
From: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: File 141248 FW: Dec. 16 - 3 PM Hearing - Appeal of Project at 3032, 3038-3040 Clement Street; BOS File # 141248

From: Sakurai, Minako [mailto:Minako.Sakurai@ed.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, December 16, 2014 10:08 AM
To: Avalos, John (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Campos, David (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Mar, Eric (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Wiener, Scott; Yee, Norman (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Dec. 16 - 3 PM Hearing - Appeal of Project at 3032, 3038-3040 Clement Street; BOS File # 141248

December 16, 2014

Re: Appeal of Project at 3032, 3038-3040 Clement Street
BOS File # 141248

Dear Honorable Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing this letter to appeal the approval of the construction of a new building as planned at 3032, 3038-3040 Clement Street (Block 1402, Lot 022 and 023). I just learned that a hearing for this matter was scheduled for this afternoon at 3:00PM. Unfortunately, I am unable to attend the hearing due to my job. For this reason, I am submitting this letter in support of each of the points raised in my neighbor, Karl Nakamura, in his letter (attached below). Many of the families are longtime residents and we plan to stay in the area. We hope that the impact this development will have on the residents will be addressed and that the neighbors will be able to work with the City and the developer to come up with a plan is workable for everyone.

Your consideration is much appreciated,

Minako Sakurai
422-31st Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94121

12/15/2014

To: Board President Katy Tang, Supervisor Eric Mar, Supervisor Mark Farrell, Supervisor London Breed, Supervisor Jane Kim, Supervisor Norman Yee, Supervisor Scott Weiner, Supervisor David Campos, Supervisor Malia Cohen, Supervisor John Avalos, and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, Angela Calvillo

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Appeal of Project at 3032, 3038-3040 Clement Street
BOS File # 141248

Dear Honorable Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing this letter to appeal the approval of the construction of a new building as planned at 3032, 3038-3040 Clement Street (Block 1402, Lot 022 and 023). I am writing and will be appearing on behalf of my neighbors who could not attend the hearing on Tuesday, December 16, 2014 at 3:00PM.

We oppose to the project as it is designed for the following reasons:

The building is too large for the neighborhood.

- The scale of the building is not typical of the neighborhood. The block is comprised mainly of 2 story single family homes and 3 story flats. The 4 story buildings are the exception rather than the rule. This particular 4 story building would dwarf the adjacent pair of two story buildings.
- While we can appreciate the need to increase the housing stock in San Francisco, the quiet livability of the Outer Richmond district is due to its careful balance of high density apartments, medium density flats, and low density single family homes. This project will bring 6 new units and 15 new bedrooms to this block. A careful examination of the floor plans reveals that the three rooms labeled as "den" are, in fact, identical in size and configuration to the rooms labeled as "bedroom" in the adjacent unit. Therefore, in reality, 18 new bedrooms are being added to this block. Our block already has problems with noise and parking from the existing 4 story apartments nearby.
- While the project provides one off-street parking space for each unit, our observations suggest that a more realistic calculation is 1 car per bedroom. Every morning I see my neighbors leaving their homes to go to their cars parked in the street. They do not pull their cars out of their garages. With this new building, we can expect up to twelve cars competing for parking in the neighborhood. With no parking left on Clement Street, we can expect more people to start parking on the adjacent blocks and in the Sea Cliff neighborhood just a block away.
- We applaud the Mayor's drive to bring more affordable housing to San Francisco. However, these units are not rental units but condominiums selling for about 1.5 million dollars each. That is hardly affordable housing.

The Rear Yard Modification Variance presents problems for the neighbors and was not sufficiently announced to the neighbors.

- This project is not compliant with Planning Code Section 134(a)(1) that requires a rear yard equal to 25% of Lot Depth. It is also not compliant with Section 134(a)(1)(A) that requires a yard at ground level and on each succeeding story of the building. We understand that a variance was granted to exempt this building from the code.
- The first problem is that patio for the 2nd floor unit comes to the level of the 2nd floor bedroom of 380 32nd Avenue. When that roof patio is extended all the way to the property line, as allowed in the variance, it comes within feet of the 2nd floor bedroom window of 380 32nd Avenue. A person leaning over the deck railing can easily touch the bedroom window. The owner of 380 32nd Avenue is greatly upset by this potential invasion of privacy.
- The 3rd and 4th floors do not have an open space set back and instead depend on a roof patio for their open space. The roof patio, being a required and regularly used part of the dwellings and not just used for maintenance, includes 3 penthouses and stucco walls **that significantly exceed the 40 foot height limit of the building. The stairs and elevator penthouses bring the total height of the building to 48 feet.**
- Because the 3rd and 4th floors are not set back, the building rises straight up past 40 feet and casts a dominating shadow over the much smaller neighboring homes. We will lose sunlight in our bedrooms starting earlier in the

year and in the day. One of our neighbors is a graphic artist who depends on natural light to do her work. If this light is blocked, it may affect her livelihood.

- The vague plans for roof top mechanicals will potentially expose the neighbors to excess noise 24 hours a day.
- No other building in the neighborhood other than a 100 year old Church has been exempted from this open space requirement.

The details of this project were poorly communicated to the immediate neighbors.

- I am appealing this project at this stage with these reasons because I was ignorant of the appeals process. I received notice of the February meeting, but I could not make the meeting in time. I am not an attorney or an architect. I work a full time job and take care of my 3 children. My neighbors are just like me and cannot take off work to come down to City Hall to observe a process that to them is of unknown impact. When I saw the final appeals notice after the demolition of the Store, I took the opportunity to write in and state my case.
- In speaking with my neighbors, some also received the notice but could not take off work to come to City Hall in the day. They said they received or read the notice just days before the hearing and could not make arrangements in time. Others saw the notice but did not realize the purpose of the hearing or the impact of the decision.
- However, most of the neighbors said they did not receive any notice at all. Most did not have any idea of the size and scale of the building going up and most did not know about the Rear Yard Variance. They were shocked at the lack of outreach as some of them have participated in construction projects of their own and knew the importance of neighborhood outreach.
- There was no attempt to contact the neighbors beyond a sign board and a notice to some in the mail.
- One neighbor said he was invited to a meeting in the store before it was torn down. He was the only neighbor who knew about this meeting. At the meeting, there was no information on the building going up or of the rear yard variance being planned.
- Though there may not have been any perceived opposition at earlier meetings, we are now more familiar with the project going up. We have not been able to contact many of our neighbors given the limited time we have, but those we contacted were supportive of our position. If we have more time, we should be able to produce many more letters.
- In reading the obviously prewritten letters of support in the original draft motion for Case #2012.0990CUEV, none are from the immediate neighbors who have to live and sleep by this new building.

I want to emphasize that we are not in opposition to a building going up in this location. We are just asking for more outreach and transparency with this project. Those of us who are directly affected by the sheer size of the building request that it be scaled back a bit so that it will have less of an impact on our daily lives. We are taking a stand now because we all plan to stay here for the rest of our lives.

Thank you for your consideration in my appeal,

Karl Nakamura
371 31st Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94121
415-752-7944

From: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: File 141248 FW: Appeal of Project at 3032, 3038-3040 Clement Street; BOS File # 141248
Attachments: 3038-3040 Clement appeal.docx

From: Karl Nakamura [mailto:karlnak@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, December 15, 2014 8:44 PM
To: Mar, Eric (BOS); Mar, Eric (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Avalos, John (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Campos, David (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Wiener, Scott; Yee, Norman (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Pagoulatos, Nickolas (BOS); Lauterborn, Peter (BOS)
Subject: Appeal of Project at 3032, 3038-3040 Clement Street; BOS File # 141248

12/15/2014

To: Board President Katy Tang, Supervisor Eric Mar, Supervisor John Avalos, Supervisor London Breed, Supervisor David Campos, Supervisor Malia Cohen, Supervisor Mark Farrell, , Supervisor Jane Kim, Supervisor Scott Weiner, Supervisor Norman Yee, and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, Angela Calvillo

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Appeal of Project at 3032, 3038-3040 Clement Street
BOS File # 141248

Dear Honorable Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing this letter to appeal the approval of the construction of a new building as planned at 3032, 3038-3040 Clement Street (Block 1402, Lot 022 and 023). I am writing and will be appearing on behalf of my neighbors who could not attend the hearing on Tuesday, December 16, 2014 at 3:00PM. We oppose to the project as it is designed for the following reasons:

The building is too large for the neighborhood.

- The scale of the building is not typical of the neighborhood. The block is comprised mainly of 2 story single family homes and 3 story flats. The 4 story buildings are the exception rather than the rule. This particular 4 story building would dwarf the adjacent pair of two story buildings.
- While we can appreciate the need to increase the housing stock in San Francisco, the quiet livability of the Outer Richmond district is due to its careful balance of high density apartments, medium density flats, and low density single family homes. This project will bring 6 new units and 15 new bedrooms to this block. A careful examination of the floor plans reveals that the three rooms labeled as "den" are, in fact, identical in size and configuration to the rooms labeled as "bedroom" in the adjacent unit. Therefore, in reality, 18 new bedrooms are being added to this block. Our block already has problems with noise and parking from the existing 4 story apartments nearby.
- While the project provides one off-street parking space for each unit, our observations suggest that a more realistic calculation is 1 car per bedroom. Every morning I see my

neighbors leaving their homes to go to their cars parked in the street. They do not pull their cars out of their garages. With this new building, we can expect up to twelve cars competing for parking in the neighborhood. With no parking left on Clement Street, we can expect more people to start parking on the adjacent blocks and in the Sea Cliff neighborhood just a block away.

- We applaud the Mayor's drive to bring more affordable housing to San Francisco. However, these units are not rental units but condominiums selling for about 1.5 million dollars each. That is hardly affordable housing.

The Rear Yard Modification Variance presents problems for the neighbors and was not sufficiently announced to the neighbors.

- This project is not compliant with Planning Code Section 134(a)(1) that requires a rear yard equal to 25% of Lot Depth. It is also not compliant with Section 134(a)(1)(A) that requires a yard at ground level and on each succeeding story of the building. We understand that a variance was granted to exempt this building from the code.
- The first problem is that patio for the 2nd floor unit comes to the level of the 2nd floor bedroom of 380 32nd Avenue. When that roof patio is extended all the way to the property line, as allowed in the variance, it comes within feet of the 2nd floor bedroom window of 380 32nd Avenue. A person leaning over the deck railing can easily touch the bedroom window. The owner of 380 32nd Avenue is greatly upset by this potential invasion of privacy.
- The 3rd and 4th floors do not have an open space set back and instead depend on a roof patio for their open space. The roof patio, being a required and regularly used part of the dwellings and not just used for maintenance, includes 3 penthouses and stucco walls **that significantly exceed the 40 foot height limit of the building. The stairs and elevator penthouses bring the total height of the building to 48 feet.**
- Because the 3rd and 4th floors are not set back, the building rises straight up past 40 feet and casts a dominating shadow over the much smaller neighboring homes. We will lose sunlight in our bedrooms starting earlier in the year and in the day. One of our neighbors is a graphic artist who depends on natural light to do her work. If this light is blocked, it may affect her livelihood.
- The vague plans for roof top mechanicals will potentially expose the neighbors to excess noise 24 hours a day.
- No other building in the neighborhood other than a 100 year old Church has been exempted from this open space requirement.

The details of this project were poorly communicated to the immediate neighbors.

- I am appealing this project at this stage with these reasons because I was ignorant of the appeals process. I received notice of the February meeting, but I could not make the meeting in time. I am not an attorney or an architect. I work a full time job and take care of my 3 children. My neighbors are just like me and cannot take off work to come down to City Hall to observe a process that to them is of unknown impact. When I saw the final appeals notice after the demolition of the Store, I took the opportunity to write in and state my case.
- In speaking with my neighbors, some also received the notice but could not take off work to come to City Hall in the day. They said they received or read the notice just days

before the hearing and could not make arrangements in time. Others saw the notice but did not realize the purpose of the hearing or the impact of the decision.

- However, most of the neighbors said they did not receive any notice at all. Most did not have any idea of the size and scale of the building going up and most did not know about the Rear Yard Variance. They were shocked at the lack of outreach as some of them have participated in construction projects of their own and knew the importance of neighborhood outreach.
- There was no attempt to contact the neighbors beyond a sign board and a notice to some in the mail.
- One neighbor said he was invited to a meeting in the store before it was torn down. He was the only neighbor who knew about this meeting. At the meeting, there was no information on the building going up or of the rear yard variance being planned.
- Though there may not have been any perceived opposition at earlier meetings, we are now more familiar with the project going up. We have not been able to contact many of our neighbors given the limited time we have, but those we contacted were supportive of our position. If we have more time, we should be able to produce many more letters.
- In reading the obviously prewritten letters of support in the original draft motion for Case #2012.0990CUEV, none are from the immediate neighbors who have to live and sleep by this new building.

I want to emphasize that we are not in opposition to a building going up in this location. We are just asking for more outreach and transparency with this project. Those of us who are directly affected by the sheer size of the building request that it be scaled back a bit so that it will have less of an impact on our daily lives. We are taking a stand now because we all plan to stay here for the rest of our lives.

Thank you for your consideration of my appeal,

Karl Nakamura
371 31st Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94121
415-752-7944

From: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: File 141248 FW: The new condos that are being built at 3032, 3038-3040 Clement Street

From: Grace Lau [<mailto:aloha318sf@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Monday, December 15, 2014 8:39 PM
To: Avalos, John (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Campos, David (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Mar, Eric (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Wiener, Scott; Yee, Norman (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: The new condos that are being built at 3032, 3038-3040 Clement Street

Hi,

I am Grace, we own and live a house on 31st Ave between California and Clement. I have the concern of the new building.

The new condos that are being built at 3032, 3038-3040 Clement Street will directly affect our neighborhood. It is already difficult to find parking here, but with the new building it will become even harder. There is only one parking space per unit available. This will lead to more people looking for parking on our already crowded streets.

We would like to have a community meeting to discuss many problems about this project. Not all of us have been properly notified about this building and how it will impact our houses. We need your help, the only way there will be changes made to the way the building is designed, is if we have support from our neighborhood. We do want the building there, but it needs to be designed in a way that meets the legal height and lot depth limits.

Please let us know and included us into your email about any news on this building planning.

Thank you
Grace

From: Karl Nakamura [karlnak@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, December 15, 2014 8:23 PM
To: Mar, Eric (BOS); Mar, Eric (BOS); Avalos, John (BOS); Wiener, Scott; Yee, Norman (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS); Campos, David (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Pagoulatos, Nickolas (BOS); Lauterborn, Peter (BOS)
Subject: Appeal of Project at 3032, 3038-3040 Clement Street; BOS File # 141248
Attachments: 3038-3040 Clement appeal.docx

12/15/2014

To: Board President Katy Tang, Supervisor Eric Mar, Supervisor Mark Farrell, Supervisor London Breed, Supervisor Jane Kim, Supervisor Norman Yee, Supervisor Scott Weiner, Supervisor David Campos, Supervisor Malia Cohen, Supervisor John Avalos, and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, Angela Calvillo

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244 San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Appeal of Project at 3032, 3038-3040 Clement Street
BOS File # 141248

Dear Honorable Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing this letter to appeal the approval of the construction of a new building as planned at 3032, 3038-3040 Clement Street (Block 1402, Lot 022 and 023). I am writing and will be appearing on behalf of my neighbors who could not attend the hearing on Tuesday, December 16, 2014 at 3:00PM.

We oppose to the project as it is designed for the following reasons:

The building is too large for the neighborhood.

- The scale of the building is not typical of the neighborhood. The block is comprised mainly of 2 story single family homes and 3 story flats. The 4 story buildings are the exception rather than the rule. This particular 4 story building would dwarf the adjacent pair of two story buildings. • While we can appreciate the need to increase the housing stock in San Francisco, the quiet livability of the Outer Richmond district is due to its careful balance of high density apartments, medium density flats, and low density single family homes. This project will bring 6 new units and 15 new bedrooms to this block. A careful examination of the floor plans reveals that the three rooms labeled as "den" are, in fact, identical in size and configuration to the rooms labeled as "bedroom" in the adjacent unit. Therefore, in reality, 18 new bedrooms are being added to this block. Our block already has problems with noise and parking from the existing 4 story apartments nearby.
- While the project provides one off-street parking space for each unit, our observations suggest that a more realistic calculation is 1 car per bedroom. Every morning I see my neighbors leaving their homes to go to their cars parked in the street. They do not pull their cars out of their garages. With this new building, we can expect up to twelve cars competing for parking in the neighborhood. With no parking left on Clement Street, we can expect more people to start parking on the adjacent blocks and in the Sea Cliff neighborhood just a block away.
- We applaud the Mayor's drive to bring more affordable housing to San Francisco. However, these units are not rental units but condominiums selling for about 1.5 million dollars each. That is hardly affordable housing.

The Rear Yard Modification Variance presents problems for the neighbors and was not sufficiently announced to the neighbors.

- This project is not compliant with Planning Code Section 134(a)(1) that requires a rear yard equal to 25% of Lot Depth. It is also not compliant with Section 134(a)(1)(A) that requires a yard at ground level and on each succeeding story of the building. We understand that a variance was granted to exempt this building from the code.
- The first problem is that patio for the 2nd floor unit comes to the level of the 2nd floor bedroom of 380 32nd Avenue. When that roof patio is extended all the way to the property line, as allowed in the variance, it comes within feet of the 2nd floor bedroom window of 380 32nd Avenue. A person leaning over the deck railing can easily touch the bedroom window. The owner of 380 32nd Avenue is greatly upset by this potential invasion of privacy.
- The 3rd and 4th floors do not have an open space set back and instead depend on a roof patio for their open space. The roof patio, being a required and regularly used part of the dwellings and not just used for maintenance, includes 3 penthouses and stucco walls that significantly exceed the 40 foot height limit of the building. The stairs and elevator penthouses bring the total height of the building to 48 feet.
- Because the 3rd and 4th floors are not set back, the building rises straight up past 40 feet and casts a dominating shadow over the much smaller neighboring homes. We will lose sunlight in our bedrooms starting earlier in the year and in the day. One of our neighbors is a graphic artist who depends on natural light to do her work. If this light is blocked, it may affect her livelihood.
- The vague plans for roof top mechanicals will potentially expose the neighbors to excess noise 24 hours a day.
- No other building in the neighborhood other than a 100 year old Church has been exempted from this open space requirement.

The details of this project were poorly communicated to the immediate neighbors.

- I am appealing this project at this stage with these reasons because I was ignorant of the appeals process. I received notice of the February meeting, but I could not make the meeting in time. I am not an attorney or an architect. I work a full time job and take care of my 3 children. My neighbors are just like me and cannot take off work to come down to City Hall to observe a process that to them is of unknown impact. When I saw the final appeals notice after the demolition of the Store, I took the opportunity to write in and state my case. • In speaking with my neighbors, some also received the notice but could not take off work to come to City Hall in the day. They said they received or read the notice just days before the hearing and could not make arrangements in time. Others saw the notice but did not realize the purpose of the hearing or the impact of the decision. • However, most of the neighbors said they did not receive any notice at all. Most did not have any idea of the size and scale of the building going up and most did not know about the Rear Yard Variance. They were shocked at the lack of outreach as some of them have participated in construction projects of their own and knew the importance of neighborhood outreach.
- There was no attempt to contact the neighbors beyond a sign board and a notice to some in the mail. • One neighbor said he was invited to a meeting in the store before it was torn down. He was the only neighbor who knew about this meeting. At the meeting, there was no information on the building going up or of the rear yard variance being planned.
- Though there may not have been any perceived opposition at earlier meetings, we are now more familiar with the project going up. We have not been able to contact many of our neighbors given the limited time we have, but those we contacted were supportive of our position. If we have more time, we should be able to produce many more letters.
- In reading the obviously prewritten letters of support in the original draft motion for Case #2012.0990CUEV, none are from the immediate neighbors who have to live and sleep by this new building.

I want to emphasize that we are not in opposition to a building going up in this location. We are just asking for more outreach and transparency with this project. Those of us who are directly affected by the sheer size of the building request that it be scaled back a bit so that it will have less of an impact on our daily lives. We are taking a stand now because we all plan to stay here for the rest of our lives.

Thank you for your consideration in my appeal,

Karl Nakamura
371 31st Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94121
415-752-7944

12/15/2014

To: Board President Katy Tang, Supervisor Eric Mar, Supervisor Mark Farrell, Supervisor London Breed, Supervisor Jane Kim, Supervisor Norman Yee, Supervisor Scott Weiner, Supervisor David Campos, Supervisor Malia Cohen, Supervisor John Avalos, and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, Angela Calvillo

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Appeal of Project at 3032, 3038-3040 Clement Street
BOS File # 141248

Dear Honorable Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing this letter to appeal the approval of the construction of a new building as planned at 3032, 3038-3040 Clement Street (Block 1402, Lot 022 and 023). I am writing and will be appearing on behalf of my neighbors who could not attend the hearing on Tuesday, December 16, 2014 at 3:00PM.

We oppose to the project as it is designed for the following reasons:

The building is too large for the neighborhood.

- The scale of the building is not typical of the neighborhood. The block is comprised mainly of 2 story single family homes and 3 story flats. The 4 story buildings are the exception rather than the rule. This particular 4 story building would dwarf the adjacent pair of two story buildings.
- While we can appreciate the need to increase the housing stock in San Francisco, the quiet livability of the Outer Richmond district is due to its careful balance of high density apartments, medium density flats, and low density single family homes. This project will bring 6 new units and 15 new bedrooms to this block. A careful examination of the floor plans reveals that the three rooms labeled as "den" are, in fact, identical in size and configuration to the rooms labeled as "bedroom" in the adjacent unit. Therefore, in reality, 18 new bedrooms are being added to this block. Our block already has problems with noise and parking from the existing 4 story apartments nearby.
- While the project provides one off-street parking space for each unit, our observations suggest that a more realistic calculation is 1 car per bedroom. Every morning I see my neighbors leaving their homes to go to their cars parked in the street. They do not pull their cars out of their garages. With this new building, we can expect up to twelve cars competing for parking in the neighborhood. With no parking left on Clement Street, we can expect more people to start parking on the adjacent blocks and in the Sea Cliff neighborhood just a block away.
- We applaud the Mayor's drive to bring more affordable housing to San Francisco. However, these units are not rental units but condominiums selling for about 1.5 million dollars each. That is hardly affordable housing.

The Rear Yard Modification Variance presents problems for the neighbors and was not sufficiently announced to the neighbors.

- This project is not compliant with Planning Code Section 134(a)(1) that requires a rear yard equal to 25% of Lot Depth. It is also not compliant with Section 134(a)(1)(A) that requires a yard at ground level and on each succeeding story of the building. We understand that a variance was granted to exempt this building from the code.
- The first problem is that patio for the 2nd floor unit comes to the level of the 2nd floor bedroom of 380 32nd Avenue. When that roof patio is extended all the way to the property line, as allowed in the variance, it comes within feet of the 2nd floor bedroom window of 380 32nd Avenue. A person leaning over the deck railing can easily touch the bedroom window. The owner of 380 32nd Avenue is greatly upset by this potential invasion of privacy.
- The 3rd and 4th floors do not have an open space set back and instead depend on a roof patio for their open space. The roof patio, being a required and regularly used part of the dwellings and not just used for maintenance, includes 3 penthouses and stucco walls **that significantly exceed the 40 foot height limit of the building. The stairs and elevator penthouses bring the total height of the building to 48 feet.**
- Because the 3rd and 4th floors are not set back, the building rises straight up past 40 feet and casts a dominating shadow over the much smaller neighboring homes. We will lose sunlight in our bedrooms starting earlier in the year and in the day. One of our neighbors is a graphic artist who depends on natural light to do her work. If this light is blocked, it may affect her livelihood.
- The vague plans for roof top mechanicals will potentially expose the neighbors to excess noise 24 hours a day.
- No other building in the neighborhood other than a 100 year old Church has been exempted from this open space requirement.

The details of this project were poorly communicated to the immediate neighbors.

- I am appealing this project at this stage with these reasons because I was ignorant of the appeals process. I received notice of the February meeting, but I could not make the meeting in time. I am not an attorney or an architect. I work a full time job and take care of my 3 children. My neighbors are just like me and cannot take off work to come down to City Hall to observe a process that to them is of unknown impact. When I saw the final appeals notice after the demolition of the Store, I took the opportunity to write in and state my case.
- In speaking with my neighbors, some also received the notice but could not take off work to come to City Hall in the day. They said they received or read the notice just days before the hearing and could not make arrangements in time. Others saw the notice but did not realize the purpose of the hearing or the impact of the decision.
- However, most of the neighbors said they did not receive any notice at all. Most did not have any idea of the size and scale of the building going up and most did not know about the Rear Yard Variance. They were shocked at the lack of outreach as some of them have participated in construction projects of their own and knew the importance of neighborhood outreach.
- There was no attempt to contact the neighbors beyond a sign board and a notice to some in the mail.

- One neighbor said he was invited to a meeting in the store before it was torn down. He was the only neighbor who knew about this meeting. At the meeting, there was no information on the building going up or of the rear yard variance being planned.
- Though there may not have been any perceived opposition at earlier meetings, we are now more familiar with the project going up. We have not been able to contact many of our neighbors given the limited time we have, but those we contacted were supportive of our position. If we have more time, we should be able to produce many more letters.
- In reading the obviously prewritten letters of support in the original draft motion for Case #2012.0990CUEV, none are from the immediate neighbors who have to live and sleep by this new building.

I want to emphasize that we are not in opposition to a building going up in this location. We are just asking for more outreach and transparency with this project. Those of us who are directly affected by the sheer size of the building request that it be scaled back a bit so that it will have less of an impact on our daily lives. We are taking a stand now because we all plan to stay here for the rest of our lives.

Thank you for your consideration in my appeal,

Karl Nakamura
371 31st Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94121
415-752-7944

From: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: File 141248 FW: Appeal of Project at 3032, 3038-3040 Clement Street; BOS File # 141248
Attachments: 3038-3040 Clement appeal.docx

From: Karl Nakamura [mailto:karlnak@yahoo.com]

Sent: Monday, December 15, 2014 8:44 PM

To: Mar, Eric (BOS); Mar, Eric (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Avalos, John (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Campos, David (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Wiener, Scott; Yee, Norman (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Pagoulatos, Nickolas (BOS); Lauterborn, Peter (BOS)

Subject: Appeal of Project at 3032, 3038-3040 Clement Street; BOS File # 141248

12/15/2014

To: Board President Katy Tang, Supervisor Eric Mar, Supervisor John Avalos, Supervisor London Breed, Supervisor David Campos, Supervisor Malia Cohen, Supervisor Mark Farrell, , Supervisor Jane Kim, Supervisor Scott Weiner, Supervisor Norman Yee, and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, Angela Calvillo

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Appeal of Project at 3032, 3038-3040 Clement Street
BOS File # 141248

Dear Honorable Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing this letter to appeal the approval of the construction of a new building as planned at 3032, 3038-3040 Clement Street (Block 1402, Lot 022 and 023). I am writing and will be appearing on behalf of my neighbors who could not attend the hearing on Tuesday, December 16, 2014 at 3:00PM. We oppose to the project as it is designed for the following reasons:

The building is too large for the neighborhood.

- The scale of the building is not typical of the neighborhood. The block is comprised mainly of 2 story single family homes and 3 story flats. The 4 story buildings are the exception rather than the rule. This particular 4 story building would dwarf the adjacent pair of two story buildings.
- While we can appreciate the need to increase the housing stock in San Francisco, the quiet livability of the Outer Richmond district is due to its careful balance of high density apartments, medium density flats, and low density single family homes. This project will bring 6 new units and 15 new bedrooms to this block. A careful examination of the floor plans reveals that the three rooms labeled as "den" are, in fact, identical in size and configuration to the rooms labeled as "bedroom" in the adjacent unit. Therefore, in reality, 18 new bedrooms are being added to this block. Our block already has problems with noise and parking from the existing 4 story apartments nearby.
- While the project provides one off-street parking space for each unit, our observations suggest that a more realistic calculation is 1 car per bedroom. Every morning I see my

neighbors leaving their homes to go to their cars parked in the street. They do not pull their cars out of their garages. With this new building, we can expect up to twelve cars competing for parking in the neighborhood. With no parking left on Clement Street, we can expect more people to start parking on the adjacent blocks and in the Sea Cliff neighborhood just a block away.

- We applaud the Mayor's drive to bring more affordable housing to San Francisco. However, these units are not rental units but condominiums selling for about 1.5 million dollars each. That is hardly affordable housing.

The Rear Yard Modification Variance presents problems for the neighbors and was not sufficiently announced to the neighbors.

- This project is not compliant with Planning Code Section 134(a)(1) that requires a rear yard equal to 25% of Lot Depth. It is also not compliant with Section 134(a)(1)(A) that requires a yard at ground level and on each succeeding story of the building. We understand that a variance was granted to exempt this building from the code.
- The first problem is that patio for the 2nd floor unit comes to the level of the 2nd floor bedroom of 380 32nd Avenue. When that roof patio is extended all the way to the property line, as allowed in the variance, it comes within feet of the 2nd floor bedroom window of 380 32nd Avenue. A person leaning over the deck railing can easily touch the bedroom window. The owner of 380 32nd Avenue is greatly upset by this potential invasion of privacy.
- The 3rd and 4th floors do not have an open space set back and instead depend on a roof patio for their open space. The roof patio, being a required and regularly used part of the dwellings and not just used for maintenance, includes 3 penthouses and stucco walls **that significantly exceed the 40 foot height limit of the building. The stairs and elevator penthouses bring the total height of the building to 48 feet.**
- Because the 3rd and 4th floors are not set back, the building rises straight up past 40 feet and casts a dominating shadow over the much smaller neighboring homes. We will lose sunlight in our bedrooms starting earlier in the year and in the day. One of our neighbors is a graphic artist who depends on natural light to do her work. If this light is blocked, it may affect her livelihood.
- The vague plans for roof top mechanicals will potentially expose the neighbors to excess noise 24 hours a day.
- No other building in the neighborhood other than a 100 year old Church has been exempted from this open space requirement.

The details of this project were poorly communicated to the immediate neighbors.

- I am appealing this project at this stage with these reasons because I was ignorant of the appeals process. I received notice of the February meeting, but I could not make the meeting in time. I am not an attorney or an architect. I work a full time job and take care of my 3 children. My neighbors are just like me and cannot take off work to come down to City Hall to observe a process that to them is of unknown impact. When I saw the final appeals notice after the demolition of the Store, I took the opportunity to write in and state my case.
- In speaking with my neighbors, some also received the notice but could not take off work to come to City Hall in the day. They said they received or read the notice just days

before the hearing and could not make arrangements in time. Others saw the notice but did not realize the purpose of the hearing or the impact of the decision.

- However, most of the neighbors said they did not receive any notice at all. Most did not have any idea of the size and scale of the building going up and most did not know about the Rear Yard Variance. They were shocked at the lack of outreach as some of them have participated in construction projects of their own and knew the importance of neighborhood outreach.
- There was no attempt to contact the neighbors beyond a sign board and a notice to some in the mail.
- One neighbor said he was invited to a meeting in the store before it was torn down. He was the only neighbor who knew about this meeting. At the meeting, there was no information on the building going up or of the rear yard variance being planned.
- Though there may not have been any perceived opposition at earlier meetings, we are now more familiar with the project going up. We have not been able to contact many of our neighbors given the limited time we have, but those we contacted were supportive of our position. If we have more time, we should be able to produce many more letters.
- In reading the obviously prewritten letters of support in the original draft motion for Case #2012.0990CUEV, none are from the immediate neighbors who have to live and sleep by this new building.

I want to emphasize that we are not in opposition to a building going up in this location. We are just asking for more outreach and transparency with this project. Those of us who are directly affected by the sheer size of the building request that it be scaled back a bit so that it will have less of an impact on our daily lives. We are taking a stand now because we all plan to stay here for the rest of our lives.

Thank you for your consideration of my appeal,

Karl Nakamura
371 31st Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94121
415-752-7944

From: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: File 141248 FW: Dec. 16 - 3 PM Hearing - Appeal of Project at 3032, 3038-3040 Clement Street; BOS File # 141248

From: Sakurai, Minako [mailto:Minako.Sakurai@ed.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, December 16, 2014 10:08 AM
To: Avalos, John (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Campos, David (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Mar, Eric (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Wiener, Scott; Yee, Norman (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Dec. 16 - 3 PM Hearing - Appeal of Project at 3032, 3038-3040 Clement Street; BOS File # 141248

December 16, 2014

Re: Appeal of Project at 3032, 3038-3040 Clement Street
BOS File # 141248

Dear Honorable Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing this letter to appeal the approval of the construction of a new building as planned at 3032, 3038-3040 Clement Street (Block 1402, Lot 022 and 023). I just learned that a hearing for this matter was scheduled for this afternoon at 3:00PM. Unfortunately, I am unable to attend the hearing due to my job. For this reason, I am submitting this letter in support of each of the points raised in my neighbor, Karl Nakamura, in his letter (attached below). Many of the families are longtime residents and we plan to stay in the area. We hope that the impact this development will have on the residents will be addressed and that the neighbors will be able to work with the City and the developer to come up with a plan is workable for everyone.

Your consideration is much appreciated,

Minako Sakurai
422-31st Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94121

12/15/2014

To: Board President Katy Tang, Supervisor Eric Mar, Supervisor Mark Farrell, Supervisor London Breed, Supervisor Jane Kim, Supervisor Norman Yee, Supervisor Scott Weiner, Supervisor David Campos, Supervisor Malia Cohen, Supervisor John Avalos, and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, Angela Calvillo

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Appeal of Project at 3032, 3038-3040 Clement Street
BOS File # 141248

Dear Honorable Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing this letter to appeal the approval of the construction of a new building as planned at 3032, 3038-3040 Clement Street (Block 1402, Lot 022 and 023). I am writing and will be appearing on behalf of my neighbors who could not attend the hearing on Tuesday, December 16, 2014 at 3:00PM.

We oppose to the project as it is designed for the following reasons:

The building is too large for the neighborhood.

- The scale of the building is not typical of the neighborhood. The block is comprised mainly of 2 story single family homes and 3 story flats. The 4 story buildings are the exception rather than the rule. This particular 4 story building would dwarf the adjacent pair of two story buildings.
- While we can appreciate the need to increase the housing stock in San Francisco, the quiet livability of the Outer Richmond district is due to its careful balance of high density apartments, medium density flats, and low density single family homes. This project will bring 6 new units and 15 new bedrooms to this block. A careful examination of the floor plans reveals that the three rooms labeled as "den" are, in fact, identical in size and configuration to the rooms labeled as "bedroom" in the adjacent unit. Therefore, in reality, 18 new bedrooms are being added to this block. Our block already has problems with noise and parking from the existing 4 story apartments nearby.
- While the project provides one off-street parking space for each unit, our observations suggest that a more realistic calculation is 1 car per bedroom. Every morning I see my neighbors leaving their homes to go to their cars parked in the street. They do not pull their cars out of their garages. With this new building, we can expect up to twelve cars competing for parking in the neighborhood. With no parking left on Clement Street, we can expect more people to start parking on the adjacent blocks and in the Sea Cliff neighborhood just a block away.
- We applaud the Mayor's drive to bring more affordable housing to San Francisco. However, these units are not rental units but condominiums selling for about 1.5 million dollars each. That is hardly affordable housing.

The Rear Yard Modification Variance presents problems for the neighbors and was not sufficiently announced to the neighbors.

- This project is not compliant with Planning Code Section 134(a)(1) that requires a rear yard equal to 25% of Lot Depth. It is also not compliant with Section 134(a)(1)(A) that requires a yard at ground level and on each succeeding story of the building. We understand that a variance was granted to exempt this building from the code.
- The first problem is that patio for the 2nd floor unit comes to the level of the 2nd floor bedroom of 380 32nd Avenue. When that roof patio is extended all the way to the property line, as allowed in the variance, it comes within feet of the 2nd floor bedroom window of 380 32nd Avenue. A person leaning over the deck railing can easily touch the bedroom window. The owner of 380 32nd Avenue is greatly upset by this potential invasion of privacy.
- The 3rd and 4th floors do not have an open space set back and instead depend on a roof patio for their open space. The roof patio, being a required and regularly used part of the dwellings and not just used for maintenance, includes 3 penthouses and stucco walls **that significantly exceed the 40 foot height limit of the building. The stairs and elevator penthouses bring the total height of the building to 48 feet.**
- Because the 3rd and 4th floors are not set back, the building rises straight up past 40 feet and casts a dominating shadow over the much smaller neighboring homes. We will lose sunlight in our bedrooms starting earlier in the

year and in the day. One of our neighbors is a graphic artist who depends on natural light to do her work. If this light is blocked, it may affect her livelihood.

- The vague plans for roof top mechanicals will potentially expose the neighbors to excess noise 24 hours a day.
- No other building in the neighborhood other than a 100 year old Church has been exempted from this open space requirement.

The details of this project were poorly communicated to the immediate neighbors.

- I am appealing this project at this stage with these reasons because I was ignorant of the appeals process. I received notice of the February meeting, but I could not make the meeting in time. I am not an attorney or an architect. I work a full time job and take care of my 3 children. My neighbors are just like me and cannot take off work to come down to City Hall to observe a process that to them is of unknown impact. When I saw the final appeals notice after the demolition of the Store, I took the opportunity to write in and state my case.
- In speaking with my neighbors, some also received the notice but could not take off work to come to City Hall in the day. They said they received or read the notice just days before the hearing and could not make arrangements in time. Others saw the notice but did not realize the purpose of the hearing or the impact of the decision.
- However, most of the neighbors said they did not receive any notice at all. Most did not have any idea of the size and scale of the building going up and most did not know about the Rear Yard Variance. They were shocked at the lack of outreach as some of them have participated in construction projects of their own and knew the importance of neighborhood outreach.
- There was no attempt to contact the neighbors beyond a sign board and a notice to some in the mail.
- One neighbor said he was invited to a meeting in the store before it was torn down. He was the only neighbor who knew about this meeting. At the meeting, there was no information on the building going up or of the rear yard variance being planned.
- Though there may not have been any perceived opposition at earlier meetings, we are now more familiar with the project going up. We have not been able to contact many of our neighbors given the limited time we have, but those we contacted were supportive of our position. If we have more time, we should be able to produce many more letters.
- In reading the obviously prewritten letters of support in the original draft motion for Case #2012.0990CUEV, none are from the immediate neighbors who have to live and sleep by this new building.

I want to emphasize that we are not in opposition to a building going up in this location. We are just asking for more outreach and transparency with this project. Those of us who are directly affected by the sheer size of the building request that it be scaled back a bit so that it will have less of an impact on our daily lives. We are taking a stand now because we all plan to stay here for the rest of our lives.

Thank you for your consideration in my appeal,

Karl Nakamura
371 31st Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94121
415-752-7944

From: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: File 141248 FW: Condominium units being built at 3032, 3038-3040 Clement Street

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

From: Sheldon M. [mailto:sheldon_medicoff@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, December 15, 2014 3:54 PM
To: Avalos, John (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Campos, David (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Mar, Eric (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Wiener, Scott; Yee, Norman (BOS); Board of Supervisors. (BOS)
Cc: pnutgalry1@gmail.com
Subject: Condominium units being built at 3032, 3038-3040 Clement Street

Greetings

Is it possible to schedule a community meeting regarding the new bldg on Clement?
My neighbors and I are very concerned that the size of the bldg impacts the neighborhood drastically, and we'd like to have the opportunity to voice our concerns.
Thank you for your consideration

Sheldon Medicoff
362 31st Ave
(415)244-1661

From: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To: Yee, Norman (BOS)
Subject: File 141248 FW: Delivery Status Notification (Failure)

From: Richard Lovett [mailto:bclovett@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, December 15, 2014 3:15 PM
To: Yee, Norman (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Fwd: Delivery Status Notification (Failure)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Mail Delivery System <MAILER-DAEMON@ironport.sfgov.org>
Date: Mon, Dec 15, 2014 at 3:00 PM
Subject: Delivery Status Notification (Failure)
To: bclovett@gmail.com

The following message to <Norman.Yeee@sfgov.org> was undeliverable.
The reason for the problem:
5.1.0 - Unknown address error 550-'Norman.Yeee@sfgov.org... No such user'

Final-Recipient: rfc822:Norman.Yeee@sfgov.org
Action: failed
Status: 5.0.0 (permanent failure)
Remote-MTA: dns; [10.250.103.240]
Diagnostic-Code: smtp; 5.1.0 - Unknown address error 550-'Norman.Yeee@sfgov.org... No such user' (delivery attempts: 0)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Richard Lovett <bclovett@gmail.com>
To: John Campo <JCAMPO@bbgslaw.com>, London.Breed@sfgov.org, David.Campos@sfgov.org, Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org, Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org, Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org, Katy.Tang@sfgov.org, Scott.Weiner@sfgov.org, Norman.Yeee@sfgov.org, Board.of.Supervisors@sfgov.org
Cc:
Date: Mon, 15 Dec 2014 15:10:50 -0800
Subject: Appeal of Building permit for Building site at 3032-40, Clement St, San Francisco 94121

To: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors and Department of Public Works

From : Richard Lovett, resident 383-31st Avenue

RE: Request for Appeal of new construction for building unit at 3032- 40, Clement St,San Francisco.

I'm writing to request an appeal of the final approval for this building. I am a neighbor at 383 -31st Avenue, which has a backyard diagonally on the south side and less than 200 ft. proximity, which houses our rear facing bedrooms as well as our neighbors. Myself, my wife Rhona and two daughters have lived in the neighbor since 1982. We have seen the density issues grow over the years and the problems that have occurred as a result. I not protesting the construction of the building, in fact it could be a welcome addition to the neighborhood. However, there are serious concerns that have evolved in the permit process, including extenuating the land use of the site and the granting by exception in the permit process for a four rather than a three story building as originally proposed. Communications on these matters were for the most part absent for the neighborhood. Communications on these matters were for the most part absent for the neighborhood. I direct you to the following points of concerns for myself and our neighbors.

1. The proposed 4th story addition with an add on deck extended to the rear of the property will directly impose privacy issues for us neighbors with rear bed rooms facing the the new building rear units and roof top garden space. The height extension of the building will significantly restrict direct Southern exposed light for us and our neighbors in the afternoon. The is of course the issue of privacy intrusion, given the proximity and alignment of the rear exposure of the building'd units.
2. Parking in the neighborhood has intensified as a problem in recent years, and this new building proposal with its multi units providing limited parking for the residents, will only add to an already urgent problem.
3. Lastly we are aware of the development siege occurring across the City, including the removal of 2,000 rental units per year over the past two years due to Condo conversions and other land use opportunities. I am requesting a conscientious appeal in this case, to bring back community involvement in these development decisions, ensuring that we as residents and San Francisco taxpayers have a fair and democratic say in the process.

Thank you for your consideration of my Appeal of the permit for this building.

Richard and Rhona Lovett, 383- 31st Avenue, San Francisco, 94121

From: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: File: 141248 FW: Condo construction at 3032-3040 Clement Street
Attachments: appeal letter.pdf

From: Cynthia Yu [<mailto:cyu@lwhs.org>]
Sent: Monday, December 15, 2014 2:48 PM
To: Avalos, John (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); David.compos@sfgov.org; Cohen, Malia (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Ericl.Mar@sfgov.org; Tang, Katy (BOS); Wiener, Scott; Yee, Norman (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Condo construction at 3032-3040 Clement Street

Good Afternoon Supervisors,

I have attached the letter to appeal for the condo construction at 3032-3040 Clement Street. We are respectfully ask your consideration on this appeal.

Thank You.

Cynthia & Keith Yu
380 32nd Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94121

12/14/2014

San Francisco Department of Public Works

c/o:

The Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco CA 94102

Dear Clerk of the Board of Supervisors and SF Department of Public Works

I am writing this letter to appeal the approval of the construction a new building at 3032, 3038 and 3040 Clement Street (Block 1402, Lot 022, and 023). I am writing on behalf of my family who oppose the building as designed for the following reasons.

- The building is too large for the neighborhood.
- The building is designed to the very limits of the lot with no open space at ground level. As a resident of over 25 years, I have never seen a residential building, built to the limits of the lot and do not foresee positive ramifications only negative ones (Increased noise pollution, invasion of privacy, etc.)
- The increased residential density will impact the parking and noise for the immediate neighbors, including our family. One parking space per unit is not enough for one-unit apartments or for a single family anymore. The proposed building will not allow enough parking spaces for their tenants/owners and this will further perpetuate the lack of parking problem that already exist in this neighborhood.
- Placing residential units at the very back of the lot and at the upper levels will allow new residents to live very close to the bedrooms of our house. We have serious concerns about the noise and our privacy. These potential new neighbors will be able to see into our homes or potentially use their roof to break into our home or even trespass onto our property.
- While there are apartment buildings already large and at four stories we do not wish for another 4 story building adjacent to our lot and blocking out the sunlight we have. With this new proposed buildings height, it will block out any sunlight that our yard/garden will see
- The prewritten letters of support in the original Draft motion for Case #2012.0990CUEV do not represent us and our concerns, my family and I have to live and sleep by the new building. The vague plans for rooftop mechanical equipment will potentially have severe impact on the peace and quiet of our home. My bedroom is less than 5 feet away from the new building and the constant noise of potential tenants and construction is disruptive. My husband works for the city of San Francisco and works the night shift. He sleeps in during the day so that he is alert and can function at night.

- The proposed plan for the buildings height and bulk will not allow sunlight into our homes and disrupt the natural light that we already receive so little of. Lowering the buildings height will solve this problem.
- Lastly, my family and I were not aware or notified of the various hearings on this project. This letter of appeal was written in a day so that it could be submitted in consideration.

Please take into account our concerns and we respectfully ask your consideration on this appeal.



Cynthia Yu
380 32nd Ave
San Francisco, CA 94121

From: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: File 141248 FW: Property at 3037-2040 Clement St. Meeting on Dec. 16

From: janet mcnerny [mailto:j_mcnerny@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, December 15, 2014 2:46 PM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Subject: Property at 3037-2040 Clement St. Meeting on Dec. 16

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing regarding a planned building on Clement between 31st & 32nd Avenues. We neighbors were not

I live on 31st, around the corner from where a 4 story bldg. is being proposed. Apart from being taller & notified of neighborhood meetings regarding these plans. I found out yesterday that at least one had taken place. I understand there is to be a meeting tomorrow regarding this and I hope you will vote to have the developers make some changes to their plans regarding height, depth & parking. deeper than the surrounding buildings, and thus keeping our view of the sky & sun limited, I am concerned regarding the additional noise coming from the back condos, which will be close to my bedroom. Another problem is the additional cars looking for parking places, as there has only been one space per condo available in the plans. This neighborhood is already saturated with resident's cars, as most families have two. I walk to the Geary bus and notice people are forced to park on the sidewalk in front of their houses. My friends who are close to or over 80, have to park blocks away and then walk up a hill or tow to get here.

Again, I hope you vote to make some changes. I realize the housing problem we have here, but please consider those of us who have lived in the city for many, many years and don't make life more difficult as we age.

Sincerely,
Janet McNerny

From: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: File 141248 FW: Condo construction at 3032-3040 Clement Street

From: Kris Toscanini [mailto:pnutgalry1@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, December 15, 2014 9:37 AM
To: Avalos, John (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Campos, David (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Mar, Eric (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Wiener, Scott; Yee, Norman (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS)
Cc: Nakamura, Karl; Jeremy Toscanini
Subject: Condo construction at 3032-3040 Clement Street

Good Morning Supervisors,

My name is Christine Toscanini and I am writing in regards to the new construction being built at 3032-3040 on Clement between 32nd and 31st Avenue.

My family and I live at 377 31st Avenue and the height and length of the new construction will directly affect our house and back yard and that of my neighbors. The reason that I am writing to you so late in the game is that I just recently found out about how tall and long this new building will be. We never received any notification or were never contacted in any way about the design of this new building. We were never given architectural design plans on the building and the only way I found out about it was through my neighbor, Karl Nakamura. He had to dig to find the information. No one from the City let us know and by no means did anyone who owns the new building let us know of these plans. We do want the new building, but we want it built to the proper codes that have been set up by the City. There are many things about this new building that are deceiving to the neighborhood and we would like to set up a community meeting to discuss what is really going on.

The way that the building is designed, we will have a lack of sunlight, lack of privacy, and lack of a sight line because the building exceeds the 40 ft. height limit and the rear yard modification decision where 25% of the lot depth must be open space.

We already are having a problem with parking here in our neighborhood. The new building has 3 living spaces, each with 3 full bedrooms. That is the **minimum** potential of 9 people. That will affect the parking here even with the one parking spot per unit. Most full units will have at least 2 cars.

Not only will there be a parking problem and a lack of privacy, but there will be a noise problem. With large complexes comes large noise. We do not want the additional noise in our neighborhood. The woman who live behind us will have the new patio butted right up to her bedroom window. She also was not notified of the design of the building and is sending an email as well.

So as you can see, we have many complaints about how this new building is designed and how we were never properly notified about it. My husband and his family own the building that we live in and we are all very upset about how this is being handled.

We know there is a meeting tomorrow at 3pm and our neighbor, Karl Nakamura will be there to represent the neighborhood. I could not get off of work because you chose to have the meeting in the middle of the day when most people are at work.

I really hope we can come to some sort of agreement on this issue. It is not fair how this whole process has taken place and we would like to have the chance to represent ourselves.

Thank you,

Christine and Jeremy Toscanini
37731st Avenue
San Francisco, Ca. 94121

From: Board of Supervisors (BOS)
To: BOS-Supervisors
Subject: File 141248 FW: Questions regarding legality of construction project at 3032 - 3040 Clement Street

From: Jeff Shaw [<mailto:jeff.shaw@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, December 14, 2014 11:31 PM
To: Mar, Eric (BOS)
Cc: Avalos, John (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Campos, David (BOS); Cohen, Malia (BOS); Farrell, Mark (BOS); Kim, Jane (BOS); Tang, Katy (BOS); Wiener, Scott; Yee, Norman (BOS); Board of Supervisors (BOS); Kris Toscanini; Karl.Nakamura@ucsfmedctr.org
Subject: Questions regarding legality of construction project at 3032 - 3040 Clement Street

Hello Supervisor Mar,

I have learned from some of my neighbors that the condominiums under construction at 3032-3040 Clement between 31st and 32nd Streets may not meet city ordinances regarding building height and depth. Apparently the building as currently planned also does not provide adequate parking for the anticipated number of new residents. Neighborhood representatives plan to attend a meeting with the Board of Supervisors concerning the construction scheduled for this Tuesday, 16 December 2014.

I will be unable to attend the meeting, but I understand the design needs careful review and revision to ensure it complies with legal restrictions that are meant to protect the entire neighborhood, and I urge you to carefully consider the concerns of the neighborhood.

Thank you,

Jeff Shaw
396 31st Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94121