

From: [Barbara Arietta](#)
To: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: PLEASE REMOVE FROM PUBLIC HEARING LIST - 1290 Holloway Ave, Block 6926, Lot 009, Sup. District 7- BOS
MTG. 5/21/24- Owner : Mary Bizzi
Date: Tuesday, May 14, 2024 2:11:30 PM

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

Re: Notice of SFBOS Public Hearing - 5/21/2024

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

On May10, 2024 Mary J. Bizzi and myself received a Notice of Public Hearing by the SFBOS to be held on 5/21/2024 concerning the property located at 1290 Holloway Avenue in San Francisco.(Block 6926, Lot 009)

According to this Notice the property had an Assessment of Costs bill that had not been paid as yet for \$2,119.90 and was being sent to the SFBOS for issuance of a lien against the property on 5/21/2024.

The Notice gave until 5/20/2024 for a response.

This email response is being sent to you in order to advise that this bill had already been paid on May 3, 2024, Receipt Number HIS19199, Issued By: JCHEUNGJ,SFDBI. Total Received: \$2,119.90. (entire amount billed)

Today, on May 14th, I called the SF Housing Inspection Division and spoke to Mr. Miguel Colon, Permit Technician, who researched the information that I presented to him and verified that my account, indeed, shows that the bill that I received on May 6, 2024 had already been paid on May 3, 2024.

The bill is paid and it is now asked that Item #152 - 1290 Holloway Ave be removed from the Public Hearing List for 5/21/2024 and no lien be issued.

Mr. Colon said that his records show the bill to have been paid.I am writing to make sure that the property is taken off the Delinquent List with the SFBOS and that no lien be issued.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this matter.

Barbara Arietta
Email: barietta@hotmail.com
415-246-0775

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Davison, Alan \(DBI\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#)
Subject: FW: Written comments on the hearing - File No. 240317
Date: Thursday, May 16, 2024 9:02:08 AM
Attachments: [DBI.docx](#)

Hello,

Please see below and attached communication regarding:

File No. 240317 - Hearing to consider objections to a report of delinquent charges for code enforcement cases with delinquent assessment of costs, and fees pursuant to the provisions of Building Code, Sections 102A.3, 102A.4, 102A.6, 102A.12, 102A.16, 102A.17, 102A.18, 102A.19, 102A.20 et seq., 103A.3.3, 108A, and 110A - Tables 1A-K and 1A-G, submitted by the Director of the Department of Building Inspection for services rendered by said Department of costs thereof having accrued pursuant to code violations referenced above; scheduled pursuant to Motion No. M24-031 (File No. 240316), approved on April 2, 2024.

Regards,

Richard Lagunte
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163
richard.lagunte@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Pronouns: he, him, his

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Scdkj <scdkj@163.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 15, 2024 10:17 PM

To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Subject: Written comments on the hearing

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

The Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center:

Relevant person in charge: In 2018, due to the malicious reports from the tenant, the inspector came to the site to inspect and did not find that the first floor was under construction, which means that the kitchen downstairs was newly built. We explained that this existed when we bought the house in 2016. The inspector asked us to apply for legalization, and then we submitted the application.

It has not been approved until now. I want to explain that the responsibility for not being able to decorate in time is not the owner of our house. The construction planning department has revised the review standards many times according to the established standards. We modified and solved a round of problems and raised a new round of problems. After 43 questions that were asked to reply in writing, no one objected. A year later, we were asked to reply again. We have done all this, but let's calculate the flow of natural wind, which is impossible. Finally, the certified engineer was asked to sign, and we also signed it. After signing, we submitted the drawings for inspection, and asked the engineer to come to check the drawings in person, otherwise the drawings would not be checked (if evidence is needed, it can be supplemented later). Therefore, it is beyond the control of our house owner. Historically, responsibilities and rights are unified. When we don't have the right, we can't take responsibility. Therefore, please consider the specific situation, suspend or exempt the punishment, and thank you.

186Maynard st owner: Junhai Bai Xiaofei Li

Emial:scdkj@163.com.

tel: 415-810-4346

Complaints about misconduct in the owner's application

The person in charge of the license center:

It has been more than 5 years since we applied for the 201912169613 project, and we have not received a normal inspection so far. There are some problems. We have spent a lot of time dealing with your established changes. We really have no choice, so we will complain about the situation to you.

1. The inspection drawing standard can be changed at any time; since July 28, 2021, many new requirements have been put forward for the previously inspected qualified drawings.

A. There are new regulations on fire escape channels.

B. More than 40 new questions have been raised, which need to be answered in writing one by one;

C. After modification and reply, ask for a new reply again after not asking any new questions;

D. Ask our engineer to sign the drawing;

E. Engineers must go to the site for inspection in person, and engineers will not check the drawings when they do not arrive at the site.

2. The license center accepts the owner's application, that is to say, it agrees that the owner should undertake all the work of the application. When submitting the application, we specially brought a translator and asked the staff, can I draw by myself? You can draw by yourself, but you can't change the main structure. This is the basis for us to undertake this work. Therefore, it is wrong to deny the original statement in the last part of the drawing review. It is wrong to deny the owner's work.

3. For the application submitted by the owner, the center accepts the owner's application, and the owner should have the right to undertake a series of work related to the application the main bearer of the work is the owner. If the owner does not do well in some aspects, this is a problem that the owner himself needs to solve. There is no need for the inspector to determine who will do it specifically, and the qualified drawings finally submitted to the center should be accepted. Therefore, Ask the engineer to go to the license center to check the drawings in person, the inspector should be beyond his scope of work.

.

4. In our application process, we dare not consult a little. Once we have the meaning of consultation, the answer is : "I can't teach you." the examiner raised too many questions that were incompatible with ordinary decoration, and even raised the problem of calculating natural airflow. For these reasons, we put forward a consultation, and the examiner should not think that we are avoiding the review. The forced ventilation flow can be calculated. The cross-sectional area is multiplied by the wind speed, and then multiplied by the time is equal to the air cubic meter. However, natural ventilation cannot calculate the flow. The size and position of windows and doors can only be required according to the size and convection conditions of the room.

5. After five years of application, the center only conducted two system checks on the drawings, one of which passed the exam before July 18, 2021. The other is the first review of the reply through the Internet. After the supplementary reply, the commentator did not raise any objections. Other comments are all about raising new questions. The whole review process is the process of solving new problems. How can reviewer blame us for the time spent here? This statement is very inconsistent with the reality.

6. The inspector clearly explained the inspection principles, review the drawings submitted by the owner according to the established standards, which is basically a discrimination against the owner's application. It is conceivable that if this is the working principle of the license center. Then the inspector's work will be very casual. If he wants the applicant to pass, he can pass. If he doesn't want the applicant to pass, he can ask unlimited questions to prevent the applicant from passing. It will become a private institution. Private institutions also have rules and regulations. The license center cannot be without rules and regulations. Please know and correct this unorganized behavior. Handle the owner's application fairly and reasonably.

Our legalization project at 186 Menard Street first entrusted a company to apply for submission, saying that they could do anything, but after signing the contract, it was postponed to start, and finally said that it would increase the cost by 50%, but we disagreed. Many people go there to paint. Later, I found a company to apply for drawing. After measuring the drawings, they begin to be applied. There has been no progress for more than half a year. They finally told them that the reason was that DBI did not approve it and we returned

the money to you. There seems to be some dependence here, relying on the behavior of monopolizing high fees. When there is no way, we can only apply by ourselves.

With Best Regards

201912169613 project Applicants: Junhai Bai

[Tel:415-810-4346](tel:415-810-4346)

Email: scdkj@163.com

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Davison, Alan \(DBI\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#)
Subject: FW: Hearing date 5/21/24 - File No. 240317
Date: Thursday, May 16, 2024 9:19:08 AM

Hello,

Please see below for communication regarding:

File No. 240317 - Hearing to consider objections to a report of delinquent charges for code enforcement cases with delinquent assessment of costs, and fees pursuant to the provisions of Building Code, Sections 102A.3, 102A.4, 102A.6, 102A.12, 102A.16, 102A.17, 102A.18, 102A.19, 102A.20 et seq., 103A.3.3, 108A, and 110A - Tables 1A-K and 1A-G, submitted by the Director of the Department of Building Inspection for services rendered by said Department of costs thereof having accrued pursuant to code violations referenced above; scheduled pursuant to Motion No. M24-031 (File No. 240316), approved on April 2, 2024.

LINE	BLOCK	LOT	Sup.Dist.	St. No.	STREET NAME	FEE	INTEREST
SUBTOTAL			LIEN CHARGE	TOTAL			
264	5335	040	10	2049	QUESADA AV	\$3,607.05	\$360.71
\$3,967.76			\$200.00	\$4,167.76			

Regards,

Richard Lagunte
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163
richard.lagunte@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Pronouns: he, him, his

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

-----Original Message-----

From: Mimi Su <misusu1982@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 15, 2024 8:11 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Hearing date 5/21/24

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

To whom it may concern,

I received letter regarding delinquent charges total of \$4167.76. I was just made aware of these charges. What are these charges? I current don't have any open permits. Please elaborate?

Sent from my iPhone