

From: 714515@gmail.com
Sent: Sunday, November 23, 2014 7:19 PM
To: Mark Farrell
Cc: Stefani, Catherine; Sanchez, Scott (CPC); Patrick.O'Riordan@sfgov.org; Fessler, Thomas (DBI); Lowrey, Daniel (DBI); Tam, Tina (CPC); Jones, Sarah (CPC); Caltagirone, Shelley (CPC); Lamug, Joy; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Carroll, John (BOS); paulmimai@yahoo.com; kbgoss@pacbell.net; michael@jaegermchugh.com; maitsai@yahoo.com; annabrockway@yahoo.com; dorinetowle@me.com; Vince Hoenigman; Kate Kardos; cjones@forwardmgmt.com; rwgoss@pacbell.net Goss; Povlitz; timothy.arcuri@cowen.com; amanda@hoenigman.com; wmore@aol.com; nancy leavens nancy; Will Morehead (; DXN2700@aol.com; Geoff Wood; Brooke Sampson; lbrooke@lmi.net (lbrooke@lmi.net); elarkin@hill-co.com; Cynthia2ndemail@gmail.com; Patriciavaughney@att.net Patricia; IDick@fbm.com
Subject: BOS HEARING NOV 25 --2853 BRODERICK CEQA ISSUES

Categories: 141083

**RECEIVED AFTER THE ELEVEN-DAY
DEADLINE, BY NOON, PURSUANT TO ADMIN.
CODE, SECTION 31.16(b)(5)**
(Note: Pursuant to California Government Code, Section
65009(b)(2), information received at, or prior to, the public
hearing will be included as part of the official file.)

Dear Supervisor Farrell:

Board of Supervisors Hearing November 25: 2853 Broderick
CEQA issues to be reviewed

There are six CEQA issues that Appellants request to be reviewed by the Board of Supervisors:

1. Height of the building: There is a legitimate dispute as to the height that the building was lifted. Appellant presented a survey by Ben Ron that showed that three consecutive surveys showed the building to be raised above 36" and to stand above 40" at its North elevation. The project sponsor disputes this with an opinion statement by its engineer that the building was raised 36" without releasing any data to substantiate the opinion. The current building height rises well above all the adjoining buildings and eliminates the staggered roof lines that followed the slope of the hill that characterizes this block of Broderick. a formal survey has not been conducted by any governmental agency to resolve the dispute.
2. Intrusion into the South side yard set back with an extension to provide a fireplace to one of the rooms. The alleys of the buildings on the West side of Broderick were built to provide wide passage for air, light and fully detached building structures. This was part of the city planning and building design for that block of Broderick between 1890 and 1915 during which time the adjoining structures were built.
3. The proposal to develop the roof and change the dormers is wrongly conceived because the entire roof line is clearly visible from the public walkways since the alleys between the buildings are eight feet wide.
4. The extension of the building into the back yard and the elimination of the back yard by an 8' x 10' gardening shed is contrary to the open spaces design of that square block of Broderick and the building design supported by the Cow Hollow Association guidelines.
5. The Dwelling Unit Merger request will alter the historic entry way of 2853 Broderick and it will turn the current entry portico to a separate unit into a staircase for up and down traffic from the proposed home to the garage.
Permit 201309066151 that was withdrawn temporarily by the project sponsor addressed the changes to the facade of the building due to the proposed Unit Merger.

6. The need to restore a second means of egress to the lower flat due to the installation of an elevator in the garage that eclipses the intended use of the garage for a second means of egress as provided for in permit No.201103252839.

Sincerely,

Irving Zaretsky
Appellant