

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, March 7, 2018
12:30 p.m.
Regular Meeting

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

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT WOLFRAM AT 12:37 PM

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Shannon Ferguson, Natalia Kwiatkowska, Shelley Caltagirone, Tim Frye –
Preservation Officer, 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

None

2. Review of Past Events at the Planning Commission, Staff Report and Announcements

Tim Frye, Preservation Officer:

I have a number of announcements to share with you this afternoon. One is in regards to your pending designation – individual designations for Washington High School, Roosevelt Middle School and Sunshine School. Last night, we attended the Board of Education meeting and presented on the proposed designations. Our designation included information reminding the Board that local landmark designation has no regulatory or financial effect on the schools because the schools are located on State property and we reassured the Board that the Department and the City, as a whole, respects the Board and the Community's process in determining the appropriate treatment for the murals at George Washington High School that are under scrutiny at the moment. We also restated that landmark designation at the local levels are intended to be a positive experience to acknowledge the architectural character of the three schools and they were all in history. We then provided some information on the next steps once the documents are forwarded to the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors. SF Heritage, Donna Graves and Robert Churney, were also in attendance and provided some public comments, but several board members still expressed concern over the landmark designations. They believe it convolutes the Board's process and to move forward with projects would complicate not only what is formally decided for the murals at Washington High School but are also concerned that just the labels of landmark designation may be used by the community to object to future alterations to these properties. With that, they also acknowledged that they believe they are very good stewards of the properties, and they don't see any reason for local landmark designation if it truly isn't only an honorific distinction. They were concerned also about the landmark designation reports not reflecting the District's perspective on those school's history and they seemed a bit concerned that the City could designate their properties without their permission or significant involvement of the School Board, but I would like to remind you that we've been attending meetings with their Buildings and Grounds Committee since 2015 on these three pending designations. So in conclusion, while it wasn't an action item it was only an informational item, they did unanimously come to a conclusion that they are not supportive of landmark designation at this time. However, we do have your decision – your unanimous decision to move forward with local designation, pending at the Board of Supervisors. This is primarily an update, but I will keep you updated once we start briefing with the individual Supervisors on the next steps.

Also, this past Monday, the Diamond Heights Safety Wall was heard at the Land Use Committee at the Board of Supervisors. Only Supervisors Tang and Safai were present, but the applicant, Bob Pullman, from the Diamond Heights Community Association, was there in support of the designation. One member of the public, who is a member of the Libertarian Party, testified against the designation but that was the only negative public comment that was received. The Supervisors however, did have questions about the ownership, which as you know has been sort of an ongoing issue because it was a

Redevelopment Agency property. We were able to locate some documents from the former Redevelopment Agency from the late 1960's that does indicate a conveyance to the city for its maintenance and ownership in the future, and so, once we confirmed that with the Department of Real Estate, we provided that information to the Committee Members after the hearing and now we're working with DPW just to iron out a few more details including whether or not the Arts Commission will formally accept the Safety Wall as part of the City's art collection. The full Board hearing is scheduled for Tuesday and I'll certainly keep you updated on the results from that hearing.

56 Mason, which as you know, is a Category 4 building in the KMMS Conservation District was heard at the Planning Commission on March 1st. As you recall, it was to replace some street facing windows of a residential hotel. Members of the TNDC and the Glide Foundation and other members of the community voiced concerns over the potential loss of residential units at this property, so the Commission took DR and approved the project, basically upholding the Historic Preservation Commission's decision on your scope of work, but added that conditions that the original tenants be offered a tenancy at the previous rental rate, that those tenants be served with a first right of refusal, and asking that the Department report back to the Commission upon occupancy that are subject to rent control. I will point out that the Department is going to provide the Planning Commission with an overview of SROs in San Francisco. There will be a memo provided and we will provide that memo to this Commission, as well, for your information.

The one troubling item that occurred after the hearing that has been brought to our attention, apparently, in the Sunday New York Times, there was an article titled "Dorm Living for Professionals Comes to San Francisco", and it does cite that this property is being converted to market-rate group housing, which apparently is legal under the Code. This is likely going to continue to be an issue, but we'll certainly keep you updated on the results of the project. Then, finally, the Department was present at History Days at The San Francisco Mint last weekend. As always, there was a huge turnout, and a lot of interest and support for the Planning Department being there in support and representation of the Historic Preservation Commission, so we're always happy to participate, but wanted to let you know it was a great turnout. That concludes my comments unless you have any questions.

Commissioner Matsuda:

Thank you. It was a busy week. What do you do in situations regarding the situation of George Washington High School and what should the Commission do?

Tim Frye, Preservation Officer:

That's a great question. I think the first thing we will do is brief the Supervisors on the outcome of the meeting and I understand that the Board of Education staff will do the same. If the Board of Supervisors or Members of the Board choose not to sponsor the designations, the Department would become the Sponsor and then, at that time, we will work with you and decide on maybe what's the best course of action. These are fairly unique landmark designations, in that our ordinances usually outline a regulatory framework for permit and design review. As these are honorific because they're State property, perhaps we can work with the City Attorney on something that would make the Board of Education feel a bit more comfortable, but we can report back to you once we have more information and maybe some tempers subside after last night's hearing.

Commissioner Johnck:

I had a similar concern about the Board of Education's decision, and I guess what was surprising, particularly in light of your comment that you've been meeting with the Building and Grounds Committee since 2015, so it seems there was a disconnect in the process of communicating up or was the Building and Grounds Committee there? Somehow it seemed like something was lost in the last couple years, which is unfortunate.

Tim Frye, Preservation Officer:

The only major change was the original facility's manager, Dave Golden, retired during this time and so new leadership was in place. However, we were still having very productive meetings regarding the designation and as you know, there are about five public school properties that are currently designated under Article 10.

President Wolfram:

Thank you. I'm just curious about the School Board's perspective, the comment about the report not including the school board's perspective. What's exactly missing?

Tim Frye, Preservation Officer:

We're not clear about what exactly they meant by that. Some of them had felt that they didn't have enough time to read the full reports – there were three lengthy reports that are received a week in advance but we will certainly follow up with them on that and that will be one of the issues we hopefully touch on when we meet with them again.

Commissioner Pearlman:

I wanted to ask a question. So if it's only an honorary type of essentially a title, when they would go to do work, would it go through the same processes of -- ?

Tim Frye, Preservation Officer:

The State is its own permitting agency.

Commissioner Pearlman:

Right.

Tim Frye, Preservation Officer:

It did seem from the conversation that there is concern that, again, that there is sort of a public perception that as a local landmark that the state should be held to a higher standard and that was something that they weren't comfortable with because it may make it difficult for them to make changes to these buildings in the future. We offered, you know, technical support and this Commission's ARC is support to help address some of these concerns if they were to arise and we cited previous experience with the IM Scott School, Mission High School, Balboa High School, etc. and it did not seem to go anywhere.

C. COMMISSION MATTERS

3. President's Report and Announcements

President Wolfram:

I would like to announce today that I would like to re-appoint Bob Cherny to the Preservation Fund Committee, we have to make that appoint every year. If there's no

objection I would like—I don't think I need a motion, I could just make that appoint as President. I will notify the Fund Committee and Mr. Cherny, as well.

4. Consideration of Adoption:

- [Draft Minutes for ARC January 17, 2018](#)

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Adopted
 AYES: Wolfram, Johnck, Johns, Matsuda, Pearlman
 ABSENT: Hyland

- [Draft Minutes for HPC February 21, 2018](#)

SPEAKERS: None
 ACTION: Adopted as Corrected
 AYES: Wolfram, Johnck, Johns, Matsuda, Pearlman
 ABSENT: Hyland

5. Commission Comments & Questions

None

D. REGULAR CALENDAR

6. [2017-013035DES](#) (S. FERGUSON: (415) 575-9074)
246 1ST STREET (PHILLIPS BUILDING) – west side of First Street, Assessor's Block 3736, Lot 006 (District 6). Consideration to Recommend to the Board of Supervisors **Landmark Designation** of the Phillips Building as an Article 10 Landmark pursuant to Section 1004.1 of the Planning Code. 234-246 First Street is architecturally significant as a distinctive example of the Art Deco style, specifically the Mayan Deco substyle, and is the largest Art Deco style loft building in San Francisco; and is significant for its association with master architects Henry H. Meyers and George R. Klinkhardt. 234-246 First Street is located within the C-3-O(SD) – Downtown Office (Special Development) Zoning District and 200-S Height and Bulk District.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve

SPEAKERS: = Shannon Ferguson – Staff presentation
 = Tim Frye – Response to questions
 ACTION: Approved
 AYES: Wolfram, Johnck, Johns, Matsuda, Pearlman
 ABSENT: Hyland
 RESOLUTION: [940](#)

- 7a. [2016-012813COA](#) (N. KWIATKOWSKA: (415) 575-9185)
31-33 LIBERTY STREET – located on the south side of Liberty Street, Assessor's Block 3608, Lot 100-101 (District 8). Request for a **Certificate of Appropriateness** and Variance for the replacement of the existing unpermitted two-level deck at rear, replacement of the existing foundation, infill of the existing light well at ground level, replacement of the existing windows and doors at ground level of the west façade, and an interior remodel to

the existing three-story, two-unit building. The subject property is located within the Article 10 Liberty-Hill Landmark District, and is located within a RH-3 (Residential-House, Three Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk Limit.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve

SPEAKERS: = Natalia Kwiatkowska – Staff report
 + Brent Hatcher – Project presentation
 ACTION: Approved
 AYES: Wolfram, Johnck, Johns, Matsuda, Pearlman
 ABSENT: Hyland
 MOTION: [0332](#)

- 7b. [2016-012813VAR](#) (N. KWIATKOWSKA: (415) 575-9185)
 31-33 LIBERTY STREET – located on the south side of Liberty Street, Assessor’s Block 3608, Lot 100-101 (District 8). Request for **Variance** from rear yard requirements pursuant to Section 134 of the Planning Code for the addition of a two-level deck located within the required rear yard. The subject property is located within the Article 10 Liberty-Hill Landmark District, and is located within a RH-3 (Residential-House, Three Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk Limit.

SPEAKERS: Same as Item 7a.
 ACTION: Acting ZA indicated an intent to Grant

8. [2018-002342LBR](#) (S. CALTAGIRONE: (415) 558-6625)
 1750 GEARY BLVD – north side of Geary Blvd between Fillmore and Webster streets in the Japantown neighborhood. Assessor’s Block 0701, Lot 001 (District 5). Consideration of adoption of a resolution recommending Small Business Commission approval of a **Legacy Business** application. Kabuki Springs and Spa is a Japanese bathhouse and spa that has served San Francisco for 50 years. The Legacy Business Registry recognizes longstanding, community-serving businesses that are valuable cultural assets to the City. In addition, the City intends that the Registry be a tool for providing educational and promotional assistance to Legacy Businesses to encourage their continued viability and success. The subject business is within the Japantown NCD (Neighborhood Commercial) Zoning District and 65-A Height and Bulk District.

Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt a Recommendation for Approval

SPEAKER: Shelley Caltagirone – Staff report
 ACTION: Adopted a Recommendation for Approval
 AYES: Wolfram, Johnck, Johns, Matsuda, Pearlman
 ABSENT: Hyland
 RESOLUTION: [941](#)

ADJOURNMENT - 1:13 PM
 ADOPTED MARCH 21, 2018