

**REJECT APPEAL  
LETTERS FROM  
THE 300 FT  
RADIUS MAP**


---

Board of Supervisors  
City and County of San Francisco

REJECT APPEAL ON 218-- 27<sup>TH</sup> AVE

Dear Board of Supervisors:

As a neighbor of the above referenced project I ask you to **REJECT THE APPEAL** of the Planning Commission Approval of this project. The Department of Planning and the Planning Commission have both rendered this project approvable after a very thorough planning process including a Planning Commission hearing resulting in a **UNANIMOUS APPROVAL BY THE COMMISSIONERS.**

John Brennan   
Name

50 EVERSON ST / 211 27<sup>TH</sup> AVE  
Address

12/3/17  
Date

CORNER BUILDING  
ACROSS STREET  
FROM SUBJECT  
PROPERTY

Board of Supervisors  
City and County of San Francisco

REJECT APPEAL ON 218-- 27<sup>TH</sup> AVE

Dear Board of Supervisors:

As a neighbor of the above referenced project I ask you to **REJECT THE APPEAL** of the Planning Commission Approval of this project. The Department of Planning and the Planning Commission have both rendered this project approvable after a very thorough planning process including a Planning Commission hearing resulting in a **UNANIMOUS APPROVAL BY THE COMMISSIONERS.**

Giwo Fortunato

Name



233 26<sup>th</sup> Ave #B

Address

2 Dec 17

Date

Board of Supervisors  
City and County of San Francisco

**REJECT APPEAL ON 218-- 27<sup>TH</sup> AVE**

Dear Board of Supervisors:

As a neighbor of the above referenced project I ask you to **REJECT THE APPEAL** of the Planning Commission Approval of this project. The Department of Planning and the Planning Commission have both rendered this project approvable after a very thorough planning process including a Planning Commission hearing resulting in a **UNANIMOUS APPROVAL BY THE COMMISSIONERS.**

Don Song Hoo

Name

262 - 27<sup>th</sup> Ave

Address

12/2/17

Date

Board of Supervisors  
City and County of San Francisco

**REJECT APPEAL ON 218-- 27<sup>TH</sup> AVE**

Dear Board of Supervisors:

As a neighbor of the above referenced project I ask you to **REJECT THE APPEAL** of the Planning Commission Approval of this project. The Department of Planning and the Planning Commission have both rendered this project approvable after a very thorough planning process including a Planning Commission hearing resulting in a **UNANIMOUS APPROVAL BY THE COMMISSIONERS.**

Nikolaj Pedersen  
Name

249a 27<sup>th</sup> Ave  
Address

12/3/17  
Date

Board of Supervisors  
City and County of San Francisco

REJECT APPEAL ON 218-- 27<sup>TH</sup> AVE

Dear Board of Supervisors:

As a neighbor of the above referenced project I ask you to **REJECT THE APPEAL** of the Planning Commission Approval of this project. The Department of Planning and the Planning Commission have both rendered this project approvable after a very thorough planning process including a Planning Commission hearing resulting in a **UNANIMOUS APPROVAL BY THE COMMISSIONERS.**

Connie Foppiano

Name

2449 Lake St

Address

12/3/17

Date

Board of Supervisors  
City and County of San Francisco

**REJECT APPEAL ON 218-- 27<sup>TH</sup> AVE**

Dear Board of Supervisors:

As a neighbor of the above referenced project I ask you to **REJECT THE APPEAL** of the Planning Commission Approval of this project. The Department of Planning and the Planning Commission have both rendered this project approvable after a very thorough planning process including a Planning Commission hearing resulting in a **UNANIMOUS APPROVAL BY THE COMMISSIONERS.**

Todd Lee  
Name

261<sup>2r</sup> #2 SF CA 94121  
Address

12-3-17  
Date

Board of Supervisors  
City and County of San Francisco

REJECT APPEAL ON 218-- 27<sup>TH</sup> AVE

Dear Board of Supervisors:

As a neighbor of the above referenced project I ask you to **REJECT THE APPEAL** of the Planning Commission Approval of this project. The Department of Planning and the Planning Commission have both rendered this project approvable after a very thorough planning process including a Planning Commission hearing resulting in a **UNANIMOUS APPROVAL BY THE COMMISSIONERS.**

Leonard Gestrin

Name

277 76 AVE #C

Address

12/3/2017

Date



Board of Supervisors  
City and County of San Francisco

**REJECT APPEAL ON 218-- 27<sup>TH</sup> AVE**

Dear Board of Supervisors:

As a neighbor of the above referenced project I ask you to **REJECT THE APPEAL** of the Planning Commission Approval of this project. The Department of Planning and the Planning Commission have both rendered this project approvable after a very thorough planning process including a Planning Commission hearing resulting in a **UNANIMOUS APPROVAL BY THE COMMISSIONERS.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name

236 . 26<sup>th</sup> # 102

\_\_\_\_\_  
Address

J. Villafuerte  
Date

12/2/17

Board of Supervisors  
City and County of San Francisco

REJECT APPEAL ON 218-- 27<sup>TH</sup> AVE

Dear Board of Supervisors:

As a neighbor of the above referenced project I ask you to **REJECT THE APPEAL** of the Planning Commission Approval of this project. The Department of Planning and the Planning Commission have both rendered this project approvable after a very thorough planning process including a Planning Commission hearing resulting in a **UNANIMOUS APPROVAL BY THE COMMISSIONERS.**

Wayne Choi

Name

436 26<sup>th</sup> Ave #201

Address

12/2/17

Date

Board of Supervisors  
City and County of San Francisco

**REJECT APPEAL ON 218-- 27<sup>TH</sup> AVE**

Dear Board of Supervisors:

As a neighbor of the above referenced project I ask you to **REJECT THE APPEAL** of the Planning Commission Approval of this project. The Department of Planning and the Planning Commission have both rendered this project approvable after a very thorough planning process including a Planning Commission hearing resulting in a **UNANIMOUS APPROVAL BY THE COMMISSIONERS.**

Name

218 - 27<sup>th</sup> Ave

Address

12/2/17

Date

Board of Supervisors  
City and County of San Francisco

**REJECT APPEAL ON 218-- 27<sup>TH</sup> AVE**

Dear Board of Supervisors:

As a neighbor of the above referenced project I ask you to **REJECT THE APPEAL** of the Planning Commission Approval of this project. The Department of Planning and the Planning Commission have both rendered this project approvable after a very thorough planning process including a Planning Commission hearing resulting in a **UNANIMOUS APPROVAL BY THE COMMISSIONERS.**

LEO KHERSONSKY  
Name

224 - 26<sup>TH</sup> AVE #201  
Address

12/02/2017  
Date

**REJECT APPEAL  
LETTERS FROM  
THE  
RICHMOND  
DISTRICT**

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**


The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:**

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.

Thank you,

JUSTIN OLANESSKAN  
Name

7434 GEARY BLVD SF, CA 94121  
Address

  
Signature

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:**

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.

Thank you,

Elizabeth Moore


---

Name

741 9th Ave, SF Ca 94118

---

Address



---

Signature

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

*As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:*

***SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.***

*The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:***

1. *The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.***
2. *The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:*
  - a. *Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access*
  - b. *Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation*
  - c. *Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing*
  - d. *Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.*
3. *The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.*
4. *The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.*
5. *This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.*

*Thank you,*

Benjamin Gerry

*Name*

314 4th avenue, San Francisco, CA 94118

*Address*

*benjie garry*

*Signature*



Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected**:

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.


Thank you,

Harry Spitzer

Name

314 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94118

Address



Signature

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected**:

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.

Thank you,

Jonathan Gillie

---

Name

314 4th Ave. San Francisco, CA 94118

---

Address

---

Signature



Jonathan Gillie (Dec 9, 2017)

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected**:

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.


Thank you,

GIANNA TOBONI

Name

1514 Lake Street, San Francisco 94118

Address

  
Signature

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:**

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.

Thank you,  
**David McMonigle**

---

Name  
**350 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

---

Address



---

Signature

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

*As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:*

***SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.***

*The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:***

1. *The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.***
2. *The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:*
  - a. *Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access*
  - b. *Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation*
  - c. *Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing*
  - d. *Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.*
3. *The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.*
4. *The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.*
5. *This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.*

*Thank you,*

Jacqueline Toboni


---

Name

1514-1516 Lake St. San Francisco, Ca 94118

---

Address



---

Signature

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:**

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.

Thank you,

Bridget and David Denning

Name

415 17th Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94121

Address

x Bridget Denning x David Denning

Signature

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:**

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.

Thank you,

FENG SHOU GAN

Name

4150 - CABRILLO ST.

Address



Signature

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:**

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.

Thank you,

G TOBONI

Name

1514 Lake St.

Address

Gianna Toboni

Signature



Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:**

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.

Thank you,

Name

*Jacqueline Toheri*

Address

*1576 Lake Street*

Signature

*Jacqueline Toheri*



Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:**

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.

Thank you,

BARRY TICKLER

Name

426 16<sup>th</sup> AVE 94118

Address



Signature

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:**

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.

Thank you,



Name

767 20 Ave 94108

Address



Signature

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:**

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.


Thank you,

RYAN YERFIC

Name

1011 A Lake St SF CA 94118

Address



Signature

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:**

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.

Thank you,

Crystal Gomez  
Name

1011 Lake St. SF, CA 94118  
Address

A. Gomez  
Signature

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected**:

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.


Thank you,

Daniel O'Neill

Name

1830 Jackson apt I SF CA 94109

Address



Signature

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**


The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected**:

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.

Thank you,

Martin Yerbic  
Name

1011 Lake St S.F CA 94118  
Address

  
Signature



Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:**

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.

Thank you,

PATRICK DILSAVER

Name

314 4<sup>th</sup> AVE, UNIT A, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94118

Address



Signature

**REJECT APPEAL  
LETTERS FROM  
SAN  
FRANCISCO**

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**


The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:**

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.


Thank you,

  
\_\_\_\_\_

Name

  
\_\_\_\_\_

Address

  
\_\_\_\_\_

Signature

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:**

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.

Thank you,

John Garcia  
Name

331 Santa Rosa Ave, SF 94112  
Address

  
Signature

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:**

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.


Thank you,

Jose Garcia

Name

331 Santa Rosa ave, SF, 94112

Address



Signature

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:**

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.

Thank you,

Mitchell Harris

Name

3346 Sacramento St, SF, CA

Address



Signature

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:**

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.


Thank you,

Victor Franco

Name

2779 - 24 ST SF C-A

Address



Signature

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:**

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.


Thank you,

Juan Antonio Yaxón

Name

148 SILLIMAN ST San Francisco CA 94134

Address

  
Signature



Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:


**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:**

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.

Thank you,

  
Name

  
Address

  
Signature

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**


The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:**

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.

Thank you,

  
Name

  
Address

  
Signature

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:**

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.


Thank you,

German Hernandez

Name

2600 Ingalls SF. CA 94124

Address

  
Signature

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:**

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.

Thank you,

Jaime Fuentes  
Name

2600 Ingalls  
Address

[Signature]  
Signature

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:**

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.


Thank you,

Ben Nahidi

Name

801 South Van Ness Ave

Address



Signature

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:**

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.

Thank you,

Lei, Yang

Name

1350 Stockton St, SF. CA 94133

Address

Lei Yang

Signature

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:**

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.

Thank you,

zhuofeng lei

Name

434 Athens St

Address

zhuofeng lei

Signature

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:**

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.

Thank you,

*Jonathan M Ferno*

Name

*243-A 17th Ave SF, CA 94102*

Address

*J. Ferno*

Signature



Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

*As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:*

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

*The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this Appeal should be Rejected:*

1. **The SF Planning Commission VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. *The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:*
  - a. *Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access*
  - b. *Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation*
  - c. *Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing*
  - d. *Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.*
3. *The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.*
4. *The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.*
5. *This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.*


Thank you,

Carlos Garcia

Name

620 eddy, San Francisco, CA

Address

  
Signature

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:**

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.

Thank you,

Imer Danilo Rivas Fuentes  
Name

3364 Sacramento St SFCA 94118  
Address

Imer Fuentes  
Signature

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected**:

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.

Thank you,

3364 sacramento st CA 94118

Name

Maurin Prado

Address

San Francisco

Signature



Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:**

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.

Thank you,

BYRON MONALDO

Name

2933 Pine Apt A

Address

Byron Monaldo

Signature

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:**

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.


Thank you,

Eduardo Navarro

Name

126 18<sup>th</sup> ave st CA 94121

Address



Signature



Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this Appeal should be Rejected:

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.

Thank you,

Eduardo Caliveas

Name

3364 Sacramento st. SF CA 94118

Address

Eduardo Caliveas  
Signature





Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:**

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.

Thank you,

Jose Ferrera  
Name

1463 Lombard #301 cf CA 94123  
Address

Jose Ferrera  
Signature

Board of Supervisors  
City Hall 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California

**Re: Reasons to Reject the Appeal for 218-27<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

As a resident of San Francisco I believe you should vote against this appeal for the following reasons:

**SF should be committed to providing Family Sized Housing to meet the Lack of Housing Crisis in SF.**

The project sponsor worked diligently for almost two years with professional staff at the SF Planning Department and went through major concessions and reiterations of the plan and for the additional following reasons this **Appeal should be Rejected:**

1. The SF Planning Commission **VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THIS PROJECT.**
2. The project sponsor has additionally agreed to several conditions:
  - a. Agreed to the removal of the roof deck and roof access
  - b. Agreed to frosted and inoperable windows at the north elevation
  - c. Agreed to provide frosted glass screening at the north entry stairs and landing
  - d. Agreed to set back the top floor 15 feet from the front elevation.
3. The property is in a RM-1 area and zoned for urban density.
4. The project sponsor has not asked for any exceptions / variances to the planning code.
5. This project only went to the planning commission because there is a recent law requiring a Conditional Use permit for the demolition of single family residences.

Thank you,

Heitor Almeida

Name

126 18<sup>th</sup> ave sf CA 94121

Address

[Signature]

Signature