

SAN FRANCISCO HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION



Meeting Minutes

Commission Chambers, Room 400
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Wednesday, September 16, 2015
12:30 p.m.
Regular Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Wolfram, Hyland, Hasz, Johnck, Johns, Matsuda, Pearlman,

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT WOLFRAM AT 12: 35PM

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Rich Sucre, Christopher Thomas, Gretchen Hilyard, Susan Parks, Tim Frye -
Preservation Coordinator, Jonas P. Ionin – Commission Secretary

SPEAKER KEY:

- + indicates a speaker in support of an item;
- indicates a speaker in opposition to an item; and
- = indicates a neutral speaker or a speaker who did not indicate support or opposition.

A. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

At this time, members of the public may address the Commission on items of interest to the public that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission except agenda items. With respect to agenda items, your opportunity to address the Commission will be afforded when the item is reached in the meeting. Each member of the public may address the Commission for up to three minutes.

None

B. DEPARTMENT MATTERS**1. [Director's Announcements](#)****Tim Frye, Preservation Coordinator:**

Good afternoon Commissioners. The Director's report was included in the packets, happy to answer any questions should you have them.

2. Review of Past Events at the Planning Commission, Staff Report and Announcements**Tim Frye, Preservation Coordinator:**

Just a couple of quick announcements, I did not have a formal report from the Planning Commission at this time. I did want to mention two items however; one is the department's annual Preservation Staff retreat is scheduled for the end of October. Occasionally a couple of commissioners will participate either during part of that retreat or the full retreat. We'll certainly forward you the information about the retreat, which will occur on October 27th, once we have more information. Again you're welcome to participate with us if you would like to do so. Second, just a quick announcement that department staff along with Commissioners Hyland and Wolfram visited the Cowell House this morning; which is on the Landmark Designation Work Program and it's already gone through one, the first initiation hearing. We met with the property owner who is very supportive of the designation; took some additional photos, answered some questions about what landmark status means for a single-family residential property. That item will be before you I believe on our October 7th hearing, so that is the next hearing. We will be using some the photographs and information we received today to update the report so there will be a new designation report at that hearing. That concludes my comments unless you have any questions.

C. COMMISSION MATTERS**3. President's Report and Announcements****President Wolfram:**

I just want to report that on September 9th Commissioner Matsuda and myself and Mr. Rahaim and members of the Department staff met with Dawn Kamalanathan from Rec and Park and Bob Hamaguchi from the Japantown Task Force and Richard Hashimoto from the Chinatown Merchant Association to discuss the landmarking of the Peace Pagoda at Japantown. There had been some concerns raised regarding whether landmarking would have an impact on needed maintenance or the rehabilitation of the plaza and the Peace Pagoda. Jonathan Lammers was also there from Planning; he took very good notes which will be distributed as a memo but the summary of the meeting is that Rec and Park is very supportive of landmarking the Peace Pagoda. They believe that could give an opportunity for raising awareness of that site and they had a number of suggestions about possible funding sources for rehabilitation of the plaza. I would say it was a very positive meeting.

4. Consideration of Adoption:

- Draft Minutes for HPC – [August 19, 2015](#)

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Adopted
AYES: Hasz, Hyland, Johnck, Johns, Pearlman, Matsuda, Wolfram

Adoption of Commission Minutes – Charter Section 4.104 requires all commissioners to vote yes or no on all matters unless that commissioner is excused by a vote of the Commission. Commissioners may not be automatically excluded from a vote on the minutes because they did not attend the meeting.

5. Commission Comments & Questions

- Disclosures.
- Inquiries/Announcements. Without discussion, at this time Commissioners may make announcements or inquiries of staff regarding various matters of interest to the Commissioner(s).
- Future Meetings/Agendas. At this time, the Commission may discuss and take action to set the date of a Special Meeting and/or determine those items that could be placed on the agenda of the next meeting and other future meetings of the Historic Preservation Commission.

President Wolfram:

Comments, questions and disclosures? I'll go, I have a few disclosures to make. I've had some phone conversations and e-mails with Mr. Haas regarding Civic Center Cultural Landscape Assessment and I've also been in communications with Stacy Carter and other members of the public regarding the Hunters Point Shipyard.

Commissioner Johns:

I also have had some communications with Mr. Haas.

Commissioner Johnck:

Yeah. Basically e-mail with Mr. Haas and also with the item on our agenda related to 16th Street with Rob Minett of the proposed comments for the environmental impact statement that will have on the draft.

6. HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND COMMITTEE REPORT

Robert Cherny, HPC Representative:

I provided a written report that I think you've all received but apparently nobody has a copy of. So if you'd like I can give you a very brief summary, if not, I could just take your questions.

President Wolfram:

Yeah. Why don't you go ahead and give us a summary. That'll be great Mr. Cherny.

Robert Cherny:

Commissioner Wolfram asked me to give you a summary of what's been going on every six months or so, which I am happy to do. During the last six months, the Preservation Fund Committee has approved funding for two new projects. We've conducted oversight for 6 projects that were funded earlier. We reviewed one completed project and we received another completed project but have not yet had a chance to look it over. Given the structure of our committee much of the oversight of ongoing projects is conducted by our subcommittee. The subcommittee consists of 3 regular members of fund committee plus

Courtney Damkroger, who is a former member of your body. In addition, we've developed a list of projects that we hope to see funded before the fund itself is exhausted. We've spent several meetings discussing that and I provided you with a list of our priorities. Now I can, if you'd like, provide you with a little more substance about which projects has been approved and the projects that we would like to see funded before the fund is exhausted.

President Wolfram:

Yeah if you could go ahead.

Robert Cherny:

Sure. During the past 6 months we've funded a request to assist with the preparation of a documentary film on the history of San Francisco City Hall. The grant was made to the City Hall Sentinel Committee but we've requested that all research materials, including all documents and interviews, be given to the San Francisco History Center at the public library so they'll be available to future researchers and we also recommended a teacher's guide be a high priority. We approved a revision and extension of an original grant that was given some time ago to create a historic context statement for Corbett Heights. We reviewed a proposal from the San Francisco Art Institute that included several separate assessment projects. After we commented on the original proposal, a revised proposal came to us in February. We approved one part of it and on a divided vote recommended against the remainder but the remainder was fund by the Mayor's office. During the past 6 months, we've conducted oversight on a Eureka Valley Historic context statement, the Corbett Heights Historic context statement, a landmark nomination for Sacred Heart Church and other structures in that immediate area that are connected to Sacred Heart Church; oversight for a resident's park historic context statement, a San Francisco Latino historic context statement, and the San Francisco LGBTQ historic context statement. A historic context statement for African-American sites in the city was submitted in January; it's now being reviewed in the Planning Department and will come to you, I understand, by the end of the year. We have recently received an assessment of the work that's needed for the Mother's Building at the zoo, which is a city landmark and we received a report only a few weeks ago so we haven't had a chance to review that assessment. We adopted the following priorities for future funding dependent upon whether or not we receive appropriate proposals for them. A Great Depression New Deal Era historic context statement that would focus on architecture and art that was produced in the city between 1929 and 1941 through government funding; city, state, and federal funding. Second, a landmark nomination for Theodore Roosevelt Middle School; third, preservation of the photographs of the city from the early 20th century; fourth, a landmark nomination for George Washington High School; fifth, completion of a historic resource survey for the Ocean Avenue Commercial District ; and sixth, the landmark nomination for the historic structures and landscaping at the San Francisco Zoo. Our list goes beyond those first six but we decided to focus on finding appropriate proposals for those first six items and then we would see how much money might be left to go on down the list and maybe I should let you know that of the original \$2.5 million we started with there's about \$330,000 left and when the fund is exhausted the committee will cease to exist I expect.

Commissioner Hasz:

I'm not sure if everybody knows Mr. Cherny because he's on Landmark Preservation Board and he's a professor of San Francisco history. I also call him the hammer of history because if you get your facts wrong he would hammer you. Thank you, Mr. Cherny, for serving on the committee.

Commissioner Pearlman:

Is there no way to replenish this fund or other ways to get funds?

Robert Cherny:

We've asked that question, I mean it would take actions by the Board of Supervisors in some way. I mean there are various things that might be thought of you know, maybe some very small tax on development that could be used to fund Historic Preservation but that is going to take some political will that our committee doesn't really have the ability to exercise. Someone else is going to have to take the lead on that.

Commissioner Johnck:

Yeah. It was a very good list of your six priorities but as you said just to have some clarity; this is depending on your receiving proposals for some of these. I was particularly interested in the New Deal Art and Architecture because I've seen a lot of work of Gray Brechin and his project over at UC...on the city he might be somebody who might want...

Robert Cherny:

I tried to recruit Gray to do that but he said he was too busy. San Francisco Heritage, to my understanding, is preparing a proposal for that.

Tim Frye:

Commissioners just wanted to fill you in briefly on one component of that New Deal Era context statement is the Washington High School landmark designation that Mr. Cherny mentioned is actually funded through an ad-back from Supervisor Mar's office of \$10,000, given that this context statement is proposed at the fund committee. We thought that it would make sense to give that money to the fund committee rather than use staff resources to prepare the designation. That way the fund committee can hire the consultant because they will be researching that era anyway through the context statement. So we have a meeting with Supervisor Mar's office in the next couple of weeks to talk about preparing that project and getting the fund committee on board to start working on that designation for your review.

Robert Cherny:

I might add to that a couple of other items on our list of priorities would fit within the overall Great Depression New Deal historic context statement. Theodore Roosevelt High School was not federally funded but it was funded by a local bond issue and the murals inside Theodore Roosevelt Middle School are WPA murals so it's a combination of state and federal funding that went into that building; mostly city and federal funding but mostly city funding and that architect of that is Timothy Pflueger. George Washington High School was funded in some significant part from the Public Works Administration. It has, I would say, the largest single collection of New Deal Art in the city with a number of murals by four different artists and a sculptured freeze on the athletic field; all of that funded by the WPA and there was also city bond issues involved at George Washington High School and again Timothy was the architect on the George Washington high school. Finally, many of the historic building at the zoo were funded by the WPA, the older buildings and landscaping, from the 1930s were all fund by WPA. So there's an overlap from the historic context statement to some of the specific landmark nominations that we hope to receive and we hope to realize some efficiencies from that kind of overlap.

President Wolfram:

Thank you very much and thank you for your service on the fund committee.

D. CONSENT CALENDAR

All matters listed hereunder constitute a Consent Calendar, are considered to be routine by the Historic Preservation Commission, and will be acted upon by a single roll call vote of the Commission. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a member of the Commission, the public, or staff so requests, in which event the matter shall be removed from the Consent Calendar and considered as a separate item at this or a future hearing.

7. [2014-002939COA](#) (R. SUCRE: (415) 575-9108)
900 22ND STREET - northwest corner of 22nd and Minnesota Streets, Assessor's 4106, Lot 014. Request for a **Certificate of Appropriateness** for ground floor storefront alterations and new signage. The subject property is a contributing resource to the Dogpatch Landmark District, and is located within a RH-3 (Residential, House, Three-Family) Zoning District and 45-X Height and Bulk Limit.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: After being pulled off of Consent; approved with conditions, including: Sponsor to work with staff on replacing the current lighting and door hardware with more contextual fixtures.

AYES: Hasz, Hyland, Johnck, Johns, Pearlman, Matsuda, Wolfram

MOTION: 0262

E. REGULAR CALENDAR

8. [2011.1330E](#) (C. THOMAS: (415) 575-9036)
901 16TH/1200 17TH STREET -3.5-acre site west side of Mississippi Street between 16th Street and 17th Street in northern Potrero Hill; Lots 001,001A and 002 in Assessor's Block 3949 and Lot 001 in Assessor's Block 3950 – **Public Hearing on the Draft Environmental Impact Report**. The project site currently contains two metal shed industrial warehouse buildings, a brick office building determined to be an eligible historic resource, a modular office structure, and surface parking lots. The proposed project would merge the four lots into two lots, demolish the two warehouses and the modular office structure, and preserve the brick office building. The project sponsor proposes to construct two new buildings on-site. The "16th Street Building" at 901 16th Street would consist of a new six-story, 68-foot tall (excluding rooftop projections of up to 82 feet), approximately 402,943 gross square foot (gsf) residential mixed-use building with 260 dwelling units and 20,318 gsf of retail on the northern lot. The "17th Street Building" at 1200 17th Street would consist of a new four-story 48-foot tall (excluding rooftop projections of up to 52 feet), approximately 213,509 gsf residential mixed-use building with 135 dwelling units and 4,650 gsf of retail on the southern lot. In addition, the proposed project would construct a new publicly accessible pedestrian alley along the entirety of its western property line. Combined, the two new buildings would contain a total of 395 dwelling units and 24,968 gsf of retail space, in addition to a total of 388 vehicular parking spaces and 455 off-street bicycle parking spaces. The proposed project would include 14,669 square feet of public open space, 33,149 square feet of common open space shared by project occupants, and 3,114

square feet of open space private to units. The project site is within the UMU (Urban Mixed Use) Use District and 48-X (southern portion) and 68-X (northern portion) Height and Bulk Districts. The proposed project would require a Large Project Authorization with various exceptions, a Conditional Use Approval for retail use size exceeding 3,999 square feet, and a General Plan Referral for sidewalk changes.

Note: Written comments will be accepted at the Planning Department until 5:00 p.m. on September 28, 2015.

Preliminary Recommendation: Review and Comment

SPEAKERS: Rob Minett – Inadequacies of the DEIR related to the historic integrity
Peter Lilenthal – Potrero Hill History
Allison Heath – Showplace Square/Potrero Hill area development.
Adaptive re-use

Yoram Mayrose – Retain metal shed buildings

Janny – Production: industrial vibe of Potrero Hill. Adaptive re-use is merited

Yvonne Gavray – Preservation of historic buildings

Phillip Anisovich – Look at current state of things and into the future

Sean Ingalls – support for adaptive re-use

Lynch Mores – Preserve what is left

Ronald Lee – Changes to your home

Audra – Changes to Portrero Hill

Ron Miguel – Feedback from HPC to CPC

ACTION: Reviewed and Commented:

1. Potential impacts to the historic resources on the site may be mitigated by further design modifications specific to the scale and massing. Siting Secretary of Interior Standard No. 9.

2. Developer to consider the preferred alternative be restructured to incorporate the Shed Alternative; and

3. Requests that the ARC have an opportunity to review and comment on the final design.

AYES: Hasz, Hyland, Johnck, Johns, Pearlman, Matsuda, Wolfram

LETTER: 0047

(T. FRYE: (425) 575-6822)

9. **HP SHIPYARD ALTERNATIVES, PHASE 2 – Informational Presentation** on the status of the proposed new development at Hunters Point Shipyard, specifically regarding preservation related elements. The Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 development received its master approval and entitlements in conjunction with the Candlestick Point development from the Board of Supervisors in 2011. The Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 component of the project includes almost all of the former Hunters Point Shipyard except for the portion being developed as Phase I and includes the following Assessor's Blocks and Lots: Assessor's Block 4591A, Lot 079; Block 4591C, Lots 010, 209, 210; and Lot 211. The master approvals included, but were not limited, Certification of the EIR, adoption of CEQA finding, amendments to the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Plan and adoption of a Design for Development document ("D4D"), which laid out requirements and guidelines for development, including several possible preservation scenarios. In total, Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 would include up to 4,275 dwelling units, three million gsf of office/commercial use, 125,000 gsf of retail, 255,000 gsf of artist space, 200 acres of open space, among other uses. This information presentation is to discuss updates of the preservation elements of the proposal including, but not limited to, plans for the Hunters

Point Commercial Drydock Historic District, and potential preservation of Buildings 231, 253, and 211.

Preliminary Recommendation: None – Informational

SPEAKERS: (F) Speaker – Presentation
+Stacey Carter – Potential HP resources Arts & Historic District
Ronald Lee – Living in HP
Mike Bulher – Renewed and meaningful review of resources
Dan Potte – HPC to show leadership
ACTION: None – Informational
COMMENT: Commissioners expressed its great interest in the plans for the Historic District at Hunters Point and would like progress reports from Lenore regarding security (in term of the longevity of the building being stabilized so it doesn't deteriorate), interim reuse opportunities, and potential preservation of buildings 231, 253, and 211.

10. [2014.1383U](#) (G. HILYARD: (415) 575-9109)
CIVIC CENTER CULTURAL LANDSCAPE INVENTORY – Consideration to adopt, modify or disapprove the findings of the **Cultural Landscape Inventory**. The Department-sponsored survey focused on the landscape characteristics and setting of the existing Civic Center Landmark District. The Department identified character-defining landscape features of the Civic Center Landmark District and identified a period of significance from 1896-1951. The purpose of the survey is to inform planning decisions within Civic Center and to encourage sensitive design treatment and maintenance of the district's cultural landscape. The general boundaries of the survey area are: Golden Gate Avenue to the north, UN Plaza to the east, Market Street to the south, and Franklin Street to the west.
Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt
(Continued from Regular Meeting of August 5, 2015)

SPEAKERS: -Jim Haas – Inaccuracies identified in the report
ACTION: Adopted with any necessary corrections to be reviewed and performed administratively by staff.
AYES: Hasz, Hyland, Johnck, Pearlman, Matsuda, Wolfram
ABSENT: Johns
MOTION: 0263

11. (S.PARKS: (415) 575-9101)/J. LAMMERS (415) 575-9093)
UPDATE ON PRESERVATION WEBSITE - **Informational presentation** regarding updates to the Historic Preservation portion of the Planning Department's website. The proposed updates will reorganize the content of the website; reflect departmental changes; provide the public with improved digital access to information and planning processes; and create opportunities that encourage community members to become involved in historic preservation within their neighborhoods and across San Francisco.
Preliminary Recommendation: None - Informational
(Continued from Regular Meeting of August 19, 2015)

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: None - Informational

ADJOURNMENT – 3:39 PM