City & County of San Francisco  
BOARD OF APPEALS  
JURISDICTION REQUEST 20-8

Date of request: **November 2, 2020**.

**Christina Sagonowsky** hereby seeks a new appeal period for the following departmental action: **ISSUANCE of Alteration Permit, 2019/09/27/2891** by **Department of Building Inspection**, issued to: **Lindsey Wetzel and Jon Wetzel**, for the property at **2622 Greenwich Street**, that was issued or became effective on **September 30, 2020**, and for which the appeal period ended at close of business on **October 15, 2020**.

Your Jurisdiction Request will be considered by the Board of Appeals on Wednesday, **November 18, 2020** at 5:00 p.m. and will be held via the Zoom video platform.

Pursuant to Article V, § 10 of the Board Rules, the **RESPONSE** to the written request for jurisdiction must be submitted by the permit, variance, or determination holder(s) and/or department(s) no later than 10 days from the date of filing, on or before **November 12, 2020**, and must not exceed 6 pages in length (double-spaced), with unlimited exhibits. An electronic copy shall be submitted to the Board office via email to: **boardofappeals@sfgov.org** and **julie.rosenberg@sfgov.org** with additional copies delivered to the opposing parties the same day.

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 the requestor, the permit holder, and the department(s) will be allowed. Your testimony should focus on the reason(s) you did not file on time, and why the Board should allow a late filing in your situation.

Based upon the evidence submitted and the testimony, the Board will make a decision to either grant or deny your Jurisdiction Request. There is currently a vacancy on the Board of Appeals and therefore three votes are necessary to grant jurisdiction. If your request is denied, an appeal may not be filed and the decision of the department(s) is final. If your request is granted, a **new five (5) day appeal period shall be created which ends on the following Monday**, and an appeal may be filed during this time.

Name: Christina Sagonowsky  
Address: P.O. Box 640366, San Francisco, CA 94164  
Phone: 415-515-6187  
Email: ggresf@comcast.net

filed electronically by Christina Sagonowsky  
Signature of Requestor or Agent
October 30, 2020

Board of Appeals
boardofappeals@sfgov.org

Re: Jurisdiction Request To File Late Appeal on Permit #201909272891 (revision to Permit #201610261228) on 2622-2624 Greenwich St. Due To City’s Inadvertent or Intentional Conduct

Dear Board of Appeals:

I am the owner of a four-unit condominium building located in Cow Hollow at 2618 Greenwich St. I am requesting that the Board of Appeals retain jurisdiction to hear my late appeal of Permit ##201909272891 (revision to Permit #201610261228) issued on September 30, 2020 for construction at the 2-unit property located at 2622-2624 Greenwich St. San Francisco CA 94123 because the City intentionally and/or inadvertently caused such late filing by not sending me a block book notice after I signed up for block book notification and paid a fee of $41.00 to the City of San Francisco Planning Department.

I do not live at this property. This property is a rental property. Due to COVID-19, I have been sheltering in place out of state. I have someone pick up my San Francisco mail several times per week when I am out of state.

My property is located next to and to the east of the 2622-2624 Greenwich St. property at issue. This property is owned by Lindsey and Jonathan Wetzel. The Wetzels applied for a permit to remodel and expand their 2-unit building. Their construction
contract was for approximately $1.8 million dollars, however they hid the full scope and
magnitude of their project from the City and their neighbors, while applying for a smaller
project at first. After their smaller project was approved, they then illegally excavated
approximately 200 cubic yards in their basement – without permit, CEQA review and
without any notice to their neighbors in violation of CA Civil Code Sec. 832.

Due to the Wetzel’s unpermitted excavation and digging soil beneath the level of
my foundation, my foundation was undermined and needs to be replaced. Similarly, the
west side adjoining property at 2628-2630 Greenwich Street’s foundation was also
undermined and needs significant repair work. This property is owned by John and Lori
Brooke, and Chris and Lilian Wagner.

The revision permit at issue is to permit this sneaky fourth level of living space.
Since the fourth level of living space was tacked on as a “serial” permit or two-step
permitting process, it was not part of a Discretionary Review Application that I filed on
November 2, 2017. The merits of my Appeal are summarized in the attached exhibits.

Block Book Notice Filed by Sagonowsky on 12-2-2019:

On December 2, 2019, I filed a Block Book Notice (“BBN”) application and paid
$41 so that I would receive notice of all building permit applications, any exterior work,
horizontal and/or vertical additions, changes of use, conditional use and variance related
to the 2622-2624 Greenwich St. property. On December 12, 2019, my $41 check #429
was cashed by the San Francisco Planning Department. See Exhibit 1.

After the City approved the permit on September 30, 2020, I never received a
block book notice from the City putting me on notice that this permit was approved. As a
result, I missed the 15 day appeal deadline due to no fault of my own.
Planning Department jurisdiction and approval did not end on 10-30-2019 as Mr. May continued to review, re-stamp and approve revised plans as late as 9-11-2020:

The Senior City Planner involved in this matter, Christopher May, concedes that no block book notice was sent to me. Although Mr. May initially approved this permit on October 30, 2019, he retained jurisdiction and supervision over the permit, and notably, on September 11, 2020 – approximately 10 months after I filed my BBN - he continued to take Planning Department action on the permit, reviewing, re-stamping it and approving it a second time. See Exhibit 2.

Exhibit 2 contains the Permit Details Report provided by Katy Sullivan of the Board of Appeals showing an entry by Senior Planner Christopher May dated 9/11/2020 and stating: “reviewed/restamped revised plans showing removal of elevator”. Since the Planning Department retained jurisdiction over the permit and continued to review and approve revisions to said permit, my BBN was timely and a BBN notice should have been sent to me so that I could have filed a timely appeal.

Planner Christopher May knew that I was interested in filing an appeal of this permit but did nothing to protect my appeal rights:

Mr. May and I have had many conversations and shared many e-mails for several years now since the filing of my Discretionary Review in November 2017. Mr. May knew that the construction at the subject property 2622-2624 Greenwich St. impacted my building. Mr. May knew that the property owners and their contractors illegally excavated approximately 200 cubic yards of dirt to accommodate an unpermitted fourth level of living space. He knew that in doing so, the neighbors undermined my foundation and the foundation of the other adjoining property. Knowing how concerned I was about the shenanigans taking place next door, Mr. May advised me in an October
24, 2019 e-mail to subscribe to a Block Book Notification “in order to be notified of permits on your neighbor’s property …”. At no time did Mr. May advise me that I would no longer receive a BBN notice. In that same e-mail, Mr. May advised me to file a Planning Code enforcement complaint given the vast amount of illegal activity taking place next door and knowing how worried I was. He provided me links to both the BBN and the Planning Code enforcement complaint. See Exhibit 3.

On November 13, 2019, I filed a Planning Code Violation Complaint and sent it to Mr. May. In that complaint, I detailed the illegal excavation activity and the large scope of unpermitted work that had taken place and compromised my property. This complaint supports the merits of my appeal and why this Jurisdiction Request should be granted. Otherwise, the City would be rewarding not only the conduct of its employees in intentionally or inadvertently interfering with my timely and meritorious appeal, but would be rewarding the bad conduct of the neighbors and their contractors. See Ex. 4.

Also on November 13, 2019, Mr. May acknowledges receipt of my Planning Code Violation Complaint, stating that he will forward it to his Enforcement Staff and alerting them of a DBI complaint filed against the Wetzes for unpermitted excavation of approximately 100 cubic yards. See Exhibit 5.

**On December 2, 2019, Senior Building Inspector Kevin Birmingham promised me that DBI would not approve the permit without a new 311 neighbor notification and that his boss, Kevin McHugh, was going to rescind Mr. May’s prior approval.**

I was discussing the permit with the building department and on 12-2-2019, senior building inspector Kevin Birmingham stated that a hold was placed on this property and that no further permits would be issued without a new 311 neighbor notification. He also stated that his boss, Kevin McHugh, was in the process of rescinding
Mr. May’s over-the-counter approval of 10-30-2019. I reasonably relied on these representations and believed Mr. Birmingham when he made the. Together with the BBN, I felt that the City would protect me. I was wrong and as a result, this Jurisdiction Request should be granted. In my 12-2-2019 e-mail to Mr. May, I advised him that the senior building inspector has concluded that a horizontal extention exists and that new 311 notifications are required. See Ex. 6. No new 311 notifications were issued.

**Mr. May refused to issue new 311 neighbor notifications, but assured me that I will have an opportunity to appeal the issuance of a building permit.**

In Mr. May’s Dec. 18, 2019 e-mail to me, he stated that no new 311 neighbor notification would be made. Because he knew how concerned I was about having my voice heard with regard to the new construction, he reassured me with these words:

“As I recommended previously, should you wish to do so, you will have an opportunity to appeal the issuance of a building permit, if/when DBI does so.”

Again, at not time, did Mr. May advise me that my BBN was ineffective and that I would not be receiving any notice. Knowing that I was now deprived of filing a new Discretionary Review because there would be no new 311 neighbor notification as found necessary by DBI Inspector Kevin Birmingham, I was now left with no recourse. Mr. May effectively – either intentionally or inadvertently – misled me into believing I had recourse, when in reality, he created a situation where I had no recourse.

**Mr. May knew that the unpermitted excavation of 200 cubic yards of dirt was a CEQA violation that required a geotech report and further investigation – and not a CEQA exemption.**

Given all the information that I provided to Mr. May, he and the Planning Department knew that over 50 cubic yards of dirt had been excavated from the subject property’s back yard to allow for an unpermitted fourth level of living space, which
undermined both my and my neighbors’ foundations.

Rather than investigate the violations of grading found by DBI inspector Kevin Birmingham, and the violations of CEQA, the Planning Department rubber stamped a CEQA Exemption on 10-24-2019. See Exhibit 7, my e-mail of 10-30-2020 to various Planning Dept. and DBI and City employees, including Christopher May. This exhibit supports in large part the merits of my appeal and why this Jurisdiction Request must be granted.

**Conclusion:**

I have acted quickly to preserve my appeal rights after learning this week that the Planning Dept. failed to provide any notice to me. Supervisor Catherine Stefani’s office spoke with Christopher May on Monday, October 26, 2020. Mr. May admitted that my BBN was filed and active, but that the Planning Dept. did not send me any notice.

I then contacted the Board of Appeals on Thursday, October 29th, to discuss filing a jurisdiction request and to set the matter for hearing. After a phone call with Katy Sullivan, I decided to file the instant Jurisdiction request and have received confirmation that the hearing is scheduled for November 18, 2020.

Thank you for your consideration of this Jurisdiction Request.

Sincerely yours,

Christina M. Sagonowsky

(415) 515-6187
APPLICATION TO REQUEST A
Block Book Notice (BBN)

Applicant Information
Applicant Name: Christina Sagonowsky
Mailing Address: 1757 Larkin Street, San Francisco, CA 94109
Email: ggrest@comcast.net
Telephone: 415-515-6197

BBN Property Location (block/lot info can be found on the SF Property Information Map)
Subject Parcel Address: 2622-2624 Greenwich St., San Francisco, CA 94123
Assessors Block/Lot: 0938/022-02 Additional Block/Lot(s):    

Notification Preference
Please identify which application(s) reviewed by the Planning Department that you are interested in receiving as notification (check all that apply):
- [ ] All Building Permit Applications (interior and exterior)
- [ ] Any Exterior Work (windows, garage doors, horizontal and vertical additions)
- [ ] Horizontal and / or Vertical Additions
- [ ] Changes of Use
- [ ] Conditional Use and Variance
- [ ] Other:    

Payment (refer to Fee Schedule re Block Book Notification)
First Assessor's Parcel: $41.00
(# of Additional Block/Lots x additional fee $___) = $____
Total Enclosed: $41.00

Requestor Signature: Christina Sagonowsky
Date: 12/2/19

FOR MORE INFORMATION:
Call or visit the San Francisco Planning Department

Central Reception
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco CA 94103-2479
TEL: 415.558.6378
FAX: 415.558.6409
WEB: https://sfplanning.org

Planning Information Center (PIC)
1660 Mission Street, First Floor
San Francisco CA 94103-2479
TEL: 415.558.6377
WEB: https://sfplanning.org/pic

Ex. 1
ESTATE OF STEFAN M MROZOWSKI
CHRISTINA SAGONOWSKY, EXECUTOR
2225 GOUGH ST.
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109

Pay to the Order of
San Francisco Planning Dept $ 41.00

429

DATE 12-2-19

Forty-one dollars 00/00

Christina Sagonowsky

 Union Bank

04-29
Amount: $41.00

Check #429

2265 Gough St.
San Francisco, CA 94109

To: FFDC - one coffee
San Francisco, POM 0007, Dept. S 41.00

Date: 12-2-19

2265 Gough ST.
San Francisco, CA 94109

For: BIN 25717

Written Checks

Estate of Stefan M Mazowiski

Christian Mazowiski, Executor

Dollars $
Welcome to our Permit / Complaint Tracking System!

Permit Details Report

Report Date: 10/26/2020 1:41:56 PM

Application Number: 201909272691
Form Number: 3
Address(es): 0938 / G23 / G 2622 GREENWICH ST

Description: REVISION TO 201810261228 EXCAVATION OF BASEMENT LEVEL BELOW THE 1ST LEVEL AND AT REAR TERRACE. NEW STAIRS AND ELEVATOR TO SERVICE THE BASEMENT TO 1ST FL NEW TERRACE AT BASEMENT LEVEL. BEDROOM, FULL BATH, PLAYROOM, STORAGE/GYM

Cost: $450,000.00
Occupancy Code: R-3
Building Use: 28 - 2 FAMILY DWELLING

Disposition / Stage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Date</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/27/2019</td>
<td>Triage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/27/2019</td>
<td>Filed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2020</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2020</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact Details:
Contractor Details:
License Number: 939216
Name: JOAO RAIMUNDO NICOLAU
Company Name: DIMENSION CONSTRUCTION INC
Address: 2550 APPIAN WY * PINOLE CA 94564-0000
Phone: 

Addenda Details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Arrive</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>In Hold</th>
<th>Out Hold</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Checked By</th>
<th>Hold Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>INAKE</td>
<td>9/27/19</td>
<td>9/27/19</td>
<td>9/27/19</td>
<td>BUJIKA SIBAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CP-ZOC</td>
<td>10/30/19</td>
<td>10/30/19</td>
<td>10/30/19</td>
<td>MAY CHRISTOPHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MECH</td>
<td>11/5/19</td>
<td>11/5/19</td>
<td>11/5/19</td>
<td>ORTEGA REYNALDO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CPB</td>
<td>2/14/20</td>
<td>2/14/20</td>
<td>2/14/20</td>
<td>GUTIERREZ NANCY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>BLDG</td>
<td>3/30/20</td>
<td>6/17/20</td>
<td>7/13/20</td>
<td>LIU STEPHEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>DPW-BSM</td>
<td>4/12/20</td>
<td>4/16/20</td>
<td>4/15/20</td>
<td>DENNIS RASSENDYLL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SFPUC</td>
<td>4/19/20</td>
<td>4/21/20</td>
<td>7/22/20</td>
<td>WONG KENDRICK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>MECH</td>
<td>8/17/20</td>
<td>8/17/20</td>
<td>8/17/20</td>
<td>ORTEGA REYNALDO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CPW-BSM</td>
<td>8/18/20</td>
<td>8/27/20</td>
<td>8/27/20</td>
<td>DENNIS RASSENDYLL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SFPUC</td>
<td>8/28/20</td>
<td>9/4/20</td>
<td>9/4/20</td>
<td>WONG KENDRICK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>EFCU</td>
<td>9/18/20</td>
<td>9/18/20</td>
<td>9/18/20</td>
<td>BLACKSHEAR JOHN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ex. 2
This permit has been issued. For information pertaining to this permit, please call 628-652-3450.

### Appointments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointment Date</th>
<th>Appointment AM/PM</th>
<th>Appointment Code</th>
<th>Appointment Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Time Slots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/30/2020</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>VS</td>
<td>IVR Scheduled</td>
<td>REINFORCING STEEL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/2020</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>VS</td>
<td>IVR Scheduled</td>
<td>START WORK</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Inspections:

**Activity Date** | **Inspector** | **Inspection Description** | **Inspection Status**
---|---|---|---
10/6/2020 | Hector Hernandez | START WORK | START WORK

### Special Inspections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addenda No.</th>
<th>Completed Date</th>
<th>Inspected By</th>
<th>Inspection Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IB53</td>
<td>CF2R-ADD-02-E - PRESCRIPTIVE RESIDENTIAL ADDITIONS THAT DO NOT REQUIRE HERS FIELD VERIFICATION</td>
<td>geotech eng to be present for foundation &amp; retaining wall work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24F</td>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IB3</td>
<td>CF2R-ENV-03-E - INSULATION INSTALLATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IB57</td>
<td>CF2R-MCH-01-E - SPACE CONDITIONING SYSTEMS DUCTS AND FANS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IB63</td>
<td>CF2R-MCH-27-H - INDOOR AIR QUALITY AND MECHANICAL VENTILATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IE2</td>
<td>CF2R-LTG-02-E - LIGHTING - MULTI FAMILY DWELLINGS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IP6</td>
<td>CF2R-PLB-01-E - MULTIFAMILY CENTRAL HOT WATER SYSTEM DISTRIBUTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CONCRETE (PLACEMENT &amp; SAMPLING)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>BOLTS INSTALLED IN CONCRETE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>REINFORCING STEEL AND PRETTRESSING TENDONS</td>
<td>reinforcing steel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For information or to schedule an inspection, call 628-652-3450 between 8:30 am and 3:00 pm.

**Online Permit and Compliant Tracking home page**

**Technical Support for Online Services**

If you need help or have a question about this service, please visit our FAQ area.
**Permit Addenda Details Report**

**Report Date:** 10/30/2020 12:12:32 PM

**Application Number:** 20160261238

**Form Number:** 3

**Address(es):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0938</th>
<th>023</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>2622</th>
<th>GREENWICH ST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Description:** INTERIOR RENOVATION & ADDITION TO (E) 2-UNIT BUILDING. 1ST FL RENOVATION & ADDITION OF MORE FL AREA. ADD ENTRANCE TO UPPER FL. FROM THE LOWER/GARAGE. 2ND FL ADD (N) KITCHEN, POWDER RM, FAMILY RM & STAIR TO BACKYARD. 3RD FL MASTER RENOVATION & 2ND BATH RENOVATION.

**Cost:** $265,000.00

**Occupancy Code:** R-3

**Building Use:** 28 - 2 FAMILY DWELLING

### Disposition / Stage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Date</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/28/2019</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/20/2019</td>
<td>Issued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contact Details:

- **License Number:** 977600
- **Name:** HERVE CLAUDE GUINARD
- **Company Name:** CREATIVELY BUILT INC
- **Address:** 2084 VINEYARD RD * NOVATO CA 94947-0000
- **Phone:**

### Contractor Details:

- **License Number:** 977600
- **Name:** HERVE CLAUDE GUINARD
- **Company Name:** CREATIVELY BUILT INC
- **Address:** 2084 VINEYARD RD * NOVATO CA 94947-0000
- **Phone:**

### Addenda Details:

**Description:** STRUCTURAL,ARCH,T24,FINAL PLANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Arrive</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>In Hold</th>
<th>Out Hold</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Checked By</th>
<th>Hold Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CPB</td>
<td>11/13/18</td>
<td>11/13/18</td>
<td>11/13/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SECONDEZ GRACE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BLDG</td>
<td>11/14/18</td>
<td>12/26/18</td>
<td>4/16/19</td>
<td>5/20/19</td>
<td>5/20/19</td>
<td>LEUNG STEPHAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MECH</td>
<td>1/18/19</td>
<td>1/18/19</td>
<td>1/18/19</td>
<td>4/5/19</td>
<td>4/29/19</td>
<td>TAN (PETER) JIA JIAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>DPW-BSM</td>
<td>2/13/16</td>
<td>2/15/19</td>
<td>2/15/19</td>
<td>10/10/19</td>
<td>5/10/19</td>
<td>DENNIS RASSENDYLL</td>
<td>4/29/2019: Approved after recheck. Returned the plans to the hold bin #28. 4/5/2019: Rechecked. Need architect's signature and stamp on drawings. GS-5 Green Building Form with Green Building Professional signature, ventilation for elevator hoistway. 2/13/2019: Comments have been emailed to Patrick Perez (<a href="mailto:patrick@designpad.net">patrick@designpad.net</a>). The plans have been routed to PPC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SFPC</td>
<td>2/19/19</td>
<td>2/27/19</td>
<td>2/27/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WONG WENDY</td>
<td>N/A Addendum. No changes to meter sizing from original assessment. Route to PPC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://dbiweb02.sfgov.org/dbipts/default.aspx?page=PermitAddendaDetails
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DFCU</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/21/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLDG</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/20/19</td>
<td>5/22/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPC</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/22/19</td>
<td>5/22/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPB</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/22/19</td>
<td>5/28/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
Hi Christina,

Further to our telephone discussion today, I wanted to point you to information about how to submit a Planning Code enforcement complaint. Once you do this, a member of our Enforcement team will go out to the site to see whether the project sponsor has exceeded the scope of the plans approved by the Planning Commission.

You may also wish to subscribe to a Block Book Notification in order to be notified of permits on your neighbor's property that you might not otherwise received a notification for.

I've also attached a copy of the proposed plans that the project sponsor forwarded to me a few weeks ago. If you have any other questions, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Christopher May, Senior Planner
Northwest Team, Current Planning Division
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9087 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map
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You may also wish to subscribe to a Block Book Notification in order to be notified of permits on your neighbor’s property that you might not otherwise received a notification for.

I’ve also attached a copy of the proposed plans that the project sponsor forwarded to me a few weeks ago. If you have any other questions, please don’t hesitate to contact me.
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PLANNING CODE VIOLATION COMPLAINT FORM

PROPERTY INFORMATION WHERE ALLEGED VIOLATION OBSERVED

Address of Property: 2622-2624 Greenwich St.   Block/Lot (if known): 0938/023
San Francisco, CA 94123

Property Owner Name: Jonathan and Lindsey Wetzel
Tenant's Name:

Phone (if known):

DESCRIPTION OF ALLEGED VIOLATION

Please provide accurate information and state the reason you believe it is a violation of Planning Code. If possible, please include supporting documentation such as photographs, reference to relevant permits and Planning Code Sections. If you are submitting this form by email, you may attach your supporting documentation to the email.

Details of Violation:
1. Exceeded scope of Planning Dept's approved plans by over-excavating to add new level of living space - approved 2014
2. Horizontal extension w/o permit, w/o neighborhood notification

Impact of Violation:
Undermining my foundation at 2618 Greenwich St. as well as west-side neighbors' foundation at 2626-30 Greenwich St. DBI issued numerous NOVs & stop work orders. DBI has placed a block to prevent any further permits from being issued.

How long have you observed the violation?:

DBI discovered violations on 10-18-19

Please list other agencies where complaint has been filed: DBI; OSHPA; CA State Contractors Licensing Board

Signature
Christina M. Sagonowsky

Name (Printed):
Christina M. Sagonowsky

Date: 11-13-19

Email Address: gg@resf@comcast.net

Phone: 415-515-6187

Your Address: 2225 Gough St. SF CA 94109

Ex.4
COMPLAINT DATA SHEET

Complaint Number: 20196813
Owner/Agent: OWNER DATA SUPPRESSED
Owner’s Phone: --
Contact Name: --
Contact Phone: --
Complainant: COMPLAINANT DATA SUPPRESSED

Date Filed: 10/24/19
Location: 2622 GREENWICH ST
Block: 0938
Lot: 023
Site:
Rating:
Occupancy Code:
Received By: Suzanna Wong
Division: BID

Complainant’s Phone:
Complaint Source:
Assigned to Division:

FIELD OBSERVATION

Excavation of approximately 200 cubic yards of soil at rear of property. Structural mat slab installed approx 800-1000 square feet without permit or plans. Misrepresentation of elevations on plans associated with PA 201610261228.

Instructions:

INSPECTOR INFORMATION

DIVISION | INSPECTOR ID | DISTRICT | PRIORITY
---------------------|---------------|----------|-----------------
BID | BIRMINGHAM | | |

REFERRAL INFORMATION

COMPLAINT STATUS AND COMMENTS

DATE | TYPE | DIV| INSPECTOR | STATUS | COMMENT
----------|------|-----|-----------|--------|--------
10/24/19 | CASE OPENED | BID | Birmingham | CASE RECEIVED | |

COMPLAINT ACTION BY DIVISION

NOV (HIS)

Inspector Contact Information
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NOTICE OF VIOLATION

DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION
City and County of San Francisco
1000 Polk St. - San Francisco, CA 94103 - 2414

ADDRESS 2322, Greenwhich St

OCCUPANCY / USE: 2-3

COMPLAINT DATE

VIOLATION DESCRIPTION:

[ ] WORK WITHOUT PERMIT (SFBC 103A); [ ] ADDITIONAL WORK PERMIT REQUIRED
[ ] EXPIRED PERMIT (SFBC 106A.4); [ ] CANCELLED PERMIT (SFBC 106A.4.7); [ ] NON-
[ ] UNSAFE BUILDING (SFBC 102A); [ ] SEE ATTACHMENTS

Following an inspection it was observed:
[ ] EXCAVATION HAS OCCURRED IN AN UNDEMNIFIED NEIGHBORING PROPERTY,

CORRECTIVE ACTION:

[ ] STOP ALL WORK SFBC 104A.2.4
[ ] FILE BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION WITHIN 5 DAYS (WITH PLANS)
[ ] OBTAIN PERMIT WITHIN 15 DAYS AND COMPLETE ALL WORK WITHIN 30 DAYS
[ ] CORRECT VIOLATIONS WITHIN DAYS
[ ] NO PERMIT REQUIRED
[ ] YOU FAILED TO COMPLY WITH THE NOTICE(S) DATED
[ ] FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THIS NOTICE WILL CAUSE ABATEMENT PROCEEDINGS TO BE INITIATED

INVESTIGATION FEE OR OTHER FEE WILL APPLY See reverse side for notice amount:

[ ] 3x Permit Fee (Work w/o Permit after 8/1/06)
[ ] 2x Permit Fee (Work w/o Permit before 8/1/06)
[ ] Reinspection Fee

APPROX. DATE OF WORK WD PERMIT:

BY ORDER OF THE DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

CONTACT INSPECTOR: CHEN, TINA

OFFICE HOURS: 9:30 TO 5:30 AM AND 8:00 TO 4:00

PHONE: 415-555-6985

CC: DCP □ EID □ PID □ BID □ HRS □ CED □ PDR □ DAD □ SPF □ D11E1

By: (Inspector's Signature)
NOTICE OF VIOLATION

DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

VIOLATION DESCRIPTION:

STORAGE OPENING STORED (S)

CORRECTIVE ACTION:

RETURN MATERIAL STORED

BY ORDER OF THE DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION
On October 22, 2019, the undersigned and contractor Eugene McGuinness, visited the site of construction at 2622 Greenwich Street to observe the impact of the construction on undermining adjacent foundations at 2618 and 2628-2630 Greenwich Street. We noted a bowed and leaning west wall, newly cracked concrete and occasionally heard popping/cracking sounds coming from the 2618 Greenwich building. This is an indication of continuing settlement and lateral displacement of the building that could potentially result in partial building failure. This could be exacerbated by heavy rains, high winds or even a minor earthquake that could cause the unsupported earth to yield and the building collapse into the excavation at 2622 Greenwich Street, if left uncorrected.

This is an urgent matter that must be addressed and properly corrected immediately.

Respectfully submitted,

Darrel Harris
Structural Engineer No. 2433
PLANNING CODE VIOLATION COMPLAINT FORM

BACKGROUND INFORMATION & SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

This form is used to report Planning Code violations on private properties. Please refer below for examples of Planning Code violations. If you would like to call in a complaint, please call the Code Enforcement Complaint Hotline at 415.575.6863.

There is no fee to file a complaint. Please be sure to provide accurate information. We accept anonymous complaints, but information that is incorrect or insufficient may hamper the investigation. Please note the Information that you provide may be disclosed in response to a Public Records Request.

Please report building construction related issues to the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) at 415.558.6570 or DBI.BID.Complaints@sfgov.org. To report illegal short-term rentals/illegal tourist hotel activities that are subject to Chapter 41A of the Administrative Code, please contact the Office of Short Term Rentals at 415.575.9116 or shorttermrentals@sfgov.org. If you are unsure where to report your complaint, please call “311” or visit www.sf311.org.

EXAMPLES OF PLANNING CODE VIOLATIONS:

• Addition or Removal of Dwelling Unit(s) without Planning Department approval;
• Alteration of Historical Building or Structure without Planning Department approval;
• ATM without Required Setback;
• Demolition without Planning Department Approval;
• Exceeding Permitted Hours of Operation;
• Expansion of Non-Conforming Use;
• Failure to Provide Required Bicycle Parking;
• Formula Retail Use (Franchise/chain store) without Planning Dept. Approval;
• Illegal Advertising Sign;
• Illegal Business Sign on Private Property;
• Illegal Massage Establishment;
• Illegal Medical Cannabis Dispensary;
• Illegal Residential, Commercial, Industrial, and Institutional Uses;
• Non-compliance with Conditions of Approval;
• Unpermitted Obstruction in Front or Rear Setback;
• Operation of Home Business beyond Limitations;
• Removal of Required Landscaping;
• Removal of Required Parking without Planning Department Approval;
• Rooming/Boarding House (Group Housing) without Planning Department Approval;
• Unpermitted Parking Facility;
• Failure to Install Required Street Tree
• Use of Required Front or Rear Setback as Parking; and
• Wireless Facility without Planning Department Approval

WHAT TO SUBMIT:

• One (1) original copy of this form with all blanks filled in.

HOW TO SUBMIT:

To file your complaint form, you may:
• submit the form in person at the Planning Information Center located at 1660 Mission Street, Ground Floor
• email the completed form to Planning.CodeEnforcement@sfgov.org
• mail the completed form to the Planning Department at:
  Attn: Code Enforcement Division
  1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
  San Francisco, CA 94103-2479
• fax the completed form to the attention of Code Enforcement Division at 415.558.6409

Español: Si desea ayuda sobre cómo llenar esta solicitud en español, por favor llame al 415.575.9010. Tenga en cuenta que el Departamento de Planificación requerirá al menos un día hábil para responder.

中文：如果您希望获得使用中文填写这份申请表的帮助，请致电415.575.9010。请注意，规划部门需要至少一个工作日来回应。

Tagalog: Kung gusto mo ng tulong sa pagkumpleto ng application na ito sa Filipino, paki tawagan ang 415.575.9121. Paki tandaan na mangangailangan ang Planning Department ng hindi iikakulangin sa isang araw na pan trabaho para makasagot.
Thanks, Christina.

I will alert our Enforcement staff of this new DBI complaint.

Christopher May, Senior Planner
Northwest Team, Current Planning Division
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9087 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map

From: Christina Sagonowsky <ggresf@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, November 13, 2019 1:40 PM
To: May, Christopher (CPC) <christopher.may@sfgov.org>; Bradley White <bradleywhite2000@comcast.net>
Subject: 2622-24 Greenwich Planning Code Violation Complaint - an additional NOV/complaint was filed yesterday by DBI ...

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

Christopher,

Thank you for forwarding my Planning Code Violation complaint to Enforcement.

I just became aware of a new DBI complaint that was filed yesterday (see below) and which should be attached to my complaint of today’s date. Please let he know if I should send this new DBI complaint directly to Enforcement, or if you can forward it to Enforcement. Thank you for your continued assistance.

Christina
415-515-6187
Welcome to our Permit / Complaint Tracking System!

COMPLAINT DATA SHEET

Complaint Number:   201900171
Owner/Agent:        OWNER DATA SUPPRESSED
Owner's Phone:      --
Contact Name:       --
Contact Phone:      --
Complainant:        COMPLAINANT DATA SUPPRESSED
Date Filed:          
Location:           2622 GREENWICH ST
Block:              0938
Lot:                023
Site:               
Rating:             
Occupancy Code:     
Received By:        Suzanna Wong
Division:           BID
An investigation has revealed that the grade at the rear of the property has been altered without a permit. Approx 100 cyard of earth has been relocated to raise the height of the yard. Per appendix "J" SFEBC

INSPECTOR INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIVISION</th>
<th>INSPECTOR</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BID</td>
<td>BIRMINGHAM</td>
<td>5330</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REFERRAL INFORMATION

COMPLAINT STATUS AND COMMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>DIV</th>
<th>INSPECTOR</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/31/19</td>
<td>OTHER BLDG/HOUSING VIOLATION</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>FIRST NOV SENT</td>
<td>1st NOV issued per K. Birmingham /tt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/19</td>
<td>CASE OPENED</td>
<td>BID</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>CASE RECEIVED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/19</td>
<td>OTHER BLDG/HOUSING VIOLATION</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>CASE UPDATE</td>
<td>1st NOV mailed per K. Birmingham. CC'd to DCP /tt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMPLAINT ACTION BY DIVISION

NOV (HIS): NOV (BID): 10/31/19
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Good morning Christopher,

I just left you a voicemail this morning requesting that you call me to explain why you approved the above referenced application over the counter and without 311 neighbor notification after I advised you that this "revision" application constitutes a horizontal extension - thus triggering 311 notifications.

In late October, you advised me to file a Planning Code Enforcement complaint after I faxed you information that supported the denial of this application by the Planning Department. I filed said complaint and am waiting to hear from the Planner assigned to it, Josephine Chan, the person you referred me to, is not the Planner, but rather, is support staff.

Can you please call me today to discuss. The Building Department senior inspector has concluded that a horizontal extension exists and that 311 notifications are required.

Thank you.

Christina M. Sagonowsky
415-515-6187

Welcome to our Permit / Complaint Tracking System!

Permit Details Report

Report Date: 11/26/2019 7:29:35 PM

Application Number: 201909272891
Form Number: 8
Address(es): 0938 / 023 / 0 2622 GREENWICH ST
Description: REVISION TO 201610261228 EXCAVATION OF BASEMENT LEV BELOW THE 1ST LEVEL AND AT REAR TERRACE. NEW STAIR AND ELEVATOR TO SERVICE THE BASEMENT TO 1ST FL NEW TERRACE AT BASEMENT LEVEL. BEDROOM, FULL BATH, PLAYROOM, STORAGE/GYM
Cost: $15,000.00
Occupancy Code: R-3
Building Use: 28 - 2 FAMILY DWELLING

Disposition / Stage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Date</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/27/2019</td>
<td>TRIAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/27/2019</td>
<td>FILING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/27/2019</td>
<td>FILED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact Details:
Contractor Details:
Addenda Details:

Description:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Arrive</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>In Hold</th>
<th>Out Hold</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Checked By</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Hold Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>INTAKE</td>
<td>9/27/19</td>
<td>9/27/19</td>
<td>9/27/19</td>
<td>BUFKA SUSAN</td>
<td>415-999-9999</td>
<td>Approved: excavation of basement level (approximately 906 square feet), extend elevator to basement level No 311 required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CP-ZOC</td>
<td>10/30/19</td>
<td>10/30/19</td>
<td>10/30/19</td>
<td>MAY CHRISTOPHER</td>
<td>415-558-6377</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BLDG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>415-558-6133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MECH</td>
<td>11/5/19</td>
<td>11/5/19</td>
<td></td>
<td>ORTEGA REYNALDO</td>
<td>415-558-6133</td>
<td>Approved, OTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SPFUC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>415-575-6941</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CPB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>415-558-6070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appointments:

- Appointment Date
- Appointment AM/PM
- Appointment Code
- Appointment Type
- Description
- Time Slots

Inspections:

- Activity Date
- Inspector
- Inspection Description
- Inspection Status

Special Inspections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addenda No.</th>
<th>Completed Date</th>
<th>Inspected By</th>
<th>Inspection Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>IB53</td>
<td></td>
<td>CF2R-ADD-02-E - PRESCRIPTIVE RESIDENTIAL ADDITIONS THAT DO NOT REQUIRE HERS FIELD VERIFICATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>IB1</td>
<td>CF2R-ENV-01-E</td>
<td>FENESTRATION INSTALLATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>IB3</td>
<td>CF2R-ENV-03-E</td>
<td>INSULATION INSTALLATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>IP6</td>
<td>CF2R-PLB-01-E</td>
<td>MULTIFAMILY CENTRAL HOT WATER SYSTEM DISTRIBUTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>IB63</td>
<td>CF2R-MCH-27-H</td>
<td>INDOOR AIR QUALITY AND MECHANICAL VENTILATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>IE2</td>
<td>CF2R-LTG-02-E</td>
<td>LIGHTING - MULTI FAMILY DWELLINGS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>IB57</td>
<td>CF2R-MCH-01-E</td>
<td>SPACE CONDITIONING SYSTEMS DUCTS AND FANS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For information, or to schedule an inspection, call 558-6570 between 8:30 am and 3:00 pm
Sent from my iPhone
Hi Christina,

I consulted with the Zoning Administrator and he confirmed to me that, given the information shown on the plans the Planning Department was presented with by the project sponsor, a new S. 311 notice is not required. As I recommended previously, should you wish to do so, you will have an opportunity to appeal the issuance of a building permit, if/when DBI does so.

Regards,

Christopher May, Senior Planner  
Northwest Team, Current Planning Division  
San Francisco Planning Department  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 415.575.9087 | www.sfplanning.org  
San Francisco Property Information Map

On Dec 11, 2019, at 11:42 AM, May, Christopher (CPC) <christopher.may@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hi Christina,

I've reached out to Kevin Birmingham in DBI, who is the inspector associated with the notice of violation on your neighbor's property. I have asked him to route the plans back to Planning so that we can have another look to determine whether
there are any further misrepresentations that we may not have been aware of earlier.

Please rest assured that if we find any work that would trigger additional neighborhood notification, I will be sure to do so so that your rights to file another Discretionary Review are retained.

I'll be in touch once I've had a chance to review the plans again and we can discuss next steps.

Regards,

Christopher May, Senior Planner
Northwest Team, Current Planning Division
San Francisco Planning Department
1550 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9087 | www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Property Information Map

From: Christina Sagonowsky <ggresf@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 11, 2019 11:33 AM
To: May, Christopher (CPC) <christopher.may@sfgov.org>
Cc: Bradley R. White <bradleywhite2000@comcast.net>
Subject: 2622-2624 Greenwich St.

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

Good morning Mr. May,

Thank you for calling me back this morning.

As we discussed (before you hung up on me), we have learned that the original 311 notifications for the construction project at 2622-2624 Greenwich St. were intentionally misleading and omitted the Project Sponsor's intent of performing unpermitted excavation to accommodate another over 900 square feet of unpermitted living space in the basement. In doing so, the Project Sponsor has not only created a horizontal extension requiring 311 notifications to be issued, but has also damaged my foundation at 2618 Greenwich St. and the foundation of the adjacent building on the west side at 2628-2630 Greenwich St. In particular, my building had, in part, an old brick foundation and an unusual condition - a 9' deep "prohibition pit" - in its subbasement that required extremely careful attention and no excavation within 3 feet of my building. Knowing these conditions existed and without any prior notice to me, the Project Sponsor ditched the approved plans and his prior representations to me - and secretly excavated up to my building's foundation and even underneath it in violation of the approved plans.
In late October 2019, I provided you with photographs that clearly show the foregoing conditions and that the Project Sponsor grossly deviated — without permit — from the approved plans by, *inter alia*, changing the previously approved plan’s pier and beam foundation to a slab foundation - without permit and without any notice to neighbors.

I also provided you with numerous Notices of Violation (NOVs) by DBI inspectors who caught this illegal work being performed on October 18, 2019, and who noted that the Project Sponsors “misrepresented” the plan’s elevations, illegally excavated below my foundation causing significant damage to it and that of the 2628-2630 Greenwich St. foundation requiring emergency shoring work. All this was done without permit and without any notice to neighbors - either in the original meet and greet, or in their 311 notifications, or at any point in the DR process and hearings before the Planning Commission.

To wit, this secret unpermitted level of living space was intentionally concealed from the neighbors and the Planning Department and Planning Commission at all times during the original permit and DR hearings. Furthermore, the Project Sponsor and his team, including the subject property owners, acted in violation of CA Civil Code for, among other things, failing to provide prior notice of their excavation.

It is beyond any doubt that the 311 notification process failed as the notifications were intentionally misleading, incomplete and, as a result, the permit was fraudulently procured. The Project Sponsors concealed the true scope of their project so they could first secure approval and permits, and then secretly expand their project without any notice to neighbors or the Planning Commission.

Since we did not receive notice during the 311 notification period of the full scope of the Project Sponsor’s intended project - and since the Project Sponsors are the very ones who concealed the full scope of their project, we demand that the Planning Department rescind its October 30, 2019 approval and require new 311 notifications. Relying on the Project Sponsor’s representations at this point would be foolish given that they already deceived the Planning Department. You have a duty of due diligence to investigate the truth of the matter and not rely on plans that City inspectors have already found to contain misrepresentations.

Approving and rewarding this type of unscrupulous and illegal conduct would be tantamount to participating in this “bait and switch” scheme to the detriment of the public, would make a mockery of the 311 notification process and would encourage others to perpetrate the same or similar unseemly tactics knowing they could get away with it. Shockingly, the Project Sponsors advised me that you coached them into making their unpermitted extra 900 square feet of living space a two-step process so they could avoid new 311 notifications.

Regardless of what their new plans show or what the Project Sponsor has told you, they have created a horizontal extension. The DBI inspectors have found this as well during their repeated visits to the job site. I have advised you of this and have
repeatedly requested that you inspect the job site, which you have not done to date, and today, you stated you would not do. You did agree, however, to take a second look at the project to see, among other things, if the foundations have indeed been changed from pier and beam to slab. You merely need to look at the photos I sent you and the DBI inspectors’ NOVs to determine that the foundation system is completely different than what was approved and that it has indeed created a horizontal extension. I asked you today if you have ascertained this by speaking to the DBI inspectors, and you advised me that you have not contacted DBI about this matter.

Above all, the Project Sponsors, by their deceptive conduct, have created a catastrophic situation - both financially to innocent members of the public and to public safety. Had we known that the Project Sponsor intended to dig down below the depth of our foundations at our property line, and even dig under our foundations, we would have objected early on at the original meet and greet and 311 notification period and would have required, among other things, further set backs and other concessions at that time. We would have then had an opportunity to object and negotiate safeguards for my building and for the other affected building that could have prevented the damage and harm that we now face. We clearly would have required the Project Sponsor to engineer adequate shoring and other necessary and preventative foundation work, including additional set backs, etc. had we known that this (illegal) excavation was going to take place so close to my brick foundation and “prohibition pit”.

Given the foregoing, it is incumbent on you to immediately revoke your October 30, 2019 over the counter approval of the Project Sponsor’s revised plans and require that the Project Sponsor send new 311 notifications so that the neighbors can evaluate the full scope of their intended project at 2622-2628 Greenwich St. before more harm befalls us.

I look forward to your anticipated cooperation and confirmation that you have done so before the end of business this Friday, December 13, 2019.

Sincerely yours,

Christina M. Sagonowsky
Owner - 2618 Greenwich St.
(415) 515-6187
Dear Ms. Vanderslice,

I own a four-unit building at 2618 Greenwich St., San Francisco, CA 94123 that is adjacent to and east of 2622-2624 Greenwich St. I understand that you work in the San Francisco Planning Department as the Principal Environmental Planner.

On October 24, 2019, you issued a CEQA Clearance of the 2622-2624 Greenwich St. property. See Exhibit 1.

Please e-mail me a copy of your completed CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination form along with any information of the investigation you undertook when you opened your CEQA review on October 23, 2019, and closed it one day later when you issued CEQA Clearance on October 24, 2019.

For example, were you aware that approximately 200+ cubic yards of soil had been excavated - without permit and without the required geotechnical report - from the backyard of 2622-2624 Greenwich St. so that the property owners could add an additional lower level of unpermitted living space without having to go through the CEQA review process and secure a geotech report?

The 2622-2624 Greenwich St. owners were cited by the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection for this illegal excavation on two dates - October 24, 2019 (the same date you issued your CEQA exemption) and October 31, 2019. Both complaints related to violations of CEQA are still ACTIVE. See Exhibit 2.

On October 24, 2019, Complaint #201908613 was filed by DBI Inspector Kevin Birmingham for:

“Extraction of approximately 200 cubic yards of soil at rear of property. Structural mat slab installed approx. 800-1000 square feet without permit or plans. Misrepresentation of elevations on plans associated with PA 202010261228.”

On October 31, 2019, Complaint #201900977 was filed by DBI Inspector Kevin Birmingham for:

“An investigation has revealed that the grade at the rear of the property has been altered without a permit. Approx. 100 cubic yards of earth has been relocated to raise the height of the yard. Per appendix “J” SFBC”

Inspector Birmingham referenced Appendix “J” of the San Francisco Existing Building Code (“SFECB”). Appendix J deals with grading in San Francisco. Since Inspector Birmingham cited this section, he believed that the over-extraction was of such magnitude and concern that it adversely affected not only the existing structure, but the adjoining landowners and constituted a “substantial modification” to PA 201910261228.

On October 18, 2019, Kevin Birmingham had already issued Complaint #201995211 and cited the 2622-2624 Greenwich St. property owners for the following: See Exhibit 3.

“Following an inspection it was observed over excavation has occurred and may have undermined neighboring properties.”

In doing this unpermitted excavation, the owners of the 2622-2624 Greenwich St. property undermined my building’s foundation, as well as the foundations of the adjacent building to the west (2628-2630 Greenwich St.) and grossly deviated from the plans they had submitted.

Given the foregoing, it is clear that you did not consider the massive amount of unpermitted soil movement when you issued your CEQA exemption and that a “substantial modification” has occurred.

I have reviewed a blank CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination form prepared by the San Francisco Planning Department. See Exhibit 4. Given that over 50 cubic yards of dirt were excavated without permits, without CEQA review and without a geotechnical report pertaining to that excavation, please immediately rescind your CEQA exemption and perform the additional environmental reviews pursuant to, among other things, CEQA and the SFECB.

Thank you for your anticipated cooperation. I look forward to your timely response with an e-mailed copy of your completed CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination form.

Christina M. Sagonowsky
415-515-6187

Ex. 7
2016-014684DRP Discretionary (DRP) 2622 GREENWICH ST
Opened: 11/8/2017
Status: Closed - DR
taken-Approved 4/9/2018
Assigned Planner: Christopher May: christopher.may@sfgov.org / 628-652-7359

> MORE DETAILS

2016-014684ENV Environmental (ENV) 2622 GREENWICH ST
Opened: 10/23/2019
Status: Closed - CEQA Clearance Issued 10/24/2019
Assigned Planner: Allison Vanderslice: allison.vanderslice@sfgov.org / 628-652-7505

> MORE DETAILS

2016-000315PRL Project Light (PRL)
Opened: 1/8/2016
Status: Closed
1/8/2016
Assigned Planner: IOMOKARO: pic@sfgov.org / 628.652.7300
widen garage door width from 7ft 10 inches to 9ft 0 inches per

> MORE DETAILS

1992.506 Project Profile (PRJ)
Opened: 8/19/1992
Status: Closed
Assigned Planner: Planning counter: pic@sfgov.org / 628.652.7300
2-unit (owner-occupied) condominium conversion.

> MORE DETAILS

1992.506Q Condo-REF (CND) 2622-2624 Greenwich St
Opened: 8/19/1992
Status: Closed - Approved 9/16/1992
Assigned Planner: Planning counter: pic@sfgov.org / 628.652.7300

> MORE DETAILS

Ex. 1
You selected:
Address: 2622 GREENWICH ST  Block/Lot: 0938/023

Please select among the following links, the type of permit for which to view address information:
Electrical Permits  Plumbing Permits  Building Permits  Complaints
(Complaints matching the selected address.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complaint #</th>
<th>Expired</th>
<th>Date Filed</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Div</th>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Street #</th>
<th>Street Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>262244444</td>
<td>07/14/2020</td>
<td>CLOSED</td>
<td>BID</td>
<td>0938</td>
<td>023</td>
<td>2622</td>
<td>GREENWICH ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2622444444</td>
<td>12/17/2010</td>
<td>CLOSED</td>
<td>BID</td>
<td>0938</td>
<td>023</td>
<td>2622</td>
<td>GREENWICH ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019000071</td>
<td>11/12/2019</td>
<td>ACTIVE</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>0938</td>
<td>023</td>
<td>2622</td>
<td>GREENWICH ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201996813</td>
<td>10/23/2019</td>
<td>ACTIVE</td>
<td>BID</td>
<td>0938</td>
<td>023</td>
<td>2622</td>
<td>GREENWICH ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019992211</td>
<td>10/18/2019</td>
<td>CLOSED</td>
<td>BID</td>
<td>0938</td>
<td>023</td>
<td>2622</td>
<td>GREENWICH ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

Contact SF Gov  Accessibility  Policies
City and County of San Francisco © 2020

Ex. 2
COMPLAINT DATA SHEET

Complaint Number: 201996813
Owner/Agent: OWNER DATA SUPPRESSED
Owner’s Phone: --
Contact Name: --
Contact Phone: --
Complainant: COMPLAINANT DATA SUPPRESSED

Date Filed: Location: 2622 GREENWICH ST
Block: 0938
Lot: 023
Site: Rating: Suzanna Wong
Occupancy Code: Received By:
Division: BID

Complainant's Phone: FIELD OBSERVATION
Complaint Source: Excavation of approximately 200 cubic yards of soil at rear of property. Structural mat slab
Assigned to installed approx 800-1000 square feet without permit or plans. Misrepresentation of elevations
Division: BID on plans associated with PA 201610261228.

Instructions:

INSPECTOR INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIVISION</th>
<th>INSPECTOR</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BID</td>
<td>HERNANDEZ</td>
<td>63494</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REFFERAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>DIV</th>
<th>INSPECTOR</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/24/19</td>
<td>CASE OPENED</td>
<td>BID</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>CASE RECEIVED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/24/19</td>
<td>OTHER BLDG/HOUSING VIOLATION</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>FIRST NOV SENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/25/19</td>
<td>OTHER BLDG/HOUSING VIOLATION</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>CASE UPDATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/03/20</td>
<td>OTHER BLDG/HOUSING VIOLATION</td>
<td>BID</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>CASE UPDATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMPLAINT ACTION BY DIVISION

NOV (HIS):          NOV (BID): 10/24/19

Inspector Contact Information

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.
COMPLAINT DATA SHEET

Complaint Number: 201900171
Owner/Agent: OWNER DATA SUPPRESSED
Owner's Phone: --
Contact Name: --
Contact Phone: --
Complainant: COMPLAINANT DATA SUPPRESSED

Complainant's Phone: --
Complaint Source: FIELD OBSERVATION
Assigned to Division: CES
Description: An investigation has revealed that the grade at the rear of the property has been altered without a permit. Approx 100 cyd of earth has been relocated to raise the height of the yard. Per appendix J of SFEBEC

Instructions:

INSPECTOR INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIVISION</th>
<th>INSPECTOR</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CES</td>
<td>HINCHION</td>
<td>J125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REFFERAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>REFERRED BY</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/13/2020</td>
<td>William Strom</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Per Joe Pena</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMPLAINT STATUS AND COMMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>DIV</th>
<th>INSPECTOR</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/31/19</td>
<td>OTHER BLDG/ HOUSING VIOLATION</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>FIRST NOV SENT</td>
<td>1st NOV issued per K. Birmingham /tt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/19</td>
<td>CASE OPENED</td>
<td>BID</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>CASE RECEIVED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/19</td>
<td>OTHER BLDG/ HOUSING VIOLATION</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>CASE UPDATE</td>
<td>1st NOV mailed per K. Birmingham. CC'd to DCP /tt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/13/20</td>
<td>OTHER BLDG/ HOUSING VIOLATION</td>
<td>BID</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>CASE UPDATE</td>
<td>OM GOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/12/20</td>
<td>OTHER BLDG/ HOUSING VIOLATION</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>CASE UPDATE</td>
<td>No compliance with NOV. ok to refer CES per M.H / J.P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/12/20</td>
<td>OTHER BLDG/ HOUSING VIOLATION</td>
<td>BID</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>FINAL WARNING LETTER SENT</td>
<td>Ok to issue FWL per M.H, J.P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/13/20</td>
<td>OTHER BLDG/ HOUSING VIOLATION</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>CASE UPDATE</td>
<td>final warning letter mailed; WS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/13/20</td>
<td>OTHER BLDG/ HOUSING VIOLATION</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>REFERRED TO OTHER DIV</td>
<td>case referred to CES per Joe Pena; WS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/13/20</td>
<td>GENERAL MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>BID</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>REFERRED TO OTHER DIV</td>
<td>transfer to div CES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/30/20</td>
<td>GENERAL MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Hinchion</td>
<td>CASE RECEIVED</td>
<td>R cvd Case -akw</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMPLAINT ACTION BY DIVISION

NOV (HIS): 10/31/19

Inspector Contact Information

https://dbiweb02.sfgov.org/dbipts/default.aspx?page=AddressComplaint&ComplaintNo=201900171
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.
COMPLAINT DATA SHEET

Complaint Number: 201995211
Owner/Agent: OWNER DATA SUPPRESSED
Owner's Phone: --
Contact Name: --
Contact Phone: --
Complainant: COMPLAINANT DATA SUPPRESSED

Date Filed: 2622 GREENWICH ST
Location: 0938
Block: 023
Lot: Site:
Rating:
Occupancy Code:
Received By: Suzanna Wong
Division: BID

Complainant's Phone: FIELD OBSERVATION
Complaint Source:
Assigned to BID
Division:
Description: Following an inspection it was observed over excavation has occurred and may have undermined neighboring properties.

Instructions:

INSPECTOR INFORMATION

DIVISION INSPECTOR ID DISTRICT PRIORITY
BID HERNANDEZ63404

REFERRAL INFORMATION

COMPLAINT STATUS AND COMMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>DIV</th>
<th>INSPECTOR</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/18/19</td>
<td>CASE OPENED</td>
<td>BID</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>CASE RECEIVED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/18/19</td>
<td>OTHER BLDG/HOUSING VIOLATION</td>
<td>BID</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>FIRST NOV SENT</td>
<td>1st NOV issued by KB; slw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/18/19</td>
<td>OTHER BLDG/HOUSING VIOLATION</td>
<td>BID</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>CASE UPDATE</td>
<td>1st NOV mailed; slw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/22/19</td>
<td>OTHER BLDG/HOUSING VIOLATION</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>ADDENDUM TO NOV</td>
<td>1st NOV amended by KMH; AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/22/19</td>
<td>OTHER BLDG/HOUSING VIOLATION</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>CASE UPDATE</td>
<td>1st amended NOV mailed; AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/03/20</td>
<td>OTHER BLDG/HOUSING VIOLATION</td>
<td>BID</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>CASE UPDATE</td>
<td>on going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/07/20</td>
<td>OTHER BLDG/HOUSING VIOLATION</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>CASE CLOSED</td>
<td>Close Complaint per Inspector J. Chiu via PA#20191285775 /It; Add'l files have been scanned and are located in J:\BID\NOV_Abated with Docs\2020; slw for it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMPLAINT ACTION BY DIVISION

NOV (HIS): NOV (BID):
10/22/19 10/18/19

Inspector Contact Information

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.

Contact SFGov Accessibility Policies
City and County of San Francisco © 2020

https://dbiweb02.sfgov.org/dbipts/default.aspx?page=AddressComplaint&ComplaintNo=201995211
CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Address</th>
<th>Block/Lot(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Permit No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- [ ] Addition/Alteration
- [ ] Demolition (requires HRE for Category B Building)
- [ ] New Construction

Project description for Planning Department approval.

STEP 1: EXEMPTION CLASS

*Note: If neither class applies, an Environmental Evaluation Application is required.*

- [ ] Class 1 - Existing Facilities. Interior and exterior alterations; additions under 10,000 sq. ft.; change of use under 10,000 sq. ft.
- [ ] Class 3 - New Construction. Up to three new single-family residences or six dwelling units in one building; commercial office structures; utility extensions
- [ ] Class 32 - In-Fill Development. New construction of seven or more units or additions greater than 10,000 sq. ft. and meets the conditions described below:
  (a) The project is consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations.
  (b) The proposed development occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than 5 acres substantially surrounded by urban uses.
  (c) The project site has no value as habitat for endangered rare or threatened species.
  (d) Approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.
  (e) The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.

FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING USE ONLY

- [ ] Class ___

Ex. 4
### STEP 2: CEQA IMPACTS
**TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

If any box is checked below, an *Environmental Evaluation Application* is required.

| Air Quality: Would the project add new sensitive receptors (specifically, schools, day care facilities, hospitals, residential dwellings, and senior-care facilities within an Air Pollution Exposure Zone? Does the project have the potential to emit substantial pollutant concentrations (e.g., backup diesel generators, heavy industry, diesel trucks, etc.)? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Air Pollution Exposure Zone) |
| Hazardous Materials: If the project site is located on the Maher map or is suspected of containing hazardous materials (based on a previous use such as gas station, auto repair, dry cleaners, or heavy manufacturing, or a site with underground storage tanks). Would the project involve 50 cubic yards or more of soil disturbance or a change of use from industrial to residential? If yes, this box must be checked and the project applicant must submit an Environmental Application with a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. *Exceptions:* do not check box if the applicant presents documentation of enrollment in the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) Maher program, a DPH waiver from the Maher program, or other documentation from Environmental Planning staff that hazardous material effects would be less than significant (refer to EP_ArcMap > Maher layer). |
| Transportation: Does the project create six (6) or more net new parking spaces or residential units? Does the project have the potential to adversely affect transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle safety (hazards) or the adequacy of nearby transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities? |
| Archeological Resources: Would the project result in soil disturbance/modification greater than two (2) feet below grade in an archeological sensitive area or eight (8) feet in a non-archeological sensitive area? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Archeological Sensitive Area) |
| Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment: Does the project site involve a subdivision or lot line adjustment on a lot with a slope average of 20% or more? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography) |
| Slope > 20%: Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required. |
| Seismic: Landslide Zone: Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required. |
| Seismic: Liquefaction Zones: Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones) If box is checked, a geotechnical report will likely be required. |

If no boxes are checked above, **GO TO STEP 3.** If one or more boxes are checked above, an *Environmental Evaluation Application* is required, unless reviewed by an Environmental Planner.

**Comments and Planner Signature (optional):**
STEP 3: PROPERTY STATUS - HISTORIC RESOURCE
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

PROPERTY IS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING: (refer to Parcel Information Map)

☐ Category A: Known Historical Resource. GO TO STEP 5.
☐ Category B: Potential Historical Resource (over 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 4.
☐ Category C: Not a Historical Resource or Not Age Eligible (under 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 6.

STEP 4: PROPOSED WORK CHECKLIST
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

Check all that apply to the project.

☐ 1. Change of use and new construction. Tenant improvements not included.
☐ 2. Regular maintenance or repair to correct or repair deterioration, decay, or damage to building.
☐ 3. Window replacement that meets the Department's Window Replacement Standards. Does not include storefront window alterations.
☐ 4. Garage work. A new opening that meets the Guidelines for Adding Garages and Such Cuts, and/or replacement of a garage door in an existing opening that meets the Residential Design Guidelines.
☐ 5. Deck, terrace construction, or fences not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
☐ 6. Mechanical equipment installation that is not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
☐ 7. Dormer installation that meets the requirements for exemption from public notification under Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 3: Dormer Windows.
☐ 8. Addition(s) that are not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way for 150 feet in each direction; does not extend vertically beyond the floor level of the top story of the structure or is only a single story in height; does not have a footprint that is more than 50% larger than that of the original building; and does not cause the removal of architectural significant roofing features.

Note: Project Planner must check box below before proceeding.

☐ Project is not listed. GO TO STEP 5.
☐ Project does not conform to the scope of work. GO TO STEP 6.
☐ Project involves four or more work descriptions. GO TO STEP 5.
☐ Project involves less than four work descriptions. GO TO STEP 6.

STEP 5: CEQA IMPACTS - ADVANCED HISTORICAL REVIEW
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

Check all that apply to the project.

☐ 1. Project involves a known historical resource (CEQA Category A) as determined by Step 3 and conforms entirely to proposed work checklist in Step 4.
☐ 2. Interior alterations to publicly accessible spaces.
☐ 3. Window replacement of original/historic windows that are not "in-kind" but are consistent with existing historic character.
☐ 4. Façade/storefront alterations that do not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.
☐ 5. Raising the building in a manner that does not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.
☐ 6. Restoration based upon documented evidence of a building’s historic condition, such as historic photographs, plans, physical evidence, or similar buildings.
7. Addition(s), including mechanical equipment that are minimally visible from a public right-of-way and meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

8. Other work consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (specify or add comments):

9. Other work that would not materially impair a historic district (specify or add comments):

(Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator)

10. Reclassification of property status. (Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator)
   - Reclassify to Category A
     - Per HRER dated
     - Other (specify)
   - Reclassify to Category C
     - (attach HRER)

Note: If ANY box in STEP 5 above is checked, a Preservation Planner MUST check one box below.

- Further environmental review required. Based on the information provided, the project requires an Environmental Evaluation Application to be submitted. GO TO STEP 6.
- Project can proceed with categorical exemption review. The project has been reviewed by the Preservation Planner and can proceed with categorical exemption review. GO TO STEP 6.

Comments (optional):

Preservation Planner Signature:

---

**STEP 6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION**

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

- Further environmental review required. Proposed project does not meet scopes of work in either (check all that apply):
  - Step 2 - CEO Impacts
  - Step 5 - Advanced Historical Review
  STOP! Must file an Environmental Evaluation Application.

- No further environmental review is required. The project is categorically exempt under CEQA. There are no unusual circumstances that would result in a reasonable possibility of a significant effect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Approval Action:</th>
<th>Signature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project.

Once signed or stamped and dated, this document constitutes a categorical exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code. In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, an appeal of an exemption determination can only be filed within 30 days of the project receiving the first approval action.

Please note that other approval actions may be required for the project. Please contact the assigned planner for these approvals.
**STEP 7: MODIFICATION OF A CEQA EXEMPT PROJECT**

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, when a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exempt project changes after the Approval Action and requires a subsequent approval, the Environmental Review Officer (or his or her designee) must determine whether the proposed change constitutes a substantial modification of that project. This checklist shall be used to determine whether the proposed changes to the approved project would constitute a "substantial modification" and, therefore, be subject to additional environmental review pursuant to CEQA.

### PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Address (If different than front page)</th>
<th>Block/Lot(s) (If different than front page)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Categorical Exemptions--Letter or Certificate</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No.</td>
<td>Previous Building Permit No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-000729GEN</td>
<td>New Building Permit No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans Dated</td>
<td>Previous Approval Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Approval Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Modified Project Description:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DETERMINATION IF PROJECT CONSTITUTES SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compared to the approved project, would the modified project:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Result in expansion of the building envelope, as defined in the Planning Code;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Result in the change of use that would require public notice under Planning Code Sections 311 or 312;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Result in demolition as defined under Planning Code Section 317 or 19005(f)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Is any information being presented that was not known and could not have been known at the time of the original determination, that shows the originally approved project may no longer qualify for the exemption?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If at least one of the above boxes is checked, further environmental review is required.

**DETERMINATION OF NO SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION**

□ The proposed modification would not result in any of the above changes.

If this box is checked, the proposed modifications are categorically exempt under CEQA, in accordance with prior project approval and no additional environmental review is required. This determination shall be posted on the Planning Department website and office and mailed to the applicant, City approving entities, and anyone requesting written notice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planner Name:</th>
<th>Signature or Stamp:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**SAN FRANCISCO**

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT**
# CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination

## PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Address</th>
<th>Block/Lot(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Permit No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- [ ] Addition/Alteration
- [ ] Demolition (requires HRE for Category B Building)
- [ ] New Construction

Project description for Planning Department approval.

## STEP 1: EXEMPTION CLASS

*Note: If neither class applies, an Environmental Evaluation Application is required.*

- [ ] Class 1 - Existing Facilities. Interior and exterior alterations; additions under 10,000 sq. ft.; change of use under 10,000 sq. ft.
- [ ] Class 3 - New Construction. Up to three new single-family residences or six dwelling units in one building; commercial/office structures; utility extensions
- [ ] Class 32 - In-Fill Development. New construction of seven or more units or additions greater than 10,000 sq. ft. and meets the conditions described below:
  1. The project is consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations.
  2. The proposed development occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than 5 acres substantially surrounded by urban uses.
  3. The project site has no value as habitat for endangered rare or threatened species.
  4. Approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.
  5. The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.

FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING USE ONLY

- [ ] Class ___
### STEP 2: CEQA IMPACTS
**TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

If any box is checked below, an *Environmental Evaluation Application* is required.

| Air Quality: Would the project add new sensitive receptors (specifically, schools, day care facilities, hospitals, residential dwellings, and senior-care facilities within an Air Pollution Exposure Zone? Does the project have the potential to emit substantial pollutant concentrations (e.g., backup diesel generators, heavy industry, diesel trucks, etc.)? (refer to [EP_ArcMap > CEQA CateX Determination Layers > Air Pollution Exposure Zone](#)) |
| Hazardous Materials: If the project site is located on the Maher map or is suspected of containing hazardous materials (based on a previous use such as gas station, auto repair, dry cleaners, or heavy manufacturing, or a site with underground storage tanks): Would the project involve 50 cubic yards or more of soil disturbance - or a change of use from industrial to residential? If yes, this box must be checked and the project applicant must submit an Environmental Application with a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. *Exceptions: do not check box if the applicant presents documentation of enrollment in the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) Maher program, a DPH waiver from the Maher program, or other documentation from Environmental Planning staff that hazardous material effects would be less than significant* (refer to [EP_ArcMap > Maher layer](#)). |
| Transportation: Does the project create six (6) or more net new parking spaces or residential units? Does the project have the potential to adversely affect transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle safety (hazards) or the adequacy of nearby transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities? |
| Archeological Resources: Would the project result in soil disturbance/modification greater than two (2) feet below grade in an archeological sensitive area or eight (8) feet in a non-archeological sensitive area? (refer to [EP_ArcMap > CEQA CateX Determination Layers > Archeological Sensitive Area](#)). |
| Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment: Does the project site involve a subdivision or lot line adjustment on a lot with a slope average of 20% or more? (refer to [EP_ArcMap > CEQA CateX Determination Layers > Topography](#)). |
| Slope = or > 20%: Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to [EP_ArcMap > CEQA CateX Determination Layers > Topography](#)). If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required. |
| Seismic: Landslide Zone: Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to [EP_ArcMap > CEQA CateX Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones](#)). If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required. |
| Seismic: Liquefaction Zone: Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to [EP_ArcMap > CEQA CateX Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones](#)). If box is checked, a geotechnical report will likely be required. |

If no boxes are checked above, GO TO STEP 3. If one or more boxes are checked above, an *Environmental Evaluation Application* is required, unless reviewed by an Environmental Planner.

**Comments and Planner Signature (optional):**
STEP 3: PROPERTY STATUS - HISTORIC RESOURCE
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

PROPERTY IS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING: (refer to Parcel Information Map)

☐ Category A: Known Historical Resource. GO TO STEP 5.
☐ Category B: Potential Historical Resource (over 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 4.
☐ Category C: Not a Historical Resource or Not Age Eligible (under 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 6.

STEP 4: PROPOSED WORK CHECKLIST
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

Check all that apply to the project.

☐ 1. Change of use and new construction. Tenant improvements not included.
☐ 2. Regular maintenance or repair to correct or repair deterioration, decay, or damage to building.
☐ 3. Window replacement that meets the Department’s Window Replacement Standards. Does not include storefront window alterations.
☐ 4. Garage work. A new opening that meets the Guidelines for Adding Garages and Curb Cuts, and/or replacement of a garage door in an existing opening that meets the Residential Design Guidelines.
☐ 5. Deck, terrace construction, or fences not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
☐ 6. Mechanical equipment installation that is not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
☐ 7. Dormer installation that meets the requirements for exemption from public notification under Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 3: Dormer Windows.
☐ 8. Addition(s) that are not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way for 150 feet in each direction; does not extend vertically beyond the floor level of the top story of the structure or is only a single story in height; does not have a footprint that is more than 50% larger than that of the original building; and does not cause the removal of architectural significant roofing features.

Note: Project Planner must check box below before proceeding.

☐ Project is not listed. GO TO STEP 5.
☐ Project does not conform to the scope of work. GO TO STEP 5.
☐ Project involves four or more work descriptions. GO TO STEP 5.
☐ Project involves less than four work descriptions. GO TO STEP 6.

STEP 5: CEQA IMPACTS - ADVANCED HISTORICAL REVIEW
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

Check all that apply to the project.

☐ 1. Project involves a known historical resource (CEQA Category A) as determined by Step 3 and conforms entirely to proposed work checklist in Step 4.
☐ 2. Interior alterations to publicly accessible spaces.
☐ 3. Window replacement of original/historic windows that are not “in-kind” but are consistent with existing historic character.
☐ 4. Façade/storefront alterations that do not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.
☐ 5. Raising the building in a manner that does not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.
☐ 6. Restoration based upon documented evidence of a building’s historic condition, such as historic photographs, plans, physical evidence, or similar buildings.
7. Addition(s), including mechanical equipment that are minimally visible from a public right-of-way and meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

8. Other work consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (specify or add comments):

9. Other work that would not materially impair a historic district (specify or add comments):

(Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator)

10. Reclassification of property status. (Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator)

- Reclassify to Category A
  - a. Per HRER dated
  - b. Other (specify):

- Reclassify to Category C
  - (attach HRER)

Note: If ANY box in STEP 5 above is checked, a Preservation Planner MUST check one box below.

- Further environmental review required. Based on the information provided, the project requires an Environmental Evaluation Application to be submitted. GO TO STEP 6.

- Project can proceed with categorical exemption review. The project has been reviewed by the Preservation Planner and can proceed with categorical exemption review. GO TO STEP 6.

Comments (optional):

Preservation Planner Signature:

---

**STEP 6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION**

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

- Further environmental review required. Proposed project does not meet scopes of work in either (check all that apply):
  - Step 2 - CEQA Impacts
  - Step 5 - Advanced Historical Review

STOP! Must file an Environmental Evaluation Application.

- No further environmental review is required. The project is categorically exempt under CEQA. There are no unusual circumstances that would result in a reasonable possibility of a significant effect.

Project Approval Action: 

Signature:

If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project.

Once signed or stamped and dated, this document constitutes a categorical exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code.

In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, an appeal of an exemption determination can only be filed within 30 days of the project receiving the first approval action.

Please note that other approval actions may be required for the project. Please contact the assigned planner for these approvals.
STEP 7: MODIFICATION OF A CEQA EXEMPT PROJECT
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, when a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exempt project changes after the Approval Action and requires a subsequent approval, the Environmental Review Officer (or his or her designee) must determine whether the proposed change constitutes a substantial modification of that project. This checklist shall be used to determine whether the proposed changes to the approved project would constitute a “substantial modification” and, therefore, be subject to additional environmental review pursuant to CEQA.

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

| Project Address (If different than front page) | Block/Lot(s) (If different than front page) |
| Categorical Exemptions—Letter or Certificate | / |
| Case No. | Previous Building Permit No. | New Building Permit No. |
| 2014-000729GEN | Previous Approval Action | New Approval Action |

Modified Project Description:

DETERMINATION IF PROJECT CONSTITUTES SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

Compared to the approved project, would the modified project:

- [ ] Result in expansion of the building envelope as defined in the Planning Code;
- [ ] Result in the change of use that would require public notice under Planning Code Sections 311 or 312;
- [ ] Result in demolition as defined under Planning Code Section 317 or 19005(f)?
- [ ] Is any information being presented that was not known and could not have been known at the time of the original determination, that shows the originally approved project may no longer qualify for the exemption?

If at least one of the above boxes is checked, further environmental review is required.

DETERMINATION OF NO SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

- [ ] The proposed modification would not result in any of the above changes.

If this box is checked, the proposed modifications are categorically exempt under CEQA, in accordance with prior project approval and no additional environmental review is required. This determination shall be posted on the Planning Department website and office and mailed to the applicant, City approving entities, and anyone requesting written notice.

Planner Name:  
Signature or Stamp:
CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Address</th>
<th>Block/Lot(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Permit No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- [ ] Addition/Alteration
- [ ] Demolition (requires HRE for Category B Building)
- [ ] New Construction

Project description for Planning Department approval.

STEP 1: EXEMPTION CLASS

*Note: If neither class applies, an Environmental Evaluation Application is required.*

- [ ] Class 1 - Existing Facilities. Interior and exterior alterations; additions under 10,000 sq. ft.; change of use under 10,000 sq. ft.
- [ ] Class 3 - New Construction. Up to three new single-family residences or six dwelling units in one building; commercial/office structures; utility extensions
- [ ] Class 32 - In-Fill Development. New Construction of seven or more units or additions greater than 10,000 sq. ft. and meets the conditions described below:
  (a) The project is consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations.
  (b) The proposed development occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than 5 acres substantially surrounded by urban uses.
  (c) The project site has no value as habitat for endangered rare or threatened species.
  (d) Approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.
  (e) The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.

FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING USE ONLY

- [ ] Class ___
STEP 2: CEQA IMPACTS
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

If any box is checked below, an Environmental Evaluation Application is required.

☐ Air Quality: Would the project add new sensitive receptors (specifically, schools, day care facilities, hospitals, residential dwellings, and senior-care facilities within an Air Pollution Exposure Zone? Does the project have the potential to emit substantial pollutant concentrations (e.g., backup diesel generators, heavy industry, diesel trucks, etc.)? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Air Pollution Exposure Zone)

☐ Hazardous Materials: If the project site is located on the Maher map or is suspected of containing hazardous materials (based on a previous use such as gas station, auto repair, dry cleaners, or heavy manufacturing, or a site with underground storage tanks): Would the project involve 50 cubic yards or more of soil disturbance - or a change of use from industrial to residential? If yes, this box must be checked and the project applicant must submit an Environmental Application with a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. Exceptions: do not check box if the applicant presents documentation of enrollment in the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) Maher program, a DPH waiver from the Maher program, or other documentation from Environmental Planning staff that hazardous material effects would be less than significant (refer to EP_ArcMap > Maher layer).

☐ Transportation: Does the project create six (6) or more net new parking spaces or residential units? Does the project have the potential to adversely affect transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle safety (hazards) or the adequacy of nearby transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities?

☐ Archeological Resources: Would the project result in soil disturbance/modification greater than two (2) feet below grade in an archeological sensitive area or eight (8) feet in a non-archeological sensitive area? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Archeological Sensitive Area)

☐ Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment: Does the project site involve a subdivision or lot line adjustment on a lot with a slope average of 20% or more? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography)

☐ Slope = or > 20%: Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required.

☐ Seismic: Landslide Zone: Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required.

☐ Seismic: Liquefaction Zones: Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones) If box is checked, a geotechnical report will likely be required.

If no boxes are checked above, GO TO STEP 3. If one or more boxes are checked above, an Environmental Evaluation Application is required, unless reviewed by an Environmental Planner.

Comments and Planner Signature (optional):
**STEP 3: PROPERTY STATUS - HISTORIC RESOURCE**

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

PROPERTY IS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING: (refer to Parcel Information Map)

- Category A: Known Historical Resource. GO TO STEP 5.
- Category B: Potential Historical Resource (over 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 4.
- Category C: Not a Historical Resource or Not Age Eligible (under 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 6.

**STEP 4: PROPOSED WORK CHECKLIST**

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

Check all that apply to the project.

- 1. Change of use and new construction. Tenant improvements not included.
- 2. Regular maintenance or repair to correct or repair deterioration, decay, or damage to building.
- 3. Window replacement that meets the Department's Window Replacement Standards. Does not include storefront window alterations.
- 4. Garage work. A new opening that meets the Guidelines for Adding Garages and Skate Cuts, and/or replacement of a garage door in an existing opening that meets the Residential Design Guidelines.
- 5. Deck, terrace construction, or fences not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
- 6. Mechanical equipment installation that is not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
- 7. Dormer installation that meets the requirements for exemption from public notification under Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 3: Dormer Windows.
- 8. Addition(s) that are not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way for 150 feet in each direction; does not extend vertically beyond the floor level of the top story of the structure or is only a single story in height; does not have a footprint that is more than 50% larger than that of the original building; and does not cause the removal of architectural significant roofing features.

Note: Project Planner must check box below before proceeding.

- Project is not listed. GO TO STEP 5.
- Project does not conform to the scope of work. GO TO STEP 5.
- Project involves four or more work descriptions. GO TO STEP 5.
- Project involves less than four work descriptions. GO TO STEP 6.

**STEP 5: CEQA IMPACTS - ADVANCED HISTORICAL REVIEW**

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

Check all that apply to the project.

- 1. Project involves a known historical resource (CEQA Category A) as determined by Step 3 and conforms entirely to proposed work checklist in Step 4.
- 2. Interior alterations to publicly accessible spaces.
- 3. Window replacement of original/historic windows that are not "in-kind" but are consistent with existing historic character.
- 4. Façade/storefront alterations that do not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.
- 5. Raising the building in a manner that does not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.
- 6. Restoration based upon documented evidence of a building's historic condition, such as historic photographs, plans, physical evidence, or similar buildings.
7. Addition(s), including mechanical equipment that are minimally visible from a public right-of-way and meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

8. Other work consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (specify or add comments):

9. Other work that would not materially impair a historic district (specify or add comments):

(Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator)

10. Reclassification of property status. (Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator)

- Reclassify to Category A
  - Per HRER dated
  - Other (specify)

- Reclassify to Category C
  - (attach HRER)

Note: If ANY box in STEP 5 above is checked, a Preservation Planner MUST check one box below.

- Further environmental review required. Based on the information provided, the project requires an Environmental Evaluation Application to be submitted. GO TO STEP 6.
- Project can proceed with categorical exemption review. This project has been reviewed by the Preservation Planner and can proceed with categorical exemption review. GO TO STEP 6.

Comments (optional):

Preservation Planner Signature:

---

STEP 6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

- Further environmental review required. Proposed project does not meet scopes of work in either (check all that apply):
  - Step 2 - CEO Impacts
  - Step 5 - Advanced Historical Review

STOP! Must file an Environmental Evaluation Application.

- No further environmental review is required. The project is categorically exempt under CEQA. There are no unusual circumstances that would result in a reasonable possibility of a significant effect.

Project Approval Action: [ ]
Signature: [ ]

If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project.

Once signed or stamped and dated, this document constitutes a categorical exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 3 of the Administrative Code. In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, an appeal of an exemption determination can only be filed within 30 days of the project receiving the first approval action. Please note that other approval actions may be required for the project. Please contact the assigned planner for these approvals.
STEP 7: MODIFICATION OF A CEQA EXEMPT PROJECT
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, when a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exempt project changes after the Approval Action and requires a subsequent approval, the Environmental Review Officer (or his or her designee) must determine whether the proposed change constitutes a substantial modification of that project. This checklist shall be used to determine whether the proposed changes to the approved project would constitute a "substantial modification" and, therefore, be subject to additional environmental review pursuant to CEQA.

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Address (If different than front page)</th>
<th>Block/Lot(s) (If different than front page)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Categorical Exemptions--Letter or Certificate</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No.</td>
<td>Previous Building Permit No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-000729GEN</td>
<td>New Building Permit No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans Dated</td>
<td>Previous Approval Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Approval Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Modified Project Description:

DETERMINATION IF PROJECT CONSTITUTES SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

Compared to the approved project, would the modified project:

☐ Result in expansion of the building envelope as defined in the Planning Code;

☐ Result in the change of use that would require public notice under Planning Code Sections 311 or 312;

☐ Result in demolition as defined under Planning Code Section 317 or 19005(f)?

☐ Is any information being presented that was not known and could not have been known at the time of the original determination, that shows the originally approved project may no longer qualify for the exemption?

If at least one of the above boxes is checked, further environmental review is required.

DETERMINATION OF NO SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

☐ The proposed modification would not result in any of the above changes.

If this box is checked, the proposed modifications are categorically exempt under CEQA, in accordance with prior project approval and no additional environmental review is required. This determination shall be posted on the Planning Department website and office and mailed to the applicant, City approving entities, and anyone requesting written notice.

Planner Name:  
Signature or Stamp:
Hi Christina,

Thank you for sending me your complaint. I have forwarded it to our Enforcement staff, who will be in touch with you shortly regarding next steps.

Christopher May, Senior Planner  
Northwest Team, Current Planning Division  
San Francisco Planning Department  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103  
Direct: 415.575.9087 | www.sfplanning.org  
San Francisco Property Information Map

From: Christina Sagonowsky <ggresf@comcast.net>  
Sent: Wednesday, November 13, 2019 1:10 PM  
To: May, Christopher (CPC) <christopher.may@sfgov.org>  
Cc: Bradley White <bradleywhite2000@comcast.net>  
Subject: 10-13-19 Planning Code Violation Complaint for 2622-2624 Greenwich St.

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

Hi Christopher,

Just wanted to thank you for sending me the links for the Planning Code Violation complaint which I faxed and mailed today. I attached a copy below.

Thank you.

Christina Sagonowsky  
415-515-6187

Sent from my iPhone

Ex. 5
From: Christine Sagonowsky  ggresf@comcast.net
Subject: Planning Code Violation Complaint for 2922-2924 Greenwich Street, San Francisco, CA
Date: November 13, 2019 at 10:15 AM
To: CodeEnforcement@sfgov.org

10-13-19
Plannin...int.pdf
Welcome to our Permit / Complaint Tracking System!

Permit Details Report

Report Date: 10/26/2020 1:41:55 PM

Application Number: 201909272891
Form Number: 3
Address(es): 0938 / 023 / 0 2622 GREENWICH ST
Description: REVISION TO 201610261228 EXCAVATION OF BASEMENT LEVEL BELOW THE 1ST LEVEL AND AT REAR TERRACE. NEW STAIRS AND ELEVATOR TO SERVICE THE BASEMENT TO 1ST FL NEW TERRACE AT BASEMENT LEVEL. BEDROOM, FULL BATH, PLAYROOM, STORAGE/GYM
Cost: $400,000.00
Occupancy Code: R-3
Building Use: 28 - 2 FAMILY DWELLING

Disposition / Stage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Date</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/27/2019</td>
<td>TRIAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/27/2019</td>
<td>FILING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/27/2019</td>
<td>FILED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2020</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2020</td>
<td>ISSUED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact Details:

Contractor Details:
License Number: 939216
Name: JOAO RAIMUNDO NICOLAU
Company Name: DIMENSION CONSTRUCTION INC
Address: 2550 APPIAN WY * PINOLE CA 94564-0000
Phone:

Addenda Details:

Description:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Arrive</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>In Hold</th>
<th>Out Hold</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Checked By</th>
<th>Hold Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>INTAKE</td>
<td>9/27/19</td>
<td>9/27/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/27/19</td>
<td>BUFKA SUSAN</td>
<td>Approved: excavation of basement level (approximately 906 square feet), extend elevator to basement level. No 311 required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CP-ZOC</td>
<td>10/30/19</td>
<td>10/30/19</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/30/19</td>
<td>MAY CHRISTOPHER</td>
<td>Approved, OTC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MECH</td>
<td>11/5/19</td>
<td>11/5/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/5/19</td>
<td>ORTEGA REYNALDO</td>
<td>28 PAGES.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CPB</td>
<td>2/14/20</td>
<td>2/14/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2/14/20</td>
<td>GUTIERREZ NANCY</td>
<td>28 PAGES.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>BLDG</td>
<td>2/14/20</td>
<td>3/30/20</td>
<td>6/17/20</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/13/20</td>
<td>LIU STEPHEN</td>
<td>teleconferencing meeting with EOR and AOR; structural revision to be submitted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This permit has been issued. For information pertaining to this permit, please call 628-652-3450.

### Appointments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointment Date</th>
<th>Appointment AM/PM</th>
<th>Appointment Code</th>
<th>Appointment Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Time Slots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/30/2020</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>VS</td>
<td>IVR Scheduled</td>
<td>REINFORCING STEEL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/6/2020</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>VS</td>
<td>IVR Scheduled</td>
<td>START WORK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Inspections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Date</th>
<th>Inspector</th>
<th>Inspection Description</th>
<th>Inspection Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/6/2020</td>
<td>Hector Hernandez</td>
<td>START WORK</td>
<td>START WORK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Special Inspections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addenda No.</th>
<th>Completed Date</th>
<th>Inspected By</th>
<th>Inspection Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IB53</td>
<td>CF2R-ADD-02-E - PRESCRIPTIVE RESIDENTIAL ADDITIONS THAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DO NOT REQUIRE HERS FIELD VERIFICATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>24F</td>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td>geotech engr to be present for foundation &amp; retaining wall work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>IB3</td>
<td>CF2R-ENV-03-E - INSULATION INSTALLATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>IB57</td>
<td>CF2R-MCH-01-E - SPACE CONDITIONING SYSTEMS DUCTS AND FANS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>IB63</td>
<td>CF2R-MCH-27-H - INDOOR AIR QUALITY AND MECHANICAL VENTILATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>IE2</td>
<td>CF2R-LTG-02-E - LIGHTING - MULTI FAMILY DWELLINGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>IP6</td>
<td>CF2R-PLB-01-E - MULTIFAMILY CENTRAL HOT WATER SYSTEM DISTRIBUTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CONCRETE (PLACEMENT &amp; SAMPLING)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>BOLTS INSTALLED IN CONCRETE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>REINFORCING STEEL AND PRETRESSING TENDONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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.
BRIEF(S) SUBMITTED BY DETERMINATION HOLDER(S)
Via Email Only
boardofappeals@sfgov.org.

Ms. Ann Lazarus
President
San Francisco Board of Appeals
49 South Van Ness Ave., Ste. #1475
San Francisco CA  94103

Re: Request for Jurisdiction: 2622-2624 Greenwich Street.

Dear President Lazarus and Board Members:

We represent Lindsey and Jonathan Wetzel, owners of the above two-unit property. Appellant had missed her 15-day deadline to appeal the alteration permit to you.

Ms Sagonowsky has been making appeals on this project for many years, starting in 2016-17. Her previous appeals were intended to make sure that our client’s building expansion did not occur close to her building, and when she requested a Discretionary Review hearing, one was held on March 15, 2018. At that time the Commission did not decide to impose an east side 3 foot setback on the rear facing portions of the rear horizontal addition. However, our clients, in a genuine effort to be “neighborly” and keep Ms. Sagonowsky happy, decided to include 3 foot setbacks which caused the clients to completely reconfigure their property.

As a result, our clients then revised the project by reconfiguring the two units such that one unit, measuring approximately 1,578 square feet, would occupy the full third floor with exposure onto both the front and rear of the building. The other unit, measuring approximately 2,522 square feet, would occupy the
full second floor and part of the first floor with frontage on both the front and rear of the building. Our client later proposed a stair down to a new lower level where additional occupiable space was created for the unit above.

Ms Sagonowsky believes that the project changes made for her benefit are not enough. Also, Appellant raises issues that are private matters between two adjacent property owners, having nothing to do with the permits, and these matters are not under the jurisdiction of the Board of Appeals or the Planning Department.

Appellant owns the adjacent building 2618 Greenwich but does not live there. She lives at 2225 Gough Street, San Francisco. In the past, none of her tenants at 2618 Greenwich Street have objected to my clients’ proposal at any time.

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT NOTIFICATIONS MADE**

Appellant paid for a Block Book Notification by which the Planning Department would notify her of any Planning Applications and Planning permit issuances. She paid for the BBN notice on December 2, 2019. She claims jurisdiction to your Board because she did not receive from the City any notice of the issuance of a recent permit for interior only work to create a lower space accessible to the unit above by a stair. As per the attached email from Assistant Zoning Administrator Scott Sanchez (Exhibit A), a BBN only provides notice to the BBN requestor when the permit is initially reviewed by the Planning Department. According to Mr. Sanchez, in the case of the subject permit, Planning initially reviewed and approved the permit in question in October of 2019, before the BBN was filed on December 2, 2019. Please keep in mind that it is the Planning Department, and not DBI, which issues a BBN notice.

Appellant argues that a BBN notification should have been sent by the City at the time DBI issued the alteration permit recently on the date of September 30, 2020, because the planner reviewed the permit once again after the BBN notice was filed. However, as Mr. Sanchez confirms in the attached email, the BBN
process works differently — notice is only performed when a permit is **initially reviewed/approved** by Planning, not later when the permit is issued.

Mr. Sanchez states that contrary to appellant, a BBN notification does not take place when the Building Department, prior to issuance of its permit, routinely sends to Planning (as it did here) a request that the DBI-reviewed construction plans be reviewed by Planning. DBI send that so that Planning can verify that the construction plans are consistent with the Discretionary Review decision made by the Planning Commission. That is not the initial review, and that is not a substantive review by which the Planning Department determines whether the project meets the Planning Code. The initial (and substantive) review for Planning Code compliance was undertaken by Planning Staff much earlier, and due to the DR, was undertaken by the Commission as well.

Since the BBN notice was filed after the initial permit was approved by Planning, it is our position (and the position of the Planning Department in the attached email from Scott Sanchez), that the permit was properly issued and that no BBN Notice was required.

Please note that in the **Exhibit A** email, Mr. Sanchez wrote that the appellant spoke with the Planner Chris May around the time the BBN request was filed, and that Chris May informed Appellant that Appellant would need to track the status of the permit on DBI’s website if she wished to appeal the permit. It appears that Appellant did not do so. Appellant asks that you forgive this mistake, but there are no grounds for you to do so. The implications of your doing so would mean you set the precedent of allowing future appellants, who also fail to track issuance of permits through the DBI website, to make a late filing; if you were to set this precedent, our Board would be inundated with Requests for Jurisdiction that you would have to honor.

Appellant also claims that she was supposed to receive a second Section 311 Notice when my clients applied (long after the Planning Commission hearing) to add habitable space in their lowest level, a change that did not increase the building envelope. With no building envelope change, appellant had no right to
receive a 311 notice upon the Department’s receipt of an application. Also, keep in mind that the permit to create a new lower level (to be part of the lowest unit) was approved in an initial review by Planning in October 2019 (before Appellant submitted the BBN request a month later.

**Building Department Notifications**

The San Francisco Building Code does not have a procedure for notifying neighbors when an alteration permit issues unless the alteration is for a structural addition or a demolition or a new building. The permit which Appellant did not timely appeal to your Board was for none of those, but rather a simple addition of square footage in the building’s lowest level. DBI’s rules for when it makes notifications is stated in the following, which is an excerpt of the October 2020 on-line “Frequently Asked Questions” section of the Building Department website:

**2. What are the notification procedures for issuance of new building permits/alteration permits?**

*For new construction building permits, a 30” x 30” sign is posted on the lot within 24 hours after a building permit is issued new construction. The posted sign displays the permit and appeals information.*

*For alteration permits such as structural additions; a letter is sent upon permit issuance to the owners of adjacent properties.*

*Upon issuance of a permit to demolish a building, mail notice is sent to owner of all properties within 300 feet of the building to be demolished’*

**Conclusion**

The only grounds for granting a Request for Jurisdiction, which is found in Section 10 of your Rules, is the following:

“extraordinary cases where the Board finds that the City intentionally or inadvertently caused the requestor to be late in filing the appeal”.

We respectfully submit that the Appellant has not shown that the City intentionally or inadvertently caused appellant to be late in filing the appeal.

We request that you deny this Request for Jurisdiction.
Ms. Ann Lazarus, President
San Francisco Board of Appeals

Very truly yours,

Brett Gladstone

10172-00/110920F.docx

CC: Clients
    Appellant
    Corey Teague, Zoning Administrator, SF Planning
    Scott Sanchez, Deputy Zoning Administrator, SF Planning
    Christopher May, Senior Planner, Current Planning, SF Planning
EXHIBIT A
On Nov 6, 2020, at 10:45 PM, Sanchez, Scott (CPC) <scott.sanchez@sfgov.org> wrote:

Hi Henry,

Thank you for the email. All is well here (working from home). Hope the same is true for you.

We are aware of the Jurisdiction Request and concerns raised by the requestor surrounding the BBN. The BBN only provides notice to the requestor when the permit is initially reviewed by the Planning Department. In the case of the subject permit, we reviewed and approved the permit before the BBN request was filed. The requestor has argued that the BBN should have been performed at the time the permit was issued, but that is simply not how the BBN process works (notice is only performed when the permit is first reviewed/approved by Planning, not when the permit is issued). Given that the BBN request was filed after the permit was approved, it is the position of the Department that this permit was properly issued (w/o BBN notice). It is also my understanding that the requestor spoke with Chris May around the time the BBN request was filed and was informed that they would need to track the status of the permit on DBI’s website if they wanted to appeal the permit. That said, it is a question for DBI as to whether they should have done any notification to the abutting properties when the permit was issued.

Regards,

Scott F. Sanchez
Deputy Zoning Administrator
San Francisco Planning

PLEASE NOTE MY NEW ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER AS OF AUGUST 17:

49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103

Direct: 628.652.7384 | www.sfplanning.org

San Francisco Property Information Map

IN ORDER FOR US TO MOVE, OUR OFFICE WILL BE CLOSED WITH NO ACCESS TO PHONES OR E-MAIL ON THURSDAY, AUGUST 13 and FRIDAY, AUGUST 14. WE APPRECIATE YOUR PATIENCE.

Due to COVID-19, San Francisco Planning is not providing any in-person services, but we are operating remotely. Our staff are available by e-mail, and the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions are convening remotely. The public is encouraged to participate. Find more information on our services here.