



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Historic Preservation Commission Motion No. 0157

HEARING DATE: MAY 16, 2012

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Filing Date: March 27, 2012
Case No.: **2012.0033A**
Project Address: **55 Laguna Street**
Historic Landmark: Nos. 257, 258, & 259: Richardson Hall, Woods Hall, & Woods Hall Annex
Zoning: RM-3 (Residential, Mixed, Medium Density) Zoning District/
40-X Height and Bulk District;
NC-3 (Moderate-Scale Neighborhood Commercial) Zoning District/
85-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 0857/ 001 & 001a
0870/ 001, 002, & 003
Applicant: Elisa Skaggs, Page & Turnbull, Inc.
724 Pine Street
San Francisco, CA 94108
Staff Contact Shelley Caltagirone - (415) 558-6625
shelley.caltagirone@sfgov.org
Reviewed By Tim Frye - (415) 558-6325
tim.frye@sfgov.org

ADOPTING FINDINGS, INCLUDING FINDINGS UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT, FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR PROPOSED WORK DETERMINED TO BE APPROPRIATE FOR AND CONSISTENT WITH THE PURPOSES OF ARTICLE 10, TO MEET THE STANDARDS OF ARTICLE 10 AND TO MEET THE SECRETARY OF INTERIOR'S STANDARDS FOR REHABILITATION, FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED ON LOTS 001 AND 001A IN ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 0857 AND LOTS 001-003 IN ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 0870, WITHIN RM-3 (RESIDENTIAL, MIXED, MEDIUM DENSITY) AND NC-3 (MODERATE-SCALE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL) ZONING DISTRICTS AND A 40-X AND 85-X HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICTS.

PREAMBLE

WHEREAS, on March 27, 2012, Elisa Skaggs, Page & Turnbull, Inc., (Project Sponsor) filed an application with the San Francisco Planning Department (hereinafter "Department") for a Certificate of Appropriateness to rehabilitate Richardson Hall for use as senior services, senior housing, and retail and/or office space; to rehabilitate Woods Hall for use as housing; and, to rehabilitate Woods Hall Annex for use as a community center.

WHEREAS, the 55 Laguna Mixed Use Project Final Environment Impact Report (FEIR), Case No. 2004.0773E, was certified by the Planning Commission on January 17, 2008 and an addendum to the EIR incorporating the current project was published on May 8, 2012.

WHEREAS, on January 17, 2008, the Commission: adopted findings under the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code §§21000 *et seq.* (CEQA), the CEQA Guidelines, 14 Cal. Code. Regs. §§15000 *et seq.*, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, including a statement of overriding considerations; adopted a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the proposed project, by Motion No. 17533; recommended approval of a General Plan amendment and Planning Code and Zoning Map amendments to the Board of Supervisors. The Planning Commission also approved a Conditional Use Authorization for the proposed project.

WHEREAS, on April 15, 2008, the Board of Supervisors took action to approve the project, and in so doing adopted the Planning Commission's CEQA approval findings as its own, adopted the MMRP, and adopted additional findings under the California Environmental Quality Act, which can be found on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in Files Nos. 071001, 071002, and 080319.

WHEREAS, on May 16, 2012, the Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing on the current project, Case No. 2012.0033A ("Project") for its appropriateness.

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

MOVED, that the Commission hereby grants the Certificate of Appropriateness, in conformance with the architectural plans labeled Exhibit A on file in the docket for Case No. 2012.0033A and the listed conditions based on the following findings, and adopts the MMRP:

CONDITIONS

- That the design guidelines for historic buildings prepared by Page & Turnbull in accordance with Mitigation Measure HR-3 of the *Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program* for the 55 Laguna Mixed Use Project Environmental Impact Report will be complied with in all aspects of design refinement for the three landmark buildings.
- That the configuration, materials, and details of all new windows and doors will be finalized and approved by Department staff to ensure their compatibility with the historic character of the landmark buildings prior to the approval of the Architectural Addendum of the building permit;
- That the sign program will be finalized and approved by Department staff to ensure their compatibility with the historic character of the landmark buildings prior to the approval of the Architectural Addendum of the building permit;
- That all condition assessments regarding the murals, stucco cladding, and clay tile roofs will be submitted to the Department prior to the approval of the Architectural Addendum of the

building permit and that all treatment and protection plans will be incorporated into the permit plans for approval by the Planning Department;

- That the existing and proposed location of the Sacred Palm associated with Woods Hall will be shown on the site plan and that a relocation and protection plan prepared by an arborist will be incorporated into the site permit for approval by the Planning Department; and,
- That all Structural and Mechanical/Electrical/Plumbing Addendum to the building permit will be reviewed by Planning Department staff to ensure that seismic and mechanical interventions do not detract from any character-defining features of the buildings or result in significant removal of historic fabric.
- That all openings in the retaining wall below Richardson Hall should be the same size to maintain a consistent look as in Variant A.
- That the awnings at the retaining wall below Richardson Hall should not have cable supports.
- That the three (3) proposed window openings at the southeast corner of the auditorium should be eliminated, two (2) on the Hermann Street façade and one (1) on the Laguna Street façade.
- That two (2) additional window openings may be created between the buttresses of the auditorium on the Laguna Street façade for a total of six (6) window openings in this location.
- That four (4) new window openings at the Haight Street façade and three (3) new window openings on the Buchanan Street facade of Woods Hall may be created in the locations indicated in the Alternate Design drawing dated May 16, 2012 of either the proposed size or within 1 foot increased width and height.

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 10:

The Historical Preservation Commission has determined that the proposed work is compatible with the character of the landmark district as described in the designation report for the following reasons:

- That the proposed new housing, retail, assembly, and public service uses for the buildings may be achieved without causing significant changes to their distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships;
- That the proposed work will not cause the removal, alteration, or obstruction of any character-defining features of the site. The portions of wall proposed to be removed for the creation of window openings or at the low wall located at the Buchanan/Haight Street entry

- will not remove any distinctive materials or significantly alter the historic character of the landmark buildings. Also, all structural, mechanical, electrical, plumbing installations will be designed in a manner which does not affect any character-defining features of the buildings and will occur in areas that are not visible from the street or are on secondary facades;
- That the window survey indicates that the majority of historic windows at the three buildings will be retained (97% at Richardson Hall, 92% at Woods Hall, and 100% at Woods Hall Annex); that no window openings will be altered; and that 28 or 29 window openings to be created at Richardson Hall will maintain the historic rhythm of fenestration;
 - That the proposed exterior changes will be carefully differentiated from the existing historic features and will be compatible with the character of the property, including the proposed railings, windows and doors, and storefronts at Hermann and Laguna Streets;
 - That the proposal calls for retaining sound historic stucco and roofing tiles and replacing in-kind or with salvaged materials when necessary;
 - That the findings of the mosaic investigative report prepared by Page & Turnbull in accordance with the EIR Mitigation Measures has ensured that the historic feature was been previously removed and, therefore, will not be affected by the proposed project;
 - That any chemical or physical treatments will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible and under the supervision of a historic architect or conservator;
 - That Mitigation Measure HR-3 of the *Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program* for the *55 Laguna Mixed Use Project Environmental Impact Report* pertaining to mural preservation will ensure the protection of these significant features; and,
 - That the installation of the proposed new elements, such as the proposed railings, windows and doors, and storefronts, will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.
 - The proposed project meets the requirements of Article 10 and the designating ordinances.
 - The proposed project meets the following *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*:

Standard 1.

A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

Standard 2.

The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

Standard 3.

Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.

Standard 4.

Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

Standard 5.

Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.

Standard 6.

Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

Standard 7.

Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

Standard 8.

Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

Standard 9.

New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Standard 10.

New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

3. **General Plan Compliance.** The proposed Certificate of Appropriateness is, on balance, consistent with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan:

I. URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT

THE URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT CONCERNS THE PHYSICAL CHARACTER AND ORDER OF THE CITY, AND THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PEOPLE AND THEIR ENVIRONMENT.

GOALS

The Urban Design Element is concerned both with development and with preservation. It is a concerted effort to recognize the positive attributes of the city, to enhance and conserve those attributes, and to

improve the living environment where it is less than satisfactory. The Plan is a definition of quality, a definition based upon human needs.

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 1.3

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

OBJECTIVE 2

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

POLICY 2.4

Preserve notable landmarks and areas of historic, architectural or aesthetic value, and promote the preservation of other buildings and features that provide continuity with past development.

POLICY 2.5

Use care in remodeling of older buildings, in order to enhance rather than weaken the original character of such buildings.

POLICY 2.7

Recognize and protect outstanding and unique areas that contribute in an extraordinary degree to San Francisco's visual form and character.

The goal of a Certificate of Appropriateness is to provide additional oversight for buildings and districts that are architecturally or culturally significant to the City in order to protect the qualities that are associated with that significance.

The proposed project qualifies for a Certificate of Appropriateness and therefore furthers these policies and objectives by maintaining and preserving the character-defining features of the landmark for the future enjoyment and education of San Francisco residents and visitors.

4. The proposed project is generally consistent with the eight General Plan priority policies set forth in Section 101.1 in that:
 - A) The existing neighborhood-serving retail uses will be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses will be enhanced:

The proposed project will not have any impact on neighborhood serving retail uses.

- B) The existing housing and neighborhood character will be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods:

The proposed project will strengthen neighborhood character by respecting the character-defining features of the building in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

- C) The City's supply of affordable housing will be preserved and enhanced:

The project will increase the affordable housing supply with the addition of affordable units at Richardson Hall.

- D) The commuter traffic will not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking:

The proposed project will not result in commuter traffic impeding MUNI transit service or overburdening the streets or neighborhood parking.

- E) A diverse economic base will be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development. And future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors will be enhanced:

The proposed will not have any impact on industrial and service sector jobs.

- F) The City will achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.

Preparedness against injury and loss of life in an earthquake is improved by the proposed work. The work will be executed in compliance with all applicable construction and safety measures.

- G) That landmark and historic buildings will be preserved:

The proposed project is in conformance with Article 10 of the Planning Code and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

- H) Parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas will be protected from development:

The proposed project will not impact the access to sunlight or vistas for the parks and open space.

5. For these reasons, the proposal overall, is appropriate for and consistent with the purposes of Article 10, meets the standards of Article 10, and the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, General Plan and Prop M findings of the Planning Code.

6. California Environmental Quality Act Findings. This Commission hereby incorporates by reference as though fully set forth and adopts the CEQA approval findings made by both the

Planning Commission, Motion No. 17533, and the Board of Supervisors, which can be found on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in Files Nos. 071001, 071002, and 080319. The FEIR and the Addendum for this project has been made available to this Commission and the public for review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street. This Commission has considered the record before it, including the Addendum, and finds based on substantial evidence found in the record that none of the conditions described in Sections 15162 or 15163 of the CEQA Guidelines calling for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR have occurred. Specifically, the Commission finds that there have been no substantial changes to the project or the circumstances surrounding the project as described in the FEIR that would lead to the involvement of new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts. Additionally, no new information of substantial importance has come to light showing that the project would result in any new significant effects or a substantial increase in any previously identified significant effects or that any mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible.

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 **ADOPTS the MMRP and GRANTS a Certificate of Appropriateness** for the property located at Assessor's Block 0857, Lots 001 and 001a and Assessor's Block 0870, Lots 001, 002, and 003 for proposed work in conformance with the renderings and architectural plans labeled Exhibit A on file in the docket for Case No. 2012.0033A.

APPEAL AND EFFECTIVE DATE OF MOTION: The Commission's decision on a Certificate of Appropriateness 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).

Duration of this Certificate of Appropriateness: This Certificate of Appropriateness is issued pursuant to Article 10 of the Planning Code and is valid for a period of three (3) years from the effective date of approval by the Historic Preservation Commission. The authorization and right vested by virtue of this action shall be deemed void and canceled if, within 3 years of the date of this Motion, a site permit or building permit for the Project has not been secured by Project Sponsor.

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 May 16, 2012.

Linda D. Avery
Commission Secretary

AYES: Chase, Damkroger, Hasz, Johns, Martinez, and Matsuda

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Wolfram

ADOPTED: May 16, 2012