Executive Summary
Conditional Use

Hearing Date: March 21, 2019

Case No.: 2019-000189CUA
Project Address: 1860 9th Avenue
Zoning: RH-2 (Residential-House, Two-Family) 40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 2045/030
Project Sponsor: Yuflex Engineering Ronald Yu
5418A Geary Blvd San Francisco, CA 94121
Staff Contact: Jeff Horn – (415) 575-6925 jeffrey.horn@sfgov.org
Recommendation: Approval with Conditions

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The proposal is for the tantamount to demolition of an 2,222 square foot, two-story two-family dwelling and to construct a horizontal and vertical addition to create four-story three-family dwelling. The existing structure consists of a 1,072 square foot two-bedroom unit on the first floor and a 1,150 square foot two-bedroom unit on the second floor. The Project would result in a three-unit, 6,986 gross square foot, four-story building. The structure will provide two 1,807 square foot three-bedroom units, a 1,080 square foot two-bedroom unit, and a two-vehicle garage, five Class 1 bicycle parking spaces, a mechanical room, storage rooms and a common ½ bathroom at the ground floor.

REQUIRED COMMISSION ACTION
The project proposes to remove vertical and horizontal elements in exceedance of the threshold established in Planning Code Section 317. In order for the Project to proceed, the Commission must grant Conditional Use Authorization pursuant to Planning Code Section 303 and 317 for the demolition of a residential unit. Pursuant to Planning Code 317 (c), “where an application for a permit that would result in the loss of one or more Residential Units Is required to obtain Conditional Use Authorization by other sections of this Code, The application for a replacement building or alteration permit shall also be subject to Conditional Use requirements.”

ISSUES AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
- Residential Dwelling Units. The Project will add one new two-bedroom dwelling unit to the City’s housing stock and will enlarge two two-bedroom units into three bedroom units. The project is zoned RH-2. Per Planning Code Section 209.1, up to two units per lot are principally permitted in RH-2 Districts and up to one unit per 1,500 Sq. Ft. of lot area is allowed with
Conditional Use Authorization. By providing three units, the proposed project meets the required Section 317 finding “Whether or not the replacement project would maximize density on the subject lot.”

- **Preservation Review:** The Property is not an “Historical Resource” under CEQA. The Departments Categorical Exemption Determination and PTR determined “No Historic Resource Present.” (See Case No. 2016-011553ENV)

**ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

The Project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) as a Class 1 categorical exemption.

**BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION**

The Department finds that the Project is, on balance, consistent with the Objectives and Policies of the General Plan. The Project will create an additional residential unit and will enlarge two existing units to create three family-size units in total. The Department also finds the project to be necessary, desirable, and compatible with the surrounding neighborhood, and not to be detrimental to persons or adjacent properties in the vicinity.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Draft Motion – Conditional Use Authorization with Conditions of Approval
Exhibit B – Plans and Renderings
Exhibit C – Environmental Determination
Exhibit D – Maps and Context Photos
ADOPTING FINDINGS RELATING TO A CONDITIONAL USE AUTHORIZATION PURSUANT TO PLANNING CODE SECTIONS 209.1, 303 AND 317 FOR THE TANTAMOUNT TO DEMOLITION OF AN 2,222 SQUARE FOOT, TWO-STORY TWO-FAMILY HOME AND TO CONSTRUCT A HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL ADDITION TO CREATE A THREE-UNIT, 6,986 GROSS SQUARE FOOT, FOUR STORY BUILDING WITHIN IN RH-2 (RESIDENTIAL-HOUSE, TWO-FAMILY) DISTRICT AND A 40-X HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICT, AND ADOPTING FINDINGS UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT.

PREAMBLE

On January 4, 2019, Ronald Yu of (Project Sponsor) Yuflex Engineering filed an application with the Planning Department (hereinafter “Department”) for Conditional Use Authorization under Planning Code Sections 209.1, 303 and 317 for the tantamount to demolition of an 2,222 square foot, two-story two-family home and to construct a horizontal and vertical addition to create a three-unit, 6,986 gross square foot, four story building (hereinafter “Project”) at 1860-1862 9th Avenue, Lot 030 of Block 2045 (hereinafter “Project Site”).

On March 21, 2019, the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter “Commission”) conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting on Conditional Use Application No. 2019-000189CUA.
The project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) as a Class 1 categorical exemption under CEQA.

The Commission has heard and considered the testimony presented to it at the public hearing and has further considered written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of the applicant, Department staff, and other interested parties.

MOVED, that the Commission hereby authorizes the Conditional Use requested in Application No. 2019-000189CUA, subject to the conditions contained in “EXHIBIT A” of this motion, based on the following findings:

FINDINGS

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

1. The above recitals are accurate and constitute findings of this Commission.

2. Site Description and Present Use. The project site is on the east side of 9th Avenue, between Noriega and Ortega Streets; Lot 030 in Assessor’s Block 2045 and is located within the RH-2 (Residential House, Two-Family) Zoning District with a 40-X Height and Bulk designation. The lot is a half lot wider than the typical lot in the City, measuring 37.5 feet wide, and has a depth of 120 feet, providing a total lot area of 4,500 square feet. The site is slopes downward towards the rear and is currently developed with a 2,222 gross square foot, two-story two-family dwelling that was constructed circa 1900.

3. Surrounding Properties and Neighborhood. The subject property is located on the east side of Inner Sunset neighborhood within Supervisorial District 7. Lots within the immediate vicinity consist of residential two- to three-story, single- and multi-family dwellings. The subject block face exhibits a great variety of architectural styles, scale and massing. 9th Avenue slopes downward laterally to the north.

4. Project Description. The proposal is for the tantamount to demolition of an 2,222 square foot, two-story two-family dwelling and to construct a horizontal and vertical addition to create four-story three-family dwelling. The existing structure consists of a 1,072 square foot two-bedroom unit on the first floor and a 1,150 square foot two-bedroom unit on the second floor. The Project would result in a three-unit, 6,986 gross square foot, four story building. At the front wall, the building is three-stories tall with a height of 30 feet, and the fourth floor is setback 15 feet and has a height of 39-feet, 8-inches. The structure will provide two 1,807 square foot three-bedroom units, a 1,080 square foot two-bedroom unit, and a two-vehicle garage, five Class 1 bicycle parking spaces, a mechanical room, storage rooms and a common ½ bathroom at the ground floor.
5. **Public Comment/Community Outreach.** To date, the Department has received no comment letters. The Sponsor will attend a meeting to present the proposed project to the Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People (SHARP) neighborhood group.

6. **Planning Code Compliance:** The Commission finds that the Project is consistent with the relevant provisions of the Planning Code in the following manner:

   A. **Height.** Planning Code Section 260 requires that all structures be no taller than the height prescribed in the subject height and bulk district. The proposed Project is located in a 40-X Height and Bulk District, with a 40-foot height limit. Planning Code Section 261 further restricts height in RH-2 Districts to 30-feet at the front lot line, then at such setback, height shall increase at an angle of 45° toward the rear lot line until the prescribed 40-foot height limit is reached.

   The project proposes a building that has a maximum height of 30 feet at the front building wall, the fourth floor is setback 15 and reaches a height of 39 feet, 8 inches.

   B. **Front Setback Requirement.** Planning Code Section 132 requires, in RH-2 Districts, a front setback that complies to legislated setbacks (if any) or a front back based on the average of adjacent properties (15 foot maximum).

   The subject property does not have a legislated setback. The project is located behind the required front setback line on 3 feet, 9 inches.

   C. **Rear Yard Requirement.** Planning Code Section 134 requires, in RH-2 Districts, a rear yard measuring 45 percent of the total depth.

   The project proposes a 54 foot, 0 inch rear yard setback which is equal to the required 45% of lot depth, the project also includes a two-story, 12-foot-deep obstruction permitted under Planning Code Section 136.

   D. **Residential Design Guidelines.** Per Planning Code Section 311, the construction of new residential buildings and alteration of existing residential buildings in R Districts shall be consistent with the design policies and guidelines of the General Plan and with the "Residential Design Guidelines."

   The Residential Design Team determined that the project complies with the Residential Design Guidelines and would not create exceptional or extraordinary circumstances. The fourth floor is setback 15 feet, so that the building presents as three-stories at the street.

   E. **Front Setback Landscaping and Permeability Requirements.** Planning Code Section 132 requires that the required front setback be at least 20% unpaved and devoted to plant material and at least 50% permeable to increase storm water infiltration.
The project will provide landscaping and permeable concrete for the driveway and walking path within required front setback to comply with Section 132 requirements.

F. **Usable Open Space.** Planning Code Section 135 requires, in RH-2 Districts, usable open space that is accessible by each dwelling (125 Sq. Ft per unit if private, ~166 Sq. Ft. if shared).

The project provides usable open space that exceeds the minimum private and shared amount required.

G. **Parking.** Planning Code Section 151 requires no parking spaces and a permits a maximum of 1.5 spaces for each dwelling unit.

The project proposes two off-street parking spaces.

H. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Section 155.2 requires at least one Class 1 bicycle parking space for each dwelling unit and one Class 2 bicycle parking space for every 20 dwelling units.

The Project requires three Class 1 bicycle parking spaces and no Class 2 bicycle parking spaces. The Project will provide five Class 1 bicycle parking spaces.

I. **Residential Demolition – Section 317:** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 317, Conditional Use Authorization is required for applications proposing to demolish a residential unit. This Code Section establishes a checklist of criteria that delineate the relevant General Plan Policies and Objectives.

The project proposed to remove vertical and horizontal elements in exceedance of the threshold established in Planning Code Section 317. As the project requires Conditional Use Authorization per the requirements of the Section 317, the additional criteria specified under Section 317 have been incorporated as findings a part of this Motion. See Item 8. “Additional Findings pursuant to Section 317” below.

J. **Residential Density, Dwelling Units.** Per Planning Code Section 209.1, up to two units per lot are principally permitted in RH-2 Districts and up to one unit per 1,500 Sq. Ft. of lot area is allowed with Conditional Use Authorization.

The subject property is 4,500 sq. ft. in area, and therefore is conditionally permitted a maximum density of 3 dwelling units.

K. **Child Care Requirements for Residential Projects.** Planning Code Section 414A requires that any residential development project that results in additional space in an existing residential unit of more than 800 gross square feet shall comply with the imposition of the Residential Child Care Impact Fee requirement.

The project proposes two new dwelling units. Therefore, the Project is subject to the Residential Child Care Impact Fee and must comply with the requirements outlined in Planning Code Section 414A.
Planning Code Section 303 establishes criteria for the Planning Commission to consider when reviewing applications for Conditional Use approval. On balance, the project does comply with said criteria in that:

A. The proposed new uses and building, at the size and intensity contemplated and at the proposed location, will provide a development that is necessary or desirable, and compatible with, the neighborhood or the community.

The proposed massing allows for a higher density and better use of the site. The project will provide three family-sized unit (2 three bedroom units, ans 1 two-bedroom unit), while maintaining ample rear yard open space. The project is designed to be in keeping with the existing development pattern and the neighborhood character.

B. The proposed project will not be detrimental to the health, safety, convenience or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity. There are no features of the project that could be detrimental to the health, safety or convenience of those residing or working the area, in that:

i. Nature of proposed site, including its size and shape, and the proposed size, shape and arrangement of structures;

The Project is designed to be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood; the enlarged building is in similar in massing to the structures on the block. The Project results in a building size, shape, and height that is appropriate for the neighborhood context.

ii. The accessibility and traffic patterns for persons and vehicles, the type and volume of such traffic, and the adequacy of proposed off-street parking and loading;

Planning Code requires no off-street parking space per dwelling unit. Two vehicle spaces are proposed, where currently there is no space provided for the existing building.

iii. The safeguards afforded to prevent noxious or offensive emissions such as noise, glare, dust and odor;

The proposal is residential and will not yield noxious or offensive emissions.

iv. Treatment given, as appropriate, to such aspects as landscaping, screening, open spaces, parking and loading areas, service areas, lighting and signs;

The proposed project is residential and will be landscaped accordingly within the required front setback.

C. That the use as proposed will comply with the applicable provisions of the Planning Code and will not adversely affect the General Plan.
The Project complies with all relevant requirements and standards of the Planning Code and is consistent with objectives and policies of the General Plan as detailed below.

D. That the use as proposed would provide development that is in conformity with the purpose of the applicable RH-2 District.

*The proposed project is conditionally consistent with the stated purpose of the RH-2 Districts.*

8. **Additional Findings pursuant to Section 317** establishes criteria for the Planning Commission to consider when reviewing applications to demolish or convert Residential Buildings. On balance, the Project does comply with said criteria in that:

a. Whether the property is free of a history of serious, continuing Code violations;

   *A review of the Department of Building Inspection and the Planning Department databases showed no open enforcement cases or notices of violation for the subject property.*

b. Whether the housing has been maintained in a decent, safe, and sanitary condition;

   *The structure does not appear to superficially be in decent or sanitary conditions, although a structural soundness report has not been submitted for review.*

c. Whether the property is an “historic resource” under CEQA;

   *The Planning Department reviewed Historic Resource Determination Supplemental Information and provided a historic resource determination in a Preservation Team Review (PTR) Form. The review concluded that the subject property is not eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) individually or as a contributor to a historic district. Therefore, the existing structure is not a historic resource under CEQA.*

d. Whether the removal of the resource will have a substantial adverse impact under CEQA;

   *Not applicable. The Planning Department determined that the existing structure is not a historic resource. Therefore, the removal of the structure would not result in a significant adverse impact on historic resources under CEQA.*

e. Whether the Project converts rental housing to other forms of tenure or occupancy;

   *Project does not convert rental housing to other forms of tenure or occupancy as the units on site will not be demolished, but rather will be relocated and/or enlarged.*

f. Whether the Project removes rental units subject to the Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance or affordable housing;
Although Planning Staff does not have the authority to make a determination on the rent control status of a property, it is to be assumed that the units to be relocated/enlarged and created will be subject to the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance.

**g. Whether the Project conserves existing housing to preserve cultural and economic neighborhood diversity;**

The project proposes additions to a two-family dwelling, and to create a third unit. Although the two existing units will be enlarged, there will be a net gain of one unit at the project site. The replacement structure proposed will include family sized units, consisting of two three-bedrooms units and a two-bedroom unit.

**h. Whether the Project conserves neighborhood character to preserve neighborhood cultural and economic diversity;**

The replacement building will conserve neighborhood character with appropriate scale, design, and materials, and improve cultural and economic diversity by appropriately increasing the number of units while providing family-sized units. The project would increase the number of dwelling units, while providing a net gain of four bedrooms to the City's housing stock.

**i. Whether the Project protects the relative affordability of existing housing;**

The project will be an expansion of an existing two unit residential building to three unit residential. Each of the units will maintain rent control keeping the units affordable. The existing units will each be enlarged and constructed with additional bedroom and updated finishes and amenities, which could result in an incremental increase to the values. The project will introduce a new 1,080 square foot, two bedroom unit that is comparable in size to the existing units onsite. Overall the project will protect the relative affordability of existing housing.

**j. Whether the Project increases the number of permanently affordable units as governed by Section 415;**

The project is not subject to the provisions of Planning Code Section 415, as the project proposes less than ten units.

**k. Whether the Project locates in-fill housing on appropriate sites in established neighborhoods;**

The project has been designed to be in keeping with the scale and development pattern of the established neighborhood character.

**l. Whether the Project increases the number of family-sized units on-site;**

The project proposes an opportunity for family-sized housing. Two three-bedroom units and one two-bedroom unit is proposed within the expanded building.
m. Whether the Project creates new supportive housing;

The project does not create supportive housing.

n. Whether the Project is of superb architectural and urban design, meeting all relevant design guidelines, to enhance existing neighborhood character;

The overall scale, design, and materials of the proposed building is consistent with the block-face and compliments the neighborhood character while preserving much of the existing architecture.

o. Whether the Project increases the number of on-site Dwelling Units;

The Project will provide a net gain of one unit at the site. The proposed expanded structure is in keeping with the scale and mass of the immediately surrounding development.

p. Whether the Project increases the number of on-site bedrooms;

The project proposes three dwelling units; two units containing three bedrooms, and a two bedroom unit – a total of four bedrooms more than the existing building.

q. Whether or not the replacement project would maximize density on the subject lot; and

The project proposes maximizes the density on the subject lot as the proposal includes three units on an RH-2 lot that is 4,500 square feet in size.

r. If replacing a building not subject to the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance, whether the new project replaces all of the existing units with new Dwelling Units of a similar size and with the same number of bedrooms.

The project proposes to expand the existing two units and provide a new dwelling unit of a similar size. In total, the project proposes three dwelling units; two units containing three bedrooms, and a two bedroom unit – a total of four bedrooms more than the existing building. The proposal results in three family-sized. The project does not result in new construction and therefore the existing building shall “remain” and should be subject to the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance.

9. General Plan Compliance. The Project is, on balance, consistent with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan:

HOUSING ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 4:
FOSTER A HOUSING STOCK THAT MEETS THE NEEDS OF ALL RESIDENTS ACROSS LIFECYCLEs.
Policy 4.1:
Develop new housing, and encourage the remodeling of existing housing, for families with children.

The project proposes to expand a two-family residence to create a building with three family-sized dwelling units.

OBJECTIVE 11:
SUPPORT AND RESPECT THE DIVERSE AND DISTINCT CHARACTER OF SAN FRANCISCO’S NEIGHBORHOODS.

Policy 11.1
Promote the construction and rehabilitation of well-designed housing that emphasizes beauty, flexibility, and innovative design, and respects existing neighborhood character.

Policy 11.2
Ensure implementation of accepted design standards in project approvals.

Policy 11.3
Ensure growth is accommodated without substantially and adversely impacting existing residential neighborhood character.

The proposed enlarged building conforms to the Residential Design Guidelines and, while contemporary architecture, are appropriate in terms of scale, proportions and massing for the surrounding neighborhood.

Policy 11.4
Continue to utilize zoning districts which conform to a generalized residential land use and density plan and the General Plan.
Policy 11.5
Ensure densities in established residential areas promote compatibility with prevailing neighborhood character.

The proposed enlarged building conditionally conforms to the zoning and general plan densities of the neighborhood.

URBAN DESIGN

OBJECTIVE 1:
EMPHASIS OF THE CHARACTERISTIC PATTERN WHICH GIVES TO THE CITY AND ITS NEIGHBORHOODS AN IMAGE, A SENSE OF PURPOSE, AND A MEANS OF ORIENTATION.

Policy 1.2:
Recognize, protect and reinforce the existing street pattern, especially as it is related to topography.

Policy 1.3:
Recognize that buildings, when seen together, produce a total effect that characterizes the city and its districts.

The proposed altered and expanded building reflects the existing mixed architectural character and development pattern of the neighborhood, particularly by proposing a construction that respects the two- to three-story heights on the block face.

OBJECTIVE 2:
CONSERVATION OF RESOURCES WHICH PROVIDE A SENSE OF NATURE, CONTINUITY WITH THE PAST, AND FREEDOM FROM OVERCROWDING.

Policy 2.6:
Respect the character of older development nearby in the design of new buildings.

The expanded building has been designed to be compatible with the neighborhood’s mixed massing, width and height. The proposed buildings reflect the pattern of the older development to have bay windows and vertically oriented projections and window form.

10. Planning Code Section 101.1(b) establishes eight priority-planning policies and requires review of permits for consistency with said policies. On balance, the project does comply with said policies in that:

A. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses be enhanced.

The project is residential and has no impact on neighborhood-serving retail uses.
B. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods.

While the existing housing is retained and one unit will be added, in total, the expanded building would provide three dwelling units in a neighborhood made up of one-, two-and three units buildings of mixed architectural character.

C. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced,

The project will be an expansion of an existing two unit residential building to three unit residential. Each of the units will maintain rent control keeping the units affordable. The existing units will each be enlarged and constructed with additional bedroom and updated finishes and amenities, which could result in an incremental increase to the values. The project will introduce a new 1,080 square foot, two bedroom unit that is comparable in size to the existing units onsite. Overall the project will protect the relative affordability of existing housing.

D. That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking.

The project would not have a significant adverse effect on automobile traffic congestion or create parking problems in the neighborhood. The project would enhance neighborhood parking by providing two off-street parking spaces, where none currently exists.

E. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced.

The proposal is a residential project in an RH-2 District; therefore, the Project would not affect industrial or service sector uses or related employment opportunities. Ownership of industrial or service sector businesses would not be affected by the Project.

F. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.

The project will significantly strengthen the existing building, bringing it up to current building and seismic codes.

G. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved.

Landmark or historic buildings do not occupy the project site.

H. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.
The project will have no negative impact on existing parks and open spaces. The height of the proposed structure is compatible with the established neighborhood development.

11. The Project is consistent with and would promote the general and specific purposes of the Code provided under Section 101.1(b) in that, as designed, the Project would contribute to the character and stability of the neighborhood and would constitute a beneficial development.

12. The Commission hereby finds that approval of the Conditional Use authorization would promote the health, safety and welfare of the City.
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 APPROVES Conditional Use Application No. 2019-000189CUA subject to the following conditions attached hereto as “EXHIBIT A” which is incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth.

APPEAL AND EFFECTIVE DATE OF MOTION: Any aggrieved person may appeal this Conditional Use Authorization to the Board of Supervisors within thirty (30) days after the date of this Motion No. XXXXX. The effective date of this Motion shall be the date of this Motion if not appealed (After the 30-day period has expired) OR the date of the decision of the Board of Supervisors if appealed to the Board of Supervisors. For further information, please contact the Board of Supervisors at (415) 554-5184, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94012.

Protest of Fee or Exaction: You may protest any fee or exaction subject to Government Code Section 66000 that is imposed as a condition of approval by following the procedures set forth in Government Code Section 66020. The protest must satisfy the requirements of Government Code Section 66020(a) and must be filed within 90 days of the date of the first approval or conditional approval of the development referencing the challenged fee or exaction. For purposes of Government Code Section 66020, the date of imposition of the fee shall be the date of the earliest discretionary approval by the City of the subject development.

If the City has not previously given Notice of an earlier discretionary approval of the project, the Planning Commission’s adoption of this Motion, Resolution, Discretionary Review Action or the Zoning Administrator’s Variance Decision Letter constitutes the approval or conditional approval of the development and the City hereby gives NOTICE that the 90-day protest period under Government Code Section 66020 has begun. If the City has already given Notice that the 90-day approval period has begun for the subject development, then this document does not re-commence the 90-day approval period.

I hereby certify that the Planning Commission ADOPTED the foregoing Motion on March 21, 2019.

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES:

NAYS:

ABSENT:

ADOPTED: March 21, 2019
EXHIBIT A

AUTHORIZATION

This authorization is for a conditional use to allow tantamount to demolition of an existing 2,222 square foot, two-story two-family home and to construct a horizontal and vertical addition to create a three-unit, 6,986 gross square foot, 39-foot, 8-inch tall, four story building at 1860-1862 9th Avenue, Lot 030 of Block 2045 pursuant to Planning Code Sections 209.1, 303 and 317 within the RH-2 District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District; in general conformance with plans, dated August 5, 2016, and stamped “EXHIBIT B” included in the docket for Case No. 2019-000189CUA and subject to conditions of approval reviewed and approved by the Commission on March 21, 2019 under Motion No XXXXX. This authorization and the conditions contained herein run with the property and not with a particular Project Sponsor, business, or operator.

RECORDATION OF CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Prior to the issuance of the building permit or commencement of use for the Project the Zoning Administrator shall approve and order the recordation of a Notice in the Official Records of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco for the subject property. This Notice shall state that the project is subject to the conditions of approval contained herein and reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission on March 21, 2019 under Motion No XXXXX.

PRINTING OF CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL ON PLANS

The conditions of approval under the ‘Exhibit A’ of this Planning Commission Motion No. XXXXX shall be reproduced on the Index Sheet of construction plans submitted with the Site or Building permit application for the Project. The Index Sheet of the construction plans shall reference to the Conditional Use authorization and any subsequent amendments or modifications.

SEVERABILITY

The Project shall comply with all applicable City codes and requirements. If any clause, sentence, section or any part of these conditions of approval is for any reason held to be invalid, such invalidity shall not affect or impair other remaining clauses, sentences, or sections of these conditions. This decision conveys no right to construct, or to receive a building permit. “Project Sponsor” shall include any subsequent responsible party.

CHANGES AND MODIFICATIONS

Changes to the approved plans may be approved administratively by the Zoning Administrator. Significant changes and modifications of conditions shall require Planning Commission approval of a new Conditional Use authorization.
Conditions of Approval, Compliance, Monitoring, and Reporting

PERFORMANCE

1. **Validity.** The authorization and right vested by virtue of this action is valid for three (3) years from the effective date of the Motion. The Department of Building Inspection shall have issued a Building Permit or Site Permit to construct the project and/or commence the approved use within this three-year period.

   For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org

2. **Expiration and Renewal.** Should a Building or Site Permit be sought after the three (3) year period has lapsed, the project sponsor must seek a renewal of this Authorization by filing an application for an amendment to the original Authorization or a new application for Authorization. Should the project sponsor decline to so file, and decline to withdraw the permit application, the Commission shall conduct a public hearing in order to consider the revocation of the Authorization. Should the Commission not revoke the Authorization following the closure of the public hearing, the Commission shall determine the extension of time for the continued validity of the Authorization.

   For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org

3. **Diligent pursuit.** Once a site or Building Permit has been issued, construction must commence within the timeframe required by the Department of Building Inspection and be continued diligently to completion. Failure to do so shall be grounds for the Commission to consider revoking the approval if more than three (3) years have passed since this Authorization was approved.

   For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org

4. **Extension.** All time limits in the preceding three paragraphs may be extended at the discretion of the Zoning Administrator where implementation of the project is delayed by a public agency, an appeal or a legal challenge and only by the length of time for which such public agency, appeal or challenge has caused delay.

   For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org

5. **Conformity with Current Law.** No application for Building Permit, Site Permit, or other entitlement shall be approved unless it complies with all applicable provisions of City Codes in effect at the time of such approval.

   For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org
DESIGN

6. Garbage, composting and recycling storage. Space for the collection and storage of garbage, composting, and recycling shall be provided within enclosed areas on the property and clearly labeled and illustrated on the building permit plans. Space for the collection and storage of recyclable and compostable materials that meets the size, location, accessibility and other standards specified by the San Francisco Recycling Program shall be provided at the ground level of the buildings.

For information about compliance, contact the Case Planner, Planning Department at 415-558-6378, www.sf-planning.org

7. Landscaping. Pursuant to Planning Code Section 132, the Project Sponsor shall submit a site plan to the Planning Department prior to Planning approval of the building permit application indicating that 50% of the front setback areas shall be surfaced in permeable materials and further, that 20% of the front setback areas shall be landscaped with approved plant species. The size and specie of plant materials and the nature of the permeable surface shall be as approved by the Department of Public Works.

For information about compliance, contact the Case Planner, Planning Department at 415-558-6378, www.sf-planning.org

8. Bicycle Parking. The Project shall provide no fewer than one Class 1 bicycle parking spaces as required by Planning Code Section 155.

For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org

PROVISIONS

10. Child Care Fee - Residential. The Project is subject to the Residential Child Care Fee, as applicable, pursuant to Planning Code Section 414A.

For information about compliance, contact the Case Planner, Planning Department at 415-558-6378, www.sf-planning.org

MONITORING

11. Enforcement. Violation of any of the Planning Department conditions of approval contained in this Motion or of any other provisions of Planning Code applicable to this Project shall be subject to the enforcement procedures and administrative penalties set forth under Planning Code Section 176 or Section 176.1. The Planning Department may also refer the violation complaints to other city departments and agencies for appropriate enforcement action under their jurisdiction.

For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org

12. Revocation due to Violation of Conditions. Should implementation of this Project result in complaints from interested property owners, residents, or commercial lessees which are not resolved by the Project Sponsor and found to be in violation of the Planning Code and/or the specific conditions of approval for the Project as set forth in Exhibit A of this Motion, the Zoning
Administrator shall refer such complaints to the Commission, after which it may hold a public hearing on the matter to consider revocation of this authorization.

For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org

OPERATION

13. **Garbage, Recycling, and Composting Receptacles.** Garbage, recycling, and compost containers shall be kept within the premises and hidden from public view, and placed outside only when being serviced by the disposal company. Trash shall be contained and disposed of pursuant to garbage and recycling receptacles guidelines set forth by the Department of Public Works.

For information about compliance, contact Bureau of Street Use and Mapping, Department of Public Works at 415-554-5810, http://sfdpw.org

14. **Sidewalk Maintenance.** The Project Sponsor shall maintain the main entrance to the building and all sidewalks abutting the subject property in a clean and sanitary condition in compliance with the Department of Public Works Streets and Sidewalk Maintenance Standards.

For information about compliance, contact Bureau of Street Use and Mapping, Department of Public Works, 415-695-2017, http://sfdpw.org

15. **Community Liaison.** Prior to issuance of a building permit to construct the project and implement the approved use, the Project Sponsor shall appoint a community liaison officer to deal with the issues of concern to owners and occupants of nearby properties. The Project Sponsor shall provide the Zoning Administrator with written notice of the name, business address, and telephone number of the community liaison. Should the contact information change, the Zoning Administrator shall be made aware of such change. The community liaison shall report to the Zoning Administrator what issues, if any, are of concern to the community and what issues have not been resolved by the Project Sponsor.

For information about compliance, contact Code Enforcement, Planning Department at 415-575-6863, www.sf-planning.org
1. Dimensions are to be field verified by contractors prior to construction.

1.1. Occupational Safety and Health Standards, (Cal OSHA).

1.2. Approved Equipment Listing (Factory Mutual).


1.4. Safety Code for Building Construction, ANSI.


1.7. California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 6607B.

2. Where differences exist between codes affecting this work, the more restrictive code shall govern.

3. All fire-rated wall and floor penetrations shall be firesafed utilizing a UL approved fire barrier.

4. All plumbing and piping systems shall be pressure tested and approved prior to calling for code inspection and final approvals.

5. These drawings represent approximations of existing conditions. All conditions and dimensions are to be field verified by contractors prior to construction.
THESE DRAWINGS REPRESENT APPROXIMATIONS OF EXISTING CONDITIONS. ALL CONDITIONS AND DIMENSIONS ARE TO BE FIELD VERIFIED BY CONTRACTORS PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.
THESE DRAWINGS REPRESENT
APPROXIMATIONS OF EXISTING
CONDITIONS. ALL CONDITIONS AND
DIMENSIONS ARE TO BE FIELD VERIFIED BY
CONTRACTORS PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.

PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS

1. Existing first floor plan
2. Existing second floor plan
1 Proposed first floor plan

2 Proposed second floor plan
THESE DRAWINGS REPRESENT APPROXIMATIONS OF EXISTING CONDITIONS. ALL CONDITIONS AND DIMENSIONS ARE TO BE FIELD VERIFIED BY CONTRACTORS PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.

1. Existing front elevation
2. Proposed front elevation
3. Existing rear elevation
4. Proposed rear elevation
5. Existing right elevation
6. Proposed right elevation

(N) Wood windows with wood trim
(N) Concrete panel
(N) Smooth stucco
(N) Metal guardrail
(N) Wood sliding door with wood trim
(N) Wood sliding door with glazing
(N) Wood door with glazing
(N) Wood garage door
(N) Wood windows with wood trim
(N) Smooth stucco
1. Existing longitudinal section
2. Proposed longitudinal section
3. Existing transverse section
4. Proposed transverse section
5. Existing left elevation
6. Proposed left elevation

THESE DRAWINGS REPRESENT APPROXIMATIONS OF EXISTING CONDITIONS. ALL CONDITIONS AND DIMENSIONS ARE TO BE FIELD VERIFIED BY CONTRACTORS PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.
Parcel Map

Conditional Use Authorization
Case Number 2019-000189CUA
1860 9th Avenue
Sanborn Map*

*The Sanborn Maps in San Francisco have not been updated since 1998, and this map may not accurately reflect existing conditions.
Aerial Photo

SUBJECT PROPERTY
## CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination

### PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Address</th>
<th>Block/Lot(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1860-1862 9th Avenue</td>
<td>2045/030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Permit No.</th>
<th>Plans Dated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-011553ENV</td>
<td>201608185448</td>
<td>11/20/2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- [✓] Addition/Alteration (requires HRER if over 45 years old)
- [  ] Demolition
- [  ] New Construction
- [  ] Project Modification

**Project description for Planning Department approval.**

Horizontal and vertical extension of the existing building, converting from a two-story, two-family dwelling into a four-story, two family dwelling unit. The building height would increase from eighteen (18) feet to approximately twenty-eight (28) feet.

### STEP 1: EXEMPTION CLASS
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

*Note: If neither class applies, an Environmental Evaluation Application is required.*

- [✓] Class 1 – Existing Facilities. Interior and exterior alterations; additions under 10,000 sq. ft.
- [  ] Class 3 – New Construction/Conversion of Small Structures. Up to three (3) new single-family residences or six (6) dwelling units in one building; commercial/office structures; utility extensions; change of use under 10,000 sq. ft. if principally permitted or with a CU. Change of use under 10,000 sq. ft. if principally permitted or with a CU.
- [  ] Class ___

### STEP 2: CEQA IMPACTS
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

If any box is checked below, an Environmental Evaluation Application is required.

- [  ] Air Quality: Would the project add new sensitive receptors (specifically, schools, day care facilities, hospitals, residential dwellings, and senior-care facilities) within an Air Pollution Exposure Zone? Does the project have the potential to emit substantial pollutant concentrations (e.g., backup diesel generators, heavy industry, diesel trucks)? Exceptions: do not check box if the applicant presents documentation of enrollment in the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) Article 38 program and the project would not have the potential to emit substantial pollutant concentrations. (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Air Pollutant Exposure Zone)

- [  ] Hazardous Materials: If the project site is located on the Maher map or is suspected of containing hazardous materials (based on a previous use such as gas station, auto repair, dry cleaners, or heavy manufacturing, or a site with underground storage tanks): Would the project involve 50 cubic yards or more of soil disturbance - or a change of use from industrial to residential? If yes, this box must be checked and the project applicant must submit an Environmental Application with a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. Exceptions: do not check box if the applicant presents documentation of enrollment in the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) Maher program, a DPH waiver from the
| **Transportation:** Does the project create six (6) or more net new parking spaces or residential units? Does the project have the potential to adversely affect transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle safety (hazards) or the adequacy of nearby transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities? |
| **Archeological Resources:** Would the project result in soil disturbance/modification greater than two (2) feet below grade in an archeological sensitive area or eight (8) feet in a non-archeological sensitive area? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Archeological Sensitive Area) |
| **Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment:** Does the project site involve a subdivision or lot line adjustment on a lot with a slope average of 20% or more? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography) |

*If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required.*

| **Slope = or > 20%:** Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required. |

| **Seismic: Landslide Zone:** Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones) If box is checked, a geotechnical report will likely be required. |

| **Seismic: Liquefaction Zone:** Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones) If box is checked, a geotechnical report will likely be required. |

---

**STEP 3: PROPERTY STATUS – HISTORIC RESOURCE**

**TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

**PROPERTY IS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING:** (refer to Parcel Information Map)

- **Category A:** Known Historical Resource. GO TO STEP 5.
- **Category B:** Potential Historical Resource (over 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 4.
- **Category C:** Not a Historical Resource or Not Age Eligible (under 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 6.
**STEP 4: PROPOSED WORK CHECKLIST**
**TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

Check all that apply to the project.

- [ ] 1. Change of use and new construction. Tenant improvements not included.
- [ ] 2. Regular maintenance or repair to correct or repair deterioration, decay, or damage to building.
- [ ] 3. Window replacement that meets the Department's *Window Replacement Standards*. Does not include storefront window alterations.
- [ ] 4. Garage work. A new opening that meets the *Guidelines for Adding Garages and Curb Cuts*, and/or replacement of a garage door in an existing opening that meets the Residential Design Guidelines.
- [ ] 5. Deck, terrace construction, or fences not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
- [ ] 6. Mechanical equipment installation that is not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
- [ ] 7. Dormer installation that meets the requirements for exemption from public notification under *Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 3: Dormer Windows*.
- [ ] 8. Addition(s) that are not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way for 150 feet in each direction; does not extend vertically beyond the floor level of the top story of the structure or is only a single story in height; does not have a footprint that is more than 50% larger than that of the original building; and does not cause the removal of architectural significant roofing features.

Note: Project Planner must check box below before proceeding.

- [x] Project is not listed. **GO TO STEP 5.**
- [ ] Project does not conform to the scopes of work. **GO TO STEP 5.**
- [ ] Project involves four or more work descriptions. **GO TO STEP 5.**
- [ ] Project involves less than four work descriptions. **GO TO STEP 6.**

**STEP 5: CEQA IMPACTS – ADVANCED HISTORICAL REVIEW**
**TO BE COMPLETED BY PRESERVATION PLANNER**

Check all that apply to the project.

- [ ] 1. Project involves a known historical resource (CEQA Category A) as determined by Step 3 and conforms entirely to proposed work checklist in Step 4.
- [ ] 2. Interior alterations to publicly accessible spaces.
- [ ] 3. Window replacement of original/historic windows that are not “in-kind” but are consistent with existing historic character.
- [ ] 4. Façade/storefront alterations that do not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.
- [ ] 5. Raising the building in a manner that does not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.
- [ ] 6. Restoration based upon documented evidence of a building’s historic condition, such as historic photographs, plans, physical evidence, or similar buildings.
- [ ] 7. Addition(s), including mechanical equipment that are minimally visible from a public right-of-way and meet the *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation*.
- [ ] 8. Other work consistent with the *Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* (specify or add comments):
9. Other work that would not materially impair a historic district (specify or add comments):

(Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator)

☐

10. Reclassification of property status. (Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator)

☐ Reclassify to Category A  ☑ Reclassify to Category C

a. Per HRER dated: (attach HRER)
b. Other (specify): Per PTR form signed 1/18/18

Note: If ANY box in STEP 5 above is checked, a Preservation Planner MUST check one box below.

☐ Further environmental review required. Based on the information provided, the project requires an Environmental Evaluation Application to be submitted. GO TO STEP 6.

☑ Project can proceed with categorical exemption review. The project has been reviewed by the Preservation Planner and can proceed with categorical exemption review. GO TO STEP 6.

Comments (optional):

Preservation Planner Signature: Elizabeth Gordon Jonckheer

STEP 6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

☐ Further environmental review required. Proposed project does not meet scopes of work in either (check all that apply):

☐ Step 2 – CEQA Impacts

☐ Step 5 – Advanced Historical Review

STOP! Must file an Environmental Evaluation Application.

☑ No further environmental review is required. The project is categorically exempt under CEQA.

Planner Name: E. Jonckheer

Project Approval Action:

Building Permit

If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project.

Signature: Elizabeth Gordon Jonckheer

Once signed or stamped and dated, this document constitutes a categorical exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code.

In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, an appeal of an exemption determination can only be filed within 30 days of the project receiving the first approval action.
STEP 7: MODIFICATION OF A CEQA EXEMPT PROJECT
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, when a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exempt project changes after the Approval Action and requires a subsequent approval, the Environmental Review Officer (or his or her designee) must determine whether the proposed change constitutes a substantial modification of that project. This checklist shall be used to determine whether the proposed changes to the approved project would constitute a “substantial modification” and, therefore, be subject to additional environmental review pursuant to CEQA.

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Address (If different than front page)</th>
<th>Block/Lot(s) (If different than front page)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Previous Building Permit No.</th>
<th>New Building Permit No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans Dated</th>
<th>Previous Approval Action</th>
<th>New Approval Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Modified Project Description:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DETERMINATION IF PROJECT CONSTITUTES SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compared to the approved project, would the modified project:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Result in expansion of the building envelope, as defined in the Planning Code;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Result in the change of use that would require public notice under Planning Code Sections 311 or 312;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Result in demolition as defined under Planning Code Section 317 or 19005(f)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Is any information being presented that was not known and could not have been known at the time of the original determination, that shows the originally approved project may no longer qualify for the exemption?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If at least one of the above boxes is checked, further environmental review is required. [TEX FORM]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DETERMINATION OF NO SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ The proposed modification would not result in any of the above changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If this box is checked, the proposed modifications are categorically exempt under CEQA, in accordance with prior project approval and no additional environmental review is required. This determination shall be posted on the Planning Department website and office and mailed to the applicant, City approving entities, and anyone requesting written notice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planner Name:</th>
<th>Signature or Stamp:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW FORM

Preservation Team Meeting Date: 1/3/2018  Date of Form Completion: 1/3/2018

PROJECT INFORMATION:

Planner: Elizabeth Jonckheer
Address: 1860-1862 9th Avenue
Block/Lot: Cross Streets:
2045/030 Noriega and Ortega Streets
CEQA Category: Art. 10/11: BPA/Case No.:
B n/a 2016-011553ENV

PURPOSE OF REVIEW:

☐ CEQA  ☐ Article 10/11  ☐ Preliminary/PIC  ☐ Alteration  ☐ Demo/New Construction

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

DATE OF PLANS UNDER REVIEW: November 20, 2015

PROJECT ISSUES:

☒ Is the subject Property an eligible historic resource?
☐ If so, are the proposed changes a significant impact?

Additional Notes:

Supplemental Information for Historic Resource Determination prepared by Stacy Farr (dated September 13, 2017).

Proposed Project: Horizontal and vertical extension of the existing building, converting from a two-story, two-family dwelling into a four-story, two family dwelling unit. The building height would increase from eighteen (18) feet to approximately twenty-eight (28) feet.

PRESEVATION TEAM REVIEW:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Historic District/Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ A</td>
<td>☐ B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Property is individually eligible for inclusion in a California Register under one or more of the following Criteria:

Criterion 1 - Event: ☐ Yes ☐ No
Criterion 2 - Persons: ☐ Yes ☐ No
Criterion 3 - Architecture: ☐ Yes ☐ No
Criterion 4 - Info. Potential: ☐ Yes ☐ No
Period of Significance: n/a

Property is in an eligible California Register Historic District/Context under one or more of the following Criteria:

Criterion 1 - Event: ☐ Yes ☐ No
Criterion 2 - Persons: ☐ Yes ☐ No
Criterion 3 - Architecture: ☐ Yes ☐ No
Criterion 4 - Info. Potential: ☐ Yes ☐ No
Period of Significance: n/a

☒ Contributor  ☐ Non-Contributor
Complies with the Secretary's Standards/Art 10/Art 11:  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEQA Material Impairment to the individual historic resource:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA Material Impairment to the historic district:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires Design Revisions:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defer to Residential Design Team:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRESERVATION TEAM COMMENTS:

According to the Supplemental Information for Historic Resource Determination by Stacy Farr (dated September 13, 2017), and information found in the Planning Department files, the subject property at 1860-62 9th Avenue is a two-story, two-unit residential building clad in stucco and horizontal channel-drop siding, constructed in 1902 (source: "Real Estate Transactions", San Francisco Chronicle and Spring Valley Water Tap record). The building reflects no specific architectural style due to alterations. Mary L. Alexander (a widow and later a secretary) appears to have commissioned the construction of the subject property for rental as she never lived at the address. Thereafter there was regular turnover in the owners and occupants of the property over time. Known alterations to the property include: stuccoing the front and replacing the stairs (1927), adding two rooms, a staircase and new front stairs to upper flat (1953), raising the foundation at the southwest portion of the building, replacing damaged rustic siding and cutting off the lower ends of door jambs at rear facade (1959), and removing the tar and gravel roofing with a fiberglass/gravel/asphalt roof (1994). Visible alterations not reflected in the permit record include: removal of first floor level tripartite windows at the primary facade replaced between 2008 and 2015: earlier windows were four-over-one double-hung wood sash windows flanking a one-over-one double-hung wood sash window.

No known historic events occurred at the subject property (Criterion 1). None of the owners or occupants have been identified as important to history (Criterion 2). The building is not architecturally distinct such that it would qualify individually for listing in the California Register under Criterion 3. The subject property is not located within the boundaries of any identified historic district. The subject property is located in the Inner Sunset neighborhood. The block of 9th Avenue between Noriega and Ortega Avenues is uniformly residential. However, unlike many other blocks in the Sunset District, construction on this block appears to have occurred incrementally, by individual builders or small scale developers. Building types include a mixture of single-family houses, two- and three-unit flats, and small, multi-unit apartment buildings. Building heights range from one to three stories, and setbacks vary, with some properties flush with the street and others set substantially back. The dates of construction on the block vary, with all decades between 1900 and 1970 represented.

- continued -

Signature of a Senior Preservation Planner / Preservation Coordinator:  

[Signature]

Date: 1/18/18

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT
Architectural styles reflect this range of construction dates, and include Queen Anne, Craftsman, Mission Revival, Mediterranean Revival, Marina, Moderne, French Normandy Revival, and Contractor Modern styles. Many properties on the block exhibit alterations at the primary facade, generally removal of original windows and replacement with aluminum sash sliding windows. Some of the oldest buildings on the block have undergone significant alterations. This neighborhood itself is not of remarkable architectural quality such that it would be significant for its architecture, and therefore could not be considered a potential historic district. The subject building is not significant under Criterion 4, since this significance criterion typically applies to rare construction types when involving the built environment. The subject building is not an example of a rare construction type.

Therefore, the subject property is not eligible for listing in the California Register under any criteria individually or as part of a historic district. This assessment does not address archeology.