon

(Signature)

301 - Wooley St.

(Residence)

9-11-10

(Date)



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

Historic Resource Evaluation Response

MEA Planner: Brett Bollinger
Project Address: 673 Brussels Street
Block/Lot: 6120 / 016
Case No.: 2009.0368E
Date of Review: September 28, 2009
Planning Dept. Reviewer: Ben Fu
 (415) 558-6613 | ben.fu@sfgov.org

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning Information:
415.558.6377

PROPOSED PROJECT Demolition Alteration

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project proposes to raise the existing one-story, single-family dwelling to accommodate a new ground floor with parking garage and two off-street parking spaces.

PRE-EXISTING HISTORIC RATING / SURVEY

According to Parcel Information Database and materials submitted by the Project Sponsor, Adolfo Alano, the current one-story residential building was constructed in 1908. The subject property is not listed on the National or the California Registers. The recorded date of construction makes it a "Category B" building requiring additional information and further consultation, for the purposes of CEQA review by the Planning Department.

HISTORIC DISTRICT / NEIGHBORHOOD CONTEXT

The property is located in the Portola District on the east side of Brussels Street between Woolsey and Dwight Streets in the RH-1 (Residential, House, One-Family) District. The adjacent property to the north at 667 Brussels Street is a one-story over garage, single-family dwelling constructed in 1908. The adjacent three properties to the south facing Dwight Street at 130 Dwight, 140 Dwight, and 154 Dwight Streets were all constructed between 1900 and 1907. The majority of other surrounding properties were constructed prior to 1930. These single-family dwellings were built in a mixed pattern in terms of architectural styles and setbacks. Almost all have had alterations performed on the building façades.

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 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: To be Determined up on Completion of Survey.

Notes: Based on the criteria, staff believes that the subject building is not eligible for inclusion on the California Register individually or as a contributor to a potential Historic District.

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;

The subject property is not located within a potential historic district, or 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.

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

Based upon the information provided, none of the owners, occupants, or others associated with the building was historically important. The property, since the original construction, had exchanged ownership seven times. It does not appear that any of the owners of the subject property are or were associated with the lives of persons significant to our local, regional, or national past. Therefore, the existing building is not individually 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;

According to the submitted photographs, the design quality and neighborhood character of the surrounding built environment is mixed. According to permit history, the subject property was constructed in 1908 and is approximately 800 square feet. The existing building features a combination of hip and gable roof with asphalt shingles. The façade material is stucco with wood siding on the side and the entrance. A metal gate separates the entry from the façade. The building appears to be in relatively poor condition, does not appear to be the work of a master, and does not have extraordinary qualities that merit special consideration under the architecture criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources.

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: Retains Lacks
Association: Retains Lacks
Design: Retains Lacks

Setting: Retains Lacks
Feeling: Retains Lacks
Materials: Retains Lacks

PART 3 – ADDITIONAL PROJECT INFORMATION	Yes	No
1. Would the project involve a major alteration of a structure constructed 50 or more years ago or a structure in an historic district? If yes, submit a <i>Supplemental Information Form for Historical Resource Evaluation</i> . Instructions on how to fill out the form are outlined in the <i>San Francisco Preservation Bulletin No. 16</i> (see pages 28-34 in Appendix B).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Would the project involve demolition of a structure constructed 50 or more years ago or a structure located in an historic district? If yes, a Historic Resource Evaluation Report (HRER)* will be required. The scope of the HRER will be determined in consultation with the Department's Preservation Coordinator.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3a. Would the project result in excavation or soil disturbance/modification greater than 10 feet below grade? If yes, how many feet below grade would be excavated? _____ What type of foundation would be used (if known)? _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3b. Is the project site located in an area of potential geotechnical hazard as identified in the San Francisco General Plan or on a steep slope or would the project be located on a site with an average slope of 20% or more? If yes to either Question 3a or 3b, please submit a Geotechnical Report.*	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Would the project involve expansion of an existing building envelope, or new construction, or grading, or new curb cuts, or demolition? If yes, please submit a <i>Tree Disclosure Statement</i> .	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Would the project result in ground disturbance of 5,000 gross square feet or more?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6. Would the project result in any construction over 40 feet in height? If yes, apply for a Section 295 (Proposition K) Shadow Study. This application is available on the Planning Department's website and should be submitted at the Planning Information Center , 1660 Mission Street, First Floor.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7. Would the project result in a construction of a structure 80 feet or higher? If yes, an initial review by a wind expert, including a recommendation as to whether a Wind Analysis* is needed, may be required, as determined by Department staff.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
8. Would the project involve work on a site with an existing or former gas station, auto repair, dry cleaners, or heavy manufacturing use, or a site with underground storage tanks? If yes, please submit a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA).* A Phase II ESA (for example, soil testing) may be required, as determined by Department staff.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9. Would the project require any variances, special authorizations, or changes to the Planning Code or Zoning Maps? If yes, please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10. Is the project related to a larger project, series of projects, or program? If yes, please describe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
11. Is the project in a Community Plan Area? If yes, please identify the area (for example, Market/Octavia).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

* Report or study to be prepared by a qualified consultant who is contracted directly by the project sponsor.

PART 4 – PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

If you are not sure of the eventual size of the project, provide the **maximum** estimates.

Gross Square Footage (GSF)	Existing Uses	Existing Uses to be Retained	Net New Construction and/or Addition	Project Totals
Residential	920 SF.	920 SF.	2,007 SF.	2,927 SF.
Retail				
Office				
Industrial				
Parking				
Other (specify use)				
Total GSF				
Dwelling units	920 SF.	920 SF.	2,007 SF.	2,927 SF.
Hotel rooms				
Parking spaces				
Loading spaces				
Number of buildings				
Height of building(s)	17 FT.		24'-8"	
Number of stories	ONE STORY		TWO STORY	
Please describe any additional project features that are not included in this table:				
<p>Additional Information: Project drawings in 11x17 format should include existing and proposed site plans, floor plans, elevations, and sections, as well as all applicable dimensions and calculations for existing and proposed floor area and height. The plans should clearly show existing and proposed off-street parking and loading spaces; driveways and trash loading areas; vehicular and pedestrian access to the site, including access to off-street parking and parking configuration; and bus stops and curbside loading zones within 150 feet of the site. A transportation study may be required, depending on existing traffic conditions in the project area and the potential traffic generation of the proposed project, as determined by the Department's transportation planners. Neighborhood notification may also be required as part of the environmental review processes.</p>				

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
CATEGORICALLY EXEMPT FROM ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

CLASS 1 - Existing Facilities

Britt Bolinger → 10/26/09
Approved Planning Dept. Britt Bolinger



**SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

Date received:
RECEIVED

MAY 08 2009

Environmental Evaluation Application & COUNTY OF S.F.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
M E A

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires public agencies to review the environmental impacts of proposed projects. In San Francisco, environmental review under CEQA is administered by the Major Environmental Analysis (MEA) division of the Planning Department. The environmental review process begins with the submittal of a completed Environmental Evaluation (EE) Application to the Planning Department. Only the current EE Application form will be accepted. No appointment is required but staff is available to meet with applicants upon request.

The EE Application will not be processed unless it is completely filled out and the appropriate fees are paid in full. Checks should be made payable to the San Francisco Planning Department. See the current *Schedule of Application Fees* and contact the staff person listed below for verification of the appropriate fees. Fees are generally non-refundable. **Documents in italics are available online at sfgov.org/planning.**

The EE Application is comprised of four parts. Part 1 is a checklist to ensure that the EE Application is complete; Part 2 requests basic information about the site and the project; Part 3 is a series of questions to help determine if additional information is needed for the EE Application; and Part 4 is a project summary table.

The complete EE Application should be submitted to the Planning Department staff as follows: For projects greater than 10,000 square feet in size and where Part 3 Questions #3, #8, #10, or #11 are answered in the affirmative, or for projects that require mitigation measures, please send the application materials to the attention of Ms. Kienker. For all other projects, please send the application materials to the attention of Mr. Bollinger.

Brett Bollinger
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 575-9024, brett.bollinger@sfgov.org

Leigh Kienker
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 575-9036, leigh.kienker@sfgov.org

PART 1 – EE APPLICATION CHECKLIST	Provided	Not Applicable
Two copies of this application with all blanks filled in	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Two sets of project drawings (see "Additional Information" at the end of page 4.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Photos of the project site and its immediate vicinity, with viewpoints labeled	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Fee	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Supplemental Information Form for Historical Resource Evaluation</i> and/or Historic Resource Evaluation Report, as indicated in Part 3 Questions 1 and 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Geotechnical Report, as indicated in Part 3 Questions 3a and 3b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>Tree Disclosure Statement</i> , as indicated in Part 3 Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, as indicated in Part 3 Question 8	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Additional studies (list)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Applicant's Affidavit. I certify the accuracy of the following declarations:

- a. The undersigned is the owner or authorized agent of the owner(s) of this property.
- b. The information presented is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.
- c. I understand that other applications and information may be required.

Signed (owner or agent): *[Signature]*

Date: 5-8-09

(For Staff Use Only) Case No. 2009.0348E

Address: 673 BRUSSELS ST.

Block/Lot: 6/20/016

PART 2 - PROJECT INFORMATION

Owner/Agent Information

Property Owner PRUDENCE BEVERLY CALDITO Telephone No. 415-290-2586
 Address 673 BRUSSELS ST. Fax No. -
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94134 Email bevsca13@yahoo.com
 Project Contact ADOLFO ALANO Telephone No. 415-334-1403
 Company _____ Fax No. 415-334-3995
 Address 144 PRINCETON ST. Email ad_alano@yahoo.com
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94134

Site Information

Site Address(es): 673 BRUSSELS ST.
 Nearest Cross Street(s) DWIGHT STREET
 Block(s)/Lot(s) 6120/016 Zoning District(s) RH-1
 Site Square Footage 2,996 SQ. FT. Height/Bulk District 40-X SUP
 Present or previous site use ONE FAMILY DWELLING
 Community Plan Area (if any) _____

Project Description - please check all that apply

Addition Change of use Zoning change New construction
 Alteration Demolition Lot split/subdivision or lot line adjustment
 Other (describe) _____ Estimated Cost \$ 250,000.00

Describe proposed use: ONE FAMILY DWELLING

Narrative project description. Please summarize and describe the purpose of the project.

CONVERT EXISTING ONE STORY BUILDING TO TWO STORY SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING.

- RAISED UP EXISTING BUILDING FLOOR AREA TO SECOND FLOOR LEVEL. REMODEL AND CONSTRUCT ADDITIONAL AREAS AS SHOWN ON PLANS.
- CONSTRUCT NEW GROUND FLOOR AREA (LIVING, DINING AND KITCHEN) WITH DECK AND TWO-CAR GARAGE,
- CONSTRUCT NEW CONCRETE DRIVEWAY AND CURB-CUT.

Workmanship: Retains Lacks

Notes: Evaluation of integrity is not applicable as the subject building has not been shown to be significant under California Register criteria. The subject building is not eligible for California Register; therefore, an investigation into the integrity was not concluded.

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 is consistent with the Secretary of Interior's Standards or if any proposed modifications 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 appears to meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. (Go to 6. below)
Optional: See attached explanation of how the project meets standards.

The project is NOT consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and 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, as modifications to the project to reduce or avoid impacts. Please recommend conditions of approval that may be desirable to mitigate the project's adverse effects.

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: The immediate context is mixed and does not display a high level of visual continuity. It does not appear that the proposal will have a significant adverse impact on any eligible off-site historic resources. The proposal is similar to the adjacent building in terms of scale, massing, and materials.

PRESERVATION COORDINATOR REVIEW


Signature: Tina Tam
Tina Tam, Preservation Coordinator

Date: 10-20-09

cc: Linda Avery-Herbert, Recording Secretary, Historic Preservation Commission
Virnaliza Byrd / Historic Resource Impact Review File



FRONT VIEW OF SUBJECT HOUSE (673 BRUSSELS ST.)



FRONT VIEW OF SUBJECT HOUSE
ONE STORY DWELLING WITH BASEMENT STORAGE
NO GARAGE

Soundness Report

FOR

Existing One Story Residence

673 Brussels Street, San Francisco, CA 94134

PREPARED FOR:

ADOLFO O. ALANO, ARCHITECT
144 PRINCETON STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94134
(415) 334-1403

PREPARED BY:

ACS CONSULTING ENGINEERS
387 17th STREET, SUITE 210, OAKLAND, CA 94612
(510) 645-1129
JOB NO. 10-11005

February 26, 2010




TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Cover Sheet	1
	Table of Contents	2
I.	Project Setting	3
II.	Summary of Soundness Calculations	4
III.	Soundness Calculations.....	5
IV.	Site Photographs	6

I. PROJECT SETTING

I. Project Description and Location

This project is for a proposed demolition of an existing one-story, wood framed residential building that is located on the east side of Brussels Street in San Francisco, CA.



PROPERTY DESCRIPTION/CONSTRUCTION HISTORY

Provide a written description of the property, describing its architectural form, features, materials, setting, and related structures.

- The subject property, 673 Brussels Street is a one-story, one-family dwelling built in 1908 that is located on the east side of the street, one house from the corner of Brussels St. and Dwight St. in San Francisco, CA. This section of Brussels is a 13% down-slope north towards Wooley St., and the property itself slopes down from the front to the rear. This allows for a crawlspace underneath most of the building and a Basement/Storage at the rear of the property. The architectural features of the house is similar to that of its immediate 2-story neighbor – combination hip and gable roof with asphalt shingles and corbels along the underside of the roof's overhang. Also similar is the bay-window directly under the smaller peak of the roof and the steel gate entry. The façade is made up of stucco and wood trim and the material used on the sides of the house is mainly wood sidings. A walkway from the sidewalk and 4 exterior steps lead to the entry gate and foyer. This home does not have a garage however there is enough space in front to allow for one car. This block consists of mixed visual character due to the many architectural styles of the homes; there is no common architectural feature.

Provide a written description of all alterations to the property. Attach copies of all available building permits.

- No alterations done to the property since bought by owner in 1979.

Provide current photographs showing all facades, architectural details, site features, adjacent buildings, the subject block face, and facing buildings.

- Photographs provided.

Provide historic photographs, if available.

- No historical photographs available.

II. SUMMARY OF SOUNDNESS CALCULATIONS

Replacement Cost

Replacement Cost as defined by the San Francisco Planning Department was calculated using an Area of Occupied, Finished Spaces equal to 1221 sq. ft. and a Unit Cost of \$175 per sq. ft. The total estimated Replacement Cost was calculated at \$213,675.00

Upgrade Cost

Upgrade Cost as defined by the San Francisco Planning Department was calculated using the following list based on visual inspection of the building:

1. Replace Building Foundation.
2. Replace Mechanical System.
3. Provide Shear Walls at entire building.
4. Replace windows with energy efficient, double pane windows.
5. Install wall and ceiling batt insulation.
6. Replace roofing.
7. Replace roof framing.
8. Replace bedroom floor framing.
9. Replace drywall at entire building.
10. Replace electrical system.
11. Replace bathroom fixtures.
12. Replace doors and hardware.
13. Replace Flooring at entire building.
14. Replace Kitchen Sink, Dishwasher, and Cabinets.
15. Repaint Interior and Exterior Finishes.

The total estimated Upgrade Cost was calculated at \$182,415.00

Ratio of Upgrade Cost Replacement Cost

The calculated ratio of the Upgrade Cost to the Replacement Cost is 85.4 % which is greater than the 50% threshold as defined in the S.F. Planning Commission Resolution no. 16700, Policy #9. Therefore the building is found to be Unsound and therefore demolition of the building is supported as per S.F. Planning Commission General Plan.

III. SOUNDNESS CALCULATIONS

CALCULATIONS

By JPA

Date 2/26/2010

Client Adolfo O. Alano, Architect

Job 07-8037

Project 673 Brussels Street, San Francisco, CA 94134

Sheet

3.1

ESTIMATED BLDG. REPLACEMENT COST

1. MAIN FLOOR $A_1 = 922$ SF

BASEMENT $A_2 = 299$ SF

* TOTAL OCCUPIED AREA

$$A_T = A_1 + A_2 = 1221 \text{ SF}$$

* TOTAL REPLACEMENT COST

$$= 1221 (\$ 175./\text{SF})$$

$$= \$ 213,675.00$$

Date 2/26/2010

Client Adolfo O. Alano, Architect

Job 07-8037

Project 673 Brussels Street, San Francisco, CA 94134

Sheet

3.2

ESTIMATED BLDG. UPGRADE COSTS

1. REPLACE BUILDING FOUNDATION

A. PERIMETER FOUNDATION, 12" THICK
BY 16" WIDE, 2500 PSI CONCRETE

$$V = [1.0 (4.33) + 1.0 (0.67)] 131.9 / 27$$

$$= 9.8 \text{ cy}$$

$$\text{COST} = 9.8 (\$700.00) = \$6860$$

B. BASEMENT WALL

$$V = 0.67 (8.0) (90) / 27 = 13.9 \text{ cy}$$

$$\text{COST} = 13.9 (\$700.-) = \$9730$$

C. CONC. SLAB-ON-GRADE (BASEMENT)

$$V = 0.33 (300) / 27 = 3.7 \text{ cy}$$

$$\text{COST} = 3.7 (\$400.00) = \$1480$$

$$* \text{TOTAL COST} = 1.20 (6860 + 9730 + 1480) = \$21,684.-$$

Date 2/26/2010

Client Adolfo O. Alano, Architect

Job 07-8037

Project 673 Brussels Street, San Francisco, CA 94134

Sheet

3.3

2. REPLACE GAS FURNACE

FURNACE COST = \$8,000.- (INCL. DEMO,
DISPOSAL, INSTALL'N)

Pipe, 4" = 25 LF (@ \$50.-)
= \$1250.-

6-REGISTERS = 6 (@ \$800.-) = \$4,800.-
(INCL. DUCTWORK)

* TOTAL COST = \$8000. + \$1250 + \$4800.
= \$14,050.-

CALCULATIONS

By JPA

Date 2/26/2010

Client Adolfo O. Alano, Architect

Job 07-8037

Project 673 Brussels Street, San Francisco, CA 94134

Sheet

3.4

3. PROVIDE PLYWOOD SHEAR WALLS

5 - PANELS @ \$3,000.00

TOTAL COST = 5 (3000.00)

= \$15,000. -

CALCULATIONS

By JPA

Date 2/26/2010

Client Adolfo O. Alano, Architect

Job 07-8037

Project 673 Brussels Street, San Francisco, CA 94134

Sheet

3.5

4. REPLACE WINDOWS

10 - WINDOWS INSTALLED

TOTAL COST = 10 (\$800.-) = \$8,000.00

* COST INCLUDES DEMO, DISPOSAL,
FLASHING

CALCULATIONS

By JPA

Date 2/26/2010

Client Adolfo O. Alano, Architect

Job 07-8037

Project 673 Brussels Street, San Francisco, CA 94134

Sheet

3.6

5. PROVIDE WALL & ROOF INSULATION

A. CEILING, $A_1 = 922$ SF

$$\text{COST} = 922 (\$ 3.75) = \$ 3458.-$$

B. FLOOR, $A_2 = 922$ SF

$$\text{COST} = 922 (\$ 3.75) = \$ 3458.-$$

C. WALL, $A_3 = 1048$ SF

$$\text{COST} = 1048 (\$ 2.50) = \$ 2620.-$$

$$* \text{ TOTAL COST} = 3458. + 3458. + 2620.-$$

$$= \$ 9536.-$$

ACS Consulting Engineers

387 17th Street, Suite 210, Oakland, CA 94612

TEL (510) 645-1129 FAX (510) 645-1139

C:\Excel\2010\jobs\10-11005.XLS

CALCULATIONS

By JPA

Date 2/26/2010

Client Adolfo O. Alano, Architect

Job 07-8037

Project 673 Brussels Street, San Francisco, CA 94134

Sheet 3.7

6. REPLACE ROOFING

$$A = 1,115 \text{ sq}$$

* USING COMPOSITION SHINGLES

$$\text{COST} = (\$ 4.00)(1115)$$

$$= \$ 4460.-$$

CALCULATIONS

By JPA

Date 2/26/2010

Client Adolfo O. Alano, Architect

Job 07-8037

Project 673 Brussels Street, San Francisco, CA 94134

Sheet 3.8

7. REPLACE ROOF FRAMING (1115 SF)

A. 1/2" PLYWOOD SHEATHING, CD-X, WITH
10d B.N. @ 4" O.C., 10d F.N. @ 12" O.C.

$$\text{COST} = 1115 (\$ 4.56)$$

$$= \$ 5018.00$$

B. REPLACE RAFTERS $\frac{1}{2}$ CORNER JOISTS
24" SPACING

$$\text{COST} = 1115 \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) (\$ 27.-)$$

$$= \$ 15,052.-$$

CALCULATIONS

By JPA

Date 2/26/2010

Client Adolfo O. Alano, Architect

Job 07-8037

Project 673 Brussels Street, San Francisco, CA 94134

Sheet 3.9

8. REPLACE BEDROOM FLOOR (INCL. STAIR TO
 (BASEMENT) ^{LITENON}

A. 3/4" PLYWOOD SUBSTRUNG, CD-X

$$\text{AREA} = 10 (46) = 460 \text{ SF}$$

$$\text{COST} = 460 (\$ 3.80)$$

$$= \$ 1748. -$$

B. FLOOR JOISTS

$$\text{COST} = 460 (\$ 8.00)$$

$$= \$ 3680. -$$

$$\text{TOTAL COST} = \$ 5428. -$$

CALCULATIONS

By JPA

Date 2/26/2010

Client Adolfo O. Alano, Architect

Job 07-8037

Project 673 Brussels Street, San Francisco, CA 94134

Sheet 13.10

9. REPLACE DRY WALL AT ENTIRE BLDG.

$$\text{CEILING AREA} = 922 + 299$$

$$= 1221 \text{ SF}$$

$$\text{WALL AREA} = 1008 \text{ SF}$$

$$\text{TOTAL COST} = (1221 + 1008) \times 4.50$$

$$= \$ 10,030.-$$

CALCULATIONS

By JPA

Date 2/26/2010

Client Adolfo O. Alano, Architect

Job 07-8037

Project 673 Brussels Street, San Francisco, CA 94134

Sheet 3.11

10. REPLACE ELECTRICAL SYSTEM

TOTAL AREA = 1221 SF

TOTAL COST = 1221 (\$10.00)

= \$12,210.-

CALCULATIONS

By JPA

Date 2/26/2010

Client Adolfo O. Alano, Architect

Job 07-8037

Project 673 Brussels Street, San Francisco, CA 94134

Sheet 3.12

II. REPLACE BATHROOM FIXTURES.

BATHTUB w/ SHOWER = 1 EA. @ \$ 4,500.-

LAVATORY = 1 EA. @ \$ 2,000.-

WATER CLOSET = 1 EA @ \$ 3,400.-

TOTAL COST = \$ 9,900.-

CALCULATIONS

By JPA

Date 2/26/2010

Client Adolfo O. Alano, Architect

Job 07-8037

Project 673 Brussels Street, San Francisco, CA 94134

Sheet

3.13

12. REPLACE DOOR & HARDWARE

* DOOR & FRAME

7 EA. @ \$800.- = \$5,600.-

* HARDWARE

7 EA. @ \$400.- = \$2,800.-

TOTAL COST = \$8,400.-

CALCULATIONS

By JPA

Date 2/26/2010

Client Adolfo O. Alano, Architect

b 07-8037

Project 673 Brussels Street, San Francisco, CA 94134

Sheet

3.14

13. REPLACE FLOORING

$$* \text{ MAIN FLOOR COST} = 922 (\$25.-)$$

$$= \$23,050.-$$

$$* \text{ BASEMENT COST} = 299 (\$25.-)$$

$$= \$7475.-$$

$$\text{TOTAL COST} = \$30,525.-$$

CALCULATIONS

By JPA

Date 2/26/2010

Client Adolfo O. Alano, Architect

ob 07-8037

Project 673 Brussels Street, San Francisco, CA 94134

Sheet

3.15

14. REPLACE KITCHEN SINK, DISHWASHER,
AND CABINETS

* CAST IRON SINK, DOUBLE BASIN (INCL. PLUMBING)
COST = \$ 2,000.-

* WOOD CABINETS, L = 20 LF.
COST = 20 (L) (\$ 250.-)
= \$ 10,000.-

* DISHWASHER, COST = \$ 2,000.-

TOTAL COST = \$ 14,000.-

CALCULATIONS

By JPA

Date 2/26/2010

Client Adolfo O. Alano, Architect

.b 07-8037

Project 673 Brussels Street, San Francisco, CA 94134

Sheet 3.16


15. REPAINT INTERIOR & EXTERIOR FINISHES


CEILING $A_1 = 922 + 299 = 1221$ SF

WALL $A_2 = 1008 + 1048$
 $= 2056$ SF


TOTAL COST = \$ 2.50 (2056)
 $= \$5140.-$

IV. SITE PHOTOGRAPHS






















DAMAGED FLOOR GOING TO STAIRS TO BASEMENT.




DAMAGED STAIRS TO BASEMENT.



WATER DAMAGED FLOOR.



DAMAGED CEILING.



WATER DAMAGED CEILING JOISTS.




Pictures of 673 Brussels



Street view of Brussels taken on Dwight



East side of Brussels Street, where property is located



West side of Brussels Street



Neighboring houses to property



Houses on the East side of Brussels down the street.




Houses on the West side of Brussels down the street



Additional Houses on the West side of Brussels Street.



Houses directly across 673 Brussels Street



PROPOSED PLOT PLAN
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



PROJECT DATA:

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: LOT #16, BLOCK 6120
 LOT AREA: 25.0' X 120.0' = 3,000 SQ. FT.
 ZONING: RH-1
 OCCUPANCY CLASSIFICATION: R-3 SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING
 CONSTRUCTION TYPE: TYPE V-B (WOOD FRAMING)
 NUMBER OF STORIES: TWO STORY

BUILDING DATA:

GROUND FLOOR AREA: 1,502 SQ. FT.
 SECOND FLOOR AREA: 1,528 SQ. FT.
 TOTAL 3,030 SQ. FT.

APPLICABLE CODES:

- 2007 CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE
- 2007 CALIFORNIA MECHANICAL CODE
- 2007 CALIFORNIA ELECTRICAL CODE
- 2007 CALIFORNIA PLUMBING CODE
- 2007 CALIFORNIA ENERGY CODE

SHEET INDEX

T-1	TOPOGRAPHIC SITE SURVEY
E-1	EXISTING PLANS
D-1	DEMOLITION PLANS
C-1	PLOT PLAN, PROJECT DATA & SHEET INDEX
A-1	PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS & ROOF PLAN
A-2	FRONT & RIGHT SIDE ELEVATIONS
A-3	REAR & LEFT SIDE ELEVATIONS
A-4	CROSS & LONGITUDINAL SECTIONS

NO.	DATE	REVISIONS	BY

ADOLFO O. ALANO
 ARCHITECT
 144 PRINCETON STREET
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104
 TEL: (415) 334-1400
 FAX: (415) 334-3895


PRUDENCE BEVERLY CALDITO
 PROJECT ADDRESS:
 673 BRUSSELS ST., SAN FRANCISCO, CA

**Project: PROPOSED
 TWO - STORY RESIDENCE**

**PLOT PLAN, DATA
 & SHEET INDEX**

Date: 02-18-10
 Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"
 Drawn: AGA
 File: BCAL-PLP2

SHEET NO.
C-1



NO.	DATE	REVISIONS	BY

ADOLFO O. ALANO
ARCHITECT
144 PRINCETON STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114
TEL: (415) 334-3865
FAX: (415) 334-3866




OWNER: PRUDENCE BEVERLY CALDITO
PROJECT ADDRESS:
673 BRUSSELS ST., SAN FRANCISCO, CA

**Project: PROPOSED
TWO - STORY RESIDENCE**

EXISTING FLOOR
PLANS, ELEVATIONS &
PHOTOS


Date: 02-24-10
Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0"
Drawn: ADA
File: BCAL-EXPL

SHEET NO.
E-1




EXISTING BASEMENT PLAN

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



EXISTING MAIN FLOOR PLAN

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"
EXISTING BUILDING FLOOR AREA: 920 SQ. FT.




EXISTING FRONT ELEVATION

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




FRONT VIEW



REAR VIEW




RIGHT SIDE VIEW



LEFT SIDE VIEW

PHOTOS OF EXISTING BUILDING



NO.	DATE	REVISIONS	BY

ADOLFO O. ALANO
ARCHITECT
144 PRINCETON STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114
Tel. # (415) 334-1403
Fax # (415) 334-3995






OWNER: PRUDENCE BEVERLY CALDITO
PROJECT ADDRESS:
673 BRUSSELS ST., SAN FRANCISCO, CA

**Project: PROPOSED
TWO - STORY RESIDENCE**

DEMOLITION
PLANS


Date: 03-01-10
Scale: AS SHOWN
Drawn: AOA
File: BCAL-DPLN
SHEET NO.
D-1



EXISTING BASEMENT PLAN

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




DEMOLITION PLANS



BRUSSELS STREET

EXISTING MAIN FLOOR PLAN

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




PLANS LEGEND:

BT/SHO	BATH TUB/SHOWER	KS	KITCHEN SINK	SD	STORM DRAIN & DOWNSPOUT
DR	CLOTHES DRYER	LAV	OVAL LAVATORY	SK	SKYLIGHT
DW	DISHWASHER	OD	OVERFLOW DRAIN	ST/OV	STOVE/OVEN
FRZR	FREEZER	RD	ROOF DRAIN	WC	WATER CLOSET
GF	GAS FURNACE	REF.	REFRIGERATOR	WH	WATER HEATER
				WM	WASHING MACHINE

NOTE:
 FRONT SETBACK SHALL BE PROVIDED WITH 50% OF FINISHABLE SURFACE AS REQUIRED BY SP CODE.

NO.	DATE	REVISIONS	BY
ADOLFO O. ALANO ARCHITECT 144 PRINCETON STREET SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94134 TEL: (415) 394-1400 FAX: (415) 394-3865			
Project: PROPOSED TWO - STORY RESIDENCE			
FLOOR PLANS & ROOF PLAN			
Date: 02-18-10 Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0" Drawn: AOA File: BCAL-FPL2			
SHEET NO. A-1			



NO.	DATE	REVISIONS	BY

ADOLFO O. ALANO
ARCHITECT
14 PRINCETON STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94134
TEL # (415) 334-3874
FAX (415) 334-3895




OWNER: PRUDENCE BEVERLY CALDITO
PROJECT ADDRESS:
673 BRUSSELS ST., SAN FRANCISCO, CA

Project: PROPOSED
TWO - STORY RESIDENCE

FRONT & RIGHT
SIDE ELEVATIONS


Date: 02-18-10
Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0"
Drawn: AOA
File: BCAL-FREL

SHEET NO.
A-2




FRONT ELEVATION SHOWING ADJACENT HOUSE

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



RIGHT SIDE ELEVATION

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



NO.	DATE	REVISIONS	BY

ADOLFO O. ALANO
ARCHITECT
144 PRINCETON STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94134
TEL: 415.334.1403
FAX: 415.334.3865




OWNER: PRUDENCE BEVERLY CALDITO
PROJECT ADDRESS: 673 BRUSSELS ST., SAN FRANCISCO, CA


Project: PROPOSED
TWO - STORY RESIDENCE

REAR & LEFT
SIDE ELEVATION

Date: 09-01-10
Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0"
Drawn: AOA
File: BCAL-RLEL
SHEET NO.
A-3




REAR ELEVATION
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"




LEFT SIDE ELEVATION
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

NO.	DATE	REVISIONS	BY



CROSS SECTION THRU A-A
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



LONGITUDINAL SECTION THRU B-B
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

ADOLFO O. ALANO
ARCHITECT
144 PRINCETON STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94134
Tel. # (415) 334-1403
FAX (415) 334-3995




OWNER: PRUDENCE BEVERLY CALDITO
PROJECT ADDRESS:
673 BRUSSELS ST., SAN FRANCISCO, CA

**Project: PROPOSED
TWO - STORY RESIDENCE**

CROSS AND
LONGITUDINAL
SECTIONS

Date: 03-01-10
Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0"
Drawn: AOA
File: BCAL-CLSEC



SHEET NO.
A-4