

119 Dames

Filing Date:

Project Address:

Case No .:

Category:

Zoning:

ed at HPC Hearing

# **Historic Preservation Commission Draft Motion**

**HEARING DATE: JUNE 21, 2017** 

1650 Mission St. Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103-2479

Reception:

415.558.6378

415.558,6409

**Planning** Information: 415.558.6377

Category I: Joseph D. Grant Building

2009.1100H

C-3-G (Downtown-General)

90-X Height and Bulk District

Block/Lot: Applicant:

3703/059 Jim Abrams

J. Abrams Law, P.C.

September 22, 2010

1095 Market Street

One Maritime Plaza, Suite 1900

San Francisco, CA 94111

Staff Contact

Jonathan Vimr - (415) 575-9109

jonathan.vimr@sfgov.org

Reviewed By

Tim Frye - (415) 575-6822

tim.frye @sfgov.org

ADOPTING FINDINGS TO SATISFY A CONDITION OF APPROVAL FOR A PERMIT TO ALTER FOR PROPOSED WORK DETERMINED TO BE APPROPRIATE FOR AND CONSISTENT WITH THE PURPOSES OF ARTICLE 11, TO MEET THE STANDARDS OF ARTICLE 11 AND TO MEET THE SECRETARY OF INTERIOR'S STANDARDS FOR REHABILITATION, FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED ON LOT 059 IN ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 3703, WITHIN A C-3-G (DOWNTOWN-GENERAL) ZONING DISTRICT AND A 90-X HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICT.

## **PREAMBLE**

WHEREAS, on September 22, 2010, JIM ABRAMS (Project Sponsor) filed an application with the San Francisco Planning Department (hereinafter "Department") for a Permit to Alter for exterior rehabilitation, including reconstruction of the historic cornice based on pictorial evidence and the installation of canopies, signage, and awnings at the subject building located on lot 059 in Assesor's Block 3703, a Category I Building, historically known as the Joseph D. Grant Building.

WHEREAS, on October 6, 2010, the Historic Preservation Commission ("Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing on the current project, Case No. 2009.1100H for the Permit to Alter ("Project").

WHEREAS, the materials before the Commission are to demonstrate fulfillment of the conditions of approval for Project Case No. 2009.1100H, determined by the Department to be categorically exempt from environmental review and incorporated therein, Permit to Alter Motion No. 0080. The Commission has reviewed and concurs with said determination.

Motion No. XXXX Hearing Date: June 21, 2017

WHEREAS, in reviewing the Application, the Commission had available for its review and consideration case reports, plans, and other materials pertaining to the Project contained in the Department's case files, has reviewed and heard testimony and received materials from interested parties during the public hearing on the Project.

WHEREAS, the Commission granted the Permit to Alter, WITH CONDITIONS, and in conformance with the architectural submittal dated October 6, 2010 and labeled Exhibit A on file in the docket for Case No. 2009.1100H.

WHEREAS, Condition of Approval No. 2 stipulated that: "Department Preservation staff shall review site mock-ups of the FRP panels, including a mock-up of the finish samples. The results of the site mock-up and all finish samples shall be presented at a future hearing to the Historic Preservation Commission for review and approval."

WHEREAS, Department staff determined that GFRC as opposed to FRP was an appropriate substitute for the replacement cornice as GFRC features a similar appearance and remains within the range of substitute materials commonly used in order to replicate terra cotta.

WHEREAS, Department staff has completed site vists and internal review of the cornice mock-up and finish sample.

WHEREAS, the results of this site mock-up have been presented before the Historic Preservation Commission for their review and consideration.

MOVED, that the Commission hereby approves the cornice mock-up and finish sample, WITH CONDITIONS, in conformance with the report and material sample dated June 21, 2017 and labeled Exhibit A on file in the docket for 2009.1100H based on the following condition(s):

## CONDITIONS

- Edges and profiles of the large flowers that flank each side of the cornice leaf shall be softened and rounded.
- 2. The edges of the cornice leaf shall feature an increased projection in line with that seen in historic photographs. This cornice leaf element as well as the flowers that flank it shall also include a greater concave reveal.
- 3. The upper corners of the cornice's inset panels shall be rounded.
- 4. The reveals of the lamb's tongue shall be slightly deepened in order to create a more pronounced profile.
- 5. Prior to the property beginning operation as a hotel, project sponsor shall provide a maintenance plan to Department staff for review and approval. This plan shall outline measures to maintain

and protect the GFRC from deterioration, including the regular reapplication of the protective water sealer on the exterior of the cornice no greater every six (6) years.

6. Any additional conditions as stipulated by this Commission.

## **FINDINGS**

Having reviewed all the materials identified in the recitals above and having heard oral testimony and arguments, this Commission finds, concludes, and determines as follows:

- 1. The above recitals are accurate and also constitute findings of the Commission.
- 2. Findings pursuant to Article 11:
  - The Historic Preservation Commission has previously determined that the project overall
    is appropriate for and consistent with the purposes of Article 11, meets the standards fo
    Article 1111.6 of the Planning Code and complies with the Secretary of the Interior's
    Standards.
  - The proposed finish samples and cornice mock-up are consistent with the appearance and design of the historic cornice, satisfying Condition of Approval No. 2 in Motion No. 0080.
- 3. **General Plan Compliance.** The project was previously determined to be, on balance, consistent with the Objectives and Policies of the General Plan. The satisfaction of the original conditions of approval as outlined in Motion No. 0080 has no change on this consistency.
- 4. The project was previously determined to be generally consistent with the eight General Plan priority policies set forth in Section 101.1. The satisfaction of the original conditions of approval as outlined in Motion No. 0080 has no change on this consistency.
- 5. For these reasons, the proposal overall, remains appropriate for and consistent with the purposes of Article 11, meets the standards of Article 11, and the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, General Plan and Prop M findings of the Planning Code.

Motion No. XXXX Hearing Date: June 21, 2017

#### DECISION

That based upon the Record, the submissions by the Applicant, the staff of the Department and other interested parties, the oral testimony presented to this Commission at the public hearings, and all other written materials submitted by all parties, the Commission hereby **GRANTS approval for finish samples and the cornice mock-up** for the property located at Lot 59 in Assessor's Block 3703 for proposed work in conformance with the report and material samples dated June 21, 2017 and labeled Exhibit A on file in the docket for Case No. 2009.1100H.

APPEAL AND EFFECTIVE DATE OF MOTION: The Commission's decision shall be final unless appealed within thirty (30) days. Any appeal shall be made to the Board of Appeals, unless the proposed project requires Board of Supervisors approval or is appealed to the Board of Supervisors as a conditional use, in which case any appeal shall be made to the Board of Supervisors (see Charter Section 4.135).

THIS IS NOT A PERMIT TO COMMENCE ANY WORK OR CHANGE OF OCCUPANCY UNLESS NO BUILDING PERMIT IS REQUIRED. PERMITS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION (and any other appropriate agencies) MUST BE SECURED BEFORE WORK IS STARTED OR OCCUPANCY IS CHANGED.

I hereby certify that the Historical Preservation Commission ADOPTED the foregoing Motion on June 21, 2017.

Jonas P. Ionin Acting Commission Secretary

AYES:

X

NAYS:

X

ABSENT:

X

ADOPTED:

June 21, 2017