## City \& County of San Francisco <br> REHEARING REQUEST FOR APPEAL NO. 23-044

Mary Jane Galviso, Appellant(s) seeks a rehearing of Appeal No. 23-044 which was decided on November 1, 2023. This request for rehearing will be considered by the Board of Appeals on Wednesday, December 6, 2023, at 5:00 p.m. and will be held in Room 416 of SF City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco. The parties may also attend remotely via the Zoom video platform.

The response to the written request for rehearing must be submitted by the opposing party and/or on or before 4:30 p.m. on Monday, November 27, 2023 and must not exceed six (6) double-spaced pages in length, with unlimited exhibits. The brief shall be double-spaced with a minimum 12-point font size. An electronic copy should be e-mailed to: boardofappeals@sfgov.org, julie.rosenberg@sfgov.org, matthew.greene@sfgov.org, tina.tam@sfgov.org and migalviso@gmail.com.

You or your representative MUST be present at the hearing. It is the general practice of the Board that only up to three minutes of testimony from each side will be allowed. Except in extraordinary cases, and to prevent manifest injustice, the Board may grant a Rehearing Request only upon a showing that new or different material facts or circumstances have arisen, where such facts or circumstances, if known at the time, could have affected the outcome of the original hearing.

Based on the evidence and testimony submitted, the Board will make a decision to either grant or deny the request. Four votes are necessary to grant a rehearing. If the request is denied, a rehearing will not be scheduled and the decision of the Board will become final. If the request is granted, a rehearing will be scheduled, the original decision of the Board will be set aside, and after the rehearing, a second decision will be made. Only one request for rehearing and one rehearing are permitted under the Rules of the Board.

## Requestor:

## Signature: Via Email

## Print Name: Mary Jane Galviso, Appellant

TO: San Francisco Board of Appeals
FROM: Mary Jane Galviso
DATE: $\quad$ November 9, 2023
RE: Appeal No. 23-044
My appeal needs to be reheard to prevent manifest injustice. The issuance of permit number 2022/1027/5336 violates the intent of the San Francisco Planning Department 311 Notification Process. According to its Pre-Application Process, community outreach is required prior to submitting permits for projects with certain scopes of work. These include projects that entail 1) New construction, 2) Any vertical addition of 7 feet or more and, 3) Any horizontal addition of 10 feet or more. The scope of work called-for in permit number 2022/1027/5336 involves all three types of construction. Therefore, a Pre-Application Meeting would have been a mandatory form of community outreach. Those invited to attend the community outreach meeting would include adjacent neighbors and relevant neighborhood organizations. While the Planning Department states that Pre-Application Meetings must be conducted in a hybrid manner, it does stipulate that meetings be conducted at one of these places: The project site (223 Anderson Street) or an alternate location within a one-mile radius of the project site (i.e. community center, coffee shop, etc.). Unfortunately, the Planning Department allows the project sponsor to "opt to have a Pre- Application Meeting held at the Planning Department instead of the project site, for a fee." The ability to opt-out of a pre-application meeting held within the community invites manifest injustice because it allows the permit holder and the Planning Dept. to meet the letter of the law while circumventing the intent of the Pre-Application 311 process. Ensuring genuine community participation in the 311 process requires community-site engagement. This is because as human beings we interact with our environment and others in a physical sense. We
come to know and understand our surroundings by engaging our senses. A meeting held in a government building miles away from the project site cannot truly involve residents and community orgs. This is especially true when residents-of-color are confronted with the white gentrification of their neighborhood. Is it a sincere attempt to involve residents-of-color when allowing the white applicant to pay for the neighborhood discussion to be removed from the neighborhood and taken outside its boundaries? No in-depth study is needed to surmise the outcome and impact of such a meeting. This is why I strongly contend that the failure of the applicant and the Planning Dept. to genuinely engage neighborhood residents, including me, is the basis for my right to a rehearing. When I received written notification of the proposed construction, I believe my response was similar to most everyone else's: The Planning Dept. simply wanted neighbors to know that a permit application had been received from one of our neighbors. In Bernal Heights, we are now so accustomed to receiving such notices because construction projects seem to be taking place non stop everywhere we go these days. And when I received notice of a meeting, I did not take it as a community meeting since it was being held in a government building and not in my neighborhood. It was only after I called the Assigned Planner, Agnihotri Kalyani, did I come to understand that that meeting was the community meeting and that the period for community engagement had passed. I feel my reaction to both notices is understandable. Afterall, I never once was approached by the neighbors / permit applicants regarding the project and my role in the pre-application process. It was only a few days before the scheduled Appeal hearing that Mr. David Coulombe make any attempt to speak with me, but he did so in a most inappropriate way. I had just returned home after driving more than 5 hours. It was nearly 9 o'clock at night and I had been up since 4:30 that morning. All I wanted was to get to bed. As I was getting out of my truck, I heard someone talking from a
distance down the street. I had no idea Mr. Coulombe was talking to me. As I was crossing the street, he spoke louder. I looked around and saw no-one else on the street. That's when I realized that he must be talking to me. "What could he want?" I thought. And, at this time of night? I found this encounter too unusual so struggling with the stuff I was carrying, I simply walked on to my house. During the hearing, I described how I have endured years of outright hostile treatment by both applicants, in particular Ms. Elyzabeth Dehapiot. Over the years, she repeatedly shouted threats to have the cops come to take away my dogs. Twice the police came in response to her phone calls and both times they went to speak to her. I overheard one office attempting to explain to her that a dog's bark was like a human talking. Since there had been no other phone call complaints from neighbors about my dog's barking, their response to her calls decreased. Her next tact was to make repeated calls to Animal Care \& Control. In one phone call, she accused me of "keeping my dogs in a dungeon." The responding officer after coming into my home and meeting my 2 dogs quickly realized that Ms. Elyzabeth Dehapiot’s accusation was simply ridiculous. I believe the dept. soon came to realize that her complaints were completely false and after a couple of calls, ACC never appeared again or wrote me. I, therefore, insist that she be present and speak at the rehearing.

In closing, I would like to say this: A result of manifest injustice is inevitable when no genuine community engagement takes place. I would like the opportunity for additional photos to be taken with a large sheet of plywood reflecting the blockage of my kitchen window to be taken. This would require the cooperation of the applicants. I use this analogy: If a building inspector is to carry out his/her duties to inspect, s/he can only do so by physically traveling to and walking the property site. I contend that this common-sense approach and logic must also be applied to
the pre-application 311 process. For neighborhoods severely impacted by gentrification such as Bernal Heights, this approach must be more strenuously applied.

I believe that the racial tension between the applicants and myself was evident at the Appeals hearing. This is not my doing because I did not mount the campaign intended to drive me out. The City \& County of San Francisco states its commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion. Yet, it can only fulfill this commitment by stopping the gentrification practices that are forcing out those residents who represent diversity and can bring about equity and inclusion. As an elderly woman-of-color, I am one of those residents and the issuance of the applicant's permit has created a situation which makes me feel like I am being driven out of a neighborhood that I have been part of since the 1980s. When I moved to San Francisco from Hawai'i, I immediately looked for my community by locating other Filipinos. I found it in Bernal Heights. My block was nearly $80 \%$ Filipino. Moreover, Bernal Heights was an area that was affordable even to me, a single woman who was able to save up a downpayment from years of being a public school teacher. There are many times that I asked why am I staying when my community has all but disappeared. I take 2 walks daily and increasingly I go days without seeing another Filipino. When I first moved into the neighborhood, there were several Filipino establishments on Cortland Avenue. I could shop for Filipino groceries and order a Filipino meal. Those Filipino establishments are all gone now with only JC Laundromat remaining. St. Kevin's Catholic Church and the Bernal Heights Community Center have both experienced the sharp decline of the Filipino population in Bernal Heights. Yet, I have remained in Bernal Heights because I find solace in my house that has been my home for many, many years. My oversized kitchen window is the major feature that gives me a sense of home. The permit's construction will completely destroy a vital part of my home.

It's very important now to be able to address several of the applicants' assertions - both written and oral - because they are outright false and misleading.

1. The applicants' photos (Exhibit 3) purport to show the view from my kitchen window: They do not. Where is my sky view? Where does the photo show just how much natural light streams through the kitchen window? Board members cannot rely on such patently false photo exhibits without a result of manifest injustice. I must be allowed to produce accurate photos and I shall do so at the rehearing. Board member decisions must be drawn from true and accurate evidence.
2. The applicants state that 225 Anderson Street is not my permanent residence. This is a bald-faced lie. How can anyone make such assertions before a government body without providing any shred of proof?

Now, let's determine whether the outcome of the project site's pre-application meeting actually accomplished what it was intended to do. I have asked the Planning Dept. for the following information:

1. A copy of the invitation to the pre-application meeting that was mailed to neighbors and neighborhood organizations;
2. A list of the neighborhood organizations and individuals invited to the meeting, including the mailing address for each;
3. A copy of the sign-in sheet;
4. A summary of the meeting and a list of any changes made to the project as a result of the neighborhood comments;
5. The affidavit, signed and dated;
6. The reduced copy of the plans presented to the neighbors at pre-application meeting, labeled as "Pre-Application Plans."

The requested information has not yet been received. Therefore, I am asking the Board of Appeals to schedule the rehearing date after the above-information can be delivered because it represents an essential exhibit. A review of the requested documents will determine whether the community was truly engaged in a pre-application 311 process.

The above information is an essential exhibit in the determination of this rehearing request. Time does not allow me to continue this written statement. I am traveling overseas with unstable.

## BRIEF SUBMITTED BY THE PERMIT HOLDER(S)

# Elyzabeth Dehapiot \& David Coulombe 

## 223 Anderson Street

San Francisco, CA 94110

November 25, 2023

Re: appeal No. 23-044 - rehearing request

Dear Board of Appeal,

In response to Ms. Galviso's request for a rehearing related to the Appeal request No. 23-044, we would like to kindly request the board to deny this request. As detailed below, Ms. Galviso does not bring any new or different material facts or circumstances which have arisen since the Appeal session on November $1^{\text {st }}$, 2023. Overall, we maintain that we have followed due process with the city Planning and Building Departments regarding our project, which has been confirmed at the appeals hearing.

We would like to note that we are the victims of personal harassment and defamatory statements both in Ms. Galviso's brief, and during the November $1^{\text {st }} 2023$ hearing. Those appear motivated by her desire to fight against "gentrification". While we cannot comment on Ms. Galviso's perspective related to the changes in the Bernal Heights neighborhood over the years, we do not believe those are directly relevant to our project as they are broad societal trends within San Francisco that are not in our control.

## Responses to Ms. Galviso's statements

1. Ms. Galviso claims that we "opted-out from a pre-application meeting held within the community". This is incorrect: we have held the pre-application meeting on September 22, 2022 on site at 223, Anderson St, and also offered an option to join via video-conference. The meeting was attended by our neighbor at 222 Anderson St. The notice for pre-hearing was mailed on September 8, 2022. Please refer to :
a. Exhibit 1 (page 4): Pre-application notice form, sent to adjacent neighbors and neighborhood organizations, indicating the location of the preapplication meeting at our residence at 223 Anderson St, and also offering participation via video-conference
b. Exhibit 2 (page 5): Mail evidence of pre-application notice, post market $9 / 8 / 2022$, which will be brought to the rehearing session
c. Exhibit 3 (page 6): Pre-application mailing list, including Ms. Galviso
d. Exhibit 4 (page 7): Pre-application mailing map, including Ms. Galviso's property at 225 Anderson St.
e. Exhibit 5 (page 8): Pre-application sign-in sheet, indicating our neighbor at 222 Anderson St. attended the meeting
f. Exhibit 6 (page 9): list of neighborhood organizations that received our notice of a pre-application meeting
g. Exhibit 7 (pages 10-11): email notifying neighborhood organizations of the pre-application meeting
h. Exhibit 8 (attached as a separate file due to size): project plans included with the Pre-application mailing
i. Exhibit 9 (attached as a separate file due to size): The affidavit of the preapplication meeting, signed and dated, as well as comment sheet
2. Ms. Galviso claims she was never approached regarding the project. This is inaccurate: not only was Ms. Galviso mailed twice regarding the project (preapplication mentioned above, as well as section 311 Notice mailed by the Planning Department), she also acknowledges ignoring my personal outreach in her brief. Refer to:
a. Exhibit 10 (file attached): 311 Notice sent by the city Planning Department
b. Exhibit 11 (page 12): Declaration of posting for section 311
c. Exhibit 12 (page13): Photo of 311 poster

## Conclusion

In conclusion, over a year ago, we provided all documentation that Ms. Galviso requested in her brief, which demonstrates that we have met both the intent and the letter of the permitting process. This process has taken over two years from engagement of our architect to permitting. With the appeals hearings, we have been set back an additional three months. We ask the Board to help us live peacefully and quietly in our home with our kids, and would kindly request the Board to deny a rehearing of the case.

Sincerely,

Elyzabeth Dehapiot and David Coulombe

## Exhibit 1 - Pre-application notice

## NOTICE OF PRE-APPLICATION MEETING

Date: $\underline{9 / 6 / 22}$
Dear Neighbor:
You are invited to a neighborhood Pre-Application meeting to review and discuss the development proposal at
223
Anderson Street
$\qquad$ cross street(s) Eugenia Ave $\qquad$ (Block/Lot\# $\qquad$ Zoning:
RH-1 Residential _), in , in accordance with the San Francisco Planning Department's Pre-Application procedures. The PreApplication meeting is intended as a way for the Project Sponsor(s) to discuss the project and review the proposed plans with adjacent neighbors and neighborhood organizations before the submittal of an application to the City. This provides neighbors an opportunity to raise questions and discuss any concerns about the impacts of the project before it is submitted for the Planning Department's review. Once a Building Permit has been submitted to the City, you may track its status at www.sfgov.org/dbi.

The Pre-Application process serves as the first step in the process prior to filing a Project Application with the Planning Department. Those contacted as a result of the Pre-Application process will also receive formal notification from the city after the project is submitted and reviewed by Planning Department staff.

A Pre-Application meeting is required because this project includes (check all that apply):
$\square \quad$ New Construction subject to Section 311;
$\square$ Any vertical addition of 7 feet or more subject to Section 311;
$\square$ Any horizontal addition of 10 feet or more subject to Section 311;
$\square$ Decks over 10 feet above grade or within the required rear yard subject to Section 311;
$\square$ All Formula Retail uses subject to a Conditional Use Authorization;
$\square$ PDR-1-B, Section 313;
$\square$ Community Business Priority Processing Program (CB3P).
The development proposal is to: Vertical addition to add new bedroom suite. Addition is set back 15 feet from front elevation. New root deck on exiting root, new connecting stair.

${ }^{* *}$ Weeknight meetings shall occur between $6: 00$ p.m. - 9:00 p.m. Weekend meetings shall be between 10:00 a.m. - 9:00 p.m, unless the Project Sponsor has selected a Department Facilitated Pre-Application Meeting.

If you have questions about the San Francisco Planning Code, Residential Design Guidelines, or general development process in the City, email the Planning counter at the Permit Center at picefsfgov.org. You may also find information about the San Francisco Planning Department and ongoing planning efforts at www.sfplanning.org.

## Exhibit 2 - Pre-application notice mailing



## Exhibit 3 - Pre-application distribution list

RADIUS SERVICES 1221 HARRISON ST \#18 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94103 415-391.4775

| BLOCK | LOT | OWNER | OADDR | CITY | STATE | ZIP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0001 | 001 | RADIUS SERVICES NO. 56e2029T | 223 ANDERSON ST | SCHMOLL | 22 | 0531 |
| 0001 | 002 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0001 | 003 | RADIUS SERVICES | 1221 HARRISON ST \#18 | SAN FRANCISCO | CA | 94103 |
| 0001 | 004 | GISELA SCHMOLL ARCHITECT | 534 BRODERICK ST | SAN FRANCISCO | CA | 94117 |
| 0001 | 005 | . . . . . . . |  |  | . |  |
| 5662 | 005 | ROBERT BROBERG | 429 LEOPARD RD | BERWMN | PA | 19312-1925 |
| 5662 | 005 | OCCUPANT | 214 ELLSWORTH ST | SAN FRANCISCO | CA | 94110-5643 |
| 5662 | 006 | SONIA TARA BANERJI | 216 ELLSWORTH ST | SAN FRANCISCO | CA | 94110-5643 |
| 5662 | 007 | DANIEL FAMALY LVG TR | 218 ELLSWORTH ST | SAN FRANCISCO | CA | 94110-5643 |
| 5662 | 028 | MARY JANE GALVISO | 225 ANDERSONST | SAN FRANCISCO | CA | 94110-5604 |
| 5662 | 029 | DAVID JCOULOMEE | 223 ANDERSONST | SAN FRANCISCO | CA | 94110-5604 |
| 5662 | 030 | CHAN JENNIFER | 219 ANDERSON ST | SAN FRANCISCO | CA | 94110-5604 |
| 5663 | 005 | FEINBERG FREEDMAN TRS | 222 ANDERSON ST | SAN FRANCISCO | CA | 94110-5805 |
| 5663 | 006 | THOMAS TRUST | 228 ANDERSON ST | SAN FRANCISCO | CA | 94110-5605 |
| 5663 | 007 | HOPE T KAMIMOTO | 236 ANDERSON ST | SAN FRANCISCO | CA | 94110-5605 |
| 9999 | 999 |  |  |  | - |  |

## Exhibit 4 - Pre-application Mailing Map



Exhibit 5 - Pre-application meeting sign-in sheet

## PRE-APPLICATION MEETING SIGN-INSHEET

|  | Thursday September 22,2022 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Meeting Date: | 6 pm |
| Meeting Time: | 223 Anderson St |
| Meeting Address: | 223 Anderson St |
| Project Address: | David Coulombe \& Elyzabeth Dehapiot |
| Property Owner | Name: |
| Project Sponsor/Representative: $\quad$ Gisela Schmoll |  |

Please print your name below, state your address and/or affiliation with a neighborhood group, and provide your phone number. Providing your name below does not represent support or opposition to the project; it is for documentation purposes only.


Exhibit 6 - List of neighborhood organization notified of the pre-application meeting

## Bernal Heights

(8)

## Andre Rothblatt <br> Bemal Heights Preservation <br> 475 Nevada St <br> San Francisco, CA 94110

## Buddy Choy

Coleridge St. Neighbors
157 Coleridge St
157 Coleridge St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Aron Deorsey
Hop Past Brew Pub
2887 Bryant St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Saskia Verbeck
Florida Slope Association
631 Florida St
San Francisco, CA 94110

Francesca Panullo
Sherwin Wilams
1415 Ocean Ave
1415 Ocean Ave
San Francisco, CA 94112

SF Citizens for Considered Development 355 11th St Ste 200
San Francisco, CA 94103

Rachel Ebora
Bernal Heights Housing Corporation
Bernal Heights Hous
515 Cortland Ave
San Francisco, CA 94110

Sue Hestor
San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth (SFRG)
870 Market St 11128
San Francisco, CA 94102

## Exhibit 7 - Pre-application meeting notice email to neighborhood organizations

Gisela Schmoll

| Notice of Pre-application Meeting for 223 Anderson |
| :--- |
| To: Gisela Schmoll, |
| Bcc: David Coulombe, Elyzabeth Dehapiot, bernalcutpath@gmail.com, bhesdrb@gmail.com, sanfranfan0-g@yahoo.com, |
| kathyangus@gmail.com, Annika.hom@missionlocal.com, nwbhdrb@gmail.com, jonhenry@bsotc.org, landuse@castrolgbtq.org |

## In accordance with the SF Planning code, please find attached two PDF's. One is the Notice of a Pre-application Meeting on Thursday 9/22 at 6 pm . The other is a set of the plans of the proposed addition. <br> The meeting will be held on site and via Zoom. Details are on the notice.

If you have any questions, feel free to reach out to me.
Best,
Gisela
GISELA SCHMOLL ARCHITECT, PC
415.244.4748
schmolldesign.com
For current work in construction see Instagram


## NOTICEOF PRE-APPLICATION MEETING

Date: $9 / 6 / 22$
Dear Neighbor:
You are invited to a neighborhood Pre-Application meeting to review and discuss the development proposal at
223 Anderson Street
$\xrightarrow[\text { RH-1 Residential }]{ }$, cross street(s) Eugenia Ave (Block/Lott: ${ }^{5662 / 029}$; Zoning; RH-1 Residential $)$, in accordance with the San Francisco Planning Department's Pre-Application procedures. The Pre Application meeting is intended as a way for the Project Sponsor(s) to discuss the project and review the proposed plans with adjacent neighbors and neighborhood organizations before the submittal of an application to the City. This provides neighbors an opportunity to raise questions and discuss any concerns about the impacts of the project before it is submitted for the Planning Department's review. Once a Building Permit has been submitted to the City, you may track its status at www.sfgov.org/dbi.
The Pre-Application process serves as the first step in the process prior to filing a Project Application with the Planning Department. Those contacted as a result of the Pre-Application process will also receive formal notification from the city after the project is submitted and reviewed by Planning Department staff

A Pre-Application meeting is required because this project includes (check all that apply):
$\square$ New Construction subject to Section 311;
$\square$ Any vertical addition of 7 feet or more subject to Section 311;
$\square$ Any horizontal addition of 10 feet or more subject to Section 311;
$\square$ Decks over 10 feet above grade or within the required rear yard subject to Section 311;
$\square$ All Formula Retail uses subject to a Conditional Use Authorization;
$\square$ PDR-1-B, Section 313;
$\square$ Community Business Priority Processing Program (CB3P).
Vertical addition to add new bedroom suite. Addition is set back 15 teet from tront
The development proposal is to:
elevation. New root deck on exiting root, new connecting stair.


| Existing net area schedule |  |  | proposed net area schedule |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| level | Nome | Area | tevel | Nome | Area |
| frstaoor | Cram LPace | ${ }^{2692355}$ | frrstoor | cram space | ${ }^{2629385}$ |
| mestioos | BEproom | ${ }^{137272555}$ | mintiou | ${ }^{\text {Bberoom }}$ | ${ }^{13725855}$ |
| Frestoor |  | ${ }^{12535385}$ | frestoor | 8eprooml | ${ }^{125523055}$ |
| frestioor | Hall | ${ }^{63,2055}$ | frestoor | ${ }_{\text {Hall }}$ |  |
| Freshoor | Lamurar |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ${ }_{4}^{4288158}$ |  |  | ${ }_{36815 \mathrm{SF}}^{425}$ |
| frethoor | c10. 2 | 249085 | frestioor | cio. 2 | 24.958 |
| frstioor | (Estar | 244155 | frestioor | нall |  |
| frestoor | Hall | 19,0085 | freshoor | star | 4.5F |
| (rastoor | cliol | ${ }^{1.50 .355}$ | frestioor | ${ }_{50} \mathbf{c} 0.1$ |  |
|  |  | ${ }_{8}^{7}$ |  |  |  |
|  | unngomngem. | 2678.65 | secondilior | famlym. | 314935 |
|  | Pramary bipoom | ${ }^{20108885}$ | seconvilior | LNNGM. | 135.6255 |
|  |  | ${ }^{2409058}$ | SECONH fior | DNME | ${ }^{1278895}$ |
|  | Stor |  | Stecon fior | kichen suor and |  |
|  | STARS | Stins | Secono fior | Sohl | ${ }_{\text {chen }}$ |
|  | prmary co. | ${ }^{3121058}$ | SECOND Fioor | IESTAR | 27.70 SF |
|  |  | ${ }^{359295}$ | seconv fioor | SAAR | 26.655 |
|  | Hall | 20.5985 | secono fioor | Hall | 2.0598 |
|  |  | 899.475 | secono fioor | cio |  |
|  |  | ${ }^{1722.155}$ | Stecon fior | clo. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | (N) Hipe fioi | Stir | ${ }_{\substack{849955 \\ 68035}}$ |
|  |  |  | Oor |  |  |
|  |  |  | (N) Hipefioor |  |  |
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## NOTICE OF PRE-APPLICATION MEETING

Date:
9/6/22

Dear Neighbor:
You are invited to a neighborhood Pre-Application meeting to review and discuss the development proposal at 223 Anderson Street , cross street(s) Eugenia Ave (Block/Lot\#. 5662/029 $\qquad$ _ Zoning:
RH-1 Residential ), in accordance with the San Francisco Planning Department's Pre-Application procedures. The PreApplication meeting is intended as a way for the Project Sponsor(s) to discuss the project and review the proposed plans with adjacent neighbors and neighborhood organizations before the submittal of an application to the City. This provides neighbors an opportunity to raise questions and discuss any concerns about the impacts of the project before it is submitted for the Planning Department's review. Once a Building Permit has been submitted to the City, you may track its status at www.sfgov.org/dbi.

The Pre-Application process serves as the first step in the process prior to filing a Project Application with the Planning Department. Those contacted as a result of the Pre-Application process will also receive formal notification from the city after the project is submitted and reviewed by Planning Department staff.

A Pre-Application meeting is required because this project includes (check all that apply):
$\square \quad$ New Construction subject to Section 311;
$\checkmark$ Any vertical addition of 7 feet or more subject to Section 311;
$\square$ Any horizontal addition of 10 feet or more subject to Section 311;Decks over 10 feet above grade or within the required rear yard subject to Section 311;All Formula Retail uses subject to a Conditional Use Authorization;
PDR-1-B, Section 313;Community Business Priority Processing Program (CB3P).
The development proposal is to:
Vertical addition to add new bedroom suite. Addition is set back 15 teet trom tront elevation. New root deck on exiting root, new connecting stair.

| Existing \# of dwelling units: 1 | Proposed: ${ }^{1}$ | Permitted: | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing bldg square footage: 1721 sf | Proposed: 2232 sf | Permitted: | 2575 sf |
| Existing \# of stories: _ $\quad 2$ | Proposed: ${ }^{2}$ | Permitted: |  |
| Existing bldg height: $\quad 19^{\prime \prime}-7^{\prime \prime}$ | Proposed: ${ }^{26}{ }^{\prime \prime-0 "}$ | Permitted: | $30^{\prime}-0{ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Existing bldg depth: $\quad 49^{\prime}-0{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | Proposed: ${ }^{49^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}}$ | Permitted: | 43'-0" |

## MEETING INFORMATION:

| Property Owner(s) name(s): $\qquad$ | Passcode. 677462 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Project Sponsor(s): | Dial in via phone: |
| Contact information (email/phone): g@schmolldesign.com/415.244.4748 | 16699006833 |
| Meeting Address*: 223 Anderson Street OR via Zoom or call via phone using mtg. ID \& passcode |  |
| Date of meeting: Thursday September 22, 2022 Time of meeting**: 6 pm | https://zoom.us/download |

*The meeting should be conducted at the project site or within a one-mile radius, unless the Project Sponsor has requested a Department Facilitated Pre-Application Meeting, in which case the meeting will be held at the Planning Department offices, at 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400.
${ }^{* *}$ Weeknight meetings shall occur between 6:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m. Weekend meetings shall be between 10:00 a.m. - 9:00 p.m, unless the Project Sponsor has selected a Department Facilitated Pre-Application Meeting.

If you have questions about the San Francisco Planning Code, Residential Design Guidelines, or general development process in the City, email the Planning counter at the Permit Center at pic@sfgov.org. You may also find information about the San Francisco Planning Department and ongoing planning efforts at www.sfplanning.org.

## AFFIDAVIT OF CONDUCTING A PRE-APPLICATION MEETING

## Gisela Schmoll <br> , , do hereby declare as follows:

1. I have conducted a Pre-Application Meeting for the proposed new construction, alteration or other activity prior to submitting a Project Application with the Planning Department in accordance with Planning Commission Pre-Application Policy.
2. The meeting was conducted at subject property/223 Anderson Street (location/address) on $\underline{9 / 22 / 2022}$ (date) from 6 pm (time).
3. I have included the mailing list, meeting invitation and postmarked letter, sign-in sheet, issue/response summary, and reduced plans with the entitlement Application. I understand that I am responsible for the accuracy of this information and that erroneous information may lead to suspension or revocation of the permit.
4. I have prepared these materials in good faith and to the best of my ability.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.
EXECUTED ON THIS DAY, $\xrightarrow{\text { September } 23}, 20 \_$IN SAN FRANCISCO.


Signature

Gisela Schmoll
Name (type or print)

## Architect, Gisela Schmoll Architect, PC

Relationship to Project (e.g. Owner, Agent)
(if Agent, give business name \& profession)

## 223 Anderson St

## Project Address

## PRE-APPLICATION MEETING SIGN-INSHEET

Meeting Date: $\qquad$ Thursday September 22, 2022
Meeting Time:
Meeting Address:
Project Address:
Property Owner Name: 6pm
$\qquad$
223 Anderson St
223 Anderson St

Project Sponsor/Representative: David Coulombe \& Elyzabeth Dehapiot

Please print your name below, state your address and/or affiliation with a neighborhood group, and provide your phone number. Providing your name below does not represent support or opposition to the project; it is for documentation purposes only.

| NAME/ORGANIZATION | ADDRESS | PHONE \# | EMAIL | SEND PLANS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Beth Freedman 222 Anderson St bethgailfreedman@gmail.com |  |  |  |  |
| 2. |  |  |  |  |
| 3. |  |  |  |  |
| 4. |  |  |  |  |
| 5. |  |  |  |  |
| 6. |  |  |  |  |
| 7. |  |  |  |  |
| 8. |  |  |  |  |
| 9. |  |  |  |  |
| 10. |  |  |  |  |
| 11. |  |  |  |  |
| 12. |  |  |  |  |
| 13. |  |  |  |  |
| 14. |  |  |  |  |
| 15. |  |  |  |  |
| 16. |  |  |  |  |

## SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION FROM THE PRE-APPLICATION MEETING

| Meeting Date: | Thursday September 22, 2022 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Meeting Time: | 6 pm |
| Meeting Address: | 223 Anderson St |
| Project Address: | 223 Anderson St |
| Property Owner | Name: |
| Project | David Coulombe \& Elyzabeth Dehapiot |

Please summarize the questions/comments and your response from the Pre-Application meeting in the space below. Please state if/ how the project has been modified in response to any concerns.

Question/Concern \#1 by (name of concerned neighbor/neighborhood group):
Beth Freedman
This neighbor lives across the street. Concerned about the vertical addition blocking her view of the bay from her daughter's bedroom window. This window is on the second floor.

Project Sponsor Response: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Question/Concern \#2: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## Project Sponsor Response:

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Question/Concern \#3:
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Project Sponsor Response: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## Question/Concern \#4:

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## Project Sponsor Response:

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

# Notice of an application for Vertical Addition 

Project Location \＆Details：
223 Anderson Street

Building Permit Application No．2022．10．27．5336
Block／Lot No． 5662 ／ 029
Zoning District：RH－1－RESIDENTIAL－HOUSE，ONE FAMILY

The Project at 223 Anderson Street proposes to modify the existing building with a Vertical Addition．The project also includes interior remodeling，the addition of an interior connecting stair，and addition new windows at the front and rear．

Applicant：Gisela Schmoll
415－244－4748 g＠schmolldesign．com
City Planner：Kalyani Agnihotri
628－652－7454 Kalyani．Agnihotri＠sfgov．org

| You are not required to take any action． | If you believe there are exceptional circumstances，you may request a public hearing for Discretionary Review by the response deadline． <br> For information on how to request a public hearing please contact the City Planner or visit sfplanning．org／resource／drp－application． |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 中文： <br> 該專案位於223 Anderson Street提議修改現有的建築，進行垂直添加。有關此通知的中文信息，請於以下截止日期前致電 628．657．7550，並提供項目地址及項目編號。 | Español： <br> El proyecto en 223 Anderson Street propone modificar el edificio existente con un agregado vertical．Para información sobre esta notificación en español，favor de llamar al 628．657．7550 antes de la fecha límite listada abajo，y mencione la dirección y número de proyecto． | Filipino： <br> Iminumungkahi ng proyektong nasa 223 Anderson Street na baguhin ang nariyan nang gusali sa pamamagitan ng Dagdag na Patayo （Vertical Addition）．Para sa impormasyon tungkol dito sa abiso sa Filipino，pakitawagan ang 628．657．7550 sa petsa ng deadline na nakalista sa ibaba，at banggitin ang address ng proyekto at ang numero ng record． |

## General Information About Procedures

Reduced copies of the proposed project plans have been included in this mailing for your information．If you have questions about the plans，please contact the project Applicant listed on the front of this notice．You may wish to discuss the plans with your neighbors or neighborhood association，as they may already be aware of the project． If you have specific questions about the proposed project， you should contact the planner listed on the front of this notice．If you have general questions about the Planning Department＇s review process，contact the Planning counter at the Permit Center via email at pic＠sfgov．org．

If you believe that the impact on you from the proposed project is significant and you wish to seek to change the project，there are several procedures you may use．We strongly urge that steps 1 and 2 be taken．

1．Contact the project Applicant to get more information and to discuss the project＇s impact on you．
2．Contact the nonprofit organization Community Boards at（415）920－3820，or online at www．communityboards．org for a facilitated． Community Boards acts as a neutral third party and has，on many occasions，helped reach mutually agreeable solutions．
3．Where you have attempted，through the use of the above steps or other means，to address potential problems without success，please contact the planner listed on the front of this notice to discuss your concerns．

If，after exhausting the procedures outlined above，you still believe that exceptional and extraordinary circumstances exist，you have the option to request that the Planning Commission exercise its discretionary powers to review the project．These powers are reserved for use in exceptional and extraordinary circumstances for projects that conflict with the City＇s General Plan and the Priority Policies of the Planning Code；therefore the Commission exercises its discretion with utmost restraint． This procedure is called Discretionary Review（＂DR＂）．If you believe the project warrants Discretionary Review by the Planning Commission，you must file a DR Application prior to the Expiration Date shown on the front of this notice．

To file a DR Application，you must：
1．Complete the Discretionary Review PDF application（https：／／sfplanning．org／resource／drp－ application）and email the completed PDF application to CPC．Intake＠sfgov．org by the expiration date listed on the front of this notice． You will receive follow－up instructions via email on
how－and by when－to post payment for the DR Application．

To determine the fee for a Discretionary Review，please refer to the Planning Department Fee Schedule available at www．sfplanning．org．If the project includes multiple building permits，i．e．demolition and new construction，a separate request for Discretionary Review must be submitted，with all required materials and fee，for each permit that you feel will have an impact on you． Incomplete applications will not be accepted．

If no Discretionary Review Applications have been filed within the Notification Period，the Planning Department will approve the application and forward it to the Department of Building Inspection for its review．

## BOARD OF APPEALS

An appeal of the Planning Commission＇s decision on a Discretionary Review case may be made to the Board of Appeals within 15 calendar days after the building permit is issued（or denied）by the Department of Building Inspection．The Board of Appeals is accepting appeals via e－mail．For further information about appeals to the Board of Appeals，including current fees，contact the Board of Appeals at（628）652－1150．

## ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

This project has undergone preliminary review pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act（CEQA）．If，as part of this process，the Department＇s Environmental Review Officer has deemed this project to be exempt from further environmental review，an exemption determination will be prepared and can be obtained through the Exemption Map at www．sfplanning．org prior to the approval action． An appeal of the decision to exempt the proposed project from CEQA may be made to the Board of Supervisors within 30 calendar days after the project approval action identified on the determination．The procedures for filing an appeal of an exemption determination are available from the Board of Supervisors at bos．legislation＠sfgov．org，or by calling（415）554－ 5184.

Under CEQA，in a later court challenge，a litigant may be limited to raising only those issues previously raised at a hearing on the project or in written correspondence delivered to the Board of Supervisors，Planning Commission，Planning Department or other City board， commission or department at，or prior to，such hearing，or as part of the appeal hearing process on the CEQA decision．

## Exhibit 11 - Declaration of posting for section 311

## declaration of posting for section 311

I, David Coulombe ,do hereby declare as follows:

1. On March 3rd , 2023 , I posted a public notice on the project site (one on each frontage for through and corner lots) indicating my intention to secure a building permit and describing the extent of the proposed work for the property located at 223 Anderson St, San Francisco, CA 94110 The public notice was furnished to me by the Planning Department.
2. After posting the aforementioned notice, I determined that the required notice was posted during the requisite duration between March 3rd and April 4th , $20 \underline{23}$.
Building Application Number: 2022.10.27.5336
Project Address: 223 Anderson St, San Francisco, CA 94110
I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

EXECUTED ON THIS DAY, April 4th 2023
IN SAN FRANCISCO.


David Coulombe
Name (Print or Type)
Owner
Relationship to Project: e.g. owner, Attorney, Architect, etc.
Submit completed Declaration of Posting immediately to the Project Planner after the expiration date.

Exhibit 12 - Photo of 311 poster


Documents submitted for the hearing on November 1, 2023

## BOARD OF APPEALS, CITY \& COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Appeal of
$\qquad$
Appellant(s)
_)

vs.
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION, )
PLANNING DEPARTMENT APPROVAL Respondent

## NOTICE OF APPEAL

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT on September 26, 2023, the above named appellant(s) filed an appeal with the Board of Appeals of the City and County of San Francisco from the decision or order of the above named department(s), commission, or officer.

The substance or effect of the decision or order appealed from is the ISSUANCE on September 18, 2023 to Elyzabeth Dehapiot and David Coulombe, of a Site Permit (vertical addition to add new suite with bedroom, bath and closet; new connecting stair, new windows at rear, new window at existing front facade; resurface existing entry stair and replace guardrails; remove existing bathroom at existing primary suite and convert into a family room) at 223 Anderson Street.

APPLICATION NO. 2022/1027/5336
FOR HEARING ON November 1, 2023

Address of Appellant(s):
Address of Other Parties:

| Mary Jane Galviso, Appellant(s) | Elyzabeth Dehapiot \& David Coulombe, Permit <br> 225 Anderson Street <br> San Francisco, CA 94110 |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Holder(s) <br> c/o Gisela Schmoll, Agent for Permit Holder(s) <br> Gisela Schmoll Architect, PC |
|  | 534 Broderick Street <br> San Francisco, CA 94117 |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## CITY \& COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF APPEALS <br> PRELIMINARY STATEMENT FOR APPEAL NO. 23-044

I / We, Mary Jane Galviso, hereby appeal the following departmental action: ISSUANCE of Site Permit No.
2022/1027/5336 by the Department of Building Inspection which was issued or became effective on:
September 18, 2023, to: Elyzabeth Dehapiot and David Coulombe, for the property located at: 223 Anderson Street.

## BRIEFING SCHEDULE:

Appellant's Brief is due on or before: 4:30 p.m. on October 12, 2023, (no later than three Thursdays prior to the hearing date). The brief may be up to 12 pages in length with unlimited exhibits. It shall be double-spaced with a minimum 12-point font. An electronic copy shall be emailed to: boardofappeals@sfgov.org, julie.rosenberg@sfgov.org, corey.teague@sfgov.org, tina.tam@sfgov.org, matthew.greene@sfgov.org, g@schmolldesign.com, dehapiot_e@yahoo.com and david_coulombe@yahoo.com.

Respondent's and Other Parties' Briefs are due on or before: 4:30 p.m. on October 26, 2023, (no later than one Thursday prior to hearing date). The brief may be up to 12 pages in length with unlimited exhibits. It shall be doubled-spaced with a minimum 12-point font. An electronic copy shall be emailed to: boardofappeals@sfgov.org, julie.rosenberg@sfgov.org, corey.teague@sfgov.org, tina.tam@sfgov.org, matthew.greene@sfgov.org and mgalb947@cs.com.

Hard copies of the briefs do NOT need to be submitted to the Board Office or to the other parties.
Hearing Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023, 5:00 p.m., Room 416 San Francisco City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place. The parties may also attend remotely via Zoom. Information for access to the hearing will be provided before the hearing date.

All parties to this appeal must adhere to the briefing schedule above, however if the hearing date is changed, the briefing schedule MAY also be changed. Written notice will be provided of any changes to the briefing schedule.

In order to have their documents sent to the Board members prior to hearing, members of the public should email all documents of support/opposition no later than one Thursday prior to hearing date by 4:30 p.m. to boardofappeals@sfgov.org. Please note that names and contact information included in submittals from members of the public will become part of the public record. Submittals from members of the public may be made anonymously.

Please note that in addition to the parties' briefs, any materials that the Board receives relevant to this appeal, including letters of support/opposition from members of the public, are distributed to Board members prior to hearing. All such materials are available for inspection on the Board's website at www.sfgov.org/boa. You may also request a hard copy of the hearing materials that are provided to Board members at a cost of 10 cents per page, per S.F. Admin. Code Ch. 67.28.

The reasons for this appeal are as follows:
See attachment.
Appellant filed the appeal by email.

I, Mary Jane Galviso, reside at 225 Anderson Street, San Francisco, CA 94110. The house to the north of me at 223 Anderson Street has been issued a permit. This is my statement to explain why I am filing an appeal regarding the issuance of this permit.

I bought my house over 30 years ago. I am filing this appeal because the issued permit will allow a structural addition that will have a negative impact upon my house and my life. If constructed, it will completely change the character of my home. My house is more than 100 years old. I have always preferred natural to electrical light. The morning sun from the east streams into the bathroom, parlor and staircase landing to the laundry room, garage and backyard below. The front 2 bedrooms and entry hall get the strong afternoon sun from the west. My bedroom faces south and gets it natural light from a single window where the south neighbor's house sets back. Outside the bedrooms, the major entry of natural light is in the kitchen. Here a large window allows a great deal of sunlight that brightens up the entire center of my home. This kitchen window is a primary reason I bought my house. From my dining table, I enjoy my meals while watching a daily view of the changing sky above Bernal Hill park. The proposed structure would completely obliterate this view and effectively block any natural light from entering my kitchen.

This single kitchen window is the only window on the northern side of my house. It also provides natural light into my bedroom whenever I leave its door open. Blocking my view and robbing me of natural light in my kitchen would be emotionally stressful for me. I am 73 years old and preparing and eating my meals in the kitchen are an enjoyable part of my life in my home today. Indeed, the kitchen has become the center of my home for me. Nowadays, I often linger to read as well as care for my many house plants, including a large variety of orchids. I am therefore filing this appeal to request that the Board of Appeals revoke the permit. The construction of a second story addition on the adjoining lot would cause an extreme negative impact upon my house's architectural character and upon my home life during these retirement years.

## Permit Details Report

Report Date:

Application Number
Form Number:
Address(es):

Description:

Cost:
Occupancy Code:
Building Use:

9/26/2023 11:18:42 AM

202210275336
3
5662 /o29 / o 223 ANDERSON ST
VERTICAL ADDITION TO ADD NEW SUITE WITH BEDROOM,BATH \&
CLOSET.NEW CONNECTING STAIR,NEW WINDOWS @ REAR,NEW WINDOW
@(E) FRONT FACADE.RESURFACE (E)ENTRY STAIR \& REPLACE
GUARDRAILS.REMOVE (E)BATH @ EXISTING PRIMARY SUITE \& CONVERT
INTO FAMILY ROOM.
\$200,000.00
R-3
27-1 FAMILY DWELLING

Disposition / Stage:

| Action Date | Stage | Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $10 / 27 / 2022$ | TRIAGE |  |
| $10 / 27 / 2022$ | FILING |  |
| $10 / 27 / 2022$ | FILED |  |
| $9 / 11 / 2023$ | APPROVED |  |
| $9 / 18 / 2023$ | ISSUED |  |

## Contact Details:

## Contractor Details:

License Number: OWNER
Name: OWNER
Company Name: OWNER
Address: OWNER * OWNER CA ooooo-oooo
Phone:

Addenda Details:
Description:

| Description: |
| :--- |
| Step Station Rev\# Arrive Start In <br> Hold Out <br> Hold Finish Checked By |
| 1 |
| CPB |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | existing meter is undersizec recommended. Please cont Installations, 525 Golden G San Francisco, CA 94102, T 2900 for more info |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | CP-ZOC | 6/29/23 | 7/5/23 |  |  | 7/5/23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AGNIHOTRI } \\ & \text { KALYANI } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | Approved: Restamp. No ch: approved scope of work. |
| 8 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { DPW- } \\ & \text { BSM } \end{aligned}\right.$ | 6/29/23 | 8/28/23 |  |  | 8/28/23 | DENNIS RASSENDYLL | ApprovedStipulated | Restamped EPR SITE Perm requirement(s) for sign off: Conformity (final inspection applications and plans MUs Download sidewalk applica http://www.sfpublicworks. Your application will be ON necessary PUBLIC WORKS completed or plan checker sign off to the satellite offic |
| 9 | SFPUC | 6/29/23 | 7/7/23 |  |  | 7/7/23 | IMSON |  | 07/07/2023 - RESTAMP D APPROVED. Capacity Char Existing fixture count (gpm proposed fixture count (gpr existing meter is undersizec recommended. Please cont Installations, 525 Golden G San Francisco, CA 94102, T 2900 for more info. |
| 10 | PPC | 11/2/22 | 11/2/22 | 9/5/23 | 9/6/23 | 9/6/23 | PHAM ANH HAI |  | 09/06/23 12:38 PM Invite out permit; HP 9/5/23: IN applicant to sign page 1 and HP 6/29/2023: Invite sent review and stamp REV2 dr Invite sent to SFFD to start review, per BLDG SFFD ne EGo2;nl 4/6/2023: Invite s and PUC to start electronic 4/6/2023: Invite sent to pla to review and stamp REV1 11/2/2022: Invite sent to a session;nl 11/2/2022: Bluel invite sent to CP-ZOC (Plan electronic plan review;nl |
| 11 | СРВ | 9/6/23 | 9/11/23 |  |  | 9/18/23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GUTIERREZ } \\ & \text { NANCY } \end{aligned}$ | Administrative | 9/18/2023:Issued to Archit 09/08/2023: SFUSD fee in fee.ay 09/07/2023: SFUSD calculation, permit not read 9/7/2023: WAITING FOR BE ADDED TO PERMIT IS |

This permit has been issued. For information pertaining to this permit, please call 628-652-3450.

## Appointments:

| Appointment <br> Date | Appointment <br> AM/PM | Appointment <br> Code | Appointment <br> Type | Description | Time |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slots |  |  |  |  |  |

## Inspections:

Activity Date|Inspector|Inspection Description|Inspection Status

## Special Inspections:

| Addenda No. | Completed Date | Inspected By\|Inspection Code | Description | Remarks |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

For information, or to schedule an inspection, call 628-652-3400 between 8:30 am and 3:00 pm.

## Station Code Descriptions and Phone Numbers

Online Permit and Complaint Tracking home page.

## Technical Support for Online Services

If you need help or have a question about this service, please visit our FAQ area.

THE APPELLANT DID NOT SUBMIT A BRIEF

## BRIEF SUBMITTED BY THE PERMIT HOLDER(S)

# Elyzabeth Dehapiot \& David Coulombe 

223 Anderson Street

San Francisco, CA 94110

October 25, 2023

Re: appeal No. 23-044

Dear Board of Appeal,

Please find below our response to Ms. Galviso's appeal brief, regarding the Site Permit No. 2022/1027/5336 related to our residence at 223 Anderson Street.

## Our project

Our family of four has been living in our house since 2013, when we moved in with our 2 young children at the time: Alexandre, now 12 years old, and Eloise, now 11 years old. We moved to the Bay Area from Europe in 2005/2006, and have changed housing many times between our arrival and 2013, when we finally purchased this house. We now call San Francisco home.

Since we moved in on Anderson St., our kids have shared the same bedroom, adjacent to ours on the first floor. The real estate listing claimed that there were two bedrooms on the second floor, however that did not meet our needs: one of the bedrooms on the second floor has been dedicated as a study (see sheet A102 on the approved site permit plans), and the other as a guest bedroom for family coming to town, and doubles
as a playroom for the kids. Please find a picture in exhibit 1 (page 7) that shows the current limited space in our kid's bedroom on the first floor.

With the advent of COVID, we had to create additional office space in the guest bedroom. Furthermore, as our kids have grown, we have had to also create a dedicated space where they can do their homework. Exhibit 2 (page 8) shows the current usage of the family room and study on the second floor.

As our kids reach their teenage years, they have understandably expressed the desire to each have their own bedroom. This request, plus the need for space dedicated for work, made us realize that the current layout of our house was no longer meeting our needs.

We then considered two options:

1. Move out of our home into a larger house, likely outside of San Francisco.
2. Create additional space to our house.

When discussing the subject within our family, we realized how much we all really love the Bernal Height neighborhood and living in San Francisco. We very often shop at the local stores and dine at local restaurants: we now even have created personal contacts with a number of restaurant owners, have hosted birthday celebrations there, etc. The kids expressed a very high level of stress to the idea of leaving the only home they now remember, so we decided to look at adding space to our house. We understood this would still be a lengthy and costly process, however based on initial discussions with our Architect, Gisela Schmoll, we determined that the Planning Code allowed us to add
sufficient space for our family's needs, and therefore decided to move forward with the project in early 2022.

We have worked on numerous variations of the floor plans and overall architectural options with Ms. Schmoll, and are glad to have found a solution which met both the Planning and Building Code requirements while helping us make a real difference towards keeping our family in the neighborhood.

## The proposed added space

As described in the plans approved by the Department of Building Inspection, we are planning on adding a primary bedroom and bathroom to our house, which would be on a new third floor. This would allow us to provide both our kids with their own bedroom and move their study desks into their respective bedrooms. This will help free up needed living space on the second floor while providing each child with more space and privacy as they move into their teenage years. Additionally, part of the new primary bedroom will become a second office space for us adults, especially as we are both employed and need separate offices for work meetings.

One of the key constraints to our project was to comply with the Planning and Building codes so that we would avoid costly revisions and delays. We have followed thoroughly all the steps outlined by the DBI in order to achieve this. Additionally, Ms. Schmoll has proposed many thoughtful designs, and we have in the end opted to minimize massing as much as possible, particularly at the front façade, to limit the impact on the neighborhood and the overall form of the house when viewed from the street, see sheet A204 in the approved site permit drawings.

As required by the permitting process, we have also offered to meet with our neighbors to hear their potential concerns prior to applying for our site permit. Some came forward and enabled us to have an exchange to evaluate if a material impact would be caused to our neighbors. Ms. Galviso did not attend this meeting or contact us at the time with her concerns. It is almost impossible to have no impact with a project of this nature, and we realize it. However we wanted to make sure there was no material impact on light or privacy to our neighbors as required by the Planning Code. We strongly believe we have achieved this.

## Impact to the property at 225 Anderson Street

Ms. Galviso states a number of potential impacts to her property, however we believe will actually have a minimal impact on her house based on the nature of her concerns:

First, Ms. Galviso states that our project would block light to the north facing window in her kitchen (see the site plans on sheet A001 for 225 Anderson's location in relation to ours and the south elevations on sheet A202). Based on the fact that her kitchen window faces north, it does not get direct sunlight, therefore, our project cannot reduce the light she receives. Additionally, if we were to use a lighter paint tone for our project, it is more likely that there would be MORE indirect light bouncing off our walls into Ms. Galviso's kitchen, and not less, and therefore would enhance the situation rather than degrade it.

Second, Ms. Galviso states that our project would remove the view she has of the sky in her kitchen. We believe the current sky view from that window to be very limited, as shown in pictures in Exhibit 3 (pages 9 \& 10). These are the closest approximation of
the best view possible from that window. Ms. Galviso's kitchen window is approximately 2'-9" away from our south facing exterior wall, and our wall and roof comprise the great majority of her current "view". Our project would therefore only have a limited impact on her existing view. Additionally, we are not planning on adding any south facing windows to our property, thus protecting the privacy of the house at 225 Anderson St.

## Additional considerations

We would like to point out a couple of additional items for the board to consider:

1. Neighbor support: we have received direct support from our neighbors at 228 and 219 Anderson Street, indicating the limited impact our project will have on the neighborhood and their properties (refer to Exhibit 4, pages 11 \& 12)
2. Occupancy of 225 Anderson Street: from our observations, we do not believe Ms. Galviso to reside permanently at 225 Anderson St. as over the years many tenants have lived at this address and we only occasionally see Ms. Galviso in the neighborhood.

## Conclusion

Our personal situation has pushed us to look at options to gain additional living space, and we made the decision to remain in San Francisco and our current home to minimize the impact to our family. Adding vertical space was the only option to achieve our goals. Having thoroughly followed the permitting process, we believe we have offered plenty of opportunity for Ms. Galviso to voice her perspectives, which she has chosen not to do until this very last step. Finally, we are also confident that any impact to Ms. Galviso's property will be minimal.

We therefore ask the Board of Appeals to maintain the site permit No. 2022/1027/5336 as designed and not place any conditions on the design. Revoking or modifying this permit to reduce the addition size would not only result in important financial loss to our household, but would certainly cause us to relocate which would cause extreme stress to our entire family.

## Exhibit 1 - Kids bedroom on first floor



Space is very tight for our kids who are reaching their teenage years.

## Exhibit 2 - family room \& study on second floor



Family room doubles as a guest bedroom and study for the kids


Study at the front of house. Covid has forced us to repurpose living space into office space.

Exhibit 3 - views from 225 Anderson Street kitchen window (from outside)


Direct view from 225 Anderson St. kitchen window: the view is only of the south facing wall and roof overhang from 223 Anderson Street.


View from 225 Anderson's st. kitchen window, looking up - equivalent to leaning on the window on the inside.

Exhibit 4 - neighbor support letters - 228 Anderson St (directly across the street from 223 Anderson St) and 219 Anderson St (adjacent property north of 223 Anderson St)

San Francisco, October 22, 2023

I, Irene Davidson Thomas, residing at 228 Anderson Street, have reviewed the drawing for the project considered by my neighbors at 223 Anderson Street related to the addition of vertical space to their house.

I believe the addition to be modest in scale, and fitting into the neighborhood context and character. The project will have negligible impact on me and I fully support the project as designed and approved by the city.


## San Francisco, October , 2023

1. Hansoin CWun , residing at 219 Anderson Street, have reviewed the drawing for the project considered by my neighbors at 223 Anderson Street related to the addition of vertical space to their house.

I believe the addition to be modest in scale, and fitting into the neighborhood context and character. The project will have negligible impact on me and I fully support the project as designed and approved by the city.

Sincerely,



MEETING DATE: 61772022 10AM
RE: Preappication Meeting Reques




## Hehitest: isisel Schmoll <br> @aschmollesigncoom

DBI Reviever: Willy $Y$ au, $P$ P.
willyvauQ Stovover
$628-62-3754$

auestion
Kccupant Load Uuestion: This singele tanily home is $\mathrm{P} \cdot \mathrm{B} 3$ occupancy. The owners wout
stoy tor apimany suite. The exsing builining is not spinikerere. Tavel distance tom the
 exsining wo-story builiding doess not reaun


 Prect


 under the horizontal proiediolion of the root or floor above. The gross floor area shal nol
include shafts interioc couns:


 area open it bebobo, our occupant toad wuld be
b) Occurant Load Rounding Question: How many decimal places should be en ioluded in



answer:


A A-hour rated parapet 30 h high at the skylight which buds along the inside face of the
 (4) $=$

```
lifs
```


${ }_{6}$ Liconseat

Ith bedroom has EERO access in the new thid floor to the fornt street facing side, then om, there should not be any division and doors separating the spaces. ( $x$ ) $=$

## Sprinkler OUsestion: Assuming the Ocupant Load is 10 or less and add a new bedroom

 answer:



sam ero popen aras without flor supporing occupants. Deck reea would be counted or
2. Two Exits Question: Would this buidining be considered to have two exits? While the

Lacesss to walamay on then noth side that opens to the public way. However, the walkway is
widt to 2 2-10": Per hiomation Sheet EG-02 regaring EERO into y yard or cout, we

Lassume thatit we can get the Occupant Loadto 10 or ress, question 2 would be a no
Ssue. II that ororect? Or would the new bediom
isc.

General notes:

1. Changes from the contract drawings shall be made


DEMOLIIION BEYOND WHAT IS INDICATED ON HHE PLANS,
REGARDLESS OF WHEHER THE CONTRACTOR BELIEVES IT IS


|  |
| :---: |


| Ation | fxxupe | MAX FLOW/FIUSH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | faucet vantry faucet BATHUB FAUCE |  |

GISELA SCHMOLL ARCHITECT, PC



|  |
| :---: |
| COLIOMBE Denhario |
| 223 ANDERSON ST SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110 |
| вוоск/LOF:562/202 |
|  |
| asam |
| 5ax |

## ITE PERMIT









112014

Ав-005
2013 San rrancisco butidng cod
Proposed Modifiction or Altemate

 $\qquad$









 pliation for Local Equivalencies








## ongmalys signeat 5 :

$\underset{\substack{\text { Frank } \mathrm{k} \text { Y. Chiu Diretor } \\ \text { Ocober } 3 \text {,200 }}}{ }$
Cary Masseanin Frie Masthal
Ocobocrs , 2002
Nproved by the Buldiding hapection Commisison on Seprember 8 8, 20
Haciment $A$ : Request for Apporval of Loeal Equivaleney

Page 5.2

rige 5.3

## 


 $\qquad$ (Note: This form shall be eceoreded as parat of

ohire
emit Applicition $n+20221027533$
223 Andersono St, San Frandisoc, C
Hock and Lot:5682 ${ }^{029}$ Occupany Group: R.3 Type of Construction: V.B $N$ No. of Sories: ${ }^{3}$ Describe Use of Fuiliding Singale tamily

 Tor




GISELA SCHMOLL ARCHITECT, PC




## Couiombe dethapor

 .ockılo:5662/202
$\qquad$ $\pm=2$ $\pm 2$

## ITE PERMIT


${ }^{\text {notis }}$ THIS Nota A Suvever. properer lines \& slopes Are approxmate.

## 



76SFF 66.5 SF
$\frac{\text { Exsiting site Plan }}{1 / 8=1 \cdot=1}$

$\mathbf{z}-$




76SFF $\mathbf{6 . 5 \text { . } 5 F}$
$\frac{\text { Proposeses Site Plan }}{1 / 88^{\circ}=1.0^{\prime \prime}}$
$\underset{\text { Rev }}{\substack{\text { Placning } \\ \text { lssued to }}} \begin{gathered}1 / 1 / 1 / 23 \\ \text { Date }\end{gathered}$
GISELA SCHMOLL ARCHIECT, PC




COUIOMBE DEAAPIOT
 LockloI:5662029
$\qquad$ $=2$ mawn

## SITE PERMIT

bis stamps:


Sheet Tite

SITE PIAN LeGEND
(E) subbect properry

NeGHBors Properit

A100






GISELA SCHMOLL ARCHITECT, PC

San fincisiso, CA9
Tel.415.244.474


COIOMBE DEEAPIOT

вاоск/LO:5662/029
 $=2$

SITE PERMIT

$\underset{\text { Rev }}{\substack{\text { Plamning } \\ \text { lssued to }}} \begin{gathered}1 / 1 / 1 / 23 \\ \text { Date }\end{gathered}$

Dote: $\quad$| $6 / 1 / 26 / 2023$ |
| :---: |
| 3:3.37 |

scale: As Noted

Massing Calcs. - Elevations

A105

(1) Trivel isistance Second floor Plon

2) Trovel Distance- Thidd Floor Plon

## common path of egress travel

3RD FLOORTO EXIT FEEI
BEDROOM TO STAIRS $\quad{ }^{6}$
STARS TO 2ND FL


## TRAVEL DISTANCE: PER SEBC $\&$ PRE-APP MTC

## Gross area per cbc chapter 2

REA (FF)

## 

TOTAL 1977
ReSIENTIAL 200 gross
OCCUPANTIOAD $\quad 9.885$ PERSONS $<0 R=10$
cbc chapter 2 - definitions
floor area, gross.
The floo rerea within the inide perimeter or the exterior
walls of the buididin under consideration exclusive of


 walls shal be the yseable area under the horizontal
projection of the roof o of floor above. The gross floor are projection of the roor or floor above. The grosst foor area




[^0](4) $\frac{\text { Proposed Section Thu Niddle Stair Run }}{1 / 2=1}$
5) Proososed Section Thu lowerstair fun

A106




$\underset{\text { Rev }}{\substack{\text { Planning } \\ \text { Lssued to }}} \begin{gathered}1 / 1 / 1 / 23 \\ \text { Dote }\end{gathered}$


Sheet Title
emo Calculations

A107



(1) Exsing S Suut Elevation


$\underset{\substack{\text { seconv floor } \\ 0}}{\substack{\text { en }}}$
$\underset{\substack{\text { CUMRB } \\ 3.6518}}{\text { Cute }}$
$\underset{-8.95 / 4}{\text { frit fior }} \in$


## Couiombe detapior

 LocklıO:5662/202
$\qquad$ $=2$ $3=$
SITE PERMIT
$\underset{\text { Rev }}{\substack{\text { Placnning } \\ \text { Issued to }}} \begin{gathered}1 / 1 / 1 / 23 \\ \text { Date }\end{gathered}$


South Elevations

A202

(1) Existing North Elevation
$1 / 4^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$


$\qquad$ (2) Proposed fiont Elevation tom Across steeet


## Coviombe - Dehapiot

 ıockılo:5662020
$\qquad$ $=2$ $=2$

## SITE PERMIT


${ }^{2020} 5$


## PERSPECTIVE Notes:


GISELA SCHMOLL ARCHITECT, PC



COULOMBE Defapiot
 висск/LO:566/2029
 =2* SITE PERMIT

$\underset{\text { Rev }}{\substack{\text { Planning } \\ \text { sssued to }}} \begin{gathered}1 / 1 / 1 / 23 \\ \text { Dote }\end{gathered}$

Exsting Sections

A300



(1) Stair Detali- Section



- Mhit ork siane




-2x blocking

$\qquad$

为
 bockllor:562/202
$\qquad$ $\pm=2$ xum
site permit

$\underset{\text { Rev }}{\substack{\text { Planning } \\ \text { lssuedto }}} \begin{gathered}\text { l/at1/2 } \\ \text { Dote }\end{gathered}$

Scale: As Noted

Details


A500



COIOMBE DEEAPIOT
23 andersonst
AN RRANCCSCO, CA 44110 .ockılo:5662/202
$\qquad$

GS1: San Francisco Green Building Site Permit Submittal Form


## PUBLIC COMMENT

| From: | Bonnie Feinberg |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | BoardofAppeals (PAB) |
| Subject: | Appeal \# 23-044/ 223 Anderson Street |
| Date: | Thursday, October 19, 2023 3:14:16 PM |

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear SF Board of Appeals,

This email pertains to appeal \#23-044 | 223 Anderson Street. I respectfully request that the proposed height of the vertical addition be reconsidered $\&$ reduced somewhat from the height proposed in the plans. While I am genuinely happy for our neighbors to be able to remodel their home, as is their prerogative, the height seemed out of proportion to the surrounding buildings.

I appreciate the opportunity to share my thoughts, and will respect the process and outcome of the Board's work.

Sincerely,
-Bonnie


[^0]:    (3) Proposed Section Thu Uperes Stair Run

