

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

мемо

April 25, 2018	1650 Mission St. Suite 400 San Francisco.
Architectural Review Committee of the Historic Preservation	CA 94103-2479
Commission	Reception: 415.558.6378
M. Pilar LaValley, Acting Principal Preservation Planner, (415) 575-9084	Fax: 415.558.6409
Review and Comment for 4840-4950 Mission Street Preservation Alternatives for Draft EIR Case No. 2016-012545ENV	Planning Information: 415.558.6377
	Architectural Review Committee of the Historic Preservation Commission Jørgen G. Cleemann, Preservation Planner, (415) 575-8763 Elizabeth White, Environmental Planner, (415) 575-6813 M. Pilar LaValley, Acting Principal Preservation Planner, (415) 575-9084 Review and Comment for 4840-4950 Mission Street Preservation Alternatives for Draft EIR

The Planning Department ("Department") and the Project Sponsor ("Sponsor") are requesting review and comment before the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) regarding the proposed Preservation Alternatives for the project at 4840-4950 Mission Street ("the Project").

On March 18, 2015, the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) adopted Resolution No. 0746 to clarify expectations for the evaluation of significant impacts to historical resource and the preparation of preservation alternatives in Environmental Impact Reports. Although the resolution does not specify ARC review of proposed preservation alternatives, the HPC, in their discussions during preparation of the resolution, expressed a desire to provide feedback earlier in the environmental review process – prior to publication of the Draft EIR – particularly for large projects. In response to the resolution, the subject Project is being brought to the ARC for feedback as the Department and Project Sponsor develop preservation alternatives to address the anticipated significant impact to the individual historical resource at 4840-4950 Mission Street.

The Planning Department is in the process of preparing an Initial Study and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to evaluate the related physical environmental effects of the proposed project. The proposed Preservation Alternatives are being brought to the ARC for comment prior to inclusion in the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR will be released for public review in November 2018. A hearing to receive the HPC's comments on the Draft EIR will occur in December 2018.

BUILDINGS AND PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

The subject property at 4840-4950 Mission Street contains four adjacent through-lots (6959/019, 025, 026, 031) extending between Mission Street and Alemany Boulevard in the Outer Mission neighborhood of San Francisco. Along Mission Street, the closest intersections are with

Onondaga Avenue to the north and with France Avenue to the south. The property is located within the Excelsior Outer Mission Neighborhood Commercial District, RH-1 (Residential, House, One Family) and RH-2 (Residential, House, Two Families) Zoning Districts, and a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

The southernmost parcel on the project site (6959/031, A.K.A. 4950 Mission Street), contains a one-story supermarket (Safeway) constructed in 1980 and a surface parking lot. Because these built elements are less than 45 years old and are not functionally or historically related to the individually-eligible historic resource at 4840 Mission Street (see below), they are not potential historic resources and are not discussed further.

The property at 4840 Mission Street comprises the remaining three lots on the project site (6959/019, 025, 026). The only building on these lots (the "subject building") is a former funeral parlor located on the northernmost lot. This building occupies the east half of its lot and fronts onto Mission Street. The west half of this lot and the entirety of the two adjacent lots to the south contain a continuous surface parking and vehicle maneuvering area associated with the funeral parlor. Although the lots extend back to Alemany Boulevard, access from this direction is blocked by a chain-link fence.

The subject building at 4840 Mission Street, known as the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home, was built in two main phases. The first phase of construction occurred in 1926. As originally designed by architect John A. Porporato, it was a two-story Spanish Colonial Revival-style building with stucco cladding, a tile roof, and a symmetrical front (Mission Street) façade featuring a central entry portico and five vertical bays of arched windows. To the rear, the building stepped down to a single story and then stepped up again to a single story over a raised basement. The second phase of construction in 1959 was designed by architect Otto G. Hintermann, engineered by Hyman Rosenthal, and constructed by the DeMartini Brothers contracting firm. In this renovation, the building was extended to the south and east with a two-story addition and was given a new façade designed in a Midcentury Modern style. The building's current appearance dates largely to this 1959 renovation.

Above a base of Roman brick veneer, the primary east (Mission Street) façade is clad in square porcelain enamel panels set in a stack bond pattern. A projecting wood belt course runs across this façade, separating the first and the second stories. At the first story, the east façade contains seven masonry openings, which are grouped toward the north end of the façade. The third opening from the north contains a recessed building entry consisting of a marble stair leading to a pair of hollow metal doors. Each of the remaining six openings contains an eight pane aluminum window with a two-pane hopper sash at the bottom, a four-pane awning sash at the center, and two fixed lights at the top. The second-story windows, framed by a projecting porcelain enamel-clad border, are identical to the first-story windows except in the location over the building entry, where they take the form of a pair of smaller, narrow, fourpane windows. A neon sign projects from above the wood belt course in between the first and second windows from the south. With the windows grouped toward the north end of the façade, the south end of the east façade consists largely of a blank section of wall, on which building signage ("Valente Marini Perata & Co. Funeral Directors") has been painted. At the extreme south end of the eastern façade, there is another pair of hollow metal doors leading to a one-story vestibule that runs along the south façade (see below). The projecting wooden beltcourse passes over these doors and extends beyond the corner of the building, where it forms part of a canopy that spans a driveway and is supported at the opposite end by a brick wall.

The secondary south façade, which fronts onto a driveway that connects to the parking area, features a one-story vestibule consisting of a brick base, large fixed aluminum-frame windows, and a flat roof. At the right (east) end of the façade, this vestibule features a projecting canopy (see above). At the center, the vestibule features a porte-cochère. Toward the left (west) end, the vestibule steps down with the slope of the lot. Behind the one-story vestibule, the second story of the south façade features two groups of ribbon windows framed by projecting borders and glazed with opaque glass block. At the right (east) end of the façade, a short section of the primary façade's porcelain enamel cladding turns the corner and features painted wall signage. Otherwise, the south façade features only utilitarian features such as louvers and drain pipes.

The tertiary west (rear) façade clearly displays both of the subject building's two major phases of construction. At the left (north) end, the 1926 design is legible in the arched wooden windows and the tile roof parapet, while the right (south) end features the aluminum windows used in the 1959 renovation. The south end also features a neon building sign. The tertiary north façade, which fronts onto a narrow alley, dates mostly to the original 1926 design, featuring a porte-cochère, arched wood windows, wood entry doors, and stucco scored to resemble ashlar masonry. Elements of the north façade that were altered in the 1959 renovation include the addition and removal of windows and the application of a short section of the modernist cladding that wraps around the corner from the primary façade.

Site features on the subject property include the parking lot, a concrete wall separating the parking lot from the driveway running along the south side of the building, masonry walls separating the parking lot from the sidewalk, and a neon sign installed on top of a post in the parking area.

In addition to the two major phases of construction, major exterior alterations to the subject building include the construction of the neon sign currently located in the parking lot (1937), the installation of the neon sign on the west façade (1961), and the replacement of the wall separating the parking lot from the sidewalk (1977). Various window replacements have occurred on the tertiary facades at unknown dates.

CEQA HISTORICAL RESOURCE(S) EVALUATION

The subject property is considered a Category A (Known Historic Resource), having been evaluated in a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE), dated January 2017, prepared by Architectural Resources Group (ARG). This HRE found the property at 4840 Mission Street to be eligible for individual listing in the California Register of Historical Resources under Criterion 3 (Architecture) as an outstanding intact example of a large-scale Midcentury Modern commercial building in San Francisco. The period of significance for the subject property is 1959. The Planning Department concurred with these findings in a Historic Resource Evaluation Response (HRER) dated March 8, 2018. The HRER also found that the subject property is not located in or adjacent to an eligible historic district.

See the attached HRE and HRER for further details regarding the subject building's historic significance.

INTEGRITY

The Department concurs with ARG's finding that the subject property retains a high degree of integrity, having undergone no major alterations since the 1959 renovation and expansion that resulted in the building's current appearance. Overall, 4840 Mission Street conveys its significance as a historic resource that is individually eligible for listing in the CRHR under Criterion 3 due to its full expression of the Midcentury Modern architectural style.

See the attached HRE and HRER for further details regarding building integrity.

CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES

Character-defining features of 4840 Mission Street are listed below:

- Box form and overall massing
- Two-story height
- Horizontal orientation
- Orientation toward Mission Street and lack of setback from the sidewalk
- Flat roof with varying heights and parapet walls
- Combination brick and reinforced concrete construction
- Large square porcelain enamel panels and brick veneer cladding
- Fenestration dating to the 1959 remodel, including aluminum sash and glass block windows
- Projecting boxes enframing windows
- Aluminum frame glazed doors
- Signage, including attached, projecting, and freestanding neon signs and painted signs
- Wood-clad belt course and awning on the east façade
- Porte-cochere on the south facade
- Enclosed walkway along the south façade
- Low tapered wall separating the driveway from the parking lot
- Landscaped beds along the east façade and the tapered wall

The Department concurs with the character-defining features identified by ARG.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project would result in the demolition of the existing historic resource at 4840 Mission Street and the non-historic building at 4950 Mission Street and associated surface parking lots, and the construction of a mixed-use development comprising three separate buildings constructed in two phases. The first phase would create the six- to seven-story 4840 Mission Street building, which would reach a maximum of 84 feet in height with setback upper stories. The second phase of development would create the two six-story buildings at 4950 Mission Street, which would share a common podium and garage and reach a maximum of 69 feet in height with setback upper stories. Altogether, the development would encompass 715,800 gsf and include 428 dwelling units (of which 175 would be affordable and 253 would be market-rate), a replacement grocery store, a health center, ground-floor retail and neighborhood services, and underground parking.

For additional information about the proposed project, please see the attached project plans.

PROJECT IMPACTS

Because it will result in the complete demolition of the existing building, which has been determined individually eligible for listing in the CRHR, the project will result in a significant impact to an identified historic resource.

PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVES

As the proposed project is anticipated to result in a significant impact on a historical resource due to demolition, the EIR will consider alternatives to the project. Alternatives considered under CEQA do not need to meet all project objectives; however, they should fully preserve the features of the resource that convey its significance while still meeting most of the basic objectives of the project. A full analysis of the project alternatives and a description of the project objectives are included in the attached Preservation Alternatives Report prepared by Page & Turnbull (Preservation Alternatives Report).

Department staff and the project team have identified the following preservation alternatives: No Project Alternative, Full Preservation Alternative 1, Full Preservation Alternative 2, and Partial Preservation Alternative. The Alternatives are depicted in the attached plan and massing studies.

No Project Alternative

The no project alternative would not include new construction or any demolition. The buildings at 4840 and 4950 Mission Street would remain.

The no project alternative would not result in a significant impact to historic resources.

Full Preservation Alternative 1

Full Preservation Alternative 1 would retain the former funeral parlor building and all character-defining features of the historic resource at 4840 Mission Street except for the freestanding neon sign adjacent to the parking lot entrance, which would be removed. The non-historic interior spaces of the funeral parlor would be removed. The non-historic supermarket building at 4950 Mission Street and all site parking lots would be demolished and three new six- to seven-story mixed-use buildings would be constructed to the south and west of the historic building. The new construction would connect to the historic building at the rear and would be physically separated from the historic building's visible south facade with a gap containing a plaza and the historic porte-cochère, which would be modified to cover a sloped vehicular entry to the underground parking. Full Preservation Alternative 1 differs from Full Preservation Alternative 2 (see below) in the wider physical separation between the historic building and the new construction along Mission Street, the modification of the driveway under the porte-cochère into a down ramp leading to underground parking, the interior program, and in miscellaneous site features such as the location and size of internal courtyards and pedestrian plazas.

Taken together, the new buildings and the rehabilitated historic building under Full Preservation Alternative 1 would contain 369 dwelling units (435, 739 gsf; 116 affordable units,

253 market-rate units), a supermarket (41,100 gsf), a health clinic (11,402 gsf), retail (13,503 gsf), a public plaza, and underground parking (285 spaces).

This Full Preservation Alternative would comply with all ten of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (the Standards) and therefore would result in a less-thansignificant impact to a historic resource. Full Preservation Alternative 1 meets or partially meets a majority of the objectives of the project. See the attached Preservation Alternatives Report for a comprehensive analysis of this Alternative under each of the Standards and an assessment of how it meets or fails to meet the individual project objectives.

Full Preservation Alternative 2

Full Preservation Alternative 2 would retain the funeral parlor building and all characterdefining features of the historic resource at 4840 Mission Street except for the freestanding neon sign adjacent to the parking lot entrance, which would be removed. The non-historic interior spaces of the funeral parlor would be removed. The non-historic supermarket building at 4950 Mission Street and all site parking lots would be demolished and three new six- to seven-story mixed-use buildings would be constructed to the south and west of the historic building. The new construction would connect to the historic building at the rear and would be physically separated from the historic building's visible south facade with an entry court containing the historic porte-cochère. Full Preservation Alternative 2 differs from Full Preservation Alternative 1 (see above) in the narrower physical separation between the historic building and the new construction along Mission Street, the modification of the driveway under the porte-cochère into a landscaped courtyard, the interior program, and in miscellaneous site features such as the location and size of internal courtyards and pedestrian plazas.

Taken together, the new buildings and the rehabilitated historic building under Full Preservation Alternative 2 would contain 369 dwelling units (472,190 gsf; 136 affordable units, 233 market-rate units), a supermarket (53,000 gsf), a health clinic (10,679 gsf), and underground parking (204 spaces).

This Full Preservation Alternative would comply with all ten of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and therefore would result in a less-than-significant impact to a historic resource. Full Preservation Alternative 2 meets or partially meets a majority of the objectives of the project. See the attached Preservation Alternatives Report for a comprehensive analysis of this Alternative under each of the Standards and an assessment of how it meets or fails to meet the individual project objectives.

Partial Preservation Alternative

The Partial Preservation Alternative for the project would demolish the rear half of the historic resource at 4840 Mission Street. The following character-defining features would be altered as a result of the removal: the box form and overall massing, the flat roof with varying heights and parapet walls, combination brick and reinforced concrete construction, some of the fenestration dating to the 1959 remodel, some of the projecting boxes enframing windows, some of the aluminum frame glazed doors, some of the wood-clad belt-course on the east façade, and some of the enclosed walkway on the south façade. Other character-defining features to be removed entirely include the porte-cochère along the visible south façade, the neon sign adjacent to the parking lot entrance, the neon sign attached to the rear façade, the

awning on the east façade, the low tapered wall separating the driveway from the parking lot, and the landscaped beds along with tapered wall would also be removed. The non-historic interior spaces of the funeral parlor would be removed.

The non-historic supermarket building at 4950 Mission Street and all site parking lots would be demolished and three new six- to seven-story mixed-use buildings would be constructed to the south and west of the modified historic building. The new construction would connect to the historic building at the rear and side (south) façade. The physical separation between the historic building and the new construction at the visible side façade would be 79 feet deep and 25 feet wide.

Taken together, the new buildings and the rehabilitated historic building would contain 379 dwelling units (465,909 gsf; 126 affordable units, 253 market-rate units), a supermarket (40,000 gsf), a health clinic (12,219 gsf), retail (13,503 gsf), and underground parking (300 spaces).

This Partial Preservation Alternative would comply with six of the ten Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. Although this Alternative would retain some architecturally significant features, more than half of the historic resource would be demolished and many of its features would be altered or removed. Therefore, the Partial Preservation Alternative would result in a significant impact to the historic resource. The Partial Preservation Alternative meets or partially meets a majority of the objectives of the project. See the attached Preservation Alternatives Report for a comprehensive analysis of this Alternative under each of the Standards and an assessment of how it meets or fails to meet the individual project objectives.

REQUESTED ACTION

Specifically, the Department seeks comments on the adequacy of the proposed Preservation Alternatives to address anticipated significant impacts to historic resources.

ATTACHMENTS

- 4840 Mission Street Preservation Alternatives Report (dated April 19, 2018), prepared by Page & Turnbull, including:
 - o Project Sponsor Objectives
 - o Preservation Alternatives Graphics Package
- Historic Resource Evaluation Part 1, prepared by Architectural Resources Group (dated January 2017)
- Historic Resource Evaluation Response, prepared by the San Francisco Planning Department (dated March 8, 2018)



4840 MISSION STREET PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVES REPORT

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA [18014, CASE NO. 2016-012545ENV] PREPARED FOR: SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT



APRIL 19, 2018

imagining change in historic environments through design, research, and technology

FINAL DRAFT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	I
METHODOLOGY	2
II. SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE	5
EVALUATION SUMMARY	5
CHARACT ER-DEFINING FEATURES	5
III. PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND DESCRIPTION	7
PROJECT SPONSORS' O BJECTIVES	7
PROPOSED PROJECT DESCRIPTION	7
IV. PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT	9
ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT O BJECTIVES	11
V. NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE	13
DESCRIPTION	13
ANALYSIS OF IMPACTS UND ER CEQA	13
VI. FULL PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE 1	14
DESCRIPTION	14
STANDARDS FOR REHABILITATION	15
ANALYSIS OF IMPACT UND ER CEQA	17
VII. FULL PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE 2	19
DESCRIPTION	19
STANDARDS FOR REHABILITATION	
ANALYSIS OF IMPACT UND ER CEQA	
VIII. PARTIAL PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE	24
DESCRIPTION	
STANDARDS FOR REHABILITATION	
ANALYSIS OF IMPACT UND ER CEQA	
IX. CONCLUSION	
X. REFERENCES CITED	30
APPENDIX: PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVES GRAPHICS PACKAGE	31

I. INTRODUCTION

This Preservation Alternatives Report has been prepared at the request of the San Francisco Planning Department for the proposed project at 4840 Mission Street (Assessor's Block 6959, Lots 019, 025, and 026) and 4950 Mission Street (Assessor's Block 6959, Lot 031) (Figure 1 and Figure 2). The project site is approximately four acres located in the Outer Mission neighborhood, just on the western border of the Excelsior neighborhood. It is bounded to the east by Mission Street, to the south by Seneca Avenue, to the west by Alemany Boulevard, and to the north by Onondaga Avenue. 4840 Mission Street contains the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home, which was initially completed in 1926 in a Spanish Colonial Revival design by architect John A. Porporato and later remodeled and expanded with a Midcentury Modern addition designed by architect Otto G. Hintermann in 1959.¹ 4950 Mission Street contains a Safeway that was constructed in 1980.²

Architectural Resource Group, Inc. (ARG) evaluated the age-eligible 4840 Mission Street property for historic significance in a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE Part 1), dated January 2017. The findings of the HRE Part 1 were reviewed and confirmed by the Planning Department in a Historic Resource Evaluation Response (HRER) dated March 8, 2018.³ The Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home at 4840 Mission Street was found to be individually eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) under Criterion 3 (Architecture) with a period of significance of 1959 and is thus considered a historical resource for the purposes of review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).⁴ The Safeway is not age eligible and has been determined not to be a historic resource for the purposes of CEQA review.

The proposed project involves the demolition of the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home at 4840 Mission Street, the Safeway at 4950 Mission Street, and all associated surface parking lots on the project site to construct one six- to seven-story mixed-use building that would reach a maximum of 84 feet, and one six-story 69-foot tall mixed-use building.⁵ The preservation alternatives analyzed in this technical report include a No Project Alternative, two Full Preservation Alternatives, and a Partial Preservation Alternative.



Figure 1: Assessor's map of the subject block. The parcels of 4840 Mission Street (the historic resource) are highlighted orange and the project site is outlined with blue dashes. Source: San Francisco Office of the Assessor-Recorder. Edited by Page & Turnbull.

¹ Architectural Resource Group, Inc., "4840 Mission Street, Historic Resource Evaluation," January 2017, 1.

² Assessor's Report, San Francisco Planning Department's Online Property Information Map.

³ San Francisco Planning Department, "Historic Resource Evaluation Response, 2016-012545ENV, 4840 Mission Street," March 8, 2018.

⁴ Architectural Resource Group, Inc., "4840 Mission Street, Historic Resource Evaluation," 25.

⁵ San Francisco Planning Department, "Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and Notice of Public Scoping Meeting (DRAFT: NOP-2)," March/April 2018, 1-2.



Figure 2: Bird's eye view of the property at 4840 Mission Street (the historic resource), delineated by orange outline. Source: Google Earth Pro, 2018. Edited by Page & Turnbull.

METHODOLOGY

This report follows the scope provided by the Planning Department for preservation alternative reports, and includes a summary of the property's significance, character-defining features, and proposed project description. Following guidance provided by "Historic Preservation Commission Resolution No. 0746," this report analyzes two Full Preservation Alternatives and a Partial Preservation Alternative for compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, pursuant to CEQA.

Under Case No. 2016-012545ENV, Page & Turnbull primarily referred to the "Historic Resource Evaluation Response, 2016-012545ENV, 4840 Mission Street" (HRER) by the Planning Department (March 8, 2018) and the "4840 Mission Street, Historic Resource Evaluation," (HRE Part 1) prepared by ARG (January 2017). Page & Turnbull also consulted the Planning Department's "Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and Notice of Public Scoping Meeting (DRAFT: NOP-2)" (March/April 2018).

The description of the proposed project is derived from the NOP. The No Project Alternative, Full Preservation Alternatives, and Partial Preservation Alternative were developed in consultation with the Planning Department. The preservation alternatives descriptions are based on the graphics package produced by Van Meter Williams Pollack LLP (see Appendix).

Determination of Significant Adverse Change Under CEQA

According to CEQA, a "project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historic resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment."⁶ Substantial adverse change is defined as: "physical demolition, destruction, relocation,

⁶ CEQA Guidelines subsection 15064.5(b).

or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historic resource would be materially impaired."⁷ The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a project "demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance" and that justify or account for its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to local ordinance or resolution.⁸ Thus, a project may cause a change in a historic resource but still not have a significant adverse effect on the environment as defined by CEQA as long as the impact of the change on the historic resource is determined to be less-than-significant, negligible, neutral, or even beneficial.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring and Reconstructing Historic Buildings provides standards and guidance for reviewing proposed work on historic properties.⁹ The Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties are used by federal agencies in evaluating work on historic properties. They have also been adopted by local government bodies across the country for reviewing proposed rehabilitation work on historic properties under local preservation ordinances. The Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties are a useful analytic tool for understanding and describing the potential impacts of substantial changes to historic properties: Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, and Reconstruction. The four distinct treatments are defined as follows:

Preservation: The Standards for Preservation "require retention of the greatest amount of historic fabric, along with the building's historic form, features, and detailing as they have evolved over time."

Rehabilitation: The Standards for Rehabilitation "acknowledge the need to alter or add to a historic building to meet continuing or new uses while retaining the building's historic character."

Restoration: The Standards for Restoration "allow for the depiction of a building at a particular time in its history by preserving materials from the period of significance and removing materials from other periods."

Reconstruction: The Standards for Reconstruction "establish a limited framework for recreating a vanished or non-surviving building with new materials, primarily for interpretive purposes."¹⁰

Typically, one treatment (and the appropriate set of standards) is chosen for a project based on the project scope. The scope for the proposed project's Full and Partial Preservation Alternatives seeks to alter a historic property to meet a new use while retaining the property's historic character. Therefore, the Standards for Rehabilitation are most appropriate.

⁷ CEQA Guidelines subsection 15064.5(b)(1).

⁸ CEQA Guidelines subsection 15064.5(b)(2).

⁹ Anne E. Grimmer, The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (U.S. Department of the Interior National Park Service Technical Preservation Services, Washington, D.C.: 2017), accessed July 20, 2017, https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/treatment-guidelines-2017.pdf.

¹⁰ National Park Service, "Introduction to Standards and Guidelines," accessed June 22, 2017,

https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/four-treatments/standguide/overview/using_standguide.htm.

Under CEQA, projects that comply with the Standards for Rehabilitation benefit from a regulatory presumption that they would have a less-than-significant adverse impact on a historic resource.¹¹ Projects that do not comply with all of the Standards for Rehabilitation may cause either a substantial or less-than-substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource. Thus, in some circumstances, a project may not comply with all ten Standards for Rehabilitation, but the historic resource's material integrity is retained to the extent that the property will continue to convey its historic significance and retain its eligibility for listing in the California Register.

¹¹ CEQA Guidelines, subsection 15064.5(b)(3).

II. SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Architectural Resource Group's HRE Part 1 for 4840 Mission Street determined that the property is eligible for individual listing in the California Register:

The Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home appears to be eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 3 as a significant example of Midcentury Modern commercial architecture in San Francisco. The period of significance dates to 1959 when the substantial remodel occurred. [...] The subject property appears to qualify for the California Register under Criterion 3 as a significant example of a Midcentury Modern commercial building in San Francisco. It exhibits several character definingfeatures of this style including a flat roof, porcelain enamel panels forming [a] geometric grid across the façade, roman brick veneer water table, aluminum sash windows and doors, clean lines, and minimal exterior detailing largely limited to the sweeping belt course across the east façade and the projecting boxes enframing windows at the second story. The prominent signage, both neon and painted, was designed to be read by drivers traveling up and down Mission Street and Alemany Boulevard, a common tactic employed [by] businesses located along busy commercial corridors of this era. Since the building has remained substantially unaltered since 1959, it represents an important intact example of a large-scale Midcentury Modern commercial building in San Francisco.12

The HRE Part 1 determined that the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home at 4840 Mission Street retains sufficient overall integrity to convey its significance. The Planning Department concurred with ARG's finding in the HRER.¹³

CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES

For a property to be eligible for national or state designation under criteria related to type, period, or method of construction, the essential physical features (or character-defining features) that enable the property to convey its historic identity must be evident. These distinctive character-defining features are the physical traits that commonly recur in property types and/or architectural styles. To be eligible, a property must clearly contain enough of those characteristics to be considered a true representative of a particular type, period, or method of construction, and these features must also retain a sufficient degree of integrity. Characteristics can be expressed in terms of form, proportion, structure, plan, style, or materials.

The Planning Department generally concurred with the list of character-defining features identified in the HRE Part 1 prepared by ARG, though the Planning Department removed those features relating to the original 1926 design from ARG's list. Therefore, the character-defining features for the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home at 4840 Mission Street are as follows:

- Box form and overall massing
- Two-story height
- Horizontal orientation
- Orientation toward Mission Street and lack of setback from the sidewalk
- Flat roof with varying heights and parapet walls

¹² Architectural Resource Group, Inc., "4840 Mission Street, Historic Resource Evaluation," 25, 27.

¹³ San Francisco Planning Department, "Historic Resource Evaluation Response, 2016-012545ENV, 4840 Mission Street," 6.

- Combination brick and reinforced concrete construction
- Large square porcelain enamel panels and brick veneer cladding
- Fenestration dating to the 1959 remodel, including aluminum sash and glass block windows
- Projecting boxes enframing windows
- Aluminum frame glazed doors
- Signage, including attached, projecting, and freestanding neon signs and painted signs
- Wood-clad belt course and awning on the east façade
- Porte-cochere on the south facade
- Enclosed walkway along the south façade
- Low tapered wall separating the driveway from the parking lot
- Landscaped beds along the east façade and the tapered wall¹⁴

Henceforth, the use of "historic" to describe an element indicates that the element is considered a character-defining feature as defined above; alternatively, the use of "non-historic" or "not historic" indicates that the element is not considered a significant or character-defining feature. Additionally, the use of "historic resource" or "historic property" refers to the collection of historic elements at 4840 Mission Street.

¹⁴ Ibid., 9-10.

III. PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND DESCRIPTION

The National Electrical Benefit Fund and BRIDGE Housing Corporation (the "Project Sponsors") are undertaking the proposed project at 4840 and 4950 Mission Street. As discussed in the HRER, the Planning Department found that "The proposed project will have a significant impact on the individually eligible historic resource at 4840 Mission Street, which will be demolished. Demolition would remove all character-defining features of the individually eligible building and would materially impair its ability convey its historic significance."¹⁵

PROJECT SPONSORS' OBJECTIVES

The Project Sponsors seek to achieve the following objectives by undertaking the proposed project:

- 1. Redevelop the project site with a mix of residential, grocery store, retail, and community health care uses.
- 2. Build approximately 430 rental dwelling units in a range of unit sizes, including approximately 40 percent on-site affordable units.
- 3. Replace the existing Safeway grocery store and expand its size, while satisfying Safeway's requirement that the existing store remain in business until the replacement store is completed.
- 4. Provide approximately 10,000 square feet of space to allow the existing Mission Neighborhood Health Center to relocate from its current location at 4434 Mission Street to the project site and to expand in size.
- 5. Provide ground floor retail space of sufficient size to attract neighborhood-serving retail and personal services tenants.
- 6. Develop a project that is financially feasible.

PROPOSED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The "Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and Notice of Public Scoping Meeting (DRAFT: NOP-2)" provides the following summary description of the proposed project at 4840 and 4950 Mission Street (refer to the **Appendix** for graphics of the proposed project):

The 4840/4950 Mission Street project (proposed project) is in San Francisco's Outer Mission/Excelsior neighborhood, encompassing the site of the Valente Marini Perata Funeral home and the existing Safeway, at 4840 and 4950 Mission Street, respectively. The National Electrical Benefit Fund (a union pension fund) and BRIDGE Housing Corporation, the project sponsors, propose to demolish the existing buildings and associated surface parking lots on the project site to construct one six- to seven-story mixed-use building that would reach a maximum of 84 feet, and one six-story 69-foot tall mixed-use building.

The proposed project would result in the phased development of three mixed-use buildings on a total 151,700-square-foot site (Assessor's Block 6959, Lot 019, 025, 026,

¹⁵ San Francisco Planning Department, "Historic Resource Evaluation Response, 2016-012545ENV, 4840 Mission Street," 11.

and 031) located at 4840 Mission Street (phase I) and 4950 Mission Street (phase II). The proposed buildings would total approximately 715,800 gross square feet, including below- grade parking. They would include 428 dwelling units, including 175 affordable units and 253 market-rate units; a replacement grocery store; a health center; other ground-floor retail and neighborhood services; as well as an underground parking garage. The proposed 4840 Mission Street building would be a maximum of 79 feet in height at the roofline along Mission Street. Due to the slope of the site, the building would be set back approximately 30 feet from the property line. At 4950 Mission Street, two buildings sharing a common podium and garage would be a maximum of 69 feet in height at the roofline along Mission Street and Alemany Boulevard. The upper three floors of the building would be set back approximately 30 feet from the property line. At 4950 Mission Street, two buildings would be set back approximately 30 feet and Alemany Boulevard. The upper three floors of the building would be set back approximately 20 feet from the Alemany Boulevard property line. Rooftop mechanical penthouses and elevator overruns (which are exempt from the measurement of building height under the planning code), would reach a height of 89 feet at 4840 Mission Street and 79 feet at 4950 Mission Street.

[...] The development of 4840 Mission Street would occur first, and would include 175 affordable rental units located above and behind a new ground-floor Safeway grocery store that would be relocated from its current location at 4950 Mission Street. The store would be open 24 hours a day. The 4840 Mission Street site would also include the Mission Neighborhood Health Center on the second-floor, a facility that would be relocated from its current location Street.

Construction at 4950 Mission Street would occur following completion of the 4840 Mission Street site, including demolition of the existing Safeway and completion of the new Safeway. The 4950 Mission Street site would include the development of 253 market-rate units above 13,500 total square feet of ground-floor neighborhood-serving retail and a public plaza. The 4840 Mission Street residential units would be available for occupancy before completion of development at 4950 Mission Street.¹⁶

¹⁶ San Francisco Planning Department, "Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and Notice of Public Scoping Meeting (DRAFT: NOP-2)," 1-2, 6.

IV. PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT

This section provides an overview of the process that the San Francisco Planning Department staff, Project Sponsors, and Page & Turnbull undertook to develop the preservation alternatives for the proposed project at 4840 and 4950 Mission Street. Three preservation alternatives have been developed and illustrated to include two full preservation alternatives and one partial preservation alternative as summarized below and described in the following sections.

The Planning Department staff, Project Sponsors, and Page & Turnbull aimed to develop two Full Preservation Alternatives that reduced impacts to the historic Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home by proposing to rehabilitate the resource to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. In order to incorporate elements of the proposed project and retain all characterdefining features of the historic resource, two components of a project objective would compete: replacing the Safeway while the existing store remains in business until the replacement store is completed, which is met by Full Preservation Alternative 1 but not by Full Preservation Alternative 2; and expanding the size of the current Safeway, which is met by Full Preservation Alternative 2 but not by Full Preservation Alternative 1. These two Full Preservation Alternatives were therefore developed to separately and more closely meet the two parts of that project objective. The aim of the Partial Preservation Alternative was to retain in full or in part the character-defining features of the identified historic resource.

Full Preservation Alternative 1 would build the Safeway grocery store and affordable residential units around the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home at 4840 Mission Street in order to retain the historic resource and nearly all of its character-defining features. The rest of Full Preservation Alternative 1, particularly at 4950 Mission Street, would remain similar to the proposed project.

Full Preservation Alternative 2 would build the affordable residential units around the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home at 4840 Mission Street in order to retain the historic resource and nearly all of its character-defining features. It would move the Safeway grocery store to 4950 Mission Street and construct the market-rate residential units above the Safeway, all of which would involve slightly different building designs as compared to Full Preservation Alternative 1.

The Partial Preservation Alternative would accommodate more affordable residential units as compared to Full Preservation Alternative 1 by removing the rear half of the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home. The rest of the Partial Preservation Alternative, particularly at 4950 Mission Street, would remain the same as Full Preservation Alternative 1.

These three preservation alternatives schemes would require extensive seismic upgrades to the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home building which would include drilling foundation piers into bedrock, underpinning the buildings' foundation system and tying the building's structural systems to the new foundation. This complex process is exacerbated by the high liquefaction susceptibility of the soils of this area and the fact that the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home includes two structures and two structural systems built over 25 years apart.

All new construction proposed in the preservation alternatives has been designed to the greatest extent that is technically feasible to be comparable in square footage to the proposed project; the preservation alternatives illustrated are based on the proposed project program, building types, and their limitations. The alternatives shown are limited in height and square footage based on the Building Code, as subject to the proposed project.

The following table from the graphics package in the **Appendix** presents a summary of approximate square footage and unit counts for the proposed project compared to the preservation alternatives, which are described in later sections of this report. This summary table also includes the CEQA-required No Project Alternative, per CEQA Section 15126.6(e).

									1			La			
	TR.	/	F	1 Percent	-	A-	- 21	/	E.		/	A	ALC ALC	/	TS P
					-	PRESERVATI	PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVES SUMMARY	FIVES SUMM	ARY						
		PROPOSED PROJECT		- 4	NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE		FUL A	FULL PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE 1	z	FULL	FULL PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE 2	z	PARTI	PARTIAL PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE	N
	4950 MISSION 4840 N STREET (MARKET STREET RATE UNITS) (AFFOR UNITS)	4840 MISSION STREET (AFFORDABLE UNITS)	TOTAL	4950 MISSION 4840 N STREET (MARKET STREET RATE UNITS) (AFFOR UNITS)	4840 MISSION STREET (AFFORDABLE UNITS)	TOTAL	4950 MISSION 4840 N STREET (MARKET STREET RATE UNITS) (AFFOR UNITS)	4840 MISSION STREET (AFFORDABLE UNITS)	TOTAL	4950 MISSION 4840 N STREET (MARKET STREET RATE UNITS) (AFFOR UNITS)	4840 MISSION STREET (AFFORDABLE UNITS)	TOTAL	4950 MISSION 4840 N STREET (MARKET STREET RATE UNITS) (AFFOR UNITS)	4840 MISSION STREET (AFFORDABLE UNITS)	TOTAL
UNITS	253	175	428	ī	1	I	253	116	369	233	136	369	253	126	379
SAFEWAY SQUARE FOOTAGE	ŗ	53,000	53,000	36,000	Ĩ	36,000	I.	41,100	41,100	53,000	E	53,000	ľ.	40,000	40,000
RESIDENTIAL SQUARE FOOTAGE *	E 288,909	207,309	496,218	1	ï	1	288,909	146,830	435,739	263,153	209,037	472,190	288,909	177,000	465,909
CLINIC SQUARE FOOTAGE		9,620	9,620	2	5	1	IJ.	11,402	11,402	j.	10,679	10,679	9	12,219	12,219
OTHER RETAIL SQUARE FOOTAGE	13,503	Ľ	13,503	Ę	Ĩ.	I.	13,503	Ĩ	13,503	Ĩ	Ĩ	15	13,503	I.	13,503
NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES	5 204	126	330	106	94	200	204	81	285	204	0	204	204	96	300
NUMBER OF STORIES	6	6 – 7	1	1	2	1	9	6 - 7	J	9	6 - 7	4	9	6 – 7	1
BUILDING HEIGHT	"0-,69	79' - 84'	T	25'-0"	35'-0"	I.	69'-0"	79' - 84'	Į.	. 69"-0"	79' - 84'	I.	.0-,69	79' - 84'	É
HISTORIC BUILDING SQUARE FOOTAGE RETAINED**	0	0	0		20,565	20,565	0	20,565	20,565	0	20,565	20,565	0	12,219	12,219
* INCLUDES RESIDENTIAL COMMON & CIRCULATION AREAS ** EXCITING STRUCTURE INCLUDES 14,400 GROUND FLOOR, 4,900 SECOND FLOOR AND 1,265 PORTE-COCHERE	MMON & CIRCULATION / .UDES 14,400 GROUND . PORTE-COCHERE	AREAS FLOOR, 4,900													

ABILITY TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The following table outlines whether or not the Project Sponsors' objectives are met in the proposed project, No Project Alternative, two Full Preservation Alternatives, and Partial Preservation Alternative. The table is for high-level comparison purposes of the preservation alternatives only. Explanations are only included if further elaboration is needed to compare the alternative to the proposed project. The table assumes that the proposed project was designed to meet all of the Project Sponsors' objectives and that the No Project Alternative does not meet any of the objectives.

	oject Sponsors' bjectives	Proposed Project	No Project Alternative	Full Preservation Alternative 1	Full Preservation Alternative 2	Partial Preservation Alternative
1.	Redevelop the project site with a mix of residential, grocery store, retail, and community health care uses.	Yes	No	Yes The project site would be redeveloped with a mix of residential, grocery store, retail, and community health care uses.	Partial "Other retail" would not be provided; the project site would only be redeveloped with a mix of residential, grocery store, and community health care uses.	Yes The project site would be redeveloped with a mix of residential, grocery store, retail, and community health care uses.
2.	Build approximately 430 rental dwelling units in a range of unit sizes, including approximately 40 percent on-site affordable units.	Yes	No	Partial Only 369 units would be built compared to 428 units in the proposed project.	Partial Only 369 units would be built compared to 428 units in the proposed project.	Partial Only 379 units would be built compared to 428 units in the proposed project.
3.	Replace the existing Safeway grocery store and expand its size, while satisfying Safeway's requirement that the existing store remain in business until the replacement store is completed.	Yes	No	Partial The size would only be expanded to 41,100 square feet compared to the 53,000 square feet in the proposed project.	Partial The existing Safeway would have to close until the replacement store is completed.	Partial The size would only be expanded to 40,000 square feet compared to the 53,000 square feet in the proposed project.

Project Object	t Sponsors' ives	Proposed Project	No Project Alternative	Full Preservation Alternative 1	Full Preservation Alternative 2	Partial Preservation Alternative
10,0 spac exist Neig Cent fron locat Miss Proj	vide approximately 00 square feet of the to allow the ting Mission ghborhood Health ter to relocate in its current tion at 4434 sion Street to the tect site and to and in size.	Yes	No	Yes All 10,000 square feet for the Mission Neighborhood Health Center would be provided.	Yes All 10,000 square feet for the Mission Neighborhood Health Center would be provided.	Yes All 10,000 square feet for the Mission Neighborhood Health Center would be provided.
retai Safe size neigl retai	vide ground floor l space [aside from way] of sufficient to attract hborhood-serving l and personal ices tenants.	Yes	No	Yes 13,503 square feet of ground-floor retail space would be provided.	No Ground-floor retail space would not be provided.	Yes 13,503 square feet of ground-floor retail space would be provided.
	relop a project that nancially feasible.	Yes	No	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

V. NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

DESCRIPTION

Under the No Project Alternative, no modifications to the existing historic resource would be completed. No additional residential, retail, and/or commercial units or buildings would be added. The historic character-defining features of the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home at 4840 Mission Street would be retained; no modifications, repairs, or restoration activities would be conducted. The Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home would remain at a height of 35 feet tall (two stories over a basement). The historic resource would retain its total 20,565 gross square feet of commercial space, including the ground floor, second floor, and porte-cochere.

The No Project Alternative would not meet any of the Project Sponsors' objectives.

ANALYSIS OF IMPACTS UNDER CEQA

Since the No Project Alternative would not demolish or make any modifications to the historic resource, it would not cause material impairment. Compared to the proposed project, which would result in a significant and unavoidable impact, the No Project Alternative would not result in any project-level impacts and would not contribute to any cumulative impacts related to historic architectural resources.

VI. FULL PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE I

DESCRIPTION

Full Preservation Alternative 1 would retain nearly all of the character-defining features of the historic resource at 4840 Mission Street. The Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home would maintain its box form and overall massing; two-story height; horizontal orientation; orientation toward Mission Street and lack of setback from the sidewalk; flat roof with varying heights and parapet walls; combination brick and reinforced concrete construction; large square porcelain enamel panels and brick veneer cladding; fenestration dating to the 1959 remodel, including aluminum sash and glass block windows; projecting boxes enframing windows; aluminum frame glazed doors; attached painted signs and projecting neon signs; wood-clad belt course and awning on the east façade; porte-cochere on the south façade; enclosed walkway along the south façade; low tapered wall separating the driveway from the parking lot; and landscaped beds along the east façade and the tapered wall. The only character-defining feature to be fully removed would be the freestanding neon sign adjacent to the parking lot entrance. Interior spaces of the historic building, which are not historic, would be significantly altered to accommodate a portion of the Safeway grocery store as well as the Mission Neighborhood Health Clinic (Clinic).

On the project site, three new mixed-use buildings would be located to the south and west of the historic building. One mixed-use building would be located at 4840 Mission Street, and would contain the Safeway at the ground level, an entry court, below-grade parking, 116 affordable residential units mostly above the Safeway, and common areas for those units (including lobbies, courtyards, and the management offices). The other two mixed-use buildings would be located at 4950 Mission Street, and would contain public plazas, retail at the ground level, below-grade parking, 253 market-rate residential units, and common areas for those units (including amenities, lobbies, and courtyards). The façades of the new buildings would be designed with modern materials, such as steel, glazing, cement plaster, integral color concrete, cement board siding, fibre cement panels, phenolic panels, and aluminum storefronts. The new buildings would require excavation for the foundations and structural work, as well as for the below-grade parking garages, which would have a total of 285 parking spaces.

The new 4840 Mission Street building adjacent to the historic building would be L-shaped in plan and would be between 79 and 84 feet tall (six to seven stories) depending on the site's slope. The new building would connect to the rear of the historic building, and would have an approximately 115-foot setback from the historic building's primary (east) façade. Along Mission Street, there would be a gap of approximately 55 feet between the historic building and the new 4840 Mission Street building to maintain the historic landscape features and view corridors from the public right-of-way. The gap would consist of a plaza and the existing porte-cochere repurposed as an access ramp to below-grade parking.

The new 4950 Mission Street buildings would directly abut the new 4840 Mission Street building to the north. These buildings would share a podium and parking garage, as well as mechanical, electrical, and plumbing. A public plaza would separate the two buildings. With rectangular- and O-shaped plans, the buildings would be up to 69 feet tall (six stories).

Overall, Full Preservation Alternative 1 would provide 435,739 gross square feet of residential use, 41,100 gross square feet for the Safeway, 13,503 gross square feet of other retail space, and 11,402 gross square feet for the Clinic. The historic building would retain its total 20,565 gross square feet for repurposed commercial use as the Clinic and as part of the Safeway with extensive interior and structural upgrades.

Full Preservation Alternative 1 meets or partially meets a majority of the Project Sponsors' objectives (see table in the "Ability to Meet Project Objectives" section).

STANDARDS FOR REHABILITATION

The following analysis applies each of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (the Standards) to Full Preservation Alternative 1 for 4840 Mission Street.

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.

Discussion: Full Preservation Alternative 1 would retain a commercial use in the historic building, though no longer as a funeral home but as the Clinic and part of the Safeway. Full Preservation Alternative 1 would also introduce a new residential use to the property, as well as additional commercial use for the remainder of the Safeway. The conversion of the funeral home to the Clinic and Safeway and the addition of the new residential use and more commercial use would require only one change to the defining characteristics of the historic resource: removing the freestanding neon sign adjacent to the existing parking lot entrance (see Rehabilitation Standard 2 for more discussion). Full Preservation Alternative 1 would change the physical appearance of the historic resource's site and environment, but the character of the historic resource would remain evident.

Therefore, Full Preservation Alternative 1 as proposed would be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 1.

Rehabilitation 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.

Discussion: Full Preservation Alternative 1 would retain and preserve nearly all of the character-defining features of the historic resource. The Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home would maintain its box form and overall massing; two-story height; horizontal orientation; orientation toward Mission Street and lack of setback from the sidewalk; flat roof with varying heights and parapet walls; combination brick and reinforced concrete construction; large square porcelain enamel panels and brick veneer cladding; fenestration dating to the 1959 remodel, including aluminum sash and glass block windows; projecting boxes enframing windows; aluminum frame glazed doors; attached painted signs and projecting neon signs; wood-clad belt course and awning on the east façade; porte-cochere on the south façade; enclosed walkway along the south façade; low tapered wall separating the driveway from the parking lot; and landscaped beds along the east façade and the tapered wall. The only character-defining feature to be fully removed would be the freestanding neon sign adjacent to the parking lot entrance. Although the removal and/or alteration of character-defining features would not be completely avoided, the historic character of the property would be maintained and preserved.

Therefore, Full Preservation Alternative 1 as proposed would be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 2.

Rehabilitation Standard 3: Each property shall 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.

Discussion: Full Preservation Alternative 1 would not apply Midcentury Modern features to the historic resource that are not substantiated by documentary evidence to have existed on the property previously, and the new buildings would be clearly differentiated from the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home in location, materiality, and design (see Rehabilitation Standard 9 for more

information). No conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings are proposed and no changes would be made that create a false sense of historical development.

Therefore, Full Preservation Alternative 1 as proposed would be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 3.

Rehabilitation Standard 4: Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

Discussion: There are no changes to the historic resource beyond the identified period of significance (1959) that have acquired historic significance in their own right. None of the non-historic features have been found significant.

Therefore, Full Preservation Alternative 1 as proposed would be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 4.

Rehabilitation Standard 5: Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.

Discussion: As described under Rehabilitation Standard 2, Full Preservation Alternative 1 would preserve nearly all of the distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize the historic resource. Only the freestanding neon sign adjacent to the parking lot entrance would be removed.

Therefore, Full Preservation Alternative 1 as proposed would be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 5.

Rehabilitation 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.

Discussion: The scope of repair has not been determined for Full Preservation Alternative 1, but repair or needed replacement of existing materials would follow the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

Therefore, Full Preservation Alternative 1 as proposed would be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 6.

Rehabilitation 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.

Discussion: The scope of chemical or physical treatments has not been determined for Full Preservation Alternative 1, but cleaning treatments would follow the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and would be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

Therefore, Full Preservation Alternative 1 as proposed would be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 7.

Rehabilitation 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.

Discussion: Full Preservation Alternative 1 involves excavation for foundation and structural work in order to support the new buildings and the associated below-grade parking. If any archaeological material were to be encountered during the construction of Full Preservation Alternative 1, the City and County of San Francisco's standard procedures for treatment of archeological materials would be adhered to.

If standard procedures are followed in the case of an encounter with archaeological material, Full Preservation Alternative 1 would be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 8.

Rehabilitation Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

Discussion: As discussed previously, Full Preservation Alternative 1 would retain nearly all of the historic resource's character-defining features. The new six- to seven-story buildings would be differentiated with modern materials and design. Despite the height and massing difference, the gap along Mission Street between the historic building and the new 4840 Mission Street building as well as the deep setback of the new building would visually separate the two buildings. The historic resource's environment would change, but the historic resource would still retain its integrity and Midcentury Modern commercial presence along Mission Street. The new buildings and related new construction would not destroy historic materials that characterize the property.

Therefore, Full Preservation Alternative 1 as proposed would be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 9.

Rehabilitation 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.

Discussion: If the new buildings and other related construction are hypothetically removed in the future, the historic resource would retain nearly all of its character-defining features. The essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired; the historic resource would still be able to convey its significance as a Midcentury Modern commercial building in San Francisco. Further, the removal of the new buildings would in fact restore a lower density environment that currently and historically has existed around the historic property.

Therefore, Full Preservation Alternative 1 as proposed would be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 10.

ANALYSIS OF IMPACT UNDER CEQA

The purpose of Full Preservation Alternative 1 is to consider a plan that would lessen the significant impacts of the proposed project on the existing historic resource. As explained in "Historic Preservation Commission Resolution No. 0746" (March 18, 2015), the Full Preservation Alternative "should fully preserve the features of the resource that convey its historic significance while still meeting most of the basic objectives of the project."¹⁷ As the above analysis demonstrates, Full

¹⁷ San Francisco Planning Department, "Historic Preservation Commission Resolution No. 0746," March 18, 2015, 2.

Preservation Alternative 1 as proposed for 4840 Mission Street would be in compliance with all ten of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. According to Section 15126.4(b)(1) of the Public Resources Code (CEQA), if a project complies with the Standards, the project's impact "will generally be considered mitigated below a level of significance and thus is not significant."

VII. FULL PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE 2

DESCRIPTION

Full Preservation Alternative 2 would retain nearly all of the character-defining features of the historic resource at 4840 Mission Street. The Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home would maintain its box form and overall massing; two-story height; horizontal orientation; orientation toward Mission Street and lack of setback from the sidewalk; flat roof with varying heights and parapet walls; combination brick and reinforced concrete construction; large square porcelain enamel panels and brick veneer cladding; fenestration dating to the 1959 remodel, including aluminum sash and glass block windows; projecting boxes enframing windows; aluminum frame glazed doors; attached painted signs and projecting neon signs; wood-clad belt course and awning on the east façade; porte-cochere on the south façade; enclosed walkway along the south façade; low tapered wall separating the driveway from the parking lot; and landscaped beds along the east façade and the tapered wall. The only character-defining feature to be fully removed would be the freestanding neon sign adjacent to the parking lot entrance. Interior spaces of the historic building, which are not historic, would be extensively altered to accommodate the Mission Neighborhood Health Clinic as well as a common space for the adjacent new affordable residential units.

On the project site, three new buildings would be located to the south and west of the historic building. One residential building would be located at 4840 Mission Street, and would contain an entry court, below-grade parking, 136 affordable residential units, and common areas for those units (including lobbies, courtyards, and the management offices). Two mixed-use buildings would be located at 4950 Mission Street, and would contain the Safeway at the ground level, a public plaza, below-grade parking, 233 market-rate residential units mostly above the Safeway, and common areas for those units (including amenities, lobbies, and courtyards). The façades of all new buildings would be designed with modern materials, such as steel, glazing, cement plaster, integral color concrete, cement board siding, fibre cement panels, phenolic panels, and aluminum storefronts. The new buildings would require excavation for the foundations and structural work, as well as for the below-grade parking garage of 4950 Mission Street, which would have a total of 204 parking spaces.

The new 4840 Mission Street building adjacent to the historic building would be L-shaped in plan and would be between 79 and 84 feet tall (six to seven stories) depending on the site's slope. The new building would connect to the rear of the historic building, and would have an approximately 115-foot setback from the historic building's primary (east) façade. Along Mission Street, there would be an entry court of approximately 47 feet between the historic building and the new 4840 Mission Street building to maintain the historic landscape features and view corridors from the public right-of-way.

The new 4950 Mission Street buildings would be mostly separated from the new 4840 Mission Street building to the north by a narrow courtyard. With rectangular- and O-shaped plans, they would be up to 69 feet tall (six stories).

Overall, Full Preservation Alternative 2 would provide 472,190 gross square feet of residential use, 53,000 gross square feet for the Safeway, 10,679 gross square feet for the Clinic, and no other retail space. The historic building would retain its total 20,565 gross square feet for repurposed commercial use as the Clinic and as common space for the affordable units with extensive interior and structural upgrades.

Full Preservation Alternative 2 meets or partially meets a majority of the Project Sponsors' objectives (see table in the "Ability to Meet Project Objectives" section).

STANDARDS FOR REHABILITATION

The following analysis applies each of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (the Standards) to Full Preservation Alternative 2 for 4840 Mission Street.

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.

Discussion: Full Preservation Alternative 2 would retain a commercial use in the historic building, though no longer as a funeral home but as the Clinic. Full Preservation Alternative 2 would also introduce a new residential use to the historic building and property; a portion of the historic building would be used as common space for the affordable units and the rest of the property would be filled with those affordable units. The conversion of the funeral home to the Clinic and common space and the addition of the new residential use to the property would require only one change to the defining characteristics of the historic resource: removing the freestanding neon sign adjacent to the existing parking lot entrance (see Rehabilitation Standard 2 for more discussion). Full Preservation Alternative 2 would change the physical appearance of the historic resource's site and environment, but the character of the historic resource would remain evident.

Therefore, Full Preservation Alternative 2 as proposed would be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 1.

Rehabilitation 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.

Discussion: Full Preservation Alternative 2 would retain and preserve the majority of the characterdefining features of the historic resource. The Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home would maintain its box form and overall massing; two-story height; horizontal orientation; orientation toward Mission Street and lack of setback from the sidewalk; flat roof with varying heights and parapet walls; combination brick and reinforced concrete construction; large square porcelain enamel panels and brick veneer cladding; fenestration dating to the 1959 remodel, including aluminum sash and glass block windows; projecting boxes enframing windows; aluminum frame glazed doors; attached painted signs and projecting neon signs; wood-clad belt course and awning on the east façade; porte-cochere on the south façade; enclosed walkway along the south façade; low tapered wall separating the driveway from the parking lot; and landscaped beds along the east façade and the tapered wall. The only character-defining feature to be fully removed would be the freestanding neon sign adjacent to the parking lot entrance. Although the removal and/or alteration of character-defining features would not be completely avoided, the historic character of the property would be maintained and preserved.

Therefore, Full Preservation Alternative 2 as proposed would be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 2.

Rehabilitation Standard 3: Each property shall 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.

Discussion: Full Preservation Alternative 2 would not apply Midcentury Modern features to the historic resource that are not substantiated by documentary evidence to have existed on the property previously, and the new buildings would be clearly differentiated from the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home in location, materiality, and design (see Rehabilitation Standard 9 for more information). No conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings are proposed and no changes would be made that create a false sense of historical development.

Therefore, Full Preservation Alternative 2 as proposed would be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 3.

Rehabilitation Standard 4: Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

Discussion: There are no changes to the historic resource beyond the identified period of significance (1959) that have acquired historic significance in their own right. None of the non-historic features have been found significant.

Therefore, Full Preservation Alternative 2 as proposed would be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 4.

Rehabilitation Standard 5: Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.

Discussion: As described under Rehabilitation Standard 2, Full Preservation Alternative 2 would preserve nearly all of the distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize the historic resource. Only the freestanding neon sign adjacent to the parking lot entrance would be removed.

Therefore, Full Preservation Alternative 2 as proposed would be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 5.

Rehabilitation 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.

Discussion: The scope of repair has not been determined for Full Preservation Alternative 2, but repair or needed replacement of existing materials would follow the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

Therefore, Full Preservation Alternative 2 as proposed would be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 6.

Rehabilitation 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.

Discussion: The scope of chemical or physical treatments has not been determined for Full Preservation Alternative 2, but cleaning treatments would follow the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and would be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

Therefore, Full Preservation Alternative 2 as proposed would be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 7.

Rehabilitation 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.

Discussion: Full Preservation Alternative 2 involves excavation for foundation and structural work in order to support the new buildings and the associated below-grade parking. If any archaeological material were to be encountered during the construction of Full Preservation Alternative 2, the City and County of San Francisco's standard procedures for treatment of archeological materials would be adhered to.

If standard procedures are followed in the case of an encounter with archaeological material, Full Preservation Alternative 2 would be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 8.

Rehabilitation Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

Discussion: As discussed previously, Full Preservation Alternative 2 would retain nearly all of the historic resource's character-defining features. The new six- to seven-story buildings would be differentiated with modern materials and design. Despite the height and massing difference, the gap along Mission Street between the historic building and the new 4840 Mission Street building as well as the deep setback of the new building would visually separate the two buildings. The historic resource's environment would change, but the historic resource would still retain its integrity and Midcentury Modern commercial presence along Mission Street. The new buildings and related new construction would not destroy historic materials that characterize the property.

Therefore, Full Preservation Alternative 2 as proposed would be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 9.

Rehabilitation 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.

Discussion: If the new buildings and other related construction are hypothetically removed in the future, the historic resource would retain nearly all of its character-defining features. The essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired; the historic resource would still be able to convey its significance as a Midcentury Modern commercial building in San Francisco. Further, the removal of the new buildings would in fact restore a lower density environment that currently and historically has existed around the historic property.

Therefore, Full Preservation Alternative 2 as proposed would be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 10.

ANALYSIS OF IMPACT UNDER CEQA

The purpose of Full Preservation Alternative 2 is to consider a plan that would lessen the significant impacts of the proposed project on the existing historic resource. As explained in "Historic Preservation Commission Resolution No. 0746" (March 18, 2015), the Full Preservation Alternative "should fully preserve the features of the resource that convey its historic significance while still meeting most of the basic objectives of the project."¹⁸ As the above analysis demonstrates, Full

¹⁸ San Francisco Planning Department, "Historic Preservation Commission Resolution No. 0746," 2.

Preservation Alternative 2 as proposed for 4840 Mission Street would be in compliance with all ten of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. According to Section 15126.4(b)(1) of the Public Resources Code (CEQA), if a project complies with the Standards, the project's impact "will generally be considered mitigated below a level of significance and thus is not significant."

VIII. PARTIAL PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE

DESCRIPTION

The Partial Preservation Alternative would remove the rear half of the historic building at 4840 Mission Street. The following character-defining features of the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home would be altered due to the removal of the historic building's rear half and construction of a new mixed-use building: the box form and overall massing; flat roof with varying heights and parapet walls; combination brick and reinforced concrete construction; some of the fenestration dating to the 1959 remodel, including aluminum sash and glass block windows; some of the projecting boxes enframing windows; some of the aluminum frame glazed doors; some of the wood-clad belt course on the east facade; and some of the enclosed walkway along the south facade. The following characterdefining features would be completely removed: the freestanding neon sign adjacent to the parking lot entrance and attached neon sign on the rear (west) façade; awning on the east façade; porte-cochere on the south façade; low tapered wall separating the driveway from the parking lot; and landscaped beds along the tapered wall. The character-defining features that would remain fully intact and undisturbed include the two-story height; horizontal orientation; orientation toward Mission Street and lack of setback from the sidewalk; large square porcelain enamel panels and brick veneer cladding; attached painted signs and projecting neon sign at the front half; and the landscaped beds along the east facade. Interior spaces of the historic building, which are not historic, would be altered to accommodate the Mission Neighborhood Health Clinic.

On the project site, three new mixed-use buildings would be located to the south and west of the historic building. One mixed-use building would be located at 4840 Mission Street, and would contain the Safeway at the ground level, small public plazas, below-grade parking, 126 affordable residential units mostly above the Safeway, and common areas for those units (including lobbies, courtyards, and the management offices). The other two mixed-use buildings would be located at 4950 Mission Street, and would contain public plazas, retail at the ground level, below-grade parking, 253 market-rate residential units, and common areas for those units (including amenities, lobbies, and courtyards). The façades of all new buildings would be designed with modern materials, such as steel, glazing, cement plaster, integral color concrete, cement board siding, fibre cement panels, phenolic panels, and aluminum storefronts. The new buildings would require excavation for the foundations and structural work, as well as for the below-grade parking garages, which would have a total of 300 parking spaces.

The new 4840 Mission Street building adjacent to the historic building would be L-shaped in plan and would be between 79 and 84 feet tall (six to seven stories) depending on the site's slope. The new building would connect to the remaining front half of the historic building, and would have an approximately 79-foot setback from the historic building's primary (east) façade. An access ramp to below-grade parking would create a gap of approximately 25 feet along Mission Street between the historic building and the new 4840 Mission Street building. This gap would somewhat maintain view corridors of the historic building from the public right-of-way.

The new 4950 Mission Street buildings would directly abut the new 4840 Mission Street building to the north. There would be a public plaza that would separate the structures, although the buildings would share a podium, garage and mechanical, electrical, and plumbing. With rectangular- and O-shaped plans, the buildings would be up to 69 feet tall (six stories).

Overall, the Partial Preservation Alternative would provide 465,909 gross square feet of residential use, 40,000 gross square feet for the Safeway, 13,503 square feet of other retail space, and 12,219 gross square feet for the Clinic. The historic building would retain 12,219 gross square feet for repurposed commercial use as the Clinic with extensive interior and structural upgrades.

The Partial Preservation Alternative meets or partially meets a majority of the Project Sponsors' objectives (see table in the "Ability to Meet Project Objectives" section).

STANDARDS FOR REHABILITATION

The following analysis applies each of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (the Standards) to the Partial Preservation Alternative for 4840 Mission Street.

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.

Discussion: The Partial Preservation Alternative would retain a commercial use in the historic building, though it would no longer function as a funeral home but as the Clinic. The Partial Preservation Alternative would also introduce new residential use to the property, as well as additional commercial use for the Safeway. Though the general historic use of the historic building would remain commercial, the other new and expanded-upon uses on the site would require removal of all or a portion of several character-defining features (see Rehabilitation Standard 2 for more discussion). The changes proposed in the Partial Preservation Alternative to convert the property into a mixed-use housing development with a large grocery store would change the physical appearance of the site and environment, but the Midcentury Modern commercial character of the historic resource would still remain evident, particularly from the public right-of-way.

Therefore, the Partial Preservation Alternative as proposed would be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 1.

Rehabilitation 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.

Discussion: The Partial Preservation Alternative would remove the rear half of the historic building at 4840 Mission Street and alter many of the character-defining features to a degree. The following character-defining features would be completely removed due to demolition of the historic building's rear half and construction of a new mixed-use building: the freestanding neon sign adjacent to the parking lot entrance and attached neon sign on the rear (west) façade; awning on the east façade; porte-cochere on the south façade; low tapered wall separating the driveway from the parking lot; and landscaped beds along the tapered wall.

The following character-defining features would be somewhat altered: the box form and overall massing; flat roof with varying heights and parapet walls; combination brick and reinforced concrete construction; some of the fenestration dating to the 1959 remodel, including aluminum sash and glass block windows; some of the projecting boxes enframing windows; some of the aluminum frame glazed doors; some of the wood-clad belt course on the east façade; and some of the enclosed walkway along the south façade. The character-defining features that would remain fully intact and undisturbed include the two-story height; horizontal orientation; orientation toward Mission Street and lack of setback from the sidewalk; large square porcelain enamel panels and brick veneer cladding; attached painted signs and projecting neon sign at the front half; and the landscaped beds along the east façade. The Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home would continue to convey its character as a Midcentury Modern commercial building in San Francisco, however the Partial Preservation Alternative only partially avoids the removal of historic materials or the alteration of features and spaces that characterize the property.

Due to the changes to the south and rear portions of the historic resource, the Partial Preservation Alternative as proposed would <u>not</u> be in full compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 2.

Rehabilitation Standard 3: Each property shall 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.

Discussion: The Partial Preservation Alternative would not apply Midcentury Modern features to the historic resource that are not substantiated by documentary evidence to have existed on the property previously, and the new buildings would be clearly differentiated from the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home in location, materiality, and design (see Rehabilitation Standard 9 for more information). No conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings are proposed and no changes would be made that create a false sense of historical development.

Therefore, the Partial Preservation Alternative as proposed would be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 3.

Rehabilitation Standard 4: Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

Discussion: There are no changes to the historic resource beyond the identified period of significance (1959) that have acquired historic significance in their own right. None of the non-historic features have been found significant.

Therefore, the Partial Preservation Alternative as proposed would be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 4.

Rehabilitation Standard 5: Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.

Discussion: As described under Rehabilitation Standard 2, the Partial Preservation Alternative would remove or alter a number of the character-defining features, though the majority would continue to be represented in all or part. Due to the changes to the south and rear portions of the historic resource, the following character-defining features would be somewhat altered: the box form and overall massing; flat roof with varying heights and parapet walls; combination brick and reinforced concrete construction; some of the fenestration dating to the 1959 remodel, including aluminum sash and glass block windows; some of the projecting boxes enframing windows; some of the aluminum frame glazed doors; some of the wood-clad belt course on the east façade; and some of the enclosed walkway along the south façade. The character-defining features that would remain fully intact and undisturbed include the two-story height; horizontal orientation; orientation toward Mission Street and lack of setback from the sidewalk; large square porcelain enamel panels and brick veneer cladding; attached painted signs and projecting neon sign at the front half; and the landscaped beds along the east façade.

The following character-defining features would be completely removed: the freestanding neon sign adjacent to the parking lot entrance and attached neon sign on the rear (west) façade; awning on the east façade; porte-cochere on the south façade; low tapered wall separating the driveway from the parking lot; and landscaped beds along the tapered wall. The Partial Preservation Alternative only partially preserves the distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize the historic resource.

Due to the changes to the south and rear portions of the historic resource, the Partial Preservation Alternative as proposed would <u>not</u> be in full compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 5.
Rehabilitation 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.

Discussion: The scope of repair has not been determined for the Partial Preservation Alternative, but repair or needed replacement of existing materials would follow the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

Therefore, the Partial Preservation Alternative as proposed would be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 6.

Rehabilitation 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.

Discussion: The scope of chemical or physical treatments has not been determined for the Partial Preservation Alternative, but cleaning treatments would follow the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and would be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

Therefore, the Partial Preservation Alternative as proposed would be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 7.

Rehabilitation 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.

Discussion: The Partial Preservation Alternative involves excavation for foundation and structural work in order to support the new buildings and the associated below-grade parking. If any archaeological material were to be encountered during the construction of the Partial Preservation Alternative, the City and County of San Francisco's standard procedures for treatment of archeological materials would be adhered to.

If standard procedures are followed in the case of an encounter with archaeological material, the Partial Preservation Alternative would be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 8.

Rehabilitation Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

Discussion: As discussed previously, the Partial Preservation Alternative would remove or alter a number of the character-defining features. To accommodate the new 4840 Mission Street building, the rear half of the historic building would be removed and there would be alterations to features on the south side in order to create an access ramp to below-grade parking. The new six- to seven-story buildings, including 4950 Mission Street, would be differentiated with modern materials and design. Despite the height and massing difference, the 25-foot gap along Mission Street between the historic building to the west would visually separate the two buildings. The historic resource and its environment would change, though the historic resource would still retain its Midcentury Modern

Preservation Alternatives Report Case No. 2016-012545ENV Final Draft

commercial presence along Mission Street. Regardless, the new buildings and related new construction would still partially destroy historic materials that characterize the property.

Due to the changes to the south and rear portions of the historic resource, the Partial Preservation Alternative as proposed would <u>not</u> be in full compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 9.

Rehabilitation 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.

Discussion: If the new buildings and other related construction are hypothetically removed in the future, the historic resource would not retain a number of its character-defining features. The historic resource would be able to convey its significance as a Midcentury Modern commercial building in San Francisco; however, the removal of the rear of the historic building and several historic landscape features would affect the essential form and integrity of the historic resource. While removing the new buildings would in fact restore a lower density environment that currently and historically has existed around the historic property, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would still be partially impaired.

Due to the changes to the south and rear portions of the historic resource, the Partial Preservation Alternative as proposed would <u>not</u> be in full compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 10.

ANALYSIS OF IMPACT UNDER CEQA

As the above analysis demonstrates, the Partial Preservation Alternative as proposed would be in compliance with six of the ten Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. According to Section 15126.4(b)(1) of the Public Resources Code (CEQA), if a project complies with the Standards, the project's impact "will generally be considered mitigated below a level of significance and thus is not significant." As the Partial Preservation Alternative does not comply with all ten Rehabilitation Standards, the following analysis is required.

The purpose of the Partial Preservation Alternative is to consider a plan that would lessen the significant impacts of the proposed project on the existing historic resource. As explained in "Historic Preservation Commission Resolution No. 0746" (March 18, 2015), the Partial Preservation Alternative "would preserve as many features of the resource that convey its historic significance as possible while taking into account the potential feasibility of the proposed alternative and the project objectives."¹⁹ The Partial Preservation Alternative would retain architecturally significant portions of the existing historic resource at 4840 Mission Street and convert the project site into a mixed-use housing development with a large grocery store by adding three new buildings. To accommodate the new 4840 Mission Street building, the rear half of the historic building would be removed and there would be alterations to features on the south side in order to create an access ramp to below-grade parking, therefore removing or altering a number of the character-defining features.

When compared to the proposed project, the Partial Preservation Alternative would at least partially retain the historic resource, including its distinctive Midcentury Modern street frontage and the massing of the east half of the building. However, as more than half of the historic resource would be demolished (including landscape features), the Partial Preservation Alternative would cause a material impairment to the historic resource.

¹⁹ San Francisco Planning Department, "Historic Preservation Commission Resolution No. 0746," 2.

IX. CONCLUSION

The Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home at 4840 Mission Street (Assessor's Block 6959, Lots 019, 025, and 026) was initially completed in 1926 in a Spanish Colonial Revival design by architect John A. Porporato and later remodeled and expanded with a Midcentury Modern addition designed by architect Otto G. Hintermann in 1959.²⁰ 4840 Mission Street was evaluated by ARG in a HRE Part 1 completed in January 2017. The property was found to be individually eligible for listing in the California Register – a finding that was agreed upon by the Planning Department – and is thus considered a historic resource for the purposes of CEQA review.

The proposed project at 4840 and 4950 Mission Street will demolish the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home, and therefore cause a material impairment to the existing historic resource. A No Project Alternative would not cause any material impairment to the historic resource under CEQA.

The purpose of the preservation alternatives is to consider plans that would lessen the significant impacts of the proposed project on the historic resource. The goal of the Full Preservation Alternative is to preserve the features of the historic resource that convey its historic significance while still meeting most of the basic objectives of the project. The goal of the Partial Preservation Alternative is to preserve as many features of the resource that convey its historic significance as possible while taking into account the potential feasibility of the proposed alternative and the project objectives.

The two Full Preservation Alternatives, which would retain nearly all of the historic resource's character-defining features, would not cause a material impairment to the historic resource. The Partial Preservation Alternative involves demolishing more than half of the historic resource (including landscape features) and would therefore cause a material impairment to the historic resource, though many of the character-defining features would be retained.

²⁰ Architectural Resource Group, Inc., "4840 Mission Street, Historic Resource Evaluation," 1.

Preservation Alternatives Report Case No. 2016-012545ENV Final Draft

X. REFERENCES CITED

- Architectural Resource Group, Inc. "4840 Mission Street, Historic Resource Evaluation." January 2017.
- Grimmer, Anne E. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring and Reconstructing Historic Buildings. U.S. Department of the Interior National Park Service Technical Preservation Services, Washington, D.C.: 2017. Accessed July 20, 2017. https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/treatment-guidelines-2017.pdf.
- National Park Service. "Introduction to Standards and Guidelines." Accessed June 22, 2017. https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/fourtreatments/standguide/overview/using_standguide.htm.
- San Francisco Planning Department. "Historic Preservation Commission Resolution No. 0746." March 18, 2015.
- -----. "Historic Resource Evaluation Response, 2016-012545ENV, 4840 Mission Street." March 8, 2018.
- -----. "Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and Notice of Public Scoping Meeting (DRAFT: NOP-2)." March/April 2018.
- State of California. California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines. Title 14 California Code of Regulations section 15000 et seq. Accessed March 7, 2018. https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Browse/Home/California/CaliforniaCodeofRegulations? guid=I95DAAA70D48811DEBC02831C6D6C108E&originationContext=documenttoc&tra nsitionType=Default&contextData=(sc.Default)&bhcp=1.
- State of California. California Environmental Quality Act Statute. Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq. Accessed March 7, 2018. http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayexpandedbranch.xhtml?tocCode=PRC& division=13.&title=&part=&chapter=&article=

Preservation Alternatives Report Case No. 2016-012545ENV Final Draft

APPENDIX: PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVES GRAPHICS PACKAGE

4840/4950 MISSION PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVES



PROJECT SITE



SHEET INDEX CONTINUED	
FULL PRESERVATION ALT. 1 - SITE PLAN	13
FULL PRESERVATION ALT. 1 – FLOOR PLANS	14
FULL PRESERVATION ALT. 1 – AXO VIEW	15
FULL PRESERVATION ALT. 1 – STREET VIEWS	16
FULL PRESERVATION ALT. 2 – SITE PLAN	17
FULL PRESERVATION ALT. 2 – FLOOR PLANS	18
FULL PRESERVATION ALT. 2 – AXO VIEW	19
FULL PRESERVATION ALT. 2 – STREET VIEWS	20
PARTIAL PRESERVATION ALT. – SITE PLAN	21
PARTIAL PRESERVATION ALT. – FLOOR PLANS	22
PARTIAL PRESERVATION ALT. – AXO VIEW	23
PARTIAL PRESERVATION ALT. – STREET VIEWS	24

SHEET INDEX	Page
COVER SHEET	01
SITE CONTEXT & EXISTING CONDITIONS	02
HISTORIC PHOTOGRAPHS & SIGNIFICANCE	03
CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES	04
PRESERVATION ALT. & STATS SUMMARY	05
PROPOSED PROJECT – SITE PLAN	06
PROPOSED PROJECT – FLOOR PLANS	07
PROPOSED PROJECT - AXO VIEW	08
PROPOSED PROJECT - STREET VIEWS	09
NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE – SITE PLAN	10
NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE – AXO VIEW	11
NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE – STREET VIEWS	12

VICINITY MAP

4840/4950 MISSION STREET DEV. COVER SHEET SAN FRANCISCO, CA 04/16/2018











VIEW D



VIEW E



VIEW B





VIEW A

4840/4950 MISSION STREET DEV. SITE CONTEXT & EXISTING CONDITIONS **SAN FRANCISCO, CA**| 04/16/2018





2 of 24

VIEW H



VIEW G



VIEW F





FIGURE 1. VIEW WEST TOWARD 4840 MISSION STREET, CA. 1930S (LITALO-AMERICANO)



FIGURE 2. CONSTRUCTION VIEW WEST TOWARD 4840 MISSION STREET, CA. SEPTEMBER 30, 1959



HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE

The Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home located at 4840 Mission Street is eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources under Criterion 3 (Architecture) as a significant example of Midcentury Modern commercial architecture in San Francisco. The period of significance dates to 1959, when the substantial remodel occurred. The property retains a high degree of integrity such that it clearly expresses its architectural significance.*

*Architectural Resource Group, Inc., "4840 Mission Street Historic Resource Evaluation [Part 1], Draft," January 2017, 25-27.

4840/4950 MISSION STREET DEV. HISTORIC PHOTOGRAPHS & SIGNIFICANCE **SAN FRANCISCO, CA** 04/16/2018



FIGURE 4. PHOTOGRAPH OF 4840 MISSION STREET, CA. 1960; (VALENTE, MARINI, PERATA & CO.)







*Architectural Resource Group, Inc., "4840 Mission Street Historic Resource Evaluation [Part 1], Draft," January 2017, 28-29.



9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

4840/4950 MISSION STREET DEV. CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES **SAN FRANCISCO, CA** 04/16/2018

CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES OF THE VALENTE, MARINI, PERATA & CO. **FUNERAL HOME AT** 4840 MISSION STREET *

- BOX FORM AND OVERALL MASSING
- TWO-STORY HEIGHT
- HORIZONTAL ORIENTATION
- ORIENTATION TOWARD MISSION STREET AND LACK OF SETBACK FROM THE SIDEWALK
- FLAT ROOF WITH VARYING HEIGHTS AND PARAPET WALLS
- COMBINATION BRICK AND REINFORCED CONCRETE CONSTRUCTION
- LARGE SQUARE PORCELAIN ENAMEL PANELS AND BRICK VENEER CLADDING
- FENESTRATION DATING TO THE 1959 REMODEL, INCLUDING ALUMINUM SASH AND GLASS BLOCK WINDOWS
- PROJECTING BOXES ENFRAMING WINDOWS
- ALUMINUM FRAME GLAZED DOORS
- SIGNAGE, INCLUDING ATTACHED, PROJECTING, AND FREESTANDING NEON SIGNS AND PAINTED SIGNS
- WOOD-CLAD BELT COURSE AND AWNING ON THE EAST FACADE
- PORTE-COCHERES ON THE NORTH AND SOUTH FACADE
- ENCLOSED WALKWAY ALONG THE SOUTH FACADE
- LOW TAPERED WALL SEPARATING THE DRIVEWAY FROM THE PARKING LOT
- LANDSCAPED BEDS ALONG THE EAST FACADE AND THE TAPERED WALL

4 of 24 REAL ESTATE ADVISORS **VAN METER** Benefit Fund WILLIAMS BRIDGE MNHC **POLLACK**



						THESEN WA									
				NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE			FULL PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE 2		PARTIAL PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE						
	STREET (MARKET RATE UNITS)	4840 MISSION STREET (AFFORDABLE UNITS)		STREET (MARKET RATE UNITS)	4840 MISSION STREET (AFFORDABLE UNITS)	TOTAL	4950 MISSION STREET (MARKET RATE UNITS)	4840 MISSION STREET (AFFORDABLE UNITS)	TOTAL	4950 MISSION STREET (MARKET RATE UNITS)	4840 MISSION STREET (AFFORDABLE UNITS)	TOTAL	4950 MISSION STREET (MARKET RATE UNITS)	4840 MISSION STREET (AFFORDABLE UNITS)	TOTAL
UNITS	253	175	428	-	-	-	253	116	369	233	136	369	253	126	379
SAFEWAY SQUARE FOOTAGE	_	53,000	53,000	36,000	-	36,000	_	41,100	41,100	53,000	-	53,000	-	40,000	40,000
RESIDENTIAL SQUARE FOOTAGE *	288,909	207,309	496,218	-	_	-	288,909	146,830	435,739	263,153	209,037	472,190	288,909	177,000	465,909
CLINIC SQUARE FOOTAGE	_	9,620	9,620	-	_	-	-	11,402	11,402	_	10,679	10,679	_	12,219	12,219
OTHER RETAIL SQUARE FOOTAGE	13,503	-	13,503	-	-	-	13,503	_	13,503	-	-	-	13,503	_	13,503
NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES	204	126	330	106	94	200	204	81	285	204	0	204	204	96	300
NUMBER OF STORIES	6	6 – 7	-	1	2	-	6	6 – 7	-	6	6 – 7	_	6	6 - 7	-
BUILDING HEIGHT	69'-0"	79' - 84'	-	25'-0"	35'-0"	-	69'-0"	79' - 84'	-	69'-0"	79' - 84'	-	69'-0"	79' - 84'	-
HISTORIC BUILDING SQUARE FOOTAGE RETAINED**	0	0	0		20,565	20,565	0	20,565	20,565	0	20,565	20,565	0	12,219	12,219

PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVES SUMMARY

* INCLUDES RESIDENTIAL COMMON & CIRCULATION AREAS

** EXISTING STRUCTURE INCLUDES 14,400 GROUND FLOOR, 4,900

SECOND FLOOR AND 1,265 PORTE-COCHERE

GENERAL NOTE: THE PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVES ILLUSTRATED ARE BASED ON THE PROPOSED PROJECT PROGRAM, BUILDING TYPES, AND THEIR LIMITATIONS. THE PROPOSED MIXED-USE PROJECT IS BASED ON GROUND FLOOR COMMERCIAL USES, BUILT IN TYPE I NON-COMBUSTIBLE CONSTRUCTION (CONCRETE) WITH RESIDENTIAL USES ABOVE, BUILT IN TYPE IIIA CONSTRUCTION (WOOD). THE ALTERNATIVES SHOWN ARE LIMITED IN HEIGHT AND SQUARE FOOTAGE BASED ON THE BUILDING CODE, AS SUBJEC TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT.

4840/4950 MISSION STREET DEV. PRESERVATION ALT. & STATS SUMMARY SAN FRANCISCO, CAI 04/16/2018





4840/4950 MISSION STREET DEV. PROPOSED PROJECT – SITE PLAN **SAN FRANCISCO, CA** 04/16/2018

160′

80'

40'



PROPOSED PROJECT							
50 MISSION REET (MARKET ITE UNITS)	4840 MISSION STREET (AFFORDABLE UNITS)	TOTAL					
253	175	428					
_	53,000	53,000					
288,909	207,309	496,218					
-	9,620	9,620					
13,503	-	13,503					
204	126	330					
6	6 – 7	-					
69'-0"	79' - 84'	-					
0	0	0					

RESIDENTIAL ENTRY OR COMMON AREA

RESIDENTIAL UNITS AND CORRIDORS

UTILITY AREAS





2ND LEVEL FLOOR PLAN

40′

0

80′

160′

4840/4950 MISSION STREET DEV. **PROPOSED PROJECT – FLOOR PLANS SAN FRANCISCO, CA** 04/16/2018







4840/4950 MISSION STREET DEV. PROPOSED PROJECT - AXO VIEW **SAN FRANCISCO, CA** 04/16/2018









VIEW LOOKING SOUTH OF MISSION STREET









4840/4950 MISSION STREET DEV. NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE – SITE PLAN **SAN FRANCISCO, CA** 04/16/2018

100 C

80'

40′

160′





	NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE			PROPOSED PROJECT	
50 MISSION REET (MARKET ITE UNITS)	4840 MISSION STREET (AFFORDABLE UNITS)	TOTAL	4950 MISSION STREET (MARKET RATE UNITS)	4840 MISSION STREET (AFFORDABLE UNITS)	TOTAL
-	_	-	253	175	428
36,000	_	36,000	-	53,000	53,000
-	-	-	288,909	207,309	496,218
-	-	-	-	9,620	9,620
-	-	-	13,503	-	13,503
106	94	200	204	126	330
1	2	-	6	6 – 7	-
25'-0"	35'-0"	-	69'-0"	79' - 84'	-
	20,565	20,565	0	0	0





4840/4950 MISSION STREET DEV. NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE – AXO VIEW **SAN FRANCISCO, CA**| 04/16/2018





4840/4950 MISSION STREET DEV. NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE – STREET VIEWS SAN FRANCISCO, CAI 04/16/2018



VIEW LOOKING SOUTH OF MISSION STREET



VIEW LOOKING NORTH OF MISSION STREET





4840/4950 MISSION STREET DEV. FULL PRESERVATION ALT. 1 - SITE PLAN **SAN FRANCISCO, CA** 04/16/2018



MAINTAIN ENTIRE SHELL OF EXISTING & **REUSE INTERIOR WITH RETAIL & CLINIC**

PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY

	PRESERVATIO	DN	PROPOSED			
A	LTERNATIVE 1			PROJECT		
50 MISSION	4840 MISSION	TOTAL	4950 MISSION	4840 MISSION	TOTAL	
REET (MARKET	STREET		STREET (MARKET	STREET		
TE UNITS)	(AFFORDABLE		RATE UNITS)	(AFFORDABLE		
	UNITS)			UNITS)		
253	116	369	253	175	428	
	41,100	41,100		53,000	53,000	
-		,	-			
288,909	146,830	435,739	288,909	207,309	496,218	
200,505	140,050	+55,755	200,505	207,505	450,210	
	11 100	11 102		0.020	0.620	
-	11,402	11,402	-	9,620	9,620	
13,503	_	13,503	13,503	_	13,503	
	_			_		
204	81	285	204	126	330	
6	6 – 7		6	6 – 7		
0	. .	-	Ũ		-	
69'-0"	79' - 84'		69'-0"	70' 04'		
69-0	79 - 84	_	69-0	79' - 84'	_	
0	20,565	20,565	0	0	0	

RESIDENTIAL ENTRY OR COMMON AREA

RESIDENTIAL UNITS AND CORRIDORS



2ND LEVEL FLOOR PLAN

40′

0

80′

160'

FULL PRESERVATION ALT. 1 – FLOOR PLANS **4840/4950 MISSION STREET DEV. SAN FRANCISCO, CA** 04/16/2018





4840/4950 MISSION STREET DEV. FULL PRESERVATION ALT. 1 – AXO VIEW **SAN FRANCISCO, CA**| 04/16/2018







VIEW LOOKING NORTH OF MISSION STREET



VIEW LOOKING SOUTH OF MISSION STREET

4840/4950 MISSION STREET DEV. FULL PRESERVATION ALT. 1 – STREET VIEWS SAN FRANCISCO, CAI 04/16/2018





4840/4950 MISSION STREET DEV. FULL PRESERVATION ALT. 2 – SITE PLAN **SAN FRANCISCO. CA| 04/16/2018**

160′

0

40′

80'



	PRESERVATIO	DN	PROPOSED			
А	LTERNATIVE 2			PROJECT		
50 MISSION	4840 MISSION	TOTAL	4950 MISSION	4840 MISSION	TOTAL	
REET (MARKET	STREET		STREET (MARKET	STREET		
TE UNITS)	(AFFORDABLE		RATE UNITS)	(AFFORDABLE		
	UNITS)			UNITS)		
233	136	369	253	175	428	
53,000		53,000		53,000	53,000	
	-		-			
263,153	209,037	472,190	288,909	207,309	496,218	
		,				
	10,679	10,679		9,620	9,620	
-	10,075	10,075	-	5,020	5,020	
			13,503		13,503	
-	-	-	15,505	-	15,505	
201				100		
204	0	204	204	126	330	
6	6 – 7	_	6	6 – 7	_	
69'-0"	79' - 84'		69'-0"	79' - 84'		
		_			_	
0	20,565	20,565	0	0	0	
	-					
				1		

RESIDENTIAL ENTRY OR COMMON AREA

RESIDENTIAL UNITS AND CORRIDORS



2ND LEVEL FLOOR PLAN

40′

0

80′

160′

FULL PRESERVATION ALT. 2 – FLOOR PLANS **4840/4950 MISSION STREET DEV. SAN FRANCISCO, CA** 04/16/2018





4840/4950 MISSION STREET DEV. FULL PRESERVATION ALT. 2 – AXO VIEW **SAN FRANCISCO, CA**| 04/16/2018





4840/4950 MISSION STREET DEV. FULL PRESERVATION ALT. 2 – STREET VIEWS SAN FRANCISCO, CAI 04/16/2018



VIEW LOOKING SOUTH OF MISSION STREET



VIEW LOOKING NORTH OF MISSION STREET





4840/4950 MISSION STREET DEV. PARTIAL PRESERVATION ALT. – SITE PLAN **SAN FRANCISCO. CA| 04/16/2018**



	AL PRESERVAT	ION		PROPOSED	
	ALTERNATIVE			PROJECT	
50 MISSION REET (MARKET TE UNITS)	4840 MISSION STREET (AFFORDABLE UNITS)	TOTAL	4950 MISSION STREET (MARKET RATE UNITS)	4840 MISSION STREET (AFFORDABLE UNITS)	TOTAL
253	126	379	253	175	428
_	40,000	40,000	-	53,000	53,000
288,909	177,000	465,909	288,909	207,309	496,218
_	12,219	12,219	_	9,620	9,620
13,503	_	13,503	13,503	-	13,503
204	96	300	204	126	330
6	6 – 7	-	6	6 – 7	-
69'-0"	79' - 84'	-	69'-0"	79' - 84'	-
0	12,219	12,219	0	0	0

RESIDENTIAL ENTRY OR COMMON AREA

RESIDENTIAL UNITS AND CORRIDORS



2ND LEVEL FLOOR PLAN

40′

0

80'

160′

4840/4950 MISSION STREET DEV. PARTIAL PRESERVATION ALT. – FLOOR PLANS SAN FRANCISCO, CAI 04/16/2018





4840/4950 MISSION STREET DEV. PARTIAL PRESERVATION ALT. – AXO VIEW **SAN FRANCISCO, CA**| 04/16/2018





4840/4950 MISSION STREET DEV. PARTIAL PRESERVATION ALT. – STREET VIEWS **SAN FRANCISCO, CA** 04/16/2018



VIEW LOOKING SOUTH OF MISSION STREET



VIEW LOOKING NORTH OF MISSION STREET





www.page-turnbull.com

ARCHITECTURE PLANNING & RESEARCH PRESERVATION TECHNOLOGY

417 S. Hill Street, Suite 211 Los Angeles, California 90013 213.221.1200 / 213.221.1209 fax 2401 C Street, Suite B Sacramento, California 95816 916.930.9903 / 916.930.9904 fax 417 Montgomery Street, 8th Floor San Francisco, CA 94104 415.362.5154 / 415.362.5560 fax





Architectural Resources Group Architecture Planning Conservation



4840 Mission Street Historic Resource Evaluation

Prepared for BRIDGE Housing Corporation

Prepared by Architectural Resource Group, Inc. San Francisco, California

DRAFT January 2017

SAN FRANCISCO

Pier 9, The Embarcadero, Suite 107 San Francisco, California 94111 T: 415.421.1680 F: 415.421.0127

argsf.com

PASADENA

8 Mills Place, 3rd Floor, Suite 300 Pasadena, CA 91105 T: 626.583.1401 F: 626.583.1414

arg-la.com

PORTLAND

111 SW Fifth Avenue, 24th Floor Portland, OR 97204 T: 971.256.5324

arg-pnw.com



4840 Mission Street Historic Resource Evaluation San Francisco, California

Draft – January 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

 Introduction 1.1 Project Background 1.2 Current Historic Status 1.3 Methodology 	
2. Site and Building Description 2.1 Site Description 2.2 Building Description	2
3. Site History 3.1 Construction Chronology	
 4. Historic Context 4.1 Neighborhood Development 4.2 Italian American Settlement in San Francisco. 4.3 Italian American Settlement in the Excelsior 4.4 Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. 4.5 John A. Porporato. 4.6 Spanish Colonial Revival Architecture 4.7 Otto G. Hintermann. 4.8 Midcentury Modern Architecture. 	
5. Evaluative Framework 5.1 California Register of Historical Resources	
 6. Evaluation of Significance 6.1 California Register of Historical Resources 6.2 Integrity Analysis 	25
7. Character-defining Features	
8. Bibliography	

Appendix

Appendix A: Existing Conditions Photographs

Appendix B: Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps

Appendix C: Building Permit Record

- Appendix D: Historic Drawings
- Appendix E: Historic Images



1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Project Background

Architectural Resources Group (ARG) prepared this Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) for the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home at 4840 Mission Street (Block 6959, Lots 019, 025, 026) in San Francisco, California. This report includes a physical description of the subject property, a historical summary of the funeral home and its surroundings, and an evaluation of the property's significance under the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) criteria.

The funeral home was completed in 1926 based on the Spanish Colonial Revival design by architect John A. Porporato and remodeled and expanded with a Midcentury Modern addition designed by architect Otto G. Hintermann in 1959. The building is located along the Mission Street commercial corridor bordered by the Mission Terrace and Outer Mission neighborhoods to the west and the Excelsior and Crocker Amazon neighborhoods to the east. The approximately 1.44-acre property is located on the west side of Mission Street between Onondaga and Seneca avenues and spans the full width of the block from Mission Street west to Alemany Boulevard. The property is located in the Zoning Districts NCD – Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District and RH1 – Residential-House, One Family.

1.2 Current Historic Status

The funeral home at 4840 Mission Street is classified as "Category B – Unknown/Age Eligible" on the San Francisco Property Information Map and has not been formally evaluated for individual listing in the California Register and National Register of Historic Places (National Register) or as a San Francisco Landmark under Article 10 of the San Francisco Planning Code. Likewise the property has not been evaluated as a contributor to a historic district eligible at the local, state, or national level. Lastly, the property was not surveyed as part of previous historic resources surveys completed by the Junior League of San Francisco in 1968, the San Francisco Planning Department in 1974-1976, and San Francisco Heritage over the past three decades.¹

In 2016, the San Francisco Planning Department recently identified the property as an "outstanding example of its type and period [i.e., Midcentury Modern]" and for appearing to have "significant associations with the Italian-American community and a significant Italian-American owned enterprise" in the draft Excelsior Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District (NCD) historic resource survey. The Planning Department also indicated that the property "should be considered for landmark designation under Article 10 of the Planning Code."² Lastly, the Planning Department identified the cluster of "individually identified Midcentury Modern buildings from c. 1935 to c. 1965" along this commercial corridor as a priority for further evaluation to determine if these properties form a discontiguous landmark district under Article 10 of the San Francisco Planning Code.³ To date, an intensive survey of this potential historic district has not been completed. When finalized, the Planning

¹ San Francisco Planning Department, San Francisco Property Information Map, 4840 Mission Street, accessed December 5, 2016, <u>http://propertymap.sfplanning.org</u>.

 ² San Francisco Planning Department, Draft Excelsior Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District (NCD), (Alemany Boulevard – San Mateo County Line) Survey, draft copy provided to ARG on November 29, 2016, 15.
 ³ Ibid., 31.
Department will bring the Excelsior Outer Mission Street NCD historic resource survey before the San Francisco Preservation Commission (HPC) for adoption.⁴

1.3 Methodology

To complete the HRE for 4840 Mission Street, ARG:

- Conducted a site visit to examine and photograph the subject property and its surroundings on November 23, 2016;
- Completed archival research at repositories including the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, San Francisco Recorder's Office, San Francisco Public Library History Center, and San Francisco Heritage;
- Reviewed online repositories, including *San Francisco Chronicle* Historical Database, Newspapers.com, Ancestry.com, Avery Index to Architectural Periodicals, Internet Archive, Online Archive of California, David Rumsey Map Collection, and Pacific Coast Architecture Database;
- Obtained copies of blueprints, drawings, and photographs provided by the property owner; and
- Reviewed primary and secondary sources regarding the history of the Italian American community in San Francisco as well as the careers of architects John A. Porporato and Otto G. Hintermann.

2. SITE AND BUILDING DESCRIPTION

The following section provides a physical description of the site and building at 4840 Mission Street. Additional photographs of the subject property are presented in Appendix A.

2.1 Site Description

The subject property at 4840 Mission Street is located at the north end of the 0.3-mile long block bounded by Mission Street to the east, Seneca Avenue to the south, Alemany Boulevard to the west, and Onondaga Street to the north (Figure 1). It is located within the Excelsior Outer Mission NCD and adjacent to the Mission Terrace neighborhood to the west and the Excelsior neighborhood to the east. The NCD is primarily comprised of commercial or commercial mixed-use buildings constructed between 1920 and 1960.⁵ The neighborhoods to the east and west consist of single-family residences that appear to have been constructed largely from the 1890s to 1940s.

⁴ Allison Vanderslice, Archaeologist/Preservation Planner, San Francisco Planning Department, personal correspondence with ARG staff, December 1, 2016.

⁵ San Francisco Planning Department, Draft Excelsior Outer Mission Street NCD Survey, 1.



Figure 1. Location of 4840 Mission Street (boundary indicated in red) at the north end of the long block (Google Earth, amended by author)

2.2 Building Description

The two-story-over-basement funeral building at 4840 Mission Street consists the original brick, Spanish Colonial Revival, rectangular-in-plan building completed in 1926 and the large reinforced concrete, Midcentury Modern addition constructed on the south façade in 1959. Both building sections have flat roofs that vary in height. The original portion of the building has remnant clay tile along the northern and western parapet walls.

The east façade facing Mission Street dates to the 1959 remodel and is clad with 38-inch square porcelain enamel panels above a roman brick veneer water table; the cladding wraps around the corners of the building (Figures 2 and 3). The primary window type is aluminum sash, eight light with the central four lights forming an awning window and the bottom two lights forming a hopper window. The first story has a deep inset entrance with a glazed, aluminum double door surmounted by a transom window and accessed by a short flight of marble stairs at the north end. The entrance is flanked by four primary type windows to the south and two the north. A similar arrangement of seven windows but enframed by a slightly projecting, porcelain enamel-clad box is located at the second story. A projecting wood-clad belt course separates the first and second stories across the east façade and continues south to form a flat awning over the entrance to the driveway accessing the parking lot. A projecting neon sign is situated above the belt course, while painted signs are located at upper portion of the southeast corner of the building.



Figure 2. 4840 Mission Street, view northwest (ARG, November 2016)



Figure 3. 4840 Mission Street, view southwest (ARG, November 2016)

The north façade largely dates to 1926 with some window openings removed and added during the 1959 remodel. The entrance is comprised of a set of wood double doors accessed by a short set of marble steps and covered by a porte-cochère with concrete column supports and a flat roof (Figure 4). A secondary entrance with a wood, glazed door accessing the basement is located to the west. The original windows consist of a set of three wood sash, six light, Tudor arched windows and wood sash, ten light casement windows. Other original and replacement windows are wood sash, one-over-one and small wood sash, multi light windows along the basement level.



Figure 4. North façade, view west (ARG, November 2016)

The northern portion of the west façade dates to the 1926 construction and retains some original features such as wood sash, Tudor arch and one-over-one windows and two garage openings with paneled, roll up doors (Figure 5). The southern portion dates to the 1959 remodel and has an entrance with double doors and three garage openings with paneled, roll up doors at the basement level. It also has a variety of window types, including primary type and replacement vinyl, one-over-one, as well as a prominent neon sign at the upper southwest corner.



Figure 5. West façade, view east (ARG, November 2016)

The south façade dates to the 1959 construction and features an enclosed walkway along the first story with an entrance leading to a large central porte-cochère on the south wall (Figure 6) and entrances with glazed aluminum doors at the east and west ends. The walkway is clad with roman brick veneer and lined with large aluminum sash fixed windows; it also has a flat roof that steps down in height toward the west. A central louvered vent flanked by two sets of glass block windows enframed in projecting concrete boxes are located at the second story. A low concrete wall runs parallel to the building separating the driveway from the parking lot; several short metal lampposts with large glass bulbs are located on the wall, while a landscaped bed with small trees runs along the south side of the wall. A similar landscaped bed with a low concrete wall and lampposts extends west of the enclosed walkway. The remaining portion of the property is comprised of a paved parking lot. The east end of the parking lot is defined by a 4-foot tall concrete block wall and a freestanding neon sign.



Figure 6. South façade, view north (ARG, November 2016)

3. SITE HISTORY

The subject property consisted of an empty lot prior to the construction of the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral parlor in 1926 (Figure 7). As originally built, the property contained the two-story funeral building facing Mission Street and a large formal garden to the rear (Figure 8; see also the historic photographs in Appendix E). In 1959, the business owners acquired additional land to the south and remodeled and enlarged the building (Figure 9). The garden was removed, and the remaining portion of the parcel paved over to create a parking lot. The property has remained largely unaltered since the 1959 remodel and continues to be owned by descendants of the original owners and to be used as a funeral home. Full-sheet Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps showing the subject property and adjacent buildings are included in Appendix B.



Figure 7. Detail of the 1915 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, Volume 9, Sheet 980; arrow indicates the approximate location of the subject property.



Figure 8. Detail of the 1950 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, Volume 9, Sheet 980; shading indicates the approximate parcel boundary of the subject property.



Figure 9. Detail of the mid-1990s Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, Volume 9, Sheet 980; shading indicates the subject property.

3.1 Construction Chronology

The building at 4840 Mission Street was designed by architect John A. Porporato in 1925. The original permit filed in December 17, 1925 indicates a construction cost of \$40,000 for a two-story brick mortuary building with a basement. The building is presumed to have been completed the following year. In 1959, architect Otto G. Hintermann designed the large addition to the building at an estimated cost of \$185,000. The fenestration and exterior ornamentation on the east and south façades of the 1926 building were removed, and a large-two story addition constructed on the south façade and portion of the west façade. On the east façade, the window openings were altered and the porcelain enamel panels and roman brick veneer extended across the entire façade to unify the old and new sections of the building. The north and west façades of the 1926 building remain mostly intact, although select windows on the north façade of the original building were removed or added. The large neon sign on the west façade was added in 1961, and the wall along the eastern edge of the parking lot was replaced in 1977. Two windows on the west façade have been replaced with vinyl windows at an unknown date.

Table 1 below lists the building permits on file at San Francisco Department of Building and Inspection that indicate exterior alterations to the building. A copy of the building permit record is included in Appendix C.

Permit Number	Date Issued	Owner/Lessee	Description
145800	Dec. 17, 1925	Valente, Marini, Perata & Co.	Construct a two-story brick building with a basement and reinforced concrete foundation for \$40,000. Architect John A. Porporato.
1157	Feb. 15, 1937	Valente, Marini, Perata & Co.	Erect a 25-foot long by 10-foot tall billboard.
	Oct. 18, 1937	Valente, Marini, Perata & Co.	Alterations to the building according to plans and specs for \$1,800. Architect Albert Farr and J. Francis Ward. No other detail provided.
159966	Oct. 10, 1953	Valente, Marini, Perata & Co.	Grade and pave, place cyclone fence and lighting, lower curbs, and build new sidewalk for \$8,000.
200500	June 9, 1959	Valente, Marini, Perata & Co.	Addition of a garage and store room at the basement and chapels and other rooms at the first story and alter the bathrooms in the existing building for \$185,000. Architect Otto G. Hintermann, engineer Hyman Rosenthal, and builder DeMartini Bros.
231013	Nov. 28, 1961	Valente, Marini, Perata & Co.	Install new neon face sign facing the rear parking lot (west façade) for \$8,350.
111158	Mar. 15, 1977	Valente, Marini, Perata & Co.	Remove 4-foot tall cyclone fence at property line of parking lot and sidewalk and replaced with 4-foot tall concrete block fence for \$2,000.

4. HISTORIC CONTEXT

The following section provides a historic context for the development of the funeral parlor at 4840 Mission Street. Drawings and blueprints are included in Appendix D, and additional historic photographs are provided in Appendix E.

4.1 Neighborhood Development

The area that would become the Outer Mission and Excelsior neighborhoods lay within the approximate 4,400-acre Rancho Rícon de las Salinas y Potrero Veijo, or "Ranch of the Salt Marsh and the Old Pasture," which had been granted by the Mexican government to Don José Cornelio Bernal in two sections in 1839 and 1840. Other than Mission Road, which began at Mission Dolores and ran south to the peninsula, aligning with present-day San Jose Avenue, the area remained largely undeveloped. Following the Gold Rush and California's entry into the Union in 1850, it remained sparsely settled as it was situated miles away from the center of the pioneer metropolis. Several roadhouses with bars, restaurants, and illegal gambling halls sprung up around Lake Merced to the west, followed by new roads to connect the city's downtown and these far-flung entertainment venues. Lake House Road (later renamed Ocean House Road and finally as Ocean Avenue) extended west from San Jose Road to the lake district. By the mid-1850s, coach service, quickly followed by horse-drawn omnibuses, provided transportation from downtown San Francisco, along Ocean Avenue, to these colorful establishments.⁶

By 1864, the San Francisco and San Jose Railroad Company completed a new railway that ran between San Francisco and Palo Alto (Figure 10). Upon reaching the city's southern boundary, the railway curved eastward and then headed northeast parallel to San Jose Road before terminating at 25th and Valencia streets. Approximately 0.5-mile west of the subject property, it bisected the 100-acre "House of Refuge" or Industrial School, which opened by the city in 1859 as a juvenile detention facility. The closest railroad station to the subject property was the "Elkton" stop near the intersection of Ocean and San Jose avenues (approximately the current location of the Balboa Park BART station). In 1868, the Southern Pacific Railroad acquired the rail line and later abandoned it to make way for the construction of I-280.⁷

⁶ Draft Excelsior Outer Mission Street NCD Survey, 1-2; Woody LaBounty, *Ingleside Terraces: San Francisco Racetrack* to Residence Park (San Francisco: Outside Lands Media, 2012), 10, 13; San Francisco Planning Department, *City Within a City: Historic Context Statement for San Francisco's Mission District*, November 2007, 16.

⁷ The city added a "House of Correction" beside the school in 1876; both buildings were demolished when the land was cleared in the early 1930s to make room for the City College of San Francisco. TBA West, *Historic Context Statement: Balboa Park Area Plan & Historic Resource Survey, San Francisco, California*, prepared for the San Francisco Planning Department, August 3, 2008, 9-10.



Figure 10. United States Coast Survey Map of the San Francisco Peninsula, 1869 (David Rumsey Map Collection, amended by author)

Capitalizing on the new rail line, real estate speculators along with newly-established homestead associations purchased land along the line and began subdividing lots, creating a patchwork of street grids that did not align with San Francisco's established gridiron pattern. Among these early developers was H.S. Brown, who filed "West End Map No. 1" in 1863, which was bounded by present-day Ocean Avenue to the north, Mission Street to the east, Ottawa Avenue to the south, and San Jose Avenue to the west and included the subject property.⁸ On the east side of Mission Street opposite the subject property, the Excelsior Homestead Association formed in 1869 and platted a grid of streets named after countries and capitals of the world (Figure 11).⁹

⁸ San Francisco History Center, San Francisco Public Library, "Homestead Maps – A & B, Final Draft," March 2011, accessed January 9, 2017,

http://cdn.calisphere.org/data/13030/0c/c86q200c/files/Guide to San Francisco Homestead Maps.pdf.

⁹ Draft Excelsior Outer Mission Street NCD Survey, 1-2; TBA West, *Historic Context Statement: Balboa Park Area Plan*, 10-11.



Figure 11. Faust's Map of the City and County Of San Francisco California, 1894 (David Rumsey Map Collection, amended by author)

Promotional literature highlighting development potential within the former Rancho Rícon de las Salinas y Potrero Veijo emphasized the advantage of the land's "deep, rich, permanent soil" and access to fresh water from Islais Creek, which began at Lake Geneva near present-day Geneva and Cayuga avenues; the creek now flows underground along Cayuga Avenue and east toward the San Francisco Bay.¹⁰ Indeed, the area attracted farmers in the 1860s, including large numbers of Italian, German, Swiss, and Irish immigrants who established small farms and grew a wide variety of produce that they conveyed in trucks to markets and local restaurants downtown. The Excelsior neighborhood also became one of the city's principal concentrations of dairies through the 1880s, and grazing land for cattle and sheep and dairy farms once blanketed what is now McLaren Park.¹¹

In 1894, the Market Street Railway built an electric streetcar line along Mission Street from the Ferry Building to China Avenue (now Excelsior Avenue), with a spur line in operation the following year from Mission Street to Ocean Avenue to reach the newly-opened Ingleside Racetrack (now developed as the Ingleside Terraces neighborhood). Development picked up after the 1906 earthquake and fire as displaced residents sought permanent homes in the city's outlying neighborhoods, and two years later, the city established Balboa Park on the eastern half of the former House of Refuge lot. Development

¹⁰ Latimer, Bros. & Seymour, *Rincon de Las Salinas, Part of the Bernal Rancho, Fronting on the Bay, and Immediately South of the City of San Francisco, California* (New York: Latimer, Bros. & Seymour, 1857): 2; Walter G. Jebe Sr., *San Francisco's Excelsior District* (Charleston, South Carolina: Arcadia Publishing, 2004), 7.

¹¹ Other significant concentrations of dairies in San Francisco were located in the Mission and South of Market districts and the Cow Hollow, Bayview, Noe Valley, Bernal Heights, Portola, and Western Addition neighborhoods. William Kostura, "The Cows of Cow Hollow," *The Argonaut* 9, no. 1 (Spring 1998): 42; Jebe, *San Francisco's Excelsior District*, 7, 17-18.

continued through the 1920s as new homes were constructed; McLaren Park was established in 1927. By 1930, the Outer Mission and Excelsior neighborhoods were largely built out with attached, one-story-over-garage, single-family homes, with Mission Street serving as the principal commercial corridor. Over time, select parcels have been infilled or redeveloped, although these neighborhoods have retained their low density, residential character.¹²

4.2 Italian American Settlement in San Francisco

In the early 1850s, Italians began immigrating to California in search of fortune in gold fields but by the end of the decade, they had largely dispersed throughout Northern California as placer mining proved to be difficult and dangerous. They particularly settled in San Francisco, the Sacramento Valley, and the Sierra Nevada foothills and found employment in lumber camps, orchards and farms, and fishing camps. Those that traveled directly to San Francisco established businesses, such as grocery and dry goods stores, restaurants, hotels, and boarding houses, at the base of Telegraph Hill at what was then known as the "Latin Quarter" as it was home to Basque, French, Italian, Mexican, Portuguese, and Spanish immigrants.¹³ Among the first wave of Italian merchants in San Francisco were Domingo Ghirardelli, the famed chocolate manufacturer, and Domenico di Domenconini, who established the Golden Grain macaroni factory. By the early 1850s, Italian language supplements began appearing in local newspapers, followed by the first, albeit short-lived, Italian language newspaper, *L'Eco della Patria*, in 1859.¹⁴ The first Italian institution, the Societa' Italiana di Mutua Beneficenza, was established in 1858 in a social hall on Grant Street.¹⁵

By 1870, approximately 2,000 Italians had settled in San Francisco, and after immigration to California picked up in the 1880s, close to one-third of the state's Italian population (approximately 5,200 out of 15,500 Italians) were residing in San Francisco by the end of the decade. They dispersed throughout the city to various neighborhoods, including North Beach, Hayes Valley, Hunter's Point, the Marina, the Inner and Outer Mission, Excelsior, and Bernal Heights, based in part on their occupation and skills. For example, the Marina District south to the city border became home to Italian truck farms, while Italian fisherman coalesced in Hunter's Point and Bernal Heights. North Beach, or "Little Italy," arguably formed the largest and most well known Italian American neighborhood in San Francisco. A scattering of homes were initially located at Dupont Street (now Grant Avenue) and Vallejo Street. Italian businesses, including grocery stores, commercial and wholesale businesses, restaurants, and fruit and vegetable vendors, soon lined Grant Avenue to the north and formed the social heart of the neighborhood. Italian residents lived in small cottages, shacks, and crowded tenement buildings on Telegraph Hill and then moved downhill into North Beach in the 1880s and 1890s. Many enduring Italian commercial, civic, and religious institutions were founded in North Beach through the early twentieth century, including Saints Peter and Paul Church (1884, rebuilt in 1913), the Bank of Italy (founded by A.P. Giannini in 1904), John Fugazi's Casa Fugazi (1912), and the Italian Community Services Agency (1916).¹⁶

¹² Draft Excelsior Outer Mission Street NCD Survey, 1-2; LaBounty, *Ingleside Terraces*, 51; TBA West, *Historic Context Statement: Balboa Park Area Plan*, 19-20.

¹³ Deanna Paoli Gumina, *The Italians of San Francisco, 1850-1930/Gli Italiani Di San Francisco, 1850-1930,* 2nd ed. (New York: Center for Migration Studies, 1985), 19-21.

¹⁴ Sebastian Fichera, *Italy on the Pacific: San Francisco's Italian Americans* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 21. ¹⁵ Fichera, *Italy on the Pacific*, 11-12.

¹⁶ Fichera, Italy on the Pacific, 3, 27; Gumina, The Italians of San Francisco, 20, 25-27.

In the 1920s, Italian immigration tapered in response to restrictive immigration laws at which time they comprised the largest European ethnic group in San Francisco, surpassing the Irish and German communities, who had ranked first and second respectively. By 1930, the number of foreign-born Italians in San Francisco peaked at just over 27,300. North Beach remained home to the largest concentration of residents with Italian ancestry, with 60,000 residents and five circulating Italian language newspapers through World War II. Over the next several decades, the city's Italian American population steadily declined as immigration waned and Italian Americans relocated to suburbs outside of San Francisco.¹⁷

4.3 Italian American Settlement in the Excelsior

Italian settlement in the Outer Mission and Excelsior neighborhoods dates to the 1850s and initially was comprised of an insular community of truck farmers from the Liguria, Tuscany, and Campania regions and Italian-Swiss dairyman. The early settlers successfully transformed sandy hills into vegetable fields and dairy farms ranging in size from 10-15 acres to 250 acres.¹⁸ The smaller farms primarily produced tomatoes and lettuce, while the larger farms diversified by growing a wide array of vegetables, including artichokes, cauliflower, cabbage, brussel sprouts, and onions. These early Italian farmers typically rented plots of land either individually or in partnership and conveyed their produce on horse-drawn wagons along Mission Street to wholesale markets in the city's burgeoning downtown. Among the most prominent was the Colombo Market, a large vegetable and produce market established by the Italian community in 1876 and spanning the block bounded by Davis, Jackson, Front, and Pacific streets.¹⁹

The Italian American community in the Outer Mission and Excelsior remained strong through the midtwentieth century as numerous religious and cultural institutions and commercial businesses were established. By 1898, the community had grown large enough to warrant the construction of the Corpus Christi Church as an auxiliary church to Saints Peter and Paul in North Beach.²⁰ The original church building at Santa Rosa Avenue and Alemany Boulevard was later replaced with a modern church designed by architect Mario Ciampi in 1952. Along this stretch of Mission Street, the copious Italian stores, delis, restaurants, bakeries, pasta and ravioli factories, and butcher shops served as an extension of North Beach. Residents also enjoyed playing bocce ball on numerous courts built on empty lots in the Excelsior in the 1920s and 1930s. As longtime Excelsior resident Walter G. Jebe Sr. recalls, the courts "were gathering paces to play and to socialize and boast about the quality of their homemade wine, often late into the night."²¹ Major social institutions include the Italian American Social Club, which met in a member's home beginning in 1928 until moving to its permanent location at 21-25 Russian Avenue in 1940. Club members must have Italian ancestry, although the restaurant is open to the public. In 1952, the fraternal lodge Sons of Italy moved to its brand new location at 5051 Mission Street.²²

¹⁷ Gumina, *The Italians of San Francisco*, 6; Rose Doris Scherini, *The Italian American Community of San Francisco: A Descriptive Study* (New York: Arno Press, 1980), 1-5; Northern California Coalition on Immigration Rights, "North Beach: Little Italy," accessed January 6, 2016, <u>http://www.foundsf.org/index.php?title=North_Beach: Little_Italy</u>. ¹⁸ Gumina, *The Italians of San Francisco*, 33.

¹⁹ Gumina, *The Italians of San Francisco*, 35, 99.

²⁰ Gumina, *The Italians of San Francisco*, 35.

²¹ Jebe, San Francisco's Excelsior District, 94.

²² Draft Excelsior Outer Mission Street NCD Survey, 11; Jebe, San Francisco's Excelsior District, 83, 94.

By the early 1970s, Italian Americans began moving to the suburbs as Latino and Filipino residents moved into the area. By the turn of the twenty-first century, the Excelsior neighborhood was home to a large concentration of Filipino residents in San Francisco, with other significant concentrations in the nearby Visitation Valley and Portola neighborhoods. As the demographics shifted, the range of businesses along Mission Street began to change to serve new clientele. Similarly, the congregation of Corpus Christi Church evolved such that Italian Americans only comprised about one-fifth of the parishioners. Today the neighborhoods bordering the outer stretch of Mission Street remain among the most diverse in the city.²³

4.4 Valente, Marini, Perata & Co.

The Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. traces its roots to North Beach in the late nineteenth century. In 1889, Joseph Valente teamed with Julius Godeau to form an undertaking business at 1328 Dupont Street (now Grant Avenue; rebuilt in 1907). By 1895, Valente had parted ways with Godeau and established the Valente, Marini & Co. with Frank Marini and Edward Catagnetto. The new company operated its funeral parlor at 1524 Stockton Street near Columbus Avenue (rebuilt in 1926) until the 1906 earthquake and fire forced it to relocate to 3448 Mission Street near Bernal Heights (extant). It quickly sought to reesetablish itself in North Beach, and with a new partner C.L.P. Marais, opened its primary funeral home at 649 Green Street (extant) by 1908 while retaining the facility at 3448 Mission Street. By 1920, the business name had changed to Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. to reflect the change in ownership. Marais had divested from the business by 1915, and son Virgil Valente and Marini took on the partners John Perata and Victor Sbragia by 1920 and John Ferrari by 1925. The following year, the funeral home at 4840 Mission Street and celebrated the opening of its brand new funeral home at 4840 Mission Street based on the design by architect John A. Porporato (Figure 12).



Figure 12. View west toward 4840 Mission Street, ca. 1930s (*L'Italo-Americano*; use permission required)

²³ Allyson Tintiangco-Cubales, "Building a Community Center: Filipinas/os in San Francisco's Excelsior Neighborhood, in *Asia America: Forming New Communities, Expanding Boundaries,* ed. Huping Ling (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 2009), 104-105; Scherini, *The Italian American Community*, 33-35.

The business ownership changed over the subsequent decades but stayed largely within the Valente, Marini, and Perata families; see Table 2 for a complete list of owners compiled from city directories, see Table 2. In 1959, owners John Perata, Clarence Ferrari, Anita Taylor (John Perata's sister), and her son James L. Taylor commissioned architect Otto G. Hintermann to design the Midcentury Modern expansion and remodel of the subject property. The building expanded to contain four chapels, three reception salons, two apartments at the second story to house staff onsite at all hours, and a casket showroom and embalming facilities in the basement. In 1970, the business closed the Green Street facility and continued to operate solely at 4840 Mission Street. The business is currently owned and operated by the fifth generation, including Steven J. Taylor and Matthew J. Taylor.²⁴



Figure 13. Photograph of 4840 Mission Street, ca. 1960; the date on the photograph is incorrect (Valente, Marini, Perata & Co.)

The following section provides biographies of the principal owners—Joseph Valente, Frank Marini, and John Perata—along with the other owners who commissioned the 1959 remodel of the 4840 Mission Street facility—Anita Taylor, James L. Taylor, and Clarence Ferrari.

Joseph L. Valente (ca. 1858-1917) was born in Italy and immigrated to the United States in 1865. He was married to Mary A. Valente, and they had two children Virgil A. Valente and Valentina A. Valente. In 1907, he was fined by the City of San Francisco for moving a body between counties without filing the property registration form. He passed away in 1917; he was living at 631? Green Street and his funeral was celebrated with a requiem high mass at Saints Peter and Paul Church in North Beach. His son Virgil A. Valente then became a partner in the firm until his death in 1925.²⁵

²⁴ San Francisco City Directories, 1889-1980; "An Announcement," advertisement placed by the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co., *San Francisco Chronicle*, February 26, 1970: 38; Valente, Marini, Perata & Co., "History & Staff," accessed January 12, 2016, <u>http://www.vmpandco.com/who-we-are/history-and-staff</u>.

²⁵ "Judge Declares Valente Guilty," San Francisco Chronicle, June 15, 1907: 16; "Joseph A. Valente, Obituary," San Francisco Chronicle, November 15, 1917: 4; "Virgil A. Valente, Obituary," San Francisco Chronicle, June 8, 1925: 6; U.S. Federal Census, 1910, accessed December 5, 2016, <u>http://www.ancestry.com</u>.

Frank Marini (1862-1952) is the most well known of the original business partners. His parents emigrated from Italy in 1952 and settled in the Bayview neighborhood where he was born. Frank Marini reportedly buried the funeral home's records in Washington Square Park to save them from destruction during the 1906 earthquake and fires. He was known as the "Mayor of North Beach" for his philanthropic endeavors, including funding the construction of a playground for the Salesian Boys' Club at Washington Square and a gymnasium for the St. Francis Parish at Columbus Avenue and Vallejo Street. In total he donated over \$500,000 for civic improvements in North Beach and donations to the Italian Welfare Agency and Telegraph Neighborhood House. Upon his death at the age of 90 in 1952, his visitation was held at the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home at 649 Green Street, followed by a requiem high mass at Saints Peter and Paul Church.²⁶

John Perata (1893-1970) was married to Clara Perata, and they had at least one daughter, Joanne Perata. He served in the U.S. Army during World War I. Similar to his business partners Valente and Marini, his funeral services were held at 4840 Mission Street, followed by a requiem high mass at Saints Peter and Paul Church.²⁷ His sister Anita Perata (1891-1980) married James Taylor, and they had a least one son, James L. Taylor (1922-1994). No substantive information was uncovered about the Perata or the Taylors other than their involvement in the family business.²⁸

Clarence J. Ferrari (1902-1994) was married to Josephine F. Ferrari, and they had at least two other children, Barbara Ferrari and Clarence Ferrari Jr. Other than his longtime partnership in the company, little substantive information was uncovered about the elder Ferrari.²⁹

Date	Owners
1889	Valente and Godeau, undertakers, 1328 Dupont Street (now Grant Avenue) Owners: Joseph Valente and Julius Godeau
1895	Valente, Marini & Co., undertakers and embalmers, 1524 Stockton Street Owners: Joseph Valente, Frank Marini, Edward Castagnetto
1900- 1905	Valente, Marini & Co., funeral directors and embalmers, 1524 Stockton Street Owners: Joseph Valente, Frank Marini

Table 2. San Francisco City Directory Listings for the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co.

²⁶ Bill Simons, "In the Districts: 35th Annual Christmas Seal Drive Starts Tomorrow," San Francisco Chronicle, November 23, 1941: 66; "Frank Marini Will Have Big Testimonial Banquet," San Francisco Chronicle, August 26, 1949: 12; "Frank Marini, Obituary," San Francisco Chronicle, November 10, 1952: 11; "Frank Marini Bust Unveiled in North Beach," San Francisco Chronicle, October 11, 1954: 3; "Margaret Marini, Obituary," San Francisco Chronicle, February 28, 1964: 26; U.S. Federal Census, 1940 accessed December 5, 2016, <u>http://www.ancestry.com</u>; U.S. Find A Grave Index, 1600s-Current, accessed December 5, 2016, <u>http://www.ancestry.com</u>.

²⁷ "Services for Mortician John Perata," *San Francisco Chronicle*, August 29, 1970: 29.

²⁸ California Death Index, 1940-1997, accessed December 5, 2016, <u>http://www.ancestry.com</u>; U.S. Society Security Application and Claims Index, 1936-2007, accessed December 5, 2016, <u>http://www.ancestry.com</u>.

²⁹ U.S. Federal Census, 1940, accessed December 5, 2016, <u>http://www.ancestry.com</u>; U.S. Social Security Death Index, 1935-2014, accessed December 5, 2016, <u>http://www.ancestry.com</u>.

1906- 1907	Valente, Marini & Co., 3448 Mission Street Owners: Joseph Valente, Frank Marini
1908- 1910	Valente, Marini, Marais & Co., 649 Green Street and 3448 Mission Street Owners: Joseph Valente, Frank Marini, C.L.P. Marais
1915	Valente, Marini & Co., 649 Green Street and 3448 Mission Street Owners: Joseph Valente, Frank Marini
1920	Valente, Marini, Perata & Co., 649 Green Street and 3448 Mission Street, Owners: Virgil Valente, Frank Marini, John Perata, and Victor Sbragia
1925	Valente, Marini, Perata & Co., 649 Green Street and 3448 Mission Street Owners: Virgil Valente, Frank Marini, John Perata, Victor Sbragia, and John Ferrari
1926- 1928	Valente, Marini, Perata & Co., 649 Green Street and 4840 Mission Street Owners: Frank Marini, John Perata, Victor Sbragia, and John Ferrari
1930	Valente, Marini, Perata & Co., 649 Green Street and 4840 Mission Street Owners: Frank Marini, John Perata, Victor Sbragia, Clarence Ferrari, and Mary Valente
1935- 1940	Valente, Marini, Perata & Co., 649 Green Street and 4840 Mission Street Owners: Frank Marini, John Perata, Victor Sbragia, Clarence Ferrari, Charles Thierry, Mary Valente
1951	Valente, Marini, Perata & Co., 649 Green Street and 4840 Mission Street Owners: Frank Marini, John Perata, Victor Sbragia, Clarence J. Ferrari, Catherine Thiery
1959- 1960	Valente, Marini, Perata & Co., 649 Green Street and 4840 Mission Street Owners: John Perata, Clarence Ferrari, Anita P. Taylor, James L. Taylor
1969- 1970	Valente, Marini, Perata & Co., 649 Green Street and 4840 Mission Street Owners: John Perata, Clarence Ferrari, Anita P. Taylor, James L. Taylor, Antone Ferrari
1980	Valente, Marini, Perata & Co., 4840 Mission Street Owners: Clarence Ferrari, Stephen Taylor, and Antone Ferrari

Around the time that the subject property was remodeled and expanded, 42 funeral homes were located citywide, with a large concentration in the Mission District (seven funeral homes lined Valencia Street alone). Since then, the number of funeral homes has steadily dwindled such that only 13 of these businesses, including the Valente, Marini, and Perata & Co. funeral home, remain in the city. This in part due to a drop in the number of deaths in San Francisco as well as a sharp increase in the number of cremations; in San Francisco, cremations comprise up to 70 percent of all funerals. Families are much more geographically dispersed, so the tradition of having a multi-day visitation has also declined, reducing the need for funeral homes. In an interview in the *San Francisco Chronicle*, Matt Taylor stated that in comparison, burials still comprise three-fourths of all services provided by the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home due its proximity to neighborhood Catholic parishes, such as Church of the Epiphany, St. John the Evangelist, and Our Lady of Perpetual Help.³⁰

4.5 John A. Porporato

John A. Porporato (1877-1965) was born in San Francisco. He was married to Mary Porporato, and they had at least two children, Anita De Vincenzi and Albert J. Porporato. His funeral was held at the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home at 649 Green Street, followed by a high mass at Saint Peter and Paul Church, which he apparently helped complete in 1939.³¹ His career has not been subject to intensive research, although he appears to have been a prolific designer of apartment buildings San Francisco in the early twentieth century. The following is a preliminary list of his known work based on a review of period newspaper articles:

- Apartment building, 972-976 Pine Street, 1910³²
- Apartment building, north side of Clay Street between Powell and Mason streets, 1902³³
- Mortuary Chapel for the Societa' Italiana di Mutua Beneficenza, Italian Cemetery, San Mateo County, 1902³⁴
- Apartment building, southwest corner of Franklin and Frisco streets, 1924³⁵
- Apartment building, southwest corner of Polk and Greenwich streets, 1924³⁶
- Apartment building, southeast corner of Greenwich and Stockton streets, 1925³⁷
- Salesian House of Studies, San Pablo, 1928³⁸
- Porporato Garage, 4434 Mission Street, 1924³⁹

³⁰ J.K. Dineen, "Last Gasp for S.F.'s Long Tradition of Funeral Homes," *San Francisco Chronicle*, October 31, 2016.

³¹ "John A. Porporato, obituary," *San Francisco Chronicle,* July 23, 1965: 19; Susan Dinkelspiel Cerny, *An Architectural Guidebook to San Francisco and the Bay Area* (Salt Lake City: Gibbs Smith, 2007), 50.

³² Sally B. Woodbridge and John W. Woodbridge, *San Francisco Architecture: The Illustrated Guide to Over 1,000 of the Best Buildings, Parks, and Public Artworks in the Bay Area* (San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1992), 58.

³³ "A Goodly Array of Local Real Estate Investments," San Francisco Chronicle, March 1, 1902: 7.

³⁴ "Mortuary Chapel to be Erected," San Francisco Chronicle, November 10, 1902: 5.

³⁵ "Marine View Apartments Completed," San Francisco Chronicle, May 27, 1924: 7.

³⁶ "50,000 Apartment Completed," San Francisco Chronicle, July 2, 1924: 8.

³⁷ "Two-Story Building Under Construction," San Francisco Chronicle, January 17, 1925: 8.

³⁸ "Salesian House of Studies Opens Today," San Francisco Chronicle, January 31, 1928: 34.

³⁹ Draft Excelsior Outer Mission Street NCD Survey, 2.

4.6 Spanish Colonial Revival Architecture

The following section describing the Spanish Colonial Revival style has been excerpted from the San Francisco Planning Department's *Sunset District Residential Builders, 1925-1950 Historic Context Statement.*⁴⁰ Due to the extensive remodel of the building in the late 1950s, the building retains a minimal amount the original design features featuring this style.

Spanish Colonial Revival references California's Spanish Colonial and Missions legacy. It is rooted in Spanish Colonial architecture as built in California, rather than Spain. In addition to red Spanish clay tiles, stucco cladding, and an emphasis on arches, this style references the thick adobe walls, shaped parapets, exposed timber, bell towers, and ironwork of the original Spanish Mission buildings. The style does not reflect attempts to recreate the past faithfully, rather it draws from the romantic associations of the Spanish Colonial rule. Examples of Spanish Colonial Revival tract houses are less common than those classified as Mediterranean Revival and in the Sunset District were constructed primarily in the early 1930s.⁴¹

The terms "Spanish Colonial Revival" and "Mediterranean Revival" are often used interchangeably to describe a style that incorporates red Spanish Clay tile roofs, textured stucco walls, and arched window and door openings. Spanish Colonial Revival is differentiated from Mediterranean Revival in that it additionally references the thick adobe walls, shaped roof forms, exposed timber, bell towers, and ironwork of 18th century Mission churches. The style draws from the design elements associated with a romanticized interpretation of the Spanish Colonial rule. When first constructed as a residential revival style, it was marketed by builders as "Spanish." Examples of the Spanish Colonial Revival style as applied to Sunset District tract houses often displayed greater variation in design and stylistic elements than other Period Revival styles. Its zenith in the design of Sunset District tract houses occurred c.1931–1935. Significant examples of the Spanish Colonial Revival style would typically display a full expression of the style including complexity of design, expressive massing, articulated façades, and would draw from the character-defining features outlined below. The appearance of thick adobe walls is one of the style's essential features. Restrained versions of the style that incorporated some features and gestures of the style, yet displayed flush façades, simple plans, and minimal ornamentation, would not qualify as architecturally significant.⁴²

4.7 Otto G. Hintermann

Archival research has revealed little information on the career of architect Otto G. Hintermann. Newspaper and magazine articles primarily document his volunteer work as a World War I veteran; he was past commander of the San Francisco Post of the American Legion and described as "one of the most popular veterans in San Francisco...who has worked long and unselfishly in the interests of less fortunate former soldiers."⁴³ He also helped organize the Veteran's Fete to mark the 20th anniversary of World War I and for local architecture groups.⁴⁴ He was active in San Francisco Architectural Club I the 1930s as well

⁴⁰ Mary Brown, *Sunset District Residential Builders, 1925-1950 Historic Context Statement,* prepared by San Francisco Planning Department, April 3, 2013.

⁴¹ Brown, Sunset District Residential Builders, 82.

⁴² Brown, *Sunset District Residential Builders*, 91.

⁴³ "Only One Listed in Race for Vet County Leader," *San Francisco Chronicle*, September 16, 1934: 52.

⁴⁴ "Veterans Draft Plans for 1938 Fete," *San Francisco Chronicle*, December 14, 1937: 30.

as helped organized a statewide architecture conference in 1935.⁴⁵ He was married to Marguerite Hinterman, whose funeral was held at the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. chapel at 4840 Mission Street upon her death in 1954.⁴⁶ He later remarried Cleo Vreeland, who passed away in 1977; her funeral was also held at the subject property.⁴⁷

A review of the Avery Index of Architectural Publications, historic newspaper databases, the *Architect and Engineer*, San Francisco Heritage files, and the University of California, Berkeley Environmental Design Archives collection list did not reveal information regarding Hintermann's architectural designs. Likewise the 1959 remodel of the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral parlor at 4840 Mission Street also did not receive any press coverage. As such, Otto G. Hintermann is not regarded as a master architect.

4.8 Midcentury Modern Architecture

Modern architecture is a broad term that encompasses a wide range of styles and extends over a number of decades. In contrast to revivalist or derivative styles, modern architecture as a whole introduced a new vocabulary and was radically different than traditional styles. Although American architects such as Louis Sullivan and Frank Lloyd Wright began experimenting with modern design at the turn of the twentieth century, European Modernism and the Bauhaus movement, both of which emerged in the late 1910s, are often considered the precursors to subsequent modernist styles.

Generally, the new architectural vocabulary was prominent in the United States from the 1930s through the 1960s, and different modern styles emerged and flourished at different times during this period. A broad and oft disputed term, Modernism encompasses styles such as Streamline Moderne, Midcentury Modernism, Bay Region, Expressionism, New Formalism, Brutalism, and Third Bay Tradition. This section specifically discusses Midcentury Modernism, since that style is most closely associated with major remodel and expansion of the subject property completed in 1959.

The Midcentury Modern style is summarized in the *San Francisco Modern Architecture and Landscape Design*, 1935-1970 Historic Context Statement:

The decades following the end of World War II represent the nation's longest period of continuous growth. Construction-related expenditures increased nearly every year from 1946 to 1969. In San Francisco, builder-developers and architects and were experimenting with new functional iterations of Modern designs. Midcentury Modern and late interpretations of the International Style were the primary styles applied to everyday residential, commercial, and institutional buildings. To a lesser extent, styles such as New Formalism and Googie/Futurism were incorporated in commercial design.

Midcentury Modern is the most common Modern style built in San Francisco from 1945-1970. It was most frequently applied to residential design, but was also commonly found in commercial, religious, office, institutional and recreational property types. Midcentury Modern design elements include cantilevered roofs and overhangs, the use of bright or contrasting colors,

⁴⁵ Harris H. Allen, "Convention," *The Architect and Engineer* 123, no. 1 (October 1935): 47-49; "With the Architects," *The Architect and Engineer* 123, no. 1 (October 1935): 58; "S.F. Architectural Club," *The Architect and Engineer* 124, no. 1 (January 1936): 58.

⁴⁶ "Mrs. Marguerite Hintermann, obituary," *San Francisco Chronicle*, December 22, 1954: 15.

⁴⁷ "Cleo V. Hintermann, obituary," San Francisco Chronicle, February 16, 1977: 27.

projecting eaves, canted windows, projecting boxes that frame the upper stories, stucco siding, spandrel glass, large expanses of windows, flat or shed roof forms, vertical corrugated siding, stacked roman brick cladding, and occasionally, vertical wood siding. New technology and materials, such as plastic laminates, spandrel glass, and anodized metal sheaths were increasingly incorporated in Midcentury Modern buildings. Many architects who practiced within the Modernist idiom did not fall neatly into the categories of International Style, Streamline Moderne, or Second Bay Tradition. The term Midcentury Modern for the purpose of this context statement is a broad term that is inclusive of Modern architects who designed buildings that emphasized many of the Midcentury Modern design elements.⁴⁸

Character-Defining Features

- Projecting eaves and exposed rafters
- Cantilevered overhangs
- Flat, shed or low-pitched gable roof forms
- Vaulted roofs and overhangs
- Articulated primary facades
- Stucco, wood (often vertical), or corrugated siding
- Stacked Roman brick or stone often used as accent material
- Expressed post and beam construction
- Strong right angles and simple cubic forms
- Projecting vertical elements
- Large steel- or wood-framed windows
- Canted windows
- Painted finish is often stained, earth tone, or brightly colored
- Projecting boxes that en-frame the upper stories
- Atrium or courtyard entryways
- Overhanging trellises, sunshades, and pergolas

Character-defining features specific to storefronts commercial and institutional buildings:

- Spandrel glass
- Stacked roman brick veneer
- Integrated planters
- Angled or deeply recessed vestibules
- Terrazzo paving
- Projecting vertical elements
- Metal awnings or canopies (zigzag, corrugated metal, or sheet metal)
- Small geometric tiles set in geometric patterns
- Slightly projecting vertical mullions
- Jalousie windows, particularly at the transom
- Base mounted signage or "advertising front" lettering
- Textile block screens or metal sheathing⁴⁹

⁴⁸ Mary Brown, *San Francisco Modern Architecture and Landscape Design, 1935-1970 Historic Context Statement,* prepared by San Francisco City and County Planning Department, January 2011, 121-128.

⁴⁹ Brown, San Francisco Modern Architecture and Landscape Design, 189-190.

From the Excelsior Outer Mission NCD survey, other Midcentury Modern buildings along the Mission Street commercial corridor include:⁵⁰

- Central Drug Store, 4494 Mission Street, 1910 but altered ca. 1950
- 4680-4690 Mission Street, 1949, architect Mario Ciampi
- Garanda Cafe, 4753-4757 Mission Street, 1949
- Sons of Italy Hall & Cultural Center, 5051 Mission Street, 1952
- Mission-Serra Motel, 5630-5638 Mission Street, ca. 1955
- Woolworth Building, 5825-5845 Mission Street, 1956
- Commercial Building, 5200-5210 Mission Street, ca. 1970
- Commercial Building, 4650 Mission Street, architect Mario Ciampi, 1950
- Commercial Building, 8 Persia Avenue, architect Mario Ciampi, 1953
- Corpus Christi Church, 62-64 Santa Rosa Road, architect Mario Ciampi, 1952

5. EVALUATIVE FRAMEWORK

5.1 California Register of Historical Resources

The California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) is the authoritative guide to the State's significant historical and archaeological resources. It serves to identify, evaluate, register, and protect California's historical resources. The California Register program encourages public recognition and protection of resources of architectural, historical, archaeological, and cultural significance; identifies historical resources for state and local planning purposes; determines eligibility for historic preservation grant funding; and affords certain protections under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). All resources listed on or formally determined eligible for the National Register are automatically listed on the California Register. In addition, properties designated under municipal or county ordinances are eligible for listing in the California Register.

The California Register criteria are modeled on the National Register criteria. A historical resource must be significant at the local, state, or national level under one or more of the following criteria:

- 1. It is associated with events or patterns of events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.
- 2. It is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history.
- 3. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values.
- 4. It has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, state or the nation.

Like the National Register, evaluation for eligibility to the California Register requires an establishment of historic significance before integrity is considered. California's integrity threshold is slightly lower than the

⁵⁰ The Cresta Brothers Auto Parts building designed in 1948 by architect Mario Ciampi at 5050 Mission Street has been demolished.

federal level. As a result, some resources that are historically significant but do not meet National Register integrity standards may be eligible for listing on the California Register.

Second, for a property to qualify under the National Register's Criteria for Evaluation, it must also retain "historic integrity of those features necessary to convey its significance."⁵¹ While a property's significance relates to its role within a specific historic context, its integrity refers to "a property's physical features and how they relate to its significance."⁵² Since integrity is based on a property's significance within a specific historic context, an evaluation of a property's integrity can only occur after historic significance has been established. To determine if a property retains the physical characteristics corresponding to its historic context, the National Register has identified seven aspects of integrity:

- *Location* is the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred.
- *Setting* is the physical environment of a historic property.
- *Design* is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.
- *Materials* are the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property.
- *Workmanship* is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory.
- *Feeling* is a property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.
- *Association* is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.

6. EVALUATION OF SIGNIFICANCE

6.1 California Register of Historical Resources

Based on the evaluation presented below, the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home appears to be eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 3 as a significant example of Midcentury Modern commercial architecture in San Francisco. The period of significance dates to 1959 when the substantial remodel occurred.

The building does not retain its integrity to the original 1926 construction by architect John A. Porporato as the majority of the original Spanish Colonial Revival detailing was stripped from the building. Due to extensive alterations, the building is essentially dates to the 1959 remodel and expansion. Therefore, the evaluation section below focuses on the Midcentury Modern addition that was completed in 1959 and designed by architect Otto G. Hintermann.

⁵¹ National Park Service, *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, 3.

⁵² Ibid, 44.

While the draft Excelsior Outer Mission Street NCD historic resource survey prioritizes the recordation and evaluation of the cluster of Midcentury Modern buildings along the commercial corridor, an intensive survey of this potential historic district has not been completed nor has the Excelsior Outer Mission Street NCD historic resource survey been certified by the San Francisco HPC. It was beyond the scope of this HRE to complete the analysis to determine if the subject property contributes to a discontiguous Midcentury Modern historic district within the NCD.

California Register Criterion 1 [Association with Significant Events]

The Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home is not significant for its association with important historic events. Although the Italian American community had an enduring impact on the development of this segment of the Mission Street commercial corridor and the adjacent Outer Mission and Excelsior neighborhoods, the area was already well established by time the remodel occurred in 1959. Similarly, the neighborhood demographics began to shift over the next decade as Italian Americans began moving out of the area. The substantial remodel of the building was preceded by other large-scale development along Mission Street commissioned by members of the Italian American community; these included the replacement of the Corpus Christi Church and the construction of the Sons of Italy hall, both in 1952. Therefore, the expansion of the funeral home in the late 1950s did not spur new development along the commercial corridor nor does it represent a significant milestone in the history of the Italian American community in San Francisco. As such, it does not meet the threshold for listing in the California Register under this criterion.

California Register Criterion 2 [Association with Significant Persons]

By the time the remodel and expansion of the subject occurred in 1959, two of the namesake owners– Joseph Valente and Frank Marini–had already passed away. The project was undertaken by John Perata, his sister Anita Taylor, nephew James L. Taylor, and his longtime business partner Clarence J. Ferrari. Beyond operating a successful business in San Francisco, the Valente family members and Clarence J. Ferrari are not known to have made broader contributions to the funeral industry or to the Italian American community in San Francisco. Therefore, the subject property does not appear to meet the threshold for listing in the California Register under this criterion.

California Register Criterion 3 [Architectural Significance]

The San Francisco Modern Architecture and Landscape Design 1935-1970 Historic Context Statement provides the following evaluation criteria and integrity thresholds for evaluating properties that may qualify as a historic resource as a representation of Midcentury Modern commercial architecture:

In order to meet local and state registration requirements under Criterion 3 (Architecture) as an individual resource, a commercial property would need to retain many of its character-defining features. Storefronts, even more so than residential or other commercial buildings, are subject to continuous alterations in order to appear up-to-date and as such there are relatively few storefronts that retain the full expression of Midcentury Modern style.

Storefronts and commercial buildings that fully embody the Midcentury Modern design vocabulary, display unusual or rare features, and are of exceptionally high integrity may also

qualify for listing in the National Register under Criterion C (Architecture). A storefront that retains its canted glass (extremely rare) may, for example, qualify for the National Register.⁵³

The subject property appears to qualify for the California Register under Criterion 3 as a significant example of a Midcentury Modern commercial building in San Francisco. It exhibits several character defining-features of this style including a flat roof, porcelain enamel panels forming an geometric grid across the façade, roman brick veneer water table, aluminum sash windows and doors, clean lines, and minimal exterior detailing largely limited to the sweeping belt course across the east façade and the projecting boxes enframing windows at the second story. The prominent signage, both neon and painted, was designed to be read by drivers traveling up and down Mission Street and Alemany Boulevard, a common tactic employed businesses located along busy commercial corridors of this era. Since the building has remained substantially unaltered since 1959, it represents an important intact example of a large-scale Midcentury Modern commercial building in San Francisco.

However, the building does not appear to be significant under this criterion for its association with architect Otto G. Hintermann as he is not regarded as a master architect as described above. Additionally, the building is not significant as example of Spanish Colonial Revival Style architecture or as the design of prominent local architect John A. Porporato as the majority of the building's exterior features dating to the original construction in 1926 have been removed.

California Register Criterion 4 [Potential to Yield Information]

Criterion 4 is typically applied to archaeological resources, and evaluation of the subject property for eligibility under this criterion was beyond the scope of this report.

6.2 Integrity Analysis

Integrity is the authenticity of a historical resource's physical identity evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource's period of significance. Integrity involves several aspects including location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. These aspects closely relate to the building's significance and must be primarily intact for eligibility.

As detailed below, the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home at 4840 Mission Street retains a high degree of integrity such that it clearly expresses its architectural significance.

Location

The funeral home has not been moved and as such, it retains integrity of location.

Design

The subject property maintains integrity of design through its exterior features and continued use as a funeral home. It retains its cladding, fenestration, exterior detailing, and signage from the 1959 remodel.

⁵³ Brown, San Francisco Modern Architecture and Landscape Design, 193-194.

Setting

Minimal redevelopment has occurred in the Outer Mission and Excelsior neighborhoods in recent decades as compared to other neighborhoods in San Francisco. As such, the setting has remained essentially the same since the late 1950s. It continues to be located adjacent to other commercial or commercial mixed use properties along Mission Street, with low density residential neighborhoods beyond. As such, the subject property retains integrity of setting.

Materials

The majority of the original exterior materials dating to the 1959 remodel appear to be extant, thus affording the building a high degree of material integrity.

Workmanship

Conforming to the tenets of modern architecture, the subject property primarily includes mass-produced building materials. The porcelain enamel panels, brick veneer, aluminum sash windows and doors, glass block windows, and neon signage are examples of such materials. While these components do not reflect the work of a particular craftsperson or culture, they do reflect the period in which the building was constructed. As such, the building retains integrity of workmanship.

Feeling and Association

The subject property displays integrity of feeling and association through its intact Midcentury Modern design and materials and its continued use as a funeral home.

7. CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES

A character-defining feature is an aspect of a building or structure's design, construction, or detail that is representative of its function, type, or architectural style. Generally, character-defining features include specific building systems, architectural ornament, construction details, massing, materials, craftsmanship, site characteristics, and landscaping within the period of significance. In order for an important historic property to retain its significance, its character-defining features must be retained to the greatest extent possible.

Character-defining features of the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home at 4840 Mission Street include:

- Box form and overall massing
- Two-story height
- Horizontal orientation
- Orientation toward Mission Street and lack of setback from the sidewalk
- Flat roof with varying heights and parapet walls
- Clay tile along the parapet walls of the north and west façades
- Combination brick and reinforced concrete construction
- Large square porcelain enamel panels and brick veneer cladding
- Fenestration dating to the original construction, including the wood sash casement, one-overone, and Tudor arched on the north and west façades
- Fenestration dating to the 1959 remodel, including aluminum sash and glass block windows
- Projecting boxes enframing windows

- Aluminum frame glazed doors
- Signage, including attached, projecting, and freestanding neon signs and painted signs
- Wood-clad belt course and awning on the east façade
- Porte-cochères on the north and south façades
- Enclosed walkway along the south façade
- Low tapered wall separating the driveway from the parking lot
- Landscaped beds along the east façade and the tapered wall

8. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Harris H. "Convention." The Architect and Engineer 123, no. 1 (October 1935): 47-49.

Brown, Mary. San Francisco Modern Architecture and Landscape Design, 1935-1970 Historic Context Statement. Prepared by San Francisco City and County Planning Department. January 2011.

_____. *Sunset District Residential Builders, 1925-1950 Historic Context Statement*. Prepared by San Francisco Planning Department. April 3, 2013.

California Death Index, 1940-1997. Accessed December 5, 2016. http://www.ancestry.com.

Cerny, Susan Dinkelspiel. *An Architectural Guidebook to San Francisco and the Bay Area.* Salt Lake City: Gibbs Smith, 2007.

- Fichera, Sebastian. *Italy on the Pacific: San Francisco's Italian Americans*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Gumina, Deanna Paoli. *The Italians of San Francisco, 1850-1930/Gli Italiani Di San Francisco, 1850-1930,* 2nd ed. New York: Center for Migration Studies, 1985.

Jebe Sr., Walter G. San Francisco's Excelsior District. Charleston, South Carolina: Arcadia Publishing, 2004.

Kostura, William. "The Cows of Cow Hollow." The Argonaut 9, no. 1 (Spring 1998): 34-59.

LaBounty, Woody. *Ingleside Terraces: San Francisco Racetrack to Residence Park*. San Francisco: Outside Lands Media, 2012.

- Latimer, Bros. & Seymour. *Rincon de Las Salinas, Part of the Bernal Rancho, Fronting on the Bay, and Immediately South of the City of San Francisco, California*. New York: Latimer, Bros. & Seymour, 1857.
- National Park Service. *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*. 2002. Accessed November 21, 2016. https://www.nps.gov/NR/PUBLICATIONS/bulletins/nrb15/3.
- . *How to Complete the National Register Registration Form*. 1997. Accessed November 21, 2016, <u>https://www.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb16a/</u>.

Northern California Coalition on Immigration Rights. "North Beach: Little Italy." Accessed January 6, 2016. <u>http://www.foundsf.org/index.php?title=North_Beach: Little_Italy</u>.

San Francisco City Directories, 1889-1980.

- San Francisco History Center, San Francisco Public Library. "Homestead Maps A & B, Final Draft." March 2011. Accessed January 9, 2017. <u>http://cdn.calisphere.org/data/13030/0c/c86q200c/files/Guide to San Francisco Homestead</u> Maps.pdf.
- San Francisco Planning Department. City Within a City: Historic Context Statement for San Francisco's Mission District, November 2007.
- . Draft Excelsior Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District (NCD), (Alemany Boulevard San Mateo County Line) Survey. Draft copy provided to ARG on November 29, 2016.
- _____. San Francisco Property Information Map. Accessed December 5, 2016. http://propertymap.sfplanning.org.
- Scherini, Rose Doris. *The Italian American Community of San Francisco: A Descriptive Study.* New York: Arno Press, 1980.
- "S.F. Architectural Club." The Architect and Engineer 124, no. 1 (January 1936): 58.
- TBA West. *Historic Context Statement: Balboa Park Area Plan & Historic Resource Survey, San Francisco, California*. Prepared for the San Francisco Planning Department, August 3, 2008.
- Tintiangco-Cubales, Allyson. "Building a Community Center: Filipinas/os in San Francisco's Excelsior Neighborhood. In *Asia America: Forming New Communities, Expanding Boundaries,* ed. Huping Ling, 104-125. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 2009.
- U.S. Federal Census, 1910-1940. Accessed December 5, 2016. http://www.ancestry.com.
- U.S. Find A Grave Index, 1600s-Current. Accessed December 5, 2016. http://www.ancestry.com.
- U.S. Society Security Application and Claims Index, 1936-2007. Accessed December 5, 2016. <u>http://www.ancestry.com</u>.
- U.S. Social Security Death Index, 1935-2014. Accessed December 5, 2016. http://www.ancestry.com.
- Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. "History & Staff." Accessed January 12, 2016. <u>http://www.vmpandco.com/who-we-are/history-and-staff</u>.
- Vanderslice, Allison, Archaeologist/Preservation Planner, San Francisco Planning Department. Personal correspondence with ARG staff. December 1, 2016.

"With the Architects." The Architect and Engineer 123, no. 1 (October 1935): 58.

Woodbridge, Sally B., and John W. Woodbridge. San Francisco Architecture: The Illustrated Guide to Over 1,000 of the Best Buildings, Parks, and Public Artworks in the Bay Area. San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1992).

Newspaper Articles

"50,000 Apartment Completed." San Francisco Chronicle. July 2, 1924: 8.

"A Goodly Array of Local Real Estate Investments." San Francisco Chronicle. March 1, 1902: 7.

"An Announcement." advertisement placed by the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. *San Francisco Chronicle*. February 26, 1970: 38.

"Cleo V. Hintermann, obituary." San Francisco Chronicle. February 16, 1977: 27.

Dineen, J.K. "Last Gasp for S.F.'s Long Tradition of Funeral Homes." *San Francisco Chronicle*. October 31, 2016.

"Frank Marini Will Have Big Testimonial Banquet." San Francisco Chronicle. August 26, 1949: 12.

"Frank Marini, Obituary." San Francisco Chronicle. November 10, 1952: 11.

"Frank Marini Bust Unveiled in North Beach." San Francisco Chronicle. October 11, 1954: 3.

"John A. Porporato, obituary." San Francisco Chronicle. July 23, 1965: 19.

"Joseph A. Valente, Obituary." San Francisco Chronicle. November 15, 1917: 4.

"Judge Declares Valente Guilty." San Francisco Chronicle. June 15, 1907: 16.

"Margaret Marini, Obituary." San Francisco Chronicle. February 28, 1964: 26.

"Marine View Apartments Completed." San Francisco Chronicle. May 27, 1924: 7.

"Mortuary Chapel to be Erected." San Francisco Chronicle. November 10, 1902: 5.

"Mrs. Marguerite Hintermann, obituary." San Francisco Chronicle. December 22, 1954: 15.

"Only One Listed in Race for Vet County Leader." San Francisco Chronicle. September 16, 1934: 52.

"Salesian House of Studies Opens Today." San Francisco Chronicle. January 31, 1928: 34.

"Services for Mortician John Perata." San Francisco Chronicle. August 29, 1970: 29.

Simons, Bill. "In the Districts: 35th Annual Christmas Seal Drive Starts Tomorrow." *San Francisco Chronicle*. November 23, 1941: 66.

"Two-Story Building Under Construction." San Francisco Chronicle. January 17, 1925: 8.

"Veterans Draft Plans for 1938 Fete." San Francisco Chronicle. December 14, 1937: 30.

"Virgil A. Valente, Obituary." San Francisco Chronicle. June 8, 1925: 6.

4840 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA Historic Resource Evaluation

Appendix A: Existing Conditions Photographs





East façade, view west (ARG, November 2016)



Projecting neon sign on the east façade, view south (ARG, November 2016)



Main entrance on the east façade, view west (ARG, November 2016)



Typical window on the east façade and throughout the 1959 addition (ARG, November 2016)



Detail of the porcelain enamel panels and brick veneer attached to the original portion of the building on the north façade (ARG, November 2016)



West end of the north façade, view southwest (ARG, November 2016)



First story windows at the west end of the north façade (ARG, November 2016)



Porte-cochère attached to the north façade, view east (ARG, November 2016)


Entrance underneath the porte-cochère on the north façade (ARG, November 2016)



First story window on the east end of the north façade (ARG, November 2016)



Second story windows at the east end of the north façade (ARG, November 2016)



North end of the west façade, view east (ARG, November 2016)



North façade of the rear portion of the 1959 addition, view south (ARG, November 2016)



South end of the west façade, view east (ARG, November 2016)



West and south façades, view southeast (ARG, November 2016)



Enclosed walkway along the south façade (ARG, November 2016)



Entrance underneath the porte-cochère on the south façade (ARG, November 2016)



East end of the south façade (ARG, November 2016)



East end of the south façade with the entrance to the enclosed walkway, view northeast (ARG, November 2016)



Typical lamp post (ARG, November 2016)



Freestanding neon sign at the south edge of the parking lot, view west (ARG, November 2016)

4840 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA Historic Resource Evaluation

Appendix B: Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps





1915 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, Volume 9, Sheet 980 The arrow indicates the future location of 4840 Mission Street.



1950 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, Volume 9, Sheet 980 The arrow indicates the location of 4840 Mission Street.



Mid-1990s Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, Volume 9, Sheet 980 The arrow indicates the location of 4840 Mission Street.

4840 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA

Historic Resource Evaluation

Appendix C: Building Permit Record





OFFICI DI DI	<u>cisc</u> सि	: O				IN INK	1211					p Phillips	& Van Orden
	ECLIC	for with	street, a	indicate in lleys, loca d building	ink corr tion of e	rectly and xisting bu	distin ulding	ctly on the	ne back lot, if	of this any, a	sheet, a nd locatio	diagram on and	n of the dimen-
			APP	LICA	TIOI	N FO	RI	BUIL	DIN	GE	PERN	ATT.	,
					÷.,	BRICK		:					and
		tese	Eng a	ade to the Ros ad La 2 feet	comen	A- on the	e lot situ:	ated W	seat.	lin	tussion to bu	Alia	cion
		in accordan	ce with the	plans and spec	ifications sub	mitted berew	ith.	0			• ••••····		
	-in	building B	40,00	220 jeet (r	Building to	be occupied a	a st	lortu	ary	en			families
	5	Size of proj	ward buildin	ing	115	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							
				used, give thic		ight of storie	s						· · · · · · · · · · · · ·
				n solid or filled							Cara		
			ill be made		7		ement	parts.	Sand	~ ¢	ts. Broken	ntune \$	parts
		Brick work		ceme	nt-	mortar			••••••		·····	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
				bonded ? /	heade	nortar	7.6 e	omale	with	l Die	Key M	aster	Tiles
			· · · · · ·	na an a	· · · ·			دی دی در ارد برایی مربو در ایس _ا ست			······		
	-	•		WALL	B.	PIERS	1		Jours	Longest		SIRDER	IS
		Fasting		nemps		wife	212			Span	Kinturisi 	8120	Span
		Foundations	•	80		11	10				·····	·····	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
		lincount 1st story	. 9'	Brick	12 12	stal	colo	connel	E Stab	A10	Steel	·····	24
	2 2 2	2nd story	. 9	6 11	e. r.	. 4	18	word	206	24'	10	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	2.58
		3rd story 4th story	•	• • • • • • •		i	<u> </u>				••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••		
		Stà story-	•										
		6th story 7th story	•						•			5	
		Oth story		• •) / 	<u> </u>		<u></u>	
		96b story 18tb story	•• •••	nge var Te		·		5	into size el	bearing g	artitions on	ach floar.	
									MATERIAL			SIZES	
		ana ara		 	· · ·	······			····			······································	
			· •								······	· § . ;	
					1								
		•••• •••	•	, • • • • •	u ¹ • ↓ ↓ • ↓			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			· · · · · ·		
			;		1	Jacobie and		4			: 		
			лк (2)	*							-		

SAN FRANCISCO TOF DEPARTM BUILDING IN CTION instruction 1st floor re-sinforced associete 2th floor forets and flooring is. construction of wood covered with 5 ply fell and gravels Flat roof, construction of swood Steep roof construction of 6 Covered with Walls up 1 with teres colla tiles Cornices of Partition in source study metal lather thealer Stair Partitions, of Same Light ourt walks, of 4 Protected with bricks Protected with some to lo thes any planter Exterior whomas, or stell Interior volumes, of steel Trusses supporting roofs, if of iron, describe Flue linings, of height of chimneys above rouf Boiler flue, of Grief tined with fire, brick height of flue above roof 5 """ No. of Stairways, width and construction three 3' &" and 9'0" basement wells of boiler roum 6" le allour tiles Boiler-room location Ceiling and floor over boiler room ne inforced concrete. doors to boiler room R. W. Loved gal are Fire shutters Bay windows, covered with Towers, domes or spires, size and extreme height above -. Sky-lights, material, number and size 24 gal soon Two 6x6 and 7×10 No. of elevators where located near Elevator enclosures, of metal lathes and plaster Vaults under sidewalk Retaining walls of concerte height ? thickness at bottom 12 thickness at top Areas, coal holes, etc., state if any, and where I hereby agree to serve, indemnify and keep harmless the City and County of San Francisco against all liabilities, judgments, costs and someways which may in anywise accrue against said city and county in consequence of the granting of this permit, or some the use or occupancy of any sidewalk, street or sub-sidewalk place by virtue thereof and will in all things strictly comply with the militions of this permit. Archine & a Porporato Address 619 Mashington Sh Owner John Builder orporat Address by his Architect or authorised Agent.) NOTE-The owner's name must be signed by himself, or

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL COPY SAN FRANCISCO -Owner ì 655 2 reau of Building Imped 19. 54 CISC PECTION D DEPARTM BUILDING IN Location Mission W. 451.701-R. 21.01 FOR PERMIT TO MAKE ADDITTONS, ALTERATION REPAIRS TO BUILDEVIC FORDER AND DELIBER CONPART APPLICATION OF R Block LIU 24 FEB 9 194 X No. Let 1. BLDG. FORM. Cost & Sag Permit Pilled 50 Issued & head late 6329 ietor (DOES) ca (DOES MEE) 10 n of constructi Workmen's Compensation ERTRO Bureau of Building Inspection Director of Pablic Health 出义 Art Commission Bureau of Engineering Department of Electricity der ma の行 193 USE. 288 91 shale? City Planning **Deve**O1 APPROVED: APPROVED APPROVED, AFFROVED **NPPROVIED** APPROVED NURLAU OF FIRE PREVENTION AND PUBLIC SAFETY real of Fire Prevention and Public Safety Fire Mamhal Automatic Sprinkler System Taker Service Connection. Groundfloor Pipe Casings Automatic Fire Pumpa. F. D. (Dry) Standpipe Wet Standpipes Refrigmention ncinerators PROVED Hose Reels **Nounpipes** N 151 2

V1		e	11 per la construcción de la con		-Pile Two Copie	and the second second	All of the second secon	
RTMENT	OF		24		ly of san fea	Sector Property and the sector		
ING IN SPECT	TIONBL	PARTMENT O G. FORM			OR BUILDING	CENTRAL FER		
		2	in a second				240	
	district of the	J		ALT	TRATION	L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L L	10 A.	
	Арр	lication is hereby	made to ti	he	of Public Works of	the City and Con		
	CIBCO	for permission for descent	to build in :	a la	of Public Works of the plans and app the hereinafter set for	cifications solvaiti	ed herewith and	
	(1)	Location	Mission	- 1.701 H	Semina 27.01	La LA	BLOOK 6957	
	(2)	For what purpo	is is preses	t building now	med 7		00	
and the	19. S 19. S #	10 1 10 AV	A STATE OF THE STATE OF	Sector I Sector	renfter ?ADVE	TISING PURPOSES		
教教 派	和法律理论。在一	Total Cost \$	Contraction of the second			No in the	New York	
	(5)	Description of w	ork to be de	50e				
	lisi				and 10 feet b	1m		
			8					
	10							1
	1							
		2					1. 2.	
			160	and the second	Steal.		Bi Je	
								1.1.1
	Sec. 11							
	(6)	Contractor (DC)BS) can	y Workman's C	empenation Insur	Marea.	*******	
		Contractor (DC DOC Supervision of c	Porte of		emponention Insur-		FR. CONDANTY	
	(7)	1840	Porte of		<u></u>	BUCK AND PERIS	and the state of the	and the second
	(7)	Supervision of c	onderection	a by		NTS HOLT ATTREE		 A second sec second second sec
	(7)	Supervision of c	onderection	a by		NTS HOLT ATTREE		and the second se
	(7)	Supervision of c	onderection	a by		NTS HOLT ATTREE		(a) A set of the se
	(7)	Supervision of c	onderection	a by		NTS HOLT ATTREE		
	(7) THE NAN OF (save, ment of the place	Supervision of c	onderection	a by	ACR LIME REQUIN ACR LIME REQUIN SAN FRANCISCO they herein specific County of San Fra accurate agrint an eccupancy of any riskly comply with	NATES AND FIFTS AND TO AND T CONTRACT AND T and the STATE of ar not; and I d art not; art not; d art not;		
	(7) THE NAN OF (save, ment of the place	Address I hereby certify a BUILDING ZON CES OF THE C CALIFORNIA wi indemnify and k a, costs and expe- e granting of this d by virtue there	onderection	a by	med, that all the p AGE LINE REQUI SAN FRANCISCO the bound specific County of San Fra accuracy of any ristly comply with	NTS HOLT ATTREE		
	(7) THE NAN OF (save, ment of the place	Address Supervision of c Address I hereby certify i BUILDING ZON CESS OF THE C CALIFORNIA wi indemnify and k a, cosh and orpe a granting of this d by virtue there Architest	and agree, NE ORDIN PTY AND II be comp eep harmic mass which permit, or sof, and wi	a by	ACR LEME REQUI SAN FRANCISCO they herein specific county of San Fra a corres against as a corres against as acceptancy of any riskly comply with	NATES AND FIFTS AND TO AND T CONTRACT AND T and the STATE of ar not; and I d art not; art not; d art not;		
	(7) THE NAN OF (save, ment of the place	Address Supervision of c Address I hereby certify 1 BUILDING ZOF CES OF THE C ALIFORNIA wi indemnify and k s, costs and appe e granting of this d by virtue there Architect	and agree, NE ORDIN PTY AND II be comp eep harmic mass which permit, or sof, and wi	a by	ACR LEME REQUI SAN FRANCISCO they herein specific county of San Fra a corres against as a corres against as acceptancy of any riskly comply with	ALTER AND THEIS ALE HOLT ATTAINS CONTINUES AND T and the STATE of or not; and I home against all dely and could dervall, street the conditions of t		
	(7) THE NAN OF (sment of the place (8)	Address Supervision of c Address I hereby certify i BUILDING ZOP CES OF THE C CALIFORNIA wi indemnify and his indemnify and his of by virtue there arranting of this of by virtue there Architect Certificate No	and agree, NE ORDIN PTY AND II be comp eep harmic mass which permit, or sof, and wi	a by	ACK LIME REQUI BAN FRANCISCO they hornin specific County of San France occupancy of any riskly comply with License No	ALTER AND THEIS ALE HOLT ATTAINS CONTINUES AND T and the STATE of or not; and I home against all dely and could dervall, street the conditions of t		
	(7) THE NAN OF (sment of the place (8)	Supervision of c Address I hereby certify i BUILDING ZON CES OF THE C ALIFORNIA wi indemnify and he a, costs and expe- e granting of this d by virtue there Architect Certificate No State of Californ Address Certificate No Certificate No Certificate No	Denten Ck construction NE ORDIN ITY AND ITY AND it be comp eep harmit meep harmit neep harmit of, and will nia	a by	Med, that all the p ACR LINE REQUI SAN FRANCISCO the herein specific County of San Fra eccure agretuat an edcupancy of any ristly comply with License No. City and County R	ALE AND FIFTS ALE ADD STRUCT rovisions of the Bi rovisions of the Bi rovisions of the BI and the STATE of ar not; and I i minute against all id city and count all id city and count the conditions of the DEC of San Prancinco IIII		
	(7) THE NAN OF (sment of the place (8)	Supervision of c Address I hereby certify i BUILDING ZON CES OF THE C ALIFORNIA wi indemnify and k a, cost and arps b granting of this d by virtue there Architest Certificate No State of Californ Engineer Certificate No State of Californ	Denten Ck construction NE ORDIN ITY AND ITY AND it be comp eep harmit meep harmit neep harmit of, and will nia	a by	Med, that all the p ACR LINE REQUI SAN FRANCISCO the herein specific County of San Fra eccure agretuat an edcupancy of any ristly comply with License No. City and County R	ALE AND FIFTS ALE ADD AND T rovisions of the B Solution and the STATE of ar not; and I bid only and county dervall, struct the conditions of t his		
	(7) THE NAN OF (ment of the place (8) (8)	Supervision of c Address I hereby certify in BUILDING ZOT CES OF THE C ALIFORNIA wind indemnify and is a cost and arpose a granting of this d by virtue there Architest	Distance of construction of construction of the composite	a by	Med, that all the p ACR LINE REQUI SAN FRANCISCO the herein specific County of San Fra eccure agretuat an edcupancy of any ristly comply with License No. City and County R	ALE AND FIFTS ALE ADD STRUCT rovisions of the Bi rovisions of the Bi rovisions of the BI and the STATE of ar not; and I i minute against all id city and count all id city and count the conditions of the DEC of San Prancinco IIII		
	(7) THE NAN OF (ment of the place (8) (8)	Supervision of c Address I hereby certify i BUILDING ZON CES OF THE C ALIFORNIA wi indemnify and k a, cost and arps b granting of this d by virtue there Architest Certificate No State of Californ Engineer Certificate No State of Californ	Distance of construction of construction of the composite	a by	ACR LIME REQUI BAN FRANCISCO ther herein specific county of San France eccupancy of any riskly comply with License No. City and County Re License No. City and County	ALE AND FIFTS ALE ADD STRUCT rovisions of the Bi rovisions of the Bi rovisions of the BI and the STATE of ar not; and I i minute against all id city and count all id city and count the conditions of the DEC of San Prancinco IIII		
	(7) THE NAN Of the place (8) (9) (10)	Supervision of c Address I hereby certify in BUILDING ZOT CES OF THE C ALIFORNIA wind indemnify and is a cost and arpose a granting of this d by virtue there Architest	Distance of construction of construction of the composite	a by	ACR LIME REQUI BAN FRANCISCO ther herein specific county of San France eccupancy of any riskly comply with License No. City and County Re License No. City and County	ALE AND FIFTS ALE NON AND T rovisions of the B Distance of the B Distance of the B of the STATE of ar not; and I distance of the STATE of San Prancisco Dist of San Prancisco		
	(7) THE NAN OF (ment of the place (8) (9) (10)	Supervision of c Address I hereby certify i BUILDING ZOP CES OF THE C ALIFORNIA wi indemnify and here a granting of this of by virtue there Architect	Distance of construction of construction of the composite	a by	Mod, that all the p ACK LINE REQUI SAN PRANCISCO the hornin specific county of San Fra accurace agrainet as accurace agrainet as accurace of any riskly comply with Receive No. City and County Receive No. City and County Receive No. City and County	ALE AND FIFTS ALE NON AND T rovisions of the B Distance of the B Distance of the B of the STATE of ar not; and I distance of the STATE of San Prancisco Dist of San Prancisco		
TENAL OF A	(7) THE NAN Osave, ment of the place (8) (9) (10) (11)	Supervision of c Address I hereby certify i BUILDING ZON CES OF THE C ALIFORNIA wi indemnify and he a costs and expe- e granting of this of by virtue there Architest Certificate No State of Californ Address Certificate No State of Californ Address Plans and specie Other than Arch Address Contractor	Denter of construction of construction of construction of the complete construction of the construction of	a by	Med, that all the p ACR LINE REQUI SAN FRANCISCO that herein specific county of San Fra eccupancy of any ristly comply with R License No. City and County R License No. City and County R License No. City and County R License No.	ALE AND THEIS ALE AND THEIS TOVISIONS OF THE BI TOVISIONS OF THE BI SUBJECT TO AND T and the STATE of an International I biotocomposed in the solution against all objects against all obj		
18 A 18	(7) THE NAN OF (ment of the place (8) (9) (10) (11)	Supervision of c Address I hereby certify i BUILDING ZON CESS OF THE C ALIFORNIA wi indemnify and is, east and expe- e granting of this d by virtue there Architest. Cartificate No State of Californ Address Engineer. Certificate No State of Californ Address Plans and specif Other than Arch Address Contractor. License No State of Californ	Denter of construction of construction of construction of the complete construction of the construction of	a by	Read, that all the p ACR LEME REQUI BAN FRANCISCO ther hereits specific county of San Fran- eccupancy of any riskly comply with License No. City and County License No. City and County E	ALE AND THEIS ALE AND THEIS TOVISIONS OF THE BI TOVISIONS OF THE BI SUBJECT TO AND T and the STATE of an International I biotocomposed in the solution against all objects against all obj		
18 A 18	(7) THE NAN Osave, ment (8) (9) (10) (11)	Supervision of c Address I hereby certify i BUILDING ZOP CES OF THE C ALIFORNIA wi indemnify and he access and expe- e granting of this of by virtue there Architect	Denter of construction of construction of construction of the complete construction of the construction of	a by	Med, that all the p ACR LINE REQUI SAN FRANCISCO that herein specific county of San Fra eccupancy of any ristly comply with R License No. City and County R License No. City and County R License No. City and County R License No.	ALE AND THEIS ALE AND THEIS TOVISIONS OF THE BI TOVISIONS OF THE BI SUBJECT TO AND T and the STATE of an International I biotocomposed in the solution against all objects against all obj		
18 A 18	 (7) THE NAN OF (10) (10) (11) (12) 	Supervision of c Address I hereby certify i BUILDING ZOT CES OF THEE C ALIFORNIA wi indemnify and is a costs and argue a granting of this d by virtue there Architect	Denter of construction of construction of construction of the complete construction of the construction of	a by	Med, that all the p ACR LINE REQUI SAN FRANCISCO the bound specific County of San Fra eccupancy of any rhitly comply with R License No. City and County R License No. City and County R License No. City and County	ALE AND FRANCISCO ALE AND FRANCISCO TOVISIONS OF THE BI TOVISIONS OF THE BI TOVISIONS OF THE BI TOVISION OF THE BI TOVISION OF THE BILLION TOVISION OF THE BILLION TOVISION OF THE BILLION TOVISION OF THE BILLION TOVISION OF THE BILLION STEP AND FRANCISCO STEP AND FRANCISCO	UILDING LAW, HE FIRE ORDI- HOUSING ACT boroby agree to Habilities, judg- in consequence or sub-sidewalk his permit.	
18 A 18	(7) THE NAN Of the place (8) (9) (10) (11) (12)	Supervision of c Address I hereby certify i BUILDING ZOP CES OF THE C ALIFORNIA wi indemnify and he a costs and expe- e granting of this of by virtue there Architect	Denter of construction of construction of construction of the complete construction of the construction of	a by	Mod, that all the p ACR LINE REQUI SAN FRANCISCO the hermin specific County of San Fra eccurse agretant an eccurse agretant an eccurse agretant an eccurse agretant an eccurse agretant an eccurse agretant an eccurse agretant agretant agretant agretant agretant License No. City and County R License No. City and County R License No. City and County R	of San Prancisco STER AND Prancisco STER AND Prancisco STER AND Prancisco STER AND Prancisco STER AND Prancisco STER AND Prancisco	UILDING LAW, HE FIRE ORDI- HOUSING ACT boroby agree to Habilities, judg- in consequence or sub-sidewalk his permit.	
18 A 18	(7) THE NAN OF (ment of the place (8) (9) (10) (11) (11)	Supervision of c Address I hereby certify i BUILDING ZOT CES OF THE C ALIFORNIA wi indemnify and is a costs and argue a granting of this d by virtue there Architect	Denter of construction of construction of construction of the complete construction of the construction of	a by	Mod, that all the p ACR LINE REQUI SAN FRANCISCO the hermin specific County of San Fra eccurse agretant an eccurse agretant an eccurse agretant an eccurse agretant an eccurse agretant an eccurse agretant an eccurse agretant agretant agretant agretant agretant License No. City and County R License No. City and County R License No. City and County R	ALE AND FRANCISCO ALE AND FRANCISCO TOVISIONS OF THE BI TOVISIONS OF THE BI TOVISIONS OF THE BI TOVISION OF THE BI TOVISION OF THE BILLION TOVISION OF THE BILLION TOVISION OF THE BILLION TOVISION OF THE BILLION TOVISION OF THE BILLION STEP AND FRANCISCO STEP AND FRANCISCO	UILDING LAW, HE FIRE ORDI- HOUSING ACT hordy agree to Habilities, judg- in consequence or sub-sidewalk his permit.	

SAN FRANCISCO Write in Ink-File Two Copies 1 DEPARTM TOF **CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO** BUILDING IN MOIT DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS **CENTRAL PERMIT BUREAU BLDG. FORM APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT** 3 ALTERATION Get 18 198.7 Application is hereby made to the Department of Public Works of the City and County of San Fran-cisco for permission to build in accordance with the plans and specifications submitted herewith and according to the description and for the purpose hereinafter set forth : 4840 Mession St. (1) Location eral Parlos (2) For what purpose is present building now used ? . (3) For what purpose will building be used hereafter?... (4) Total Cost \$ 1800 as per place + specification (5) Description of work to be done... (6) Contractor (DOES) carry Workmen's Compensation Insurance. (DOES NOT) (7) Supervision of construction by Address I hereby certify and agree, if a permit is issued, that all the provisions of the BUILDING LAW, THE BUILDING ZONE ORDINANCES, SET BACK LINE REQUIREMENTS AND THE FIRE ORDI-NANCES OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO and the STATE HOUSING ACT OF CALIFORNIA will be complied with, whether herein specified or not; and I hereby agree to save, indemnify and keep harmless the City and County of San Francisco against all liabilities, judg-ments, costs and expenses which may in anywise accrue against said city and county in consequence of the granting of this permit, or from the use or occupancy of any sidewalk, street or sub-sidewalk placed by virtue thereof, and will in all things strictly comply with the conditions of this permit. albert Fr. m + J. Jera (8) Architect Certificate No. State of California icense Ne City and County of San Francisco 68 Port St Address (9) Engineer Certificate No._____ State of California License No. City and County of San Francisco Address Plans and specifications prepared by Other than Architect or Engineer. (10) Addres Franchis Truffelli (11) Contractor. License No. City and County of San Francisco N65 Clay At Address Valente, Marini, Persta + Co (12) Owner. 4840 Mincion for Address Fracchia . By____ **Owner's** Authorized Agent. THE DEPARTMENT WILL CALL UP TELEPHONE NO. IF ANY ALTERATIONS OR CHANGES ARE NECESSARY ON THE PLANS SUBMITTED.

OFFICIAL COP SAN FRANCISCO 1 k-File Two Copies PAN BY Write in I and cou CITY Contraction of the second DEPARTM NTOR of Building I RINT TO MARK ARTE DEP 王 5年 PLI CTH/ SPECTIONS BUILDING IN M BLI AVACENCI C 0 ONDOTION ON TUDING ? APPEACATION 012 bereby made to Diana di 24 4894 sharet Du n. -23 8 10 -.8 n to build igaccor nahi tiw 10 20 HOL 200 BUDD. FORM free the parpo rintion a 2: Sinco ADDRINONS, erint Location Permit fardie fandie d (2)100 building. 15 .01% building hereafter (Σ) 2 ton fetor TE i sige hetter an an and (5) Description of work to be done... APPLICANT MUST FILL OUT COMPENSATION INSURANCE RSE SIDE. ER NO (1) Supervision of construction by tationA (8) Impection in to. **Electricity** nse No. Ret-50 Commission State c Francis and County BOO addr. Building 8 (9) Engine nutag Jo Y 8 Department Bureau pae No. Plan -0 and County Francisc christ Superintendent Bureau Sil 췸 Buchashis (10) Phane ed by 21 squ inter an Architect or Other Ô Approved: (11)Approved DIBAOU OVED Approved Approve 020 and Co simo? at is issued herein that all the provisions of the BUILDING CITE, STIPLACK LIME REQUIREMENTS AND FIRE WITH OF SAN FILANCISCO, the STATE HOUSING ACT of the complied with, whether specified herein or shown on gries to save, indennity and keep harmless the Gity and the and County or any of its officials in consequence of the destit complexity of any sidewalk, street, or sub-sidewalk space methy with the conditions of this permit. The fore-sidewale study with the conditions of this permit. The fore-sidewale of said property, the applicant, their heirs, succesreby certify and agree, if a per ND BUILDING ZONE ORDIN NGES OF THE CITY AND C ORNIN and of sup permit withouthed becautify and basis Services or labor to be performed by In return for alg of surfamines OF TYAN only, received from any functions, OF CYA charthable or relief organization nd heret affectials affectials Offerund d bert 11510 2 in anywis this pern 010 2:03 同川 lo ga fitten ings Gled with 6.011 8 2.4411 of Fire Prevention nibriidi A Compensation 195 18 of exclusion checked No one to be employed 110 Felloy or Certificate Casual labor employed Certificate 2 ð a Hanna's Burner Automa's P **APPROVIED** Owner's Authorized Agent, T. FLEPHONE NO. ARE NECESSART ON THE PLANS SUBMITTED. **Cook** INIC 2 3 ê 3

OFFICIAL DI LI DI DECEIVE Write in Bill -File Two Caples MAY 5 1917 GITT AND COUPAN OF EAST PANT 8.1 DEPARTMENT O DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS BUILDING INCRETION BLDG. FORM COPY D CITY AND COUNTY or our than is.d APPLICATION FOR BOILDING I RULLUN 3 1.0 Mug - Se Dal 191 7 Application is hereby made to the Departs claco for permission to build in accordance with cording to the description and for the purpose of Public Work I OR City and C aty of San Pra e with the place and rith and -+ Borth : LOBA FOR 0200 (1) Location 4840 No. of familie (2) Present use of building. (3) Use of building hereafter. marci No. of families (4) Total Cost \$ 200 2 Unigental. (5) Description of work to be done (6) APPLICANT MUST FILL OUT COMPENSATION INSURANCE DATA ON REVERSE SIDE (1) Supervision of construction by. 965 -Adde (8) Architect No. City and County 7 Stin Pr Addre Pull (9) Engineer n No City and County of Sain Fra 11.75 A-3-6 (10) Plans and specifications prepared by Other than Architest or Engineer..... Add Ele (11) Could City and Con ty of San Pro 965 d de I haveby certify and agree, if a persait is insued herein that all the provisions of the BUILDING LAW AND BUILDING SOME ORDINANCES, SET-BACK LIME REQUEREMENTS AND FIRE ORDINANCES OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, the STATE BOUBSING ACT OF CALIFORNIA, and of said persit will be complied with, whether specified herein or shown on any glass submitted herewith, and hereby agree to mave, indennify and here hereins the City and y agree to mye, ind ith, and beruin agone all dam ad its officials agoinst all dam run against and City and Co 101 ay in anywin s, Habil may in anywire energy against as y of this permit, or from the use to thereof, and will in all things symmetry shall be binding man i and City and County or any of its officials is co use or occupanity of any aldewalk, stress, or su go strictly comply with the conditions of this p is the owner of mid property, the applicant, the nit. Ti 35 to. 50 -0.9 4840 -2 201 1 **FOREFACE** eldatizatio 2000 um. Owner's Authorized Agent. 23 日本 THE DEPARTMENT VILL CALL OF THE PROVIE NO. L'en 2 (a) 3 6



OFFICIAL Walto in July-Wie Two Capitan P 7. 00. 400 DECENVE CONTAIN OUR TO TRAIL OF ANY DEALERS AY 5 100 COPY DEPARTMENT O PORTO OF POLLO WORKS BUILDING INSPECTION 200. POLD BUREAU OF BUILDING INSPECTION APPLICATION FOR DOWNERS PI BUITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ALK- VYSE 104 7 Application is hereby made to the Department of I circo for permission to build in accordance with the pla cording to the description and for the purpose berefast the City of Pr and latte 4840 - mine 12 (1) Lecetion a property (2) Present use of building. ma (3) Use of building herenfter. (4) Total Cast 8 4465 00 cha t (5) D to be d 0 ling dat VALENT MARINI PERATA J. 4 16: L (6) APPLICANT MUST FILL OUT COMPENSATION BESIDEANCE DATA ON DEVELOPE SIDE. w=a((7) Supervision of construction by. X 1.11 965 - I dan All. (8) Architect Curtificite Ho. -12 (m) 15 in texterino. City and County of S -17 apase. 1000000 22 6 69 いた (9) Engl * idente No. LA Cardian a No City and County of Sim Pa 10 12 and specifications propared by r then Architect or Engineer..... (10) F E.S. E. . (11) 6 City and Con dem ty of Sun Pr doch 965 -I have eartify and agree, if a permit is W AND BUILDING ZONE ORDINANCE and have that all the SHT-BACK LINE RE dit in in THEFT IS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCE 1 75.0 COL Marine Brow AGR 0 1111 trasta C Store iy h a 15 ay of a in them h the 1 631 (19) O 2 2 4845 1 ling. Dy ---あるいろう は日 **Owner's Authorized Agent.** A STREED REALS CONTRACT WILL CALL OF THE REDUCE NO. 1



OFFICIAL)e(•)e|Ve -Julo Tero Ca Write in 1 MAK5 CHEY AND COUNTY OF BAN PRAN 1347 DEPARTMENT O DEPARTMENT OF FUELD WOLLS BUILDING INSPECTION Bunchistor Lattream InSPECTION 211 COPY CITY AND COUNTY IN SHI THANGING APPLICATION FOR INTRONG PI MIGLIE ROTTAR CH 3 Alle Par 503 101 7. at of Public Works of the City and Can ity of San Fran-Application is hereby made to the Department of Public Works o cisco for permission to build in accordance with the plans and specific cording to the description and for the purpose hereinsforr set forth: Date stationers B/C-N.O.R Sov N.M. le (1) Location 4940 -DOL17 af 6 (2) Present use of building Ž No. of familie (3) Use of building hereafter. mon (4) Total Cost \$ _____. 記録が行うと he (5) Description of work to be done Itangantal (6) APPLICANT MUST FILL OUT COMPANSATION INSUBANCE DATA ON REVERSE SIDE. 71 (1) Supervision of construction by... 965 - 20 Addre (6) Architect 1 AND S CO. 34 011 n No. City and County of San Franc Addre 100 To Party 24 (9) Engine 1 No. City and County of Son Francisco Address (10) Plans and specifications prepared by Other than Architect or Regimeer..... (11) Contractor. no No No State of California City and County of San Fra 965de or I hereby certify and agree, if a permit is issued herein that all the provisions of the BUILDING LAW AND BUILDING ZONE ORDINANCES, SET-BACK LINE REQUERISHENTS AND FIRE ORDINANCES OF THE CITY AND ODINATION OF SAN FRANCISCO, the STATE BOUSING ACT OF CALIFORNIA, and of said permit will be complied with, whether specified been or shown on any gians submitted herewith, and hereby agree to save, indexed/y and here hermises the City and Causely of San Francisco and its atilicials agrees to save, indexed/y and here hermises the City and Causely of San Francisco and its atilicials agrees to save, indexed/y and here hermises the City and Causely of San Francisco and its atilicials agrees to save, indexed/y and here hermises the City and Causely of San Francisco and its atilicials agrees to save, indexed/y and here hermises the City and this is dust all O its official may in anywho adorno a og of this permit, or from million t of of the y or e or occupantly on a strictly comply with the n the m t, or from the will in all the permit. tas thereof, and w 1000 the appl NOV. ata a In 101191 (12) 01 an ma 484 D3. bin 102 was pie ILTII. **Owner's Authorized Agent.** THE DEPARTMENT WILL CALL UP TELEPHONE NO. IF ANY ALTERATIONS OF CHANGES ARE NECESSARY ON THE PLANS SUBMITTED. 5 5 E

OFFICIAL COPY SAN F 0 Co ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OF REPAIRS Valente, Marini, Perata Owner SuperIntendent Bureau of Building Inspection 194 5 194C 194 Approved: () [P [P [P [P] () V [E] Location 4840 Mission Street NUG - 4 1908 Sal FOR PERMIT TO MAKE PARTINE CONTENT OF L 20 1946 AUG 2. DEPAR BUILDIN APPLICATION OF MENT AUG 16 1938 INSPECTR TO BUILDING T. 20 1.1 No Cost \$ 4500, 00 BLDG, FORM Permit No. 3 Issued. Filed. DBCCCI BUREAU OF ENGINEERING BBI STRUCT, ENCINEER DEFT. CF FUELIC HEALTH REFER TO BOLER INSPECTOR ART COMMISION 10 SuperIntendent Bureau of Bullding Inspection Commission Director of Public Health Department of Electricity Bureau of Engineering Art Commission Approved: Approved: Approved: Approved: Zoning:---Approved: Approved Øx1x Division of Fire Prevention and Investigation . . Permit Bureau only, received from any religious, charitable or relief organization Casual labor only to be No Workmen's Compensation Insur-ance Policy or Certificate on file for Workmen's Compensation Insurance Pollcy or Certificate filed with Central in return for aid or sustenance Services or labor to be performed (a) No one to be employed . . . reason of exclusion checked: employed APPROVED: (q) <u>ම</u>

MFRIN				
	CISCO	RAL PERMIT SURVAU F. NO. 455	Write in Ink-Fil	e Two Copies
	1.	CII	EY AND COUNTY O	F SAN FRANCISCO
シー		PARTMENT OF PURLIC		CENTRAL PERMIT BUREAU
	NT OF	DG. FORM	PPLICATION FOR B	UILDING PERMIT
		3 AD	DITIONS, ALTERAT	TIONS OR REPAIRS
				July 28, 19484
	else	Application is hereby made to for permission to build in a ding to the description and f	accordance with the pla	Public Works of the City and County of San Fran ans and specifications submitted herewith and ac after set forth:
	(IJ	Location 4840 Miss	ion Street	
	(2)	Present use of building	Mortuary	
	(3)	Use of building hereafter	Sane	No. of families
	(4)	Total Cost \$4500.00		ELECTRIC WORK TO BE PERFORMED YES NO
*	(5)	Description of work to be	done	na thar 1995 and ber to B. S. Bitts (WES) NO
1		Remove exist:	ing folding door	re and replace with new
		Kemove partit	tion in Chapel	, install new lighting.
Ι.,			*****	
	2			2
			*******	2
1.				ION INSURANCE DATA ON REVERSE SIDE
			Ciampi Li	icense No
¥.	a a	State of California	Ci	ity and County of San Francisco
	in ^{ter}			
	(9	• •		
		Certificate No State of California	Li Ci	icense No
		Address		
	(10) Plans and specifications p	repared by	
	(11			<u></u>
1. IS		License No. State of California	⁻⁷ Li Ci	icense No ity and County of San Francisco
	ORI OF any Cou whi gra by gol sor	I hereby certify and agree W AND BUILDING ZONE DINANCES OF THE CITY CALIFORNIA, and of said plans submitted herewith, inty of San Francisco and its ich may in anywise accrue a nting of this permit, or from virtue thereof, and will in a ng covenants shall be bindin s and assignees.	, if a permit is issued ORDINANCES, SE. AND COUNTY OF permit will be compli- and hereby agree to sofficials against all d against said City and m the use or occupance all things strictly com- ng upon the owner of	I herein that all the provisions of the BUILDING T-BACK LINE REQUIREMENTS AND FIRE SAN FRANCISCO, the STATE HOUSING AC ied with, whether specified herein or shown o save, indemnify and keep harmless the City an lamages, liabilities, judgments, costs and expense County or any of its officials in consequence of th by of any sidewalk, street, or sub-sidewalk spac ply with the conditions of this permit. The fore is and property, the applicant, their heirs, succes
ŧ.	(12			
2 ¹⁷		Address 4840 Missio	n Street	and the second
	· · · ·	Des		Elesen allestreet
		БУ пворулициональной и и и и и и и и и и и и и и и и и и и		Owner's Authorized Agent.

OFFICIAL COPY	BLDG. FORM	VALEONE, WARNOL & VERAND. A VERAND. Owner FOR PERMIT TO MAKE ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OF REPAIRS TO BUILDING,	Location_M	Total Cost \$	Approved:	A Property of	Superintendent, Bureau of Building Inspection	Issued 19
	REFER TO: Bureau of Engineering	and 137-6" from		of the sharenge cone			Building Inspector, Bureau of Building Inspection I agree to comply with all conditions or stipula- tions of the various Bureaus or Departments noted hereon,	
	Approved:	. Department of Public Health Approved:	Electrical Inspector Approved:	Art Commission	Approved:	Boller Inspector Approved:		Bureau of Engineering
	Approved: Zone L. Dizerate	Dep	Approved:		Bureau of Fire Prevention & Public Safety	Approved:	•	Structural Engineer, Burreau Building Inspection

SAN FRA	NCISC	
- I		NTFAL PERMIT BUREAU F435 Write in Ink—File Two Copies
0/11	_ Kr	1. CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DED LOTI		EPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS CENTRAL PERMIT BUREAU
BUILDING	INSPECTIC	DIG. FORM APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
÷		ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS
		10 Oct, 1953
	an	Application is hereby made to the Department of Public Works of San Francisco for permission to ild in accordance with the plans and specifications submitted herewith and according to the description d for the purpose hereinafter set forth:
1	(1) Location MISSION TO ALEYING 320' 5-5/L OUOUDAGA
	(2) Total Cost \$ \$ 500 ± (3) No. of stories (4) Basement. No.
	(5) Present use of building
1	(5) Present use of building
	(
1.	(1	9) Type of construction
		2) Does this alteration create an additional floor of occupancy
1		Yes or No
	(1	3) Does this alteration create an additional story to the building. No
	(1-	4) Electrical work to be performed. YES
	(1	5) Ground floor area of building
	(1	7) Detailed description of work to be done
-		GRADE AND PAUE, PLACE CYCLONE FENSCE & LIGHTING, LOWER
;	C	ORDS BUILD VEW SIDEWALK.
l s	••••	
1	•••••	
	·····	
i i		
	·	
2		
•		
	(1) an	B) No portion of building or structure or scaffolding used during construction, to be closer than 6'0" to y wire containing more than 750 volts. See Sec. 385, California Penal Code.
1	(1	9) Supervision of construction by Pog. Purs. Co. Address 95 BARSTIN
	(2)	0) General contractor PACIFIC PAVEMENTS Co. LTD. California License No. 33222
		Address
	(2)	1) Architect
1		Address
	(2:	2) Engineer
2 		Address
	tic I : da an inj	3) I hereby certify and agree that if a permit is issued for the construction described in this applica- m, all the provisions of the permit and all laws and ordinances applicable thereto will be complied with. further agree to save San Francisco and its officials and employees harmless from all costs and mages which may accrue from use or occupancy of the sidewalk, street or subsidewalk space or from ything else in connection with the work included in the permit. The foregoing covenant shall be bind- g upon the owner of said property, the applicant, their heirs, successors and assignces.
	(24	4) Owner VALENTE, MARIOI & PERATA (Phone Pa 3-0161) (For Contact by Bureau)
2		Address 4840 Mission St. (For Contact by Bureau)
		By PAGIEL PAUENEUXS Co. LED. Address 55 BARSTON G. SAN FRIDUSCO Owner's Authorized Agent to be Owner's Authorized Architect, Engineer or General Contractor.
1		

8

-

(in example) ()



AMFRANCI	<u>SCO</u>
N r	
	Visite in Int-File Two Caples
EPARTME	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
IILDING INSPEC	TION DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS CENTRAL PERMIT BURRAU
14-	Application for soliding percept
21	ADDITIONS, ALTHRATIONS OR REPAIRS
	Application is hereby made to the Department of Public Works of San Francisco for permission to build in accordance with the plans and quelifications submitted herewith and according to the description and for the purpose hereinafter ast furth:
	(1) Louding 4840 Mission Street
	(2) Total Cost 8. 184. 985. 00. (8) No. of stories 2 (4) Becoment 40.
	(5) Present use of building Mortuary (5) No. of families Mone
	(1) Remained was of building MORBULLY (1) No. of families
	(9) Type of construction First Floor Type 5 (10) 12 Division &
	1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 Building Cede Occupancy Classification (11) Any other building on lot
	Yes or No
	(14) Sour the entrelation create an exclusion a constant of occupanty
	(13) Does this alteration create an additional story to the building. No
	(14) Electrical work to be performed
	(15) Ground floor area of building. 1215
	(17) Describe Work to be done (in addition to reference to drawings & specifications)
	Addition of Garage and Store Room Dasement Floor; Chapels and
	other rooms on Firtet Floor, Alterations to Men and Womens
	Follet in existing building
103	
and the second se	(18) No portion of building or structure or scaffolding used during construction, to be closer than 6'0" to any wire containing more than 756 volts. See Sec. 205, California Penal Code.
	(19) Supervision of construction by
	(20) General contractor Dellartini Bros., Inc California License No.
ALL ALL	Address 2018 Stockton St
	(21) Architest Otto Hintermann California Certificate No.
	Address 2847 Golden Date Ave
	(22) Regineer Hyman Rosenthal
	(23) I hereby certify and agree that if a mermit is issued for the construction described in this applica-
	(23) I hereby certify and agree that if a permit is issued for the construction described in this applica- tion, all the provisions of the permit and all laws and ordinances applicable thereto will be complied with. I further egree to save San Francisco and its officials and employees harmless from all costs and damages which may accrue from use or eccupancy of the aidewalk, street or subsidewalk space or from anything eise in connection with the work included in the permit. The foregoing covenant shall be bind- ing upon the owner of said property, the applicant, their heirs, successors and assignees.
	(26) Owner Valante, Marini, Perata Go
	Alle 1849 green street , Can Francisco Sound Willbully rear 2018 Forkton St
	Owner's Arthorized Asset to be Owner's Authorized Architect, Engineer or General Contractor.

nI.



SAMFRANCISCO	
FO	CENTHAL PERMIT BUREAU F435
	Write in Ink-File Two Copies
O DEPARTATIOF	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS CENTRAL PERMIT BUREAU
BUILDING INSPECTION	BLDG. FORM APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
×	3 ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OB REPAIRS
~	<u>May 3</u> 19.59
	Application is hereby made to the Department of Public Works of San Francisco for permission to build in accordance with the plans and specifications submitted herewith and according to the description and for the purpose hereinafter set forth:
	(1) Location <u>4840 Mission Street</u>
	(2) Total Cost \$ 194, 785, 00. (3) No. of stories 2 (4) Basement 102 Yes or No
	(5) Present use of building Mortuary (6) No. of families None
	(7) Proposed use of building Mortuary (8) No. of families None (8)
- * ¥	(9) Type of construction First Floor Type 5 (10) 12 Division 2
	(11) Any other building on lot <u>no</u> Yes or No. (Must be shown on plot plan if answer is Yes.)
	(12) Does this alteration create an additional floor of occupancy
	(13) Does this alteration create an additional story to the building. NO
	(14) Electrical work to be performed. Yes Plumbing work to be performed. Yes
	(15) Ground floor area of building. 1215
	(17) Describe Work to be done (in addition to reference to drawings & specifications)
	Addition of Garage and Store Room Basement Floor; Chapels and
	other rooms on Firtst Floor. Alterations to Ken and Womens
	Toilet in existing building
•	
*	(18) No portion of building or structure or scaffolding used during construction, to be closer than 6'0" to any wire containing more than 750 volts. See Sec. 385, California Penal Code.
	(19) Supervision of construction by
	(20) General contractor DeMartini Bros., Inc California License No.
	Address 2018 Stocktor St
	(21) Architect. Otto Hintermann
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Address 2347 Golden Gate Ave
	(22) Engineer. Hyman Rosenthal
•	599 Front Street
а	(23) I hereby certify and agree that if a name it is issued for the
5 a - 1	I further agree to save San Francisco and its officials and applicable thereto will be complied with.
	damages which may accrue from use or occupancy of the sidewalk, street or subsidewalk space or from anything else in connection with the work included in the permit. The foregoing covenant shall be bind- ing upon the owner of said property, the applicant, their heirs, successors and assignees.
	or the or bard property, the applicant, their neirs, successors and assignees.
	(24) OwnerValente, Marini, Perata 20. (Phone Su 1-3154
L	St. Milling
	By Authorized Agent to be Owner's Authorized Architect, Engineer or General Contractor.
· · · · · ·	
	-
- <u>A</u>	

.,?



SAN FR	Neise	Ö Ödjatend Permit Buroau P. No. 432
Sr. AV		Write in Ink File Two Copies
E 1/		CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
	LAUTO	DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS . CENTRAL PERMIT BUREAU
	A E N T O	F BLDG. FORM
	Charles and the	APPLICATION FOR PERMIT
		TO ERECT SIGN
-	- e	Date1963/19
	0 	Application is hereby made to the Department of Public Works of the City and County of San Francisco for permission to build in accordance with the plans and specifications submitted herewith and according to the description and for the purpose hereinafter set forth:
	國際進行	ELECTRIC SIGN 🖾 NON-ELECTRIC SIGN 🗖
		(1) Logation
	C.	(2) Total Cost 8
	Contraction of the second seco	(4) Present use of building Luneral home
		(6) Class of sign, per Art. 47, S. F. Building Codesingle.face.horizontal
-	9	Thicknoss. 6"
		Total Area of Advertising Surface. 105
		(7)
		PLOT PLAN AND ELEVATION
		Indicate exactly the location of sign horizontally and vertically.
		그는 것이 같은 것이 같은 것이 같은 것이 같은 것이 같은 것이 같이 많이
1 -	er d	To install one single face sign consisting of 3 sections to be placed at an elevation of 20' facing the rear parking lot. Drawing showing typical installation
		attached.
	-	
		n an
		VALENTEI MARINI]
•		IPERATA
•	Þ	
		do'elir
a -		이 같은 것은
		이 같은 것 같은 것 같은 것 같은 것 같은 것 같은 것 같이 있는 것 같은 것 같이 있는 것 같이 없다.
	100 A	가 없는 것은 것 같은 것이 같은 것은 것은 것은 것은 것은 것은 것은 것은 것이 없는 것이 없 않는 것이 없는 것이 않은 것이 없는 것이 않이
		(8) Drawings in duplicate showing methods of attachments must be submitted with this application.
_	and said a straight	 (9) Where top guy wire is required, anchor with 1/2" dia, through-bolt (minimum), to the structural frame of the building below the parapet wall.
-	¢	10) No portion of building or structure, or scaffolding used during construction, to be closer than 6'0" to any wire containing more than 750 volts. See Sec. 385, Calif. Penal Code.
	and the second second second second	
31		11) Contractor
		San Francisco Registration No. C1.3
		AddressPhone NoPhone No
	1	2) Engineer or Architect
		AddressPhone No
	1	(3) I hereby certify and agree that if a permit is issued for the construction described in this application, all the
		provisions of the normit and all the lowe and and unneed applied here for will be something with I further
		agree to save San Francisco and its officials and employees harmless from all costs and damages which may accrue from use or occupancy of the sidewalk, street or sidewalk space or from anything else in connection with the work included in the permit. The foregoing covenant shall be binding upon the owner of said
	말했는 것은 말까 있었다. 나라에 나라 나라 나라 가지 않는 것이 나라 가지 않는 것이 같이	with the work included in the permit. The foregoing covenant shall be binding upon the owner of said property, the applicant, their heirs, successors and assignees.
	n	4) Owner, Valente, Marini Perata & Gasan and asgness
		4) Owner, Valente Marini Perata & Co.
		4) Owner, Valente Marini Perata & Co.
	WC	

MAR 7	977 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
PARTM LDING INI ECTIONI MAR 15 1977 RH-4 C	APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS
	APPLICATION IS HEREBY MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF PANE MORES OF SAM FRANCISCO FOR PERMISSION TO BUILD IN ACCORDANC WITH THE RAMS AND SPORT OT PERMISSION TO BUILD IN ACCORDANC WITH TO THE DESCRIPTION AND FOR THIS PLASSOC MARCHINE SET FORTHS.
FEB 23, 1977 fulle DATE THE B FEB 23, 1977 sub of the BICEBET HOL FEB 23, 1977 sub of the BICEBET HOL REALING FEE BICEBET REALING FEE BICEBET REAL	AL VALENTE MARINI PERATA TUNERAL 4840 Mission St., S.F. 94112
TALL TIPE OF CONSTR. 1-10 DIN OF ISAL NUMBER 10 2 D 3 D 4 D 3 D C OF STORES OF OCCUPANCY	DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING
(4) TIPE Q. CONSTR. L.K. U.N. (3) NUMBER QF (4) TIPE Q. CONSTR. L.K. U.N. (3) NUMBER QF (5) TOORES QF (14: Hallmeete Off (7) PROPOSED USE (8) BADG. COOSE (7) SOUTH STATE AND CELLARS: (11) DEL ST. HIG ALTERATION (11) SOUTH ST. SOUTH S
ASTRO ENTER PRISES (20) ARCHTECT OR ENGINEER (DESIGN O CONSTRUCTION D) (23) CONSTRUCTION LENDER ENTER NAME AND BRANCH DESIGNA # THERE IS NO KNOWN CONSTRUCTIC & LENDER, ENTER "UNIT	NOWN') CLUB CONTRACTOR OF CONTRACTON OF CONTRACTOR OF CONTRA
REMOVE 4'0 high cy Boxking lot and a	INKNOWN A EUNERAL 4840 MISSION ST S.F. 333-0161 THE UPPLICATION ARTERENT BUT HANG IS NOT SUPPORTING INTE OF CLONE FENCE at property line OF idenovity Jone OF Decrete block FENCE IN PLACE OF

(1)	ODECOMOSTICASE HAR TO CONDITIONS AND STIPULATIONS	IN LANSAGRAGE SOA			
1 1/1. Parte	APPROVED:	DATE			
PARTM NTO	APPLICATION FORMULT IS REALLY	REASON: 1005 100			
ILDING IN PECTIO	ABDITIONS, ALTERATIONS BE REALED IN THE	MARIST			
KIRT-	and a second state and some second se	1. 222.000			
	COPY COPY	to a strengt on una water			
	quet tox eith 3/2/27	NOTIFIED MR.			
San D	EGEDING INSPECTOR, BUR, OF BLDG, MER.				
	APPROVED: C-2 DISTRICTOR	DATE:			
	the second s	REASON:			
S	MOJECT IN A CATEGORY C. P. CONTR. POWAC	H daulta ikk sig			
eta	$Q \rightarrow Q \rightarrow Q$				
1-10-	DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING	NOTIFIED MR.			
0	APPROVED:	DATE:			
	And	REASON:			
ែត					
	A CALL A				
	BUREAU OF FIRE PREVENTION & PUBLIC SAFETY	NOTIFIED MR.			
	APPROVED:	DATE:			
5. 	Proventier and the second s	REASON:			
	1212 States States and States and States	2.2.4.11 - 2.7.4.3.1 2.7.4 (0.7.1) - 2.7.4 (0.7.1) 2.7.4 (0.7.1) - 2.7.4 (0.7.1)			
	and planting the series which have				
	CML ENGINEER, DUE OF BLOG, INSPECTION	NOTIFIED MR.			
and the second	APPROVED:	DATE:			
· · · ·		REASON:			
	BUREAU OF ENGINEERING	NOTIFIED MR.			
and the second	APPROYED:	DATE: REASON: NOTIFIED MR.			
	HOTA HALVE PUR NOR	REASON:			
17.535.43 (1924) 10	DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH	NOTIFIED MR.			
	APPROVED:	DATE:			
		REASON.			
in provident of	REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY	NOTIFIED MR.			
	APPROVED:	DATE:			
		REASON:			
a datara	RESIDENTIAL ENV. INSPECTOR, DHY OF APT. & HOTEL INSP., B.B.I.	NOTIFIED MR.			
en e	APPROVED:	DATE:			
	ang Africa Mangha Abada ang Afrika. Dipangati Pangga ang Antoning ang Antoning	REASON:			
ender for the Second Second Second Second Second	Advised of the second sec	NOTIFIED MR.			
Landon v	AGREE TO COMPLY WITH ALL CONDITIONS OR STRUGATIONS OF THE VARIOUS BUREAUS DR.DEPARTMERT'S NOTED ON THIS. APPLICATION, AND ATTACHED STATEMENTS OF CONDITIONS OR STIPULATIONS, WHICH ARE REPERTING A PART OF THIS	and a second Contract of the second s			
1977 Sec. 1975 1.					
oľ.	$\frac{1}{1}$	1.			
-----	---	---	--	--	--
	FEB 2 AL	P B O Y E D MAR 15 1977 Prher C L	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC APPLICATION FOR BUILDI ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS APPLICATION IS NERREY MADE TO THE DEPARTM OF SAN PRACTORY FOR MEDICESSON TO BUILD TO THE DESCENTON AND FOR THE DEPARTMENT TO THE DESCENTON AND FOR THE DEPARTMENT INSTRET ADDRESSON FOR VALENTE MARINI PERATA 4840 MISSION ST., S.F. \$2,000 \$200	WORKS	
		DESCRIPTION OF B DESCRIPTION	ADDRESS ADD	OCCUP. CLASS	
	c suiding remain out SQ21. Son Frontices No particle of buildin them 60° to carry w Penel Code. Penulation to Sec. 30 pasted on the job. 11 layer or to building vin- grade lanes os trav- carred grade lanes, wall footings require ANY STIPULATION & BURLING NOT TO POSTED ON THE BURLING NOT TO POSTED ON THE BURLING AND PLUMA ANSWER IS "YEST TO THIS IS NOT A BURLI PENNIT S ISSUED.	In on drawings accompanying the application are assume able lines for our the same is shown revised drawings tom and fills together with complete densits of randining of mart be submitted with Surveys for approval. EQUIRED HEREIN OR BY CODE MAY BE APFEALED. BE OCCUPED UNITL CENTRICATE OF FINAL COMPLE LIDING OR FERMIT OF OCCUPANCY GRANTED, WHEN RE APPLICATION DOES NOT CONSTITUTE AN APPROVALE OR FULMEING INSTALLATIONS, A SEPARATE FERMITS ARE REQ O ANY OF ARCHE QUESTIONS (5): 116) (17) (20) (21) o DING PERMIT. NO WORK SHALL BE STARTED UNITL A BU aring metericial must have a decrance of not less than twi views or equipment.	Andring de. I HEREBY CERTIFY AND AGREE THAT F. DESCRIBED IN THIS APPLICATION, ALL T AND ORDINANCES THERETO WILL BE AND ORDINANCES THERETO WILL BE In comformity with the provisions of Se California, the opplicant shall have an fi Cartificate () or (1) or (11) designated be whichever is applicable. Check one of an admitted interver, of industrial Relation () L Cartificate of Ward an admitted interver, SRED F. () EL Cartificate of Ward an admitted interver, sRED F. () EL Cartificate of Ward an admitted interver, sRED F. () M. The card the work () L. Cartify that in the pro- sect of the work () L. Cartify that in the may ubject to the work of California and for section 300 of the L. () L. Cartify that in the may ubject to the work of California and for Section 300 of the L. () L. Cartify the same of California and for Section 300 of the L. () L. Cartify the section of California and for Section 300 of the L. () L. Cartify the section of California and for Section 300 of the L. () L. Cartify the section of California and for Section 300 of the L. () L. Cartify the section of California and for Section 300 of the L. () L. Cartify the section of the cartificator who can California and who its in the section of California and for Section 300 of the L.	O APPLICANT ction 3900 of the Labor Code of the State of its, or file with the Central Permit Bureau, either ow or shall indicate them it'l or (Y) or (Y) pelow, the following methods of compliance: mat to Self-insure issued by the Director tann's Compencation Insurance issued by oplicate of (f) certified by the Director or (8) or, to be performed is \$100 or less. Informance of the work for which this Permit is large complexity of the Director or (8) or, to performed is \$100 or less. Informance of the work for which this Permit is large complexity for the the tart of the Labor Code all to comply forthwith with the provisions of allow Code, that the Permit haven applied for	

OFFICIAL COPY ł fore entage 2 CONDITIONS AND STIPULATIONS DEPARTAG BUILDING HISPECTOOP DATE: REASON: 30 1. 22 NOTIFIED MR. APPROVED: C-2 2 STRI CT D ١ DATE: REASON: MOUSCI IN A CATEGORY C. P. CONT. POWNE J e Vo Cla MAR 3 NOTIFIED MR 1977 0 APPROVED: DATE:_ HOLD SECTION REASON: -1 NOTE BUREAU OF FIRE PREVENTION & PUBLIC SAFETY NOTIFIED MR. APPROVED: s. . . DATE: DATES AND NAMES OF ALL REASON 1 CIVIL ENGINEER, BUR, OF BLDG, INSPECTION NOTIFIED MR. APPROVED: PERSONS NOTIFIED DURING DATE: REASON: \Box BUREAU OF ENGINEERING NOTIFIED MR. -APPROVED: DATE: PROCESSING L REASON: DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH NOTIFIED MR. APPROVED: DATE . REASON: REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY NOTIFIED MR. APPROVED: DATE: REASON: RESIDENTIAL ENV. INSPECTOR, DIV. OF APT. & HOTEL INSP., B.B.L. NOTIFIED MAR. APPROVED: DATE: REASON: NOTIFIED MR. 1. 1 AGREE TO COMPLY WITH ALL CONDITIONS OR STIPULATIONS OF THE VARIOUS BUPEAUS OR OTHER APPLICATION, AND ATTACHED STATEMENTS OF CONDITIONS OR STIPULATION, WHICH ARE HISTER APPLICATION, NUMBER OF ATTACHMENTS I MADE & PART OF THIS 294 v AGENT FOR G CR LESSEE ON Non and the second -



OWNER OR LESSEE		JC	B LOCATI	ON			APP. NO		
Valente, M. OWNER OR LESSEE'S AD		Feralta	L	4840 Mise		St.	7701' HOUSE N		-
Same ESTIMATED COST	9993-9997-9997-9997-999-999-999-999-99	- 			DATE	ICATION			
PERMIT ISSUED	76	PERMIT	(~	orga	INSP		2-23. eilly	-77	
ERECT/ALTER	BLDG. TYPE	CODE	00	CUPANCY DESCRIPTION		PLANS	NUMBE STORIES	R OF FAM.	
	5		Par	king Lot				<u> </u>	
CONTRACTOR -				ADDRESS					=
ARCHITECT				ADDRESS					-
ENGINEER				ADDRESS					_ ==-
BUILDING INSPE	OL NOITO	B CARD			CIT	BUILD DEPARTIMENT Y AND COUN	OF PUBLIC N	WORKS RANCISCO	Ē
OWNER OR LESSEE)(DB LOCAT	NON			APP. NO	•	
(see abov	e)	1	4840	Mission St			770	1742	1

m

SAN FRANCH	
OFFICIAL 3050	WORK COMMENCED PRORTO 7701742
BUILDING MISPEC	FOUNDATION FORMS INSPECTED. O.K. TO POUR
11	LATHING PERMISSION TAG POSTED
11	FLUES BY NO.
11	EXTERIOR OR STRUCTURAL PLASTERING OK
- 1 1.	ALL SPECIAL INSPECTION REPORTS RECEIVED.
1 1'	FIRE ESCAPE INSTALLED PER APPROVED PLAN.
11	3hour WALL FENCE-
305M	Shock WALL FENCE-
11	
11	
- 1 1	
11	
11	
11.	
11	
11	
11	
1.1	
11	
5/23/	57 (WORK COMPLETED) FINAL CERTIFICATE POSTED.
-ff	Jaire H Mi & Ruly BUILDING INSPECTOR

SAN FR	ANCISCO	6
FIC		AUG 3 0 2002
		AUG S 0 2002
BUILDING	MENT OF	
Y		
	NO VIOL	APPLICE
	APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS OR REPAIRS	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION
x	FORM 3 COTHER AGENCIES REVIEW REQUIRED BU	
	FORMA- OVER THE COUNTER ISSUANCE	RMISSION TO BUILD IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ANS AND SPECIFICATIONS SUBMITTED HEREWITH AND CORDING TO THE DESCRIPTION AND FOR THE
line of	NUMBER OF PLAN SETS	ANS AND SPECIFICATIONS SUBMITTED HEREWITH AND CORDING TO THE DESCRIPTION AND FOR THE RPASS HERMINAL TERDETIFORTH. WE HIS MERTIFICATION CONTRACTOR OF THE DESCRIPTION AND FOR THE WE HIS MERTIFICATION SUBMITTED HEREWITH AND SHOW AND SPECIFICATIONS SUBMITTED HEREWITH AND CONTRACTOR OF THE DESCRIPTION AND FOR THE PROVIDE THE DESCRIPTION AND FOR THE PROVIDE
	DATE FILED FILING FEE RECEIPTING (I) STREET ADRESS OF JOB	
1	G 29, 99 (FEE) 484° M15 PERMIT NO. ISSUED (24) ESTIMATED COST OF JOB	SION V 6959 /019;020 77 00
	387,600	BY: DATE:
	LEGAL DESCRIPT	
	(A) TYPE OF CONSTR. (GA) NO. OF III - N STATES OF 2 (GA) NO. OF ADD CELLARS: I (TA) PRESENT USE: AND CELLARS: I FUNERAL 4	tome (BA) OCCUP CLASS . BAN NO. OF DELLANG UNITS:
	(4) TYPE OF CONSTR. (5) NO. OF STORIES OF (6) NO. OF BASEMENTS (7) PROPOSED USE (LEGAL U	AB DWELLING
	(10) IS AUTO RUNWAY TO BE CONSTRUCTED YES USED DURING	YES IN TRANSITION YES OF THE YES
	(14) GENERAL CONTRACTOR ADDRESS	NO D PERFORMED? NO 20 PERFORMED? NO 20 ZIP PHONE CALIF. U.C. NO. EXPIRATION DATE
	(15) OWNER - LESSEE (CROSS OUT ONE) ADDRESS	ZIP BTRC # PHONE (FOR CONTACT BY DEPT.)
الر	STEPHEN TAYLOR ABO MISSI (18) WRITE IN DESCRIPTION OF ALL WORK TO BE PERFORMED UNDER THIS APPLICATION (REFERENCE TO PL	ANS IS NOT SUFFICIENT)
	SEISMIC BEACHING, HANDICUP ACCESSIBLE RATH C	OF TRAVEL UPERADE, FRONT FACADE ATTERATION.
ļ.		
	(17) DOES THIS ALTERATION YES UP (17) IS YES, STATE CREATE ADDITIONAL HEIGHT ON YES UP (17) IS YES, STATE OR STORY TO BULLONG? NO CENTER LINE OF FRONT (27) MULL SUBDIVISION OF VECTOR V	(19) DOES THIS ALTERATION YES (20) IF (19) IS YES, STATE CREATE DECK OR HORIZ, NO RW ORQUND FT. EXTINSION TO BUILDING? NO FLOOR AREA 90. FT. (23) ANY OTHER EXISTING BLDG. YEE (24) DOES THIS ALTERATION
	SUB SIDEWALK SPACE BE	YES D (23) AN UNITY DE ESS INTE BLUE. YES D CONSTITUES AL BAN UNITY DE ESS INTE BLUE. YES D CONSTITUES AL BAN UNITY DE ESS INTE BLUE. NO ZI CONSTITUES AL BAN UNITY DE ESS INTE BLUE. YES D CONSTITUES AL BAN UNITY DE ESS INTE BLUE. YES INTE BLUE. YES INTE BLUE ESS INTE BL
	IRVING CONTRUCTION LENDER (ATTEN AND BRANCH DESIGNATION IF ANY,	-1,41,55
	IF THERE IS NO KNOWN CONSTRUCTION LENDER, ENTER "UNKNOWN").	
	IMPORTANT NOTICES No change shall be made in the character of the occupancy or use without first obtaining a Bu Permit authorizing such change. See San Francisco Ho	NOTICE TO APPLICANT ilding HOLD HARIMLESS CLAUSE: The permittee(s) by acceptance of the permit, agree(s) to indemnify using and hold harmless the City and County of San Francisco from and against any and all claims,
	Code. No portion of building or structure or scatfolding used during construction, to be closer than 6 any wire containing more than 750 volts. See Sec. 385, California Penal Code.	demands and actions for damages resulting from operations under this permit, regardless of regularized of the City and County of See Francisco and to excurse the defense of the City and
	Pursuant to San Francisco Building Code, the building permit shall be posted on the job owner is responsible for approved plans and application being kept at building site.	The In conformity with the provisions of Section 3800 of the Labor Code of the State of California, the applicant shall have coverage under (I), or (II) designated below or shall indicate item (III), or (IV), or (IV), whichever is applicable. It however item (IV) is checked item (IV) must be checked as well.
12	Grade lines as shown on drawings accompanying this application are assumed to be corru- actual grade lines are inot the same as shown revised drawings showing correct grade lines and fills together with complete details of retaining walls and wall foolings required must	ect. If Mark the appropriate method of compliance below:
	submitted to this department for approval. ANY STIPULATION REQUIRED HEREIN OR BY CODE MAY BE APPEALED.	() I. I have and will maintain a certificate of consent to self-insure for workers' compensation, as provided by Section 3700 of the Labor Code, for the performance of the work for which this permit is issued q.
	BUILDING NOT TO BE OCCUPIED UNTIL CERTIFICATE OF FINAL COMPLETION IS POS ON THE BUILDING OR PERMIT OF OCCUPANCY GRANTED, WHEN REQUIRED. APPROVAL OF THIS APPLICATION DOES NOT CONSTITUTE AN APPROVAL FOR	3700 of the Labor Code, for the performance of the work for which this permit is issued. My workers' compensation insurance carrier and policy number are:
	ELECTRICAL WIRING OR PLUMBING INSTALLATIONS. A SEPARATE PERMIT FOR WIRING AND PLUMBING MUST BE OBTAINED. SEPARATE PERMITS ARE REQUIRE ANSWER IS "YES" TO ANY OF ABOVE QUESTIONS (10) (11) (12) (13) (22) OR (24).	THE DIF Carrier
	THIS IS NOT A BUILDING PERMIT. NO WORK SHALL BE STARTED UNTIL A BUILD PERMIT IS ISSUED.	() III. The cost of the work to be done is \$100 or less.
	In dwellings all insulating materials must have a clearance of not less than two inches fro electrical wires or equipment. CHECK APPROPRIATE BOX	m all () IV. I certify that in the performance of the work for which this permit is issued, I shall not employ any person in any manner, so, as to become subject to the workfors compensation laws of California. I further acknowledge that I understand that in the event hat I should begome subject to the workers' compensation provisions of the
4		Labor Code of California and fail to comply forthwith with the provisions of Section 3800 of the Labor Code, that the permit herein applied for shall be deemed revoked.
		(V) V. Icentry as the owner (or the agent for the owner) that in the performance of the work, for which this permit is issued, will employ a contractor who complex with the workers' compensation laws of California and who, prior to the commencement of any work, will the a completed copy of this form with the Central Permit Bureau.
	I HEREBY CERTIFY AND AGREE THAT IF A PERMIT IS ISSUED FOR THE CONSTRUC DESCRIBED IN THIS APPLICATION, ALL THE PROVISIONS OF THE PERMIT AND ALL L AND ORDINANCES THERETO WILL BE COMPLIED WITH.	TION
	9003-03 (REV. 1/96)	Signature of Applicant or Agent

OFFICIAL SAN FRANCISCO CONDITIONS AND STIPULATIONS REFER DATE APPROVED: 1 REASON: he district building inspector at the start of work ca DEPARTMENTS of active district building inspector at the start of work of BUILDING INSPECESS. For plumbing inspection scheduling call 558-6030 This application is approved, without site inspection, detailed plumbing or electrical plan review and does not constitute and plant 1:1 1 SEP 27 1999 approval of the building. Work authorized must be done in \varkappa strict accordance with all applicable codes. Any electrical ∞ plumbing work shall require appropriate separate permits. an NOTIFIED MR. BUILDING INSPECTOR. DEPT. OF BLDG. INSP. For tacade vork + seismic uparade APPROVED: only DATE: ASTRACT OF THE APPLICATION APPLIES TO REASON: SPECIFIED PROTINGELY AND DOES NOT CON-STITUTE AN APPROVAL OF THE CULDING OR USE UNDER THE RLAPN STOCKE ŧ att. NOTIFIED MR. TOFF ANNING DE OFC APPROVED: DATE: 1 NOI REASON: NUIEDAIES 215 NOTIFIED MR. BUREAU OF FIRE PREVENTION & PUBLIC SAFET ANU NAMES OF APPROVED: DATE: REASON: . 3 ALL THHS NOTIFIED MP CIVIL ENGINEER, DEPT. OF BLDG. INSPECTION - -CNS APPROVED: 12 1. DATE: ____ NUTIFIED REASON: . DUHING NOTIFIED MR. BUREAU OF ENGINEERING APPROVED: DATE a Twi ". 1 REASON: ŝ NOTIFIED MR. DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH DATE: REASON: NOTIFIED MR. REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY APPROVED: DATE: REASON: NOTIFIED MR. 210 I agree to comply with all conditions or stipulations of the various bureaus or departments noted on this application, and attached ments of conditions or stipulations, which are hereby made a part of this application. 1 14 Number of attachments OWNER'S AUTHORIZED AGENT

OFFICIAL SAN FRANCISCO 1 **APPLICATION FILING FEE-**305804 6 DEPARTMENTOF PLAN CHECKING RECEIPT COPY BUILDING INSPECTION BUILDING APPLICATION NUMBERS **RECEIVED OF** Japini Persta 460 Alente 3 BUREAU APPLICATION

 FEE FOR APPLICATION FILING AND CHECKING PLANS, PRESCRIBED BY SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE

 ESTIMATED COST OF JOB
 EXPEDITER

 PLAN CHECK FEE REVENUE 7226
 FILING FEE 7223

 DEMOLITION
 NOTICE FEE 1212

 ESTIMATED COST OF JOB EXPEDITER BGGG -t 387,6007 15041 FIRE FEE 7299 DCP FEE 7081 SURCHARGE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION FULL PLAN CHECK 176. 611.40 1/4 PLAN CHECK 171.60 CENTRAL PERMIT BUREAU N. 9003-01 (REV. 2/95) 87 089 At 1 En APPLICATION # OTHER PCSD ROUTING SLIP. C EXPRESS 99 Commercial C Residential G Major / SSS BACK CHÈCK DATE REVISED STATIO PLAN DATE DATE DATE HOLD COST CHECKER LOG-IN START APPR'D HOUR .. DATE ARCH 8/11/99 9 19 127199 12 SPRUCT MECH FIRE BSM DPH DADIPCD BID FUTURE ROUTING Permite to DCP to review changes to exterior elevation QMMENT cance 1 SU PERMIT GONTROL SLIP ACTIVE COMPLAINTS ADDRESS: MISSION ST. CED/PCD BID OTHE PAD-STATION DCP CNT-CNT-PAD-PAD-PAD-SSS/ FIRE DAD B B D R C PC CE PC STR P B MECH MAJ PARA PCD P Di S PET CED D H M SEQ 2 D 2 5 ACCEPT 5 APPR'D DATE B 6/29/99 CHECK APPLICABLE : O EXPRESS OF PARA LLEL O ONE STOP D BLDG.ENLARGE G SITE PERMIT **O** OTHER COMMENT: * MSE ??

CENTRAL PE	MIT BUREAU		Appl. #	- 99/3/7 - 4840 MISS	4
E 1660 MISSION		1.25 G	Address	- 4840 MISS	al st.
UDANIERANCE	TGOT CA 94103	i.	i, a c		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
2			1971	-in -	
ş	TICENSET	O CONTRACTOR	'S STATEME		
•	II COLUMNIA	CONTRACTOR	3 STATEME	ANK .	
Licensed Co	ntractor's Declaration				•
that I am lice	ae Business and Professions nsed under the provisions o Professions Code, and that	of Chapter 9 (com	mencing wit	th Sec. 7000) of	
Linuar	Alumbur	τ:,			
License	Number		ense Class		
Expiral	tion Date	Cc	ontractor"		·
				PRINT	
	-				
				-SIGNATU	RE
I hereby affir	ler Declaration m under penalty of perjury Professions Code (Sec. 70 I, as owner of the property, o will do the work, and the st	31.5). (Mark the or my employees v ructure is not inter-	vith wages as	te box below.) s their sole competered for sale (Se	cense Law, ensation, c. 7044). I
I hereby affir	m under penalty of perjur Professions Code (Sec. 70 L as owner of the property, o will do the work, and the st further acknowledge that I commenced contrary to the	31.5). (Mark the or my employees w tructure is not inte understand and a e representations	e appropriat with wages as ended or off gree that in t	Contractor's Lite box below.) s their sole competered for sale (Set the event that an	cense Law, ensation, c. 7044). I ny work is
1 hereby affir	m under penalty of perjury Professions Code (Sec. 70 I, as owner of the property, c will do the work, and the st further acknowledge that I	31.5). (Mark the or my employees w tructure is not inte understand and a e representations	e appropriat with wages as ended or off gree that in t	Contractor's Lite box below.) s their sole competered for sale (Set the event that an	cense Law, ensation, c. 7044). I ny work is
1 hereby affir	m under penalty of perjur Professions Code (Sec. 70 L as owner of the property, o will do the work, and the st further acknowledge that I commenced contrary to the	31.5). (Mark the or my employees w tructure is not inte understand and a e representations	e appropriat with wages as ended or off gree that in t	Contractor's Lite box below.) s their sole competered for sale (Set the event that an	cense Law, ensation, c. 7044). I ny work is
I hereby affir Business and	m under penalty of perjur Professions Code (Sec. 70 L as owner of the property, o will do the work, and the st further acknowledge that I commenced contrary to the herein applied for shall be deer architect, agent	31.5). (Mark the or my employees w ructure is not inte understand and a representations ned suspended.	e appropriat with wages as ended or offe gree that in t contained he	contractor's Liste box below.) the box below.) the sole competence ered for sale (Section that an erein, that the Pe	cense Law, ensation, c. 7044). I ny work is ermit
I hereby affir Business and	m under penalty of perjury Professions Code (Sec. 70 I, as owner of the property, c will do the work, and the st further acknowledge that I commenced contrary to the herein applied for shall be deer	31.5). (Mark the or my employees we tructure is not inte- understand and a representations ned suspended. m exclusively con 044). Tcertify that	e appropriat with wages as ended or off gree that in t contained he tracting with at the time su	e Contractor's Li te box below.) s their sole compe- ered for sale (Se the event that an erein, that the Pe- licensed contract ich contractors ar	cense Law, ensation, c. 7044). I ny work is ermit
I hereby affir Business and	m under penalty of perjury Professions Code (Sec. 70 t, as owner of the property, c will do the work, and the st further acknowledge that I commenced contrary to the herein applied for shall be deer architect, agent T, as owner of the property, a construct this project (Sec. 7	31.5). (Mark the or my employees w ructure is not inte understand and a representations ned suspended. m exclusively con 044). Tcertify that this form (License	e appropriat with wages as ended or offe gree that in t contained he tracting with at the time su	contractor's Lite box below.) s their sole competered for sale (Setthe event that an erein, that the Peterein, that the Peterei	cense Law, ensation, c. 7044). I ny work is ermit tors to e selected, I rior to the
I hereby affir Business and	m under penalty of perjury Professions Code (Sec. 70 I, as owner of the property, c will do the work, and the st further acknowledge that I commenced contrary to the herein applied for shall be deer architect, agent T, as owner of the property, a construct this project (Sec. 7 will have them file a copy of commencement of any wor that, in the event that said of	31.5). (Mark the or my employees we ructure is not inte- understand and a representations ned suspended. m exclusively con 044). T certify that this form (License k. I further ackn contractors fail to	e appropriat with wages as ended or off gree that in t contained he tracting with at the time su of Contractor owledge that file a copy of	e Contractor's Li te box below.) s their sole compe- ered for sale (Se the event that an erein, that the Po- licensed contract ich contractors are 's Declaration) p t I understand ar of the Declaratio	cense Law, ensation, c. 7044). I by work is ermit tors to e selected, I rior to the nd agree on with the
I hereby affir Business and	m under penalty of perjury Professions Code (Sec. 70 I, as owner of the property, c will do the work, and the st further acknowledge that I commenced contrary to the herein applied for shall be deer architect, agent I, as owner of the property, a construct this project (Sec. 7 will have them file a copy of commencement of any wor	31.5). (Mark the or my employees we ructure is not inte- understand and a representations ned suspended. m exclusively con 044). T certify that this form (License k. I further ackn contractors fail to	e appropriat with wages as ended or off gree that in t contained he tracting with at the time su of Contractor owledge that file a copy of	e Contractor's Li te box below.) s their sole compe- ered for sale (Se the event that an erein, that the Po- licensed contract ich contractors are 's Declaration) p t I understand ar of the Declaratio	cense Law, ensation, c. 7044). I by work is ermit tors to e selected, I rior to the nd agree on with the
I hereby affir Business and	m under penalty of perjury Professions Code (Sec. 70 I, as owner of the property, c will do the work, and the st further acknowledge that I commenced contrary to the herein applied for shall be deer architect, agent T, as owner of the property, a construct this project (Sec. 7 will have them file a copy of commencement of any wor that, in the event that said of	931.5). (Mark the or my employees we cructure is not inte- understand and a representations ned suspended. (Mark the mexclusively cont 044). T certify that this form (License k. I further ackn contractors fail to e Permit herein app	e appropriat with wages as ended or off gree that in t contained he tracting with at the time su of Contractor owledge that file a copy of blied for shall h	e Contractor's Li te box below.) s their sole compe- ered for sale (Se the event that an erein, that the Po- licensed contract ich contractors are 's Declaration) p t I understand ar of the Declaratio	cense Law, ensation, c. 7044). I by work is ermit tors to e selected, I rior to the nd agree on with the
I hereby affir Business and	m under penalty of perjury Professions Code (Sec. 70 I, as owner of the property, c will do the work, and the st further acknowledge that I commenced contrary to the herein applied for shall be deer architect, agent T, as owner of the property, a construct this project (Sec. 7 will have them file a copy of commencement of any wor that, in the event that said of Central Permit Bureau, that the	931.5). (Mark the or my employees we cructure is not inte- understand and a representations ned suspended. (Mark the mexclusively cont 044). T certify that this form (License k. I further ackn contractors fail to e Permit herein app	e appropriat with wages as ended or off gree that in t contained he tracting with at the time su of Contractor owledge that file a copy of blied for shall h	e Contractor's Li te box below.) s their sole compe- ered for sale (Se the event that an erein, that the Po- licensed contract ich contractors are 's Declaration) p t I understand ar of the Declaratio	cense Law, ensation, c. 7044). I by work is ermit tors to e selected, I rior to the nd agree on with the
I hereby affir Business and	m under penalty of perjury Professions Code (Sec. 70 I, as owner of the property, c will do the work, and the st further acknowledge that I commenced contrary to the herein applied for shall be deer architect, agent T, as owner of the property, a construct this project (Sec. 7 will have them file a copy of commencement of any wor that, in the event that said of Central Permit Bureau, that the I am exempt under Business	31.5). (Mark the or my employees we tructure is not inte- understand and a representations ned suspended. (Mark the representations ned suspended.) (Mark the mexclusively cont 044). Tcertify that this form (License k. I further ackn contractors fail to e Permit herein app as and Professions	e appropriat vith wages as ended or off gree that in t contained he tracting with at the time su owledge that file a copy o blied for shall t s Code Sec.	e Contractor's Li te box below.) s their sole compe- ered for sale (Se the event that an erein, that the Po- licensed contract ich contractors are 's Declaration) p t I understand ar of the Declaratio	cense Law, ensation, c. 7044). I by work is ermit tors to e selected, I rior to the ad agree on with the added.
I hereby affir Business and	m under penalty of perjury Professions Code (Sec. 70 I, as owner of the property, c will do the work, and the st further acknowledge that I commenced contrary to the herein applied for shall be deer architect, agent T, as owner of the property, a construct this project (Sec. 7 will have them file a copy of commencement of any wor that, in the event that said of Central Permit Bureau, that the I am exempt under Business	931.5). (Mark the or my employees we ructure is not inte- understand and a representations ned suspended. m exclusively con 044). Tcentify that this form (License k. I further ackn contractors fail to e Permit herein app as and Professions	e appropriat vith wages as ended or off gree that in t contained he tracting with at the time su owledge that file a copy of blied for shall h code Sec.	e Contractor's Li te box below.) s their sole compe- ered for sale (Se the event that an erein, that the Po- licensed contract ich contractors are 's Declaration) p t I understand ar of the Declaratio be deemed susper	cense Law, ensation, c. 7044). I by work is ermit tors to e selected, I rior to the ad agree on with the aded.
I hereby affir Business and	m under penalty of perjur Professions Code (Sec. 70 I, as owner of the property, c will do the work, and the st further acknowledge that I commenced contrary to the herein applied for shall be deer architect, agent T, as owner of the property, a construct this project (Sec. 7 will have them file a copy of commencement of any wor that, in the event that said of Central Permit Bureau, that the I am exempt under Business Reason	931.5). (Mark the or my employees we inderstand and a representations ned suspended. In exclusively con 044). T certify that this form (License k. I further ackn contractors fail to e Permit herein app as and Professions	e appropriat vith wages as ended or off gree that in t contained he tracting with at the time su owledge that file a copy of blied for shall h code Sec.	Contractor's Little box below.) s their sole competend for sale (Settine event that an erein, that the Pole contractors and 's Declaration) p t I understand an of the Declaration be deemed susperted to the contractors and 's Declaration) p	cense Law, ensation, c. 7044). I by work is ermit tors to e selected, I rior to the ad agree on with the aded.

1

REV., CPB-1/95



CPB-37/85-

5000

CERTIFICATION OF AUTHORIZED AGENT

I hereby certify that for the purpose of filing an application for a building or other permit with the Central Permit Bureau, or completion of any form related to the S.F. building – Code, or to City and County ordinances and regulations, or to state laws and codes, I am the agent of the owner and am authorized to sign all documents connected with this application or permit.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

1 los los Applicant's Signature

DAVID WINSLOW Type or Print Name

N7797551 (CA DRIVERS LICENSE Identification_____

(Drivers Lic. No., etc.)

Owner/Lessee

6.30.99

Date

	FICIAL	REVIEWED BY F	APPLICATION IS HER DEMOLISH IN ACCO SPECIFICATIONS SUE PURPOSE SET FORTH	ET 0.5 2006 BYLMADE FOR PERMISSION TO RDANCE WITH THE PLANS AND MITTED HEREWITH AND FOR THE HEREIN:	BLDG. 6 2030 8 13 80
		FIRE DEPT INSP	ZEINT	ICE COPY	99
		- NIS-X-1	ARAD M	ission Street	APF
		3 (6	1040 H	Ission Street	APPROVAL NUMBER:
		S. i. i. s. i. i.	LABEL W SDE Missio	n Street st. AVE.	ALN
		0 + REF + 300 MM	P+4ST- 208 FL S FROM	Onondaga Avenue SI	UMB
		DATE FILED FILING/FEE RECEIP		NEAREST CROSS STREET	
		В/11/0 <u>2</u> РЕРМИТ NO. ISSUED	14 BLOCK	LOT	-
			6959	019	<u> </u>
			DESCRIPTION		1 1 .
		SIZE FRONT REAR AVE. DEPTH OF LDT: 103 - 81 - 268 -	STREET FRONTAGE OR (F NONE) SHORTEST SIDE OF BUILDING: 10.3 FT.		
		LOT: 103 FT. 81 FT. 268 F MAX, HT. WILL STREET OF BLDG. SPACE BE USED YES J	TYPE OF BUILDING BAAOMD	Onondaga STRE	EI
		25 FT. DURING CONSTRUZ NO	U III-N/V-N		
		IS ASBESTOS PRESENT IN/ON YES LI PREMISES? NO X PROPERTY LINE? NO I	STORIES 3 ADEA 191E SU.		7
		LAST OCCUPANCY CODE	USE OF BUILDING	Al emany WEE	EAS Mission
		A-3/S-3	Mortuary/Parking	×	EAST
		DWELLING GUEST	NUMBER OF HAS BLOG BEEN BASEMENTS GIVEN LANDMARK YES D STATUS? NO D	any	P 19
		DEMOLITION PROGRAM			
		REQUIRED AND YES (ATTACHED EXEMPT			
		ANY STAND YES U PIPES? NO V	SPRINKLERED7 YES INNO 55	STREE	STREET
		GENERAL CONTRACTOR	ADDRESS		I II .
		To Be Selected		STRE	
		CALIFORNIA LICENSE NUMBER CLASS EX	PRRATION DATE TELEPHONE	SOUTH	
		ARCHITECT OR ENGINEER	ADDRESS		
					1
		CALIFORNIA CENTIFICATE NUMBER	TELEPHONE	NOTE: THE BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT REQUIRES, BY	LAW.
		OWNER'S NAME	ADDRESS 4840 Mission St.,	PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF ALL DEMOLITIC	
		Valente Marini Perata & Co.	SF, CA 94112	UNDER PENALTY OF FINE. PHONE 771-6000 EXT. 217 FOR DETAILS	
			TELEPHONE	THORE TT FOUD EAT. 217 FOR DETAILS	.
			415-333-0161		
242		UTILITY DISCONNECTION ELECTRIC: 861 TELEPHONE NUMBERS: PG & E: 781	-8000 X 324 PT & T: 553-3056 -4214 X 3786 WATER: 558-3196	AT&T CABLE: 800-395-2396	

IMPORTANT NOTICES

Demolition work shall be performed in accordance with the San Francisco Building Code and other applicable ordinances.

No portion of building or structure or scaffolding used during construction, to be closer than 60° to any wire containing more than 750 volts. See Sec. 385, California Penal Code.

Pursuant to the San Francisco Building Code, the demolition permit shall be posted on the job. The owner is responsible for approved plans and application being kept at building site.

All debris to be removed from the street, sidewalk and lot. Premises to be left in a sanitary condition and complying with the Building Code.

If demolstion involves abandonment of side sewer, applicant must obtain a side sewer permit. Side sewer will then be blocked. Applications for demolition of Historic Landmarks will be referred to the Landmark Commission

ANY STIPULATION REQUIRED HEREIN OR BY CODE MAY BE APPEALED.

THIS IS NOT A DEMOLITION PERMIT. NO WORK SHALL BE STARTED UNTIL 15 DAYS AFTER THE PERMIT HAS BEEN ISSUED.

CHECK APPROPRIATE BOY

4

. 9003-05 (REV. 8/00)

inter t

UNEUR AFFRUFRIAT	C DUA		
C OWNER	ARCHITECT	ENGINEER	
LESSEE	AGENT WITH P	OWER OF ATTORNEY	
FI CONTRACTOR	CLATTORNEY IN .	FACT	

APPLICANT'S CERTIFICATION

I CERTIFY THAT I HAVE READ THIS APPLICATION AND STATE THAT THE ABOVE INFORMATION IS CORRECT. I AGREE THAT IF A PERMIT IS ISSUED FOR THE DEMOLITION DESCRIBED IN THIS APPLICATION, ALL THE PROVISIONS OF THE PERMIT AND ALL LAWS AND ORDINANCES THERETO WILL BE COMPLIED WITH.

:

See

NOTICE TO APPLICANT

HOLD HARMLESS CLAUSE: The permittee(s) by acceptance of the permit, agree(s) to indemnify and hold harmless the City and County of San Francisco from and against any and all claims, demands and actions for damages resulting from operations under this permit, regardless of negligence of the City and County of San Francisco, and to assume the defense of the City and County of San Francisco egainst all such claims, demands or actions.

In conformity with the provisions of Section 3800 of the Labor Code of the State of California, the applicant shall have coverage under (i), or (II) designated below or shall indicate tem (III), or (IV), or (V), whichever is applicable. If however tem (V) is checked item (IV) must be checked as well, Mark the appropriate method of compliance below:

I hereby affirm under penalty of perjury one of the following declarations:

- I have and will maintain a certificate of consent to self-insure for workers' compensation, as provided by Section 3700 of the Labor Code, for the performance of the work for which this permit is issued. ()
- I have and will maintain workers' compensation insurance, as required by Section 3700 of the Labor Code, for the performance of the work for which this permit is issued. My workers' compensation insurance carrier and policy number are: ()

Carrier - r	
Policy Number	

- () III. The cost of the work to be done is \$100 or less.
- (X) IV. I certify that in the performance of the work for which this permit is issued. I shall not employ any person in any manner so as to become subject to the workers' compensation laws of California. I further acknowledge that I understand that in the event that I should become subject to the workers' compensation provisions of the Labor Code of California and fail to comply forthwith with the provisions of Section 3800 of the Labor Code, that the permit herein applied for shall be deemed revoked.

V. I certify as the owner (or line agent for the owner) that in the performance of the work for which this permit is issued, I will employ a contractor who complex with the workers' compensation laws of California and who, prior to the commencement of any work, will file a completed copy of this form with the Central Permit Bureau. (×) 1- 1 ...

NVO Signature of Applicant or Age Date 030443



OWNER OR OWNER'S AUTHORIZED AGENT (TO BE AUTHORIZED ARCHITECT, ENGINEER, OR CONTRACTOR)



ADDRES	5: q	484		1155	IUN	58		CTIV	E.		D	DBI)	C CE	s	۵D	AS
	i/CP	CNT- PC	CNT- CE	PAD- PC	PAD- STR	PAD- MECH	PAD- MAJ	PAD- SSS	PAR A PET	FIRE	CES/	H	B I	B S	D P	RD	
SEQ,				5	F		2	<u> </u>	124	-	DAS	D	D	м	Н	v	B
ACCEPT	UNI			WC						->-			-4	4	·		6
PPR'T	DES						WG	[n//	111		i.			at			
DATE.	0/12							20	uu j	e ju	139	Ю Ц		-11	1	- í	-
	11-			2/11			8/11		-	4H		Ť		el.	-+	\neg	-
MICK APP	LICABL	E: QE	XPRESS	D PAR	ALLEL	ONE	STOP (BLDG.	ENLAR	GED	SITE PI	RMIT		701 MER			

APPLICA	· ,			UTING SLEP		DAC			
2003/081	41809	Residentia	J Comm	ercial Major	r	YESNO			
STATION	PLAN CHECK	DATE LOG-IN	DATE	DATE HOLD	DATE APPRVD	REVISED COST	BACK CHEC		
Architectural RICC Structural		1.1.1					DATE	HOUR	
		10/18/24	n/id of	12/10/04	·				
Mechanical									
FUTURE ROUTING	DCP	FIRE	BOE HEA		'dn两n		BID	СРВ	
			X	17/3	TINNOVT	1 2006		X	
COMMENT			1 (
		Canel (e122106				<u></u>		

:



DATE 8/12/03	APPLICATION FILING FEE- PLAN CHECKING RECEIPT	339474
RECEIVED OF WWE WMA FEE FOR APPLICATION FILING AND ESTIMATED COST OF JOB DEMD FIRE FEE 7299 DCP FEE 7081 400.00 9003-01 (REV. 2/9C)	2 M 36 CHECKING PLANS, PRESCRIBED BY SAN FRANCI PLANCHECK FEE REVENUE 7226 NEW CONST ALTERATION SIGNS SURCHARGE C FULL PLAN CHECK	

٢

H.

DEPARTA BUILDING I	WAIVE This pu informa may be	ER ermit aj ation af	ND COUNTY OF SAN I APPLICATION CO oplication is accepted as complete ler further analysis of the applicat ed for the project to be built. At the MSSIQN SP	e for lion p his ti	purp inior 1 me,	se o	nt of inil mple ollow	SS lial (il ling i ing a	CO ing. ts rev dditic	NT The riew. mal a	Depa Oth applic	L S	SH ent r	EE	T . lind i	l neo	ess	ary t	o rec	ques entaj ed a	t olhe I doc Is nee	er umer cessa	ntation ary,
Y	ASSESSOR'S BLO	ск	69.59 LOT_	01	9			zoł	ling	Rł	1-1	7ĥ	IC -	3	HE	GHT	• .		40)-)	χ		
	•SUD		SSD#	٠ſ	B	GR I					LTI	ER	A T	10	NS	5 (F	orm	3 &	8)	-			$\overline{\Box}$
			HIST DIST	2	DEMOLITION (Form 6)	GRADING (Form	SIGN (Form 4.1		BAY	-	Concession of the local division of the loca	-	-	-		ITIO		·	ŕ			8	7
					TION -	G		NEW GARAGE	WINI	RMER	NEW ROOF	CADE	┝	EX :	금공	Т	ח			WORK	INTER	CUPA	NEW
			DT PLN CONSV. DIST		For			AGE	BAY WINDOWS,	(S), P	OF (C	WOR		EXTENSION	HORIZON		FLOOP	NEW		Ř	RIOR	OCCUPANCY/USE	CONS
	PREVIOUS ACTION	4S	UMB		n 6)			5		ENTH	hange	K (Ne	╞		-	-	r -	1-	+				BIB
							Toolin		H. IMF	OUSE	(Change of Profile)	w Win	LATERAL	REAR	FRONT	EAR	TOTAL	RON	EXTE	OMM	LOWER	CHANGED	CTIO
	CODE VIOLATIONS		ES 🗆 NO			CANOPIES(Form3	Form 4.1 THE AWARING CANODICAL		ARCH. IMPROVEMENT	DORMER(S), PENTHOUSE, PROJECTION	ofile)	FACADE WORK (New Window/Siding)	AL			REAR (Partial)		FRONT (Partial)	PIOR MED	COMM. TENANT	FLR	GED	CONSTRUCTION (Form
	 Required for residential buildings in RH and RM districts excluding Bernal Heights S.U.D. 	1.000	EQUIRED INFORMATION DESCRIPTION			2	1		TNE	CTION.		(gn							EXTERIOR MECH. EQUIP	T IMPR.	ROOMS		$\left \right $
	1A.Required if the proposed work is to	SE	C. 311: MAP, LIST, LABELS,	╋	+	9	╇	1					1	<u> </u>	-	-	+	-	Ļ	-			Н
	increase dwelling unit(s) or change of use, 2. Required for buildings	SIT	AFFIDAVIT	-	+-	+-	╉	┼				-	Ľ	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	A	1A	-
	in Residential Districts only.		EVEYOR OR CIVIL ENGR.)	┢								333	333				335		659				2
	 Required when the proposed work is in an R district and increases 	đ	ADJACENT FRONT WALLS	╀							-											10	
	the number of dwelling units. Roof plan will	PLOT	(FULL WIDTH-ADJ. LOTS) ADJACENT REAR WALLS	╇	+	\vdash				_		_											
	enable determining compliance lo open	F-	(FULL WIDTH-ADJ. LOTS) FLOOR PLAN(S) OF	4		ļ.,																	
	space requirements. 4. Required when the		FLOOR(S) OF WORK																				8
	proposed work is in the garage level and it		FLOOR PLAN(S) OF OTHER FLOOR(S)											7	7						7		
	could reduce the number of parking	N (S)	ROOF PLAN	Τ		Γ	8	П		Ì			90	8A	8				8B		3	3	
	spaces. 5. Required when the	L ►	GARAGE (EXISTING & PROPOSED PRKG, SPACES)	\uparrow	1	\uparrow	\uparrow					-		-	-	-973			_		4		
	addition is at least 20% of the gross floor area	۹.	LANDSCAPING (SHOW TREE PLANTER & UTIL, LINES)	T	\uparrow	1-	\square	5	1	\neg	+	-	5	5	5	5	5	5	-	-	-		
	of the existing building, and when the proposed work eliminates planters		SIGN (CANOPY OR AWNING) SHOW LOCATION OF OTHER	1	+		\vdash		-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	_	-	-+	-	*
	and street trees. 6. Required when work is	(S)	FRONT	\uparrow	╈		11		9					6	200	6		89	_		\neg	-	
	visible from the street or 6A.Required to evaluate	TION	REAR	╋	╋	<u> </u>	ŀ		9					6		6	-		6	6	-	_	
	link between addition and building.	ELEVATION	LATERAL	╋	+		-			-		-	_						_	$ \downarrow$	_		
	7. Required when the link between the existing	-		┢																			
	work is weak and		TIONS																				
	8. If proposed work is	DET,	-		12	12							12	12	12	12	12	12					
	Required for all building expansions except deck	нs	BLDGS. ON THE SAME SIDE OF THE STREET		Γ	Γ			6					6		6				+	-+	-	
	88.11 mechanical equipment	AP	BLDGS. ON THE FACING SIDE OF THE STREET	T	-				-		T	Ì	Ť	6		6			-+	+	+	-	
	9. Depends on the	ОСЯ	FRONT FACADE OF THE SUBJECT BUILDING	1	1			9	6		Ť		-	6		6	-		-	+	+		
	improvements, so as to match.	010	REAR FACADE OF THE SUBJECT BUILDING		+		\square	9			Ŧ								6	+	\downarrow		
	10.When there is more than one building on the	Hd	REAR VIEW OF THE	┝	+-	Η	-	4	-				1	6A		_	4		_	_	_	_	
	lot. 11.If it affects the root line.	SECT	ADJACENT BUILDINGS					-		-					_		4		_	_			
9 *	12.Required if the building is a Landmark or	CPC F	POSITION M) FINDINGS	×	 		ļ	_	\downarrow	1													
	Architecturally Significant or if the type	BPA L	DECISION ING/FIRE DEPT(S).	_				_										T	T	T	T	T	1
	of work requires extensive alterations.	DETE	RMINATION	13												T	T	T	T		1	T	1
	13 Required if the building Is damaged by fire.	OTHE	7			T	Ţ	T	T		1	T	T		1	+	T	1	+	+	- -	+	1
	CHECK LIST LEGENDS:	Req	Lired No. Required in circumsta	ances		: 10	nolern	nation	subr	nitte	d X	Inf		alion			1	-	1			1	l
	REMARKS: SUL	hille	t DELVIN	V	NA	51	117	1G	TÙ	h	- 7.	1	onth	anun	HUL	requ	u eQ	V.	info	mat		eriv _i re	id
	<u> </u>	_ 1	<u></u>	Ľ														-					-

ATTACH THIS FORM TO THE BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION

OFFICIA	SAN FRAN	00	SE DEPAN ILDING PERN DGER CARD	115 200	0F GITY	2/809	<u>.</u> 6	S COL ACTIVIT TEAM		VERIFICATION BY METRO SCAN
0	DEPARTM	08	2/13/03				To	T I		TE NO ": INTERIOR WORK. OTHER: (SPECIFY)
		Constant		TE STARTED	DATE CON			HECKE	-	
		-	E5s :				EGISLAT	ED FRU	~~ =	
		CON	NPLAINT YES	~ 0	3R	HID	SANBOR	N OTHE	R	
						.			٦	ADDRESSEE :
			SE /OCCUPANCY	PROPOSED	· FIA	DING	<u> </u>	PERMIT	EP	
		l i	RONT SET BACK						_	
		2-								
		EVINA						ļ		STAFF CONTACT :
		R.	REAR YARD					3		
		1179						-	i	
		NAV NAV	14			12				
		3-				· .				
		80	PEN SPACE							
			HEIGHT							
		Cart	PARKING	MEALTAL DA	numu La			1	<u>)</u>	
		<u> </u>	MUNARY ENVIRON	ATION C	F HOLD	OFR	ת וווז	NG P	FF	ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION RORD
OR ENGINEER.							BACK CHECK FEE D' LIVELATION ALERT D' LABATEMENT FEE PLAN SHOW BUILDING LOCATION AND WORK SHOW AD LABAT DEVELOPMENT:			
								1		
	4		ELEVATIONS :	SHOW			5.		~	10N5: 6HDW:
	(PARKING PLAN				<u>- 200</u>	. +		
		-		: 3HOW			_ 7.3		004	PLAN SHOW
	ć	8	FRONT SET BA	EPLANDSOAP			9.			PANCY I CUR RECORDS SHOW THE LEGAL PANCY OF YOUR PROPERTY TO BE ;
	10	00	COMPLETE NOTICE		RESTRICTU	avs.	11.			OG CLARIFY DISCREPANCIES . TOSITION M. FINDINGS.
		20	OTHER DEPARTA	NENTAL ACT	ION IS REE	WIRED:	10 • 10	 		
			CONDITION	E APPROPRIAT	wess C Di C El	SCRETIONA WIROVMEN VST: MASTE	TAL EVAL	WATTON		COASTAL PERMIT I ZONNE TEXT CHANGE IM. P. JEFERRAL II VARIANCE LAND SUBDIVISION I ZONING RECLASS.
	13	3 🗆	DESIGN REVIE, PANDRAMIC I BUILDINGS ON FACADES OF	HEWS OF THE	STREET	FA RA	CADE OF	SUR IAP	TB	UILDING I WINDOW SCHEDULE.
	1.	4[]	OTHER :							
	. .									
					<u> </u>					
				Q. 1						



OF TOCity & County of San Francisco 1660 Mission Street, San Francisco, California 94103-2414

Permit Application #: <u>2003/08/12</u>/1809 Job Address: 4840 Mission. Block/Lot Number: 6959 /019

DEMOLITION AFFIDAVIT

I declare under penalty of perjury that every party who has a recorded mortgage or recorded deed of trust on the property that is the subject of the application has been notified of the filing of this application as per San Francisco Building Code Section 106.3.2.3.

Signature: Print Name: Date:

읶	SAN FRANCISC	ō, .			
FICIAL	FI States	DEPARTMENT OF BUILDIN	NG INSPECTIO	DN	
L C C C		City & County of San Francisco	co, California 94	103-2414	e E
Ϋ́.	10111 · 0011	CENTRAL PERMIT BUREAU 1660 MISSION STREET	Appl. # 20 Address 48	03/08/12/ 40 Missian	
	3	SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103			

LICENSED CONTRACTOR'S STATEMENT

Licensed Contractor's Declaration

Pursuant to the Business and Professions Code Sec. 7031.5, I hereby affirm under penalty of perjury that I am licensed under the provisions of Chapter 9 (commencing with Sec. 7000) of Division 3 of the Business and Professions Code, and that my license is in full force and effect.

License Number

License Class

Expiration Date

Contractor

PRINT

SIGNATURE

Owner-Builder Declaration

I hereby affirm under penalty of perjury that I am exempt from the Contractor's License Law, Business and Professions Code (Sec. 7031.5). (Mark the appropriate box below).

I, as owner of the property, or my employees with wages as their sole compensation, will do the work, and the structure is not intended or offered for sale (Sec. 7044). I further acknowledge that I understand and agree that in the event that any work is commenced contrary to the representations contained herein, that the Permit herein applied for shall be deemed suspended.

architect, agent

I, as owner of the property, am exclusively contracting with licensed contractors to construct this project (Sec. 7044). I certify that at the time such contractors are selected, I will have them file a copy of this form (Licensed Contractor's Declaration) prior to the commencement of any work. I further acknowledge that I understand and agree that, in the event that said contractors fail to file a copy of the Declaration with the Central Permit Bureau, that the Permit herein applied for shall be deemed suspended.

I am exempt under Business and Professions Code Sec.

Reason

Date 8/12/13

 Architect (PRIN	Ŋ	
 Agent (PRINT)	DESTA	Collins.
 Owner (PRINT)		
(SIGNATURE)	Deste	billos

NOTICE: "Any violation of the Bus. & Prof. Code Sec. 7031.5 by any permit applicant shall be subject to a civil penalty of not more than five hundred dollars (\$500)." Bus. & Prof. Code Sec. 7031.5. Revised 09/05/01



Of City and County of San Francisco 1001 1660 Mission Street, San Francisco, California 94103-2414

CERTIFICATION OF AUTHORIZED AGENT

I hereby certify that for the purpose of filing an application for a building or other permit with the Central Permit Bureau, or completion of any form related to the San Francisco Building Code, or to City and County ordinances and regulations, or to state laws and codes, I am the agent of the owner and am authorized to sign all documents connected with this application or permit.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct:

gnature

Type or Print Name

1215

Identification (Drivers License Number, etc.)

Perata + Co Owner/Lessee

Date

CPB-37/85





×.



chit

City & County of San Francisco 1660 Mission Street, 2nd Floor, San Francisco, California 94103-2414

Certified Mail

NOTICE OF DIRECTOR'S HEARING

June 10, 2003

OWNER(S):

Mission Properties 4840 Mission Street San Francisco, CA 94112 PROPERTY ADDRESS: 4840 Mission Street BLOCK: 6959 LOT: 019 PROPERTY OWNER: Mission Properties INSPECTOR: Jerry Sullivan (415-558-6059)

iving

Date and Time of Hearing: July 9, 2003, 9:00 A.M. At 1660 Mission Street, Room 2001, San Francisco, CA 94103

TO OWNERS, LESSEES AND OTHER PERSONS WITH A RECORDED INTEREST:

Pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 16B of the San Francisco Building Code, the above referenced property been inventoried as an Unreinforced Masonry Building (UMB), Risk level 4. Table 16B-A (14-A of Chapter 14 SFBC), the UMB Program Implementation Schedule prescribes that each owner of a Risk level 4 UMB should have an application for a building permit or for demolition by February 15, 2003. Furthermore, the program schedule stipulates that the application for a permit must be issued by February 15, 2004 and that construction under the perm completed by February 15, 2006. To date, our records indicate that you have not met these deadlines.

Failure to meet these time lines are a violation of the Building Code. Once a violation of the Building Coc found, the Director of Building Inspection is authorized to conduct administrative hearings to compel abatement of violation. In this instance, at the Director's Hearing, an order of abatement determining that the building is a public nuisa as a result of this failure will be issued and recorded against title.

Should you fail to appear at the hearing on the above date or fail to comply with the decision of the Director, Permit of Occupancy and/or Certificate of Occupancy for the property may be revoked. If an Order of Abatement is iss by the Director, you will be charged all administrative costs incurred by the Department in enforcing your obligation satisfy all requirements of the UMB ordinance. Also, if the UMB is residential rental property, six months from the d of the Director's hearing, the Department will notify the Franchise Tax Board, and you will be prohibited from deduct depreciation, interest, and taxes of this property from your income taxes from the calendar year in which the hearing is he

Finally, should the Department refer your case to the City Attorney for prosecution, civil penalties in the amount of \$500.00 per day will accrue for each day each violation exists. These will be collected from you in a civil laws brought against you by the City.

By:

Very truly yours,

Frank Y. Chiu, Director Department of Building Inspection

Yah Yan Chew, S. E. Manager Major & UMB Plan Check Division

rskl4hrg.frm (199)(101 Kotot)

ż



OfCity & County of San Francisco 1011660 Mission Street, San Francisco, California 94103-2414

CANCELLATION OF INCOMPLETE APPLICATION

Valente Marini Perata & Co. 4840 Mission Street San Francisco, CA 94112 DATE: APPLICATION NO: JOB ADDRESS: PLAN REVIEWER: CANCEL DATE:

6/7/2006 2003/0812/1809 4840 Mission Street RKC/Jeff Ma 6/28/2006

Dear Applicant:

In accordance with Section 106.3.7 of the San Francisco Building Code, you are hereby notified that the above referenced application will be canceled on the cancel date shown above, unless all corrections and/or submittals have been satisfactorily made and approved by the plan reviewer by or on the cancel date. Revised plans must be submitted to 2nd Floor, 1660 Mission Street, at least five (5) working days prior to the cancel date. However, when you wait until then, you run the risk that revised plans may not be adequate or acceptable; in which case, the application will be canceled on cancel date without further notice.

A one time extension of 60 days, at any point during the approval procedure, may be granted by the Director upon written request by the applicant with a payment of \$32.80 (non-refundable) made payable to the Department of Building Inspection.

If you have any questions regarding this notice, please call the clerk in Plan Check Services Division at (415) 558-6133.

Very truly yours,

Manager Plan Check Services Division

S.E. Silveira 31 Twelve Oak Hill San Rafael, CA 94903

cc:

BY: CERTIFIED MAIL WITH RETURN CARD

4840 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA Historic Resource Evaluation

Appendix D: Historic Drawings

Note: Copies of the 1959 blueprints obtained from the property owner by the project architect are pending.





ICILLA













· SEGND FLOR AND ROOF PLAN.

-SCALE 4 SONE FOOTA

Ś

- J. A. PORPORATO -ARCHITECT - 619 WASHINGTON ST S.F.*



Blueprints dated 1959



ALTERATIONS & ADDITION & MORTUARI BLOG VALENTE MARINI BERTATES ARIO MARION ST. SIN FRANCIS

- STRUCTURAL MODIFICATIONS to Extension of Existing Building -Structury New Roof Dreins and David Secula



4840 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA Historic Resource Evaluation

Appendix E: Historic Images





Composite aerial photographs of San Francisco from 1938 that show the subject property (see the arrow) with the original building and a rear garden. (David Rumsey Map Collection, amended by author)



Detail from the composite aerial photographs of San Francisco from 1938 that shows the subject property (see arrow) (David Rumsey Map Collection, amended by author)



View north on Mission Street from the intersection with France Street, 1939; the Valente, Martini, Perata & Co. sign is located on the far left (see arrow) (OpenSFHistory, wnp14.1549.jpg, use permission required, amended by author)



Photograph of the addition under construction, 1959 (Valente, Marini, Perata & Co.)



Photograph of the addition under construction, September 1959 (Valente, Marini, Perata & Co.)


Advertisement in the 1925 San Francisco City Directory, page 211 (Internet Archive)



Advertisement in the 1951 San Francisco City Directory, page 53 (Internet Archive)



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Historic Resource Evaluation Response

Date	March 8, 2018	(
Case No.:	2016-012545ENV	F
Project Address:	4840 Mission Street	
Zoning:	Excelsior Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District	
	Residential, House – One Family (RH-1) Zoning District	
	40-X Height and Bulk District	
Block/Lot:	6959/019, 025, 026, 031	F
Date of Review:	March 8, 2018 (Parts 1 and 2)	4
Staff Contact:	Elizabeth White (Environmental Planner)	
	(415) 575-6813	
	elizabeth.white@sfgov.org	
	Jørgen G. Cleemann (Preservation Planner)	
	(415) 575-8763	
	jorgen.cleemann@sfgov.org	

PART I: HISTORIC RESOURCE EVALUATION

Buildings and Property Description

The subject property at 4840 Mission Street, known as the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home, contains three adjacent through-lots extending between Mission Street and Alemany Boulevard in the Outer Mission neighborhood of San Francisco. Along Mission Street, the closest intersections are with Onondaga Avenue to the north and with France Avenue to the south. The property is located within the Excelsior Outer Mission Neighborhood Commercial District, an RH-1 (Residential, House, One Family) Zoning District, and a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

The only building on the subject property is a funeral parlor located on the northernmost of the three adjacent lots.¹ This building occupies the east half of its lot and fronts onto Mission Street. The west half of this lot and the entirety of the two adjacent lots to the south contain a continuous surface parking and vehicle maneuvering area associated with the funeral parlor. Although the lots extend back to Alemany Boulevard, access from this direction is blocked by a chain-link fence.

The subject building at 4840 Mission Street was built in two main phases. The initial section was constructed in 1926 to the designs of architect John A. Porporato. As originally built, it was a two-story Spanish Colonial Revival-style building with stucco cladding, a tile roof, and a

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

Reception: 415.558.6378

Fax: 415.558.6409

Planning Information: **415.558.6377**

¹ In addition to the three adjacent lots referenced above, the project that precipitated this review also includes a fourth adjacent lot to the south (6959/031), which contains a supermarket and parking area constructed in 1980. Because the built elements on this fourth lot are less than forty-five years old and are not related functionally to the age-eligible building at 4840 Mission Street, they are not evaluated for potential historic significance in the current report.

Historic Resource Evaluation Response March 8, 2018

symmetrical front (Mission Street) façade featuring a central entry portico and five vertical bays of arched windows. To the rear, the building stepped down to a single story and then stepped up again to a single story over a raised basement. The second phase of construction occurred in 1959. It was designed by architect Otto G. Hintermann, engineered by Hyman Rosenthal, and constructed by the DeMartini Brothers contracting firm. In this renovation, the building was extended to the south and east with a two-story addition and was given a new façade designed in a Midcentury Modern style. The building's current appearance dates largely to this 1959 renovation.

Above a base of Roman brick veneer, the primary east (Mission Street) façade is clad in square porcelain enamel panels set in a stack bond pattern. A projecting wood belt course runs across this façade, separating the first and the second stories. At the first story, the east façade contains seven masonry openings, which are grouped toward the north end of the façade. The third opening from the north contains a recessed building entry consisting of a marble stair leading to a pair of hollow metal doors. Each of the remaining six openings contains an eight pane aluminum window with a two-pane hopper sash at the bottom, a four-pane awning sash at the center, and two fixed lights at the top. The second-story windows, framed by a projecting porcelain enamel-clad border, are identical to the first-story windows except in the location over the building entry, where they take the form of a pair of smaller, narrow, four-pane windows. A neon sign projects from above the wood belt course in between the first and second windows from the south. With the windows grouped toward the north end of the façade, the south end of the east façade consists largely of a blank section of wall, on which building signage ("Valente Marini Perata & Co. Funeral Directors") has been painted. At the extreme south end of the eastern façade, there is another pair of hollow metal doors leading to a one-story vestibule that runs along the south façade (see below). The projecting wooden beltcourse passes over these doors and extends beyond the corner of the building, where it forms part of a canopy that spans a driveway and is supported at the opposite end by a brick wall.

The secondary south façade, which fronts onto a driveway that connects to the parking area, features a one-story vestibule consisting of a brick base, large fixed aluminum-frame windows, and a flat roof. At the right (east) end of the façade, this vestibule features a projecting canopy (see above). At the center, the vestibule features a porte-cochère. Toward the left (west) end, the vestibule steps down with the slope of the lot. Behind the one-story vestibule, the second story of the south façade features two groups of ribbon windows framed by projecting borders and glazed with opaque glass block. At the right (east) end of the façade, a short section of the primary façade's porcelain enamel cladding turns the corner and features painted wall signage. Otherwise, the south façade features only utilitarian features such as louvers and drain pipes.

The tertiary west (rear) façade clearly displays both of the subject building's two major phases of construction. At the left (north) end, the 1926 design is legible in the arched wooden windows and the tile roof parapet, while the right (south) end features the aluminum windows used in the 1959 renovation. The south end also features a neon building sign. The tertiary north façade, which fronts onto a narrow alley, dates mostly to the original 1926 design, featuring a portecochère, arched wood windows, wood entry doors, and stucco scored to resemble ashlar masonry. Elements of the north façade that were altered in the 1959 renovation include the

addition and removal of windows and the application of a short section of the modernist cladding that wraps around the corner from the primary façade.

Site features on the subject property include the parking lot, a concrete wall separating the parking lot from the driveway running along the south side of the building, masonry walls separating the parking lot from the sidewalk, and a neon sign installed on top of a post in the parking area.

In addition to the two major phases of construction, major exterior alterations to the subject building include the construction of the neon sign currently located in the parking lot (1937), the installation of the neon sign on the west façade (1961), and the replacement of the wall separating the parking lot from the sidewalk (1977). Various window replacements have occurred on the tertiary facades at unknown dates.

Pre-Existing Historic Rating / Survey

The subject property is considered a "Category B" property (Properties Requiring Further Consultation and Review) for the purposes of the Planning Department's California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review procedures due to its age (constructed in 1926, extensively renovated in 1959). It is not listed on any local, state, or national registries. In the draft Excelsior Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District Historic Resource Survey (Historic Resource Survey), the Planning Department identified the subject building as one of thirty-two buildings in the Neighborhood Commercial District that "are of unusually expressive design, appear to retain a high level of physical integrity, and/or are of a rare property type," and therefore require follow-up evaluation to determine their individual significance and integrity. Referring specifically to the subject building, the survey states that "this building is an outstanding example of its type and period [Midcentury Modern] and it appears to have significant associations with the Italian-American community and [is] a significant Italian-American owned enterprise ... It should be considered for landmark designation under Article 10 of the Planning Code." In a separate section addressing follow-up work necessary to identify historic districts within the Neighborhood Commercial District, the survey states that "[a] larger cluster for prioritization could include all of the individually-identified Midcentury Modern buildings from c. 1935 to c. 1965." Such a cluster would include the subject building. Aside from the Historic Resource Survey, the subject property is not included on any other historic resource surveys.

Neighborhood Context and Description

In the vicinity of the subject building, Mission Street serves as the border between two different officially recognized neighborhoods: to the west, encompassing the subject building, is the Outer Mission neighborhood; to the east is the Excelsior neighborhood. Approximately three blocks to the south, Mission Street also divides the Outer Mission and Crocker Amazon neighborhoods. In addition to—and in some ways eclipsing—its role as a border, however, Mission Street between Interstate 280 to the north and the San Francisco-San Mateo county line to the south forms a continuous commercial corridor that runs through a residential area composed mostly of single-

3

family homes.² For zoning purposes, the Planning Department has identified this corridor as the Excelsior Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District (NCD). Notable commercial streets that intersect with Mission Street in this area and extend the boundaries of the NCD include Ocean and Geneva Avenues.

Mission Street is one of San Francisco's oldest roadways. Within the confines of the NCD, Mission Street follows the path of El Camino Real, the historic route that connected the missions and presidios of the Spanish colony of Alta California in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. During this period, the subsequent Mexican period (1821-1846), and the early American period, the area surrounding the subject property was mainly agricultural, initially supporting large ranches and later smaller produce farms. The first major spur to neighborhood development was the construction in the 1860s of the San Francisco and San Jose Railroad, which ran to the west of the subject site, following a course similar to that of Interstate 280 today. Anticipating future growth, real estate speculators and homestead associations bought large tracts of land next to this rail line and subdivided them into lots. One such developer was H.S. Brown, who in 1863 bought a large tract on the west side of Mission Street that included the site of the subject property. A tract on the opposite side of Mission Street was purchased and platted by the Excelsior Homestead Association in 1869. In 1894 the Market Street Railway extended its electric streetcar line to the intersection of Mission Street and China (now Excelsior) Avenue. Another rail line-the Ocean Shore Electric Railway, running along the path of the future Alemany Boulevard-was completed by 1908. The 1906 earthquake and the resultant demand for housing provided another spur to the area's growth. The establishment of Balboa Park (1908) and McLaren Park (1927) further enhanced the area's desirability as a residential neighborhood.

In spite of these various stimuli, as late as 1920 the west side of Mission Street remained sparsely developed with vegetable farms, open fields, and a few scattered rows of houses. Mission Street itself contained long stretches of undeveloped land between houses and commercial establishments. To the east of Mission Street, on the other hand, more intensive residential development had started to fill the blocks out with long rows of houses designed in vernacular and Spanish Colonial Revival Styles. The area's remaining open spaces dwindled and contracted as residential and commercial development continued through the mid twentieth century. Toward the end of this period, changing architectural tastes resulted in the construction of a cluster of Midcentury Modern commercial buildings on and around Mission Street.

The Outer Mission and Excelsior neighborhoods have historically hosted a large Italian American population. In fact, the Italian presence pre-dates the area's development into residential neighborhoods and extends back to the late nineteenth century, when the surrounding lands were divided into vegetable farms cultivated by Italian immigrants. Into the 1960s, the Italian-American population maintained and reinforced its identity in the area through the creation of numerous businesses and institutions with a distinctly Italian-American identity. When this population started to relocate to the suburbs in the 1970s, residents of Latino and Filipino

² Mission Street continues as a commercial corridor after it crosses into San Mateo County. The scope of this review is limited to properties and neighborhoods located within the City and County of San Francisco.

heritage moved in. Reflecting this demographic shift, new businesses opened and existing institutions accommodated their practices to serve the needs of this new population.

Known historic resources close to the subject property include the following:

- 35-45 Onondaga Avenue (aka Alemany Emergency Hospital and Health Center), San Francisco City Landmark No. 272, designated 2016. These two buildings were determined to be significant under National Register of Historic Places Criteria A (events) and C (architecture). Built in 1933, these are the last buildings constructed as part of San Francisco's emergency hospital system. Designed by master architect Charles H. Sawyer, they embody the distinctive characteristics of Spanish Baroque and Spanish Colonial Revival style architecture. Additionally, their interiors contain two significant frescoes painted in 1934 by the noted artist Bernard Zakheim.
- 1000 Cayuga Avenue (aka Balboa High School), San Francisco City Landmark No. 205, designated 1995. Balboa High School was built in phases between 1927 and 1931. It was designed in a Spanish Colonial Revival style by an assortment of architects that included John Reid, Jr., Samuel Lightner Hyman, A. Appelton Associates, Bakewell and Weihe Architects Associates. The designation case report states that the school "represents San Francisco's 'golden age' of school construction … and is the most prominent and visible school building extant in the southern quadrant of the city."

CEQA Historical Resource(s) Evaluation

Step A: Significance

Under CEQA section 21084.1, a property qualifies as a historic resource if it is "listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources." The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources or not included in a local register of historical resources, shall not preclude a lead agency from determining whether the resource may qualify as a historical resource under CEQA.

Individual	Historic District/Context	
Property is individually eligible for inclusion in a California Register under one or more of the following Criteria:	Property is eligible for inclusion in a California Register Historic District/Context under one or more of the following Criteria:	
Criterion 1 - Event:□ Yes ⋈ NoCriterion 2 - Persons:□ Yes ⋈ NoCriterion 3 - Architecture:⋈ Yes ⋈ NoCriterion 4 - Info. Potential:□ Yes ⋈ NoPeriod of Significance:1959	Criterion 1 - Event: Yes No Criterion 2 - Persons: Yes No Criterion 3 - Architecture: Yes No Criterion 4 - Info. Potential: Yes No Period of Significance: Yes Non-Contributor	

To assist in the evaluation of the properties associated with the proposed project, the Project Sponsor has submitted a consultant report:

□ Architectural Resources Group, 4840 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA, Historic Resource Evaluation – Part 1 (January 2017) (ARG Part 1 report)

Below is a brief evaluation of the subject building's historical significance per the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) eligibility criteria. This summary is based upon the Architectural Resources Group (ARG) Part 1 report, which finds that the subject building is eligible for individual listing in the CRHR under Criterion 3. Staff concurs with the findings of this report and refers the reader to it for a more thorough evaluation of individual significance. Planning staff also finds that that the subject building is not located in an eligible historic district.

Criterion 1: Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.

To be eligible under the event Criterion, the building cannot merely be associated with historic events or trends but must have a specific association to be considered significant. Staff concurs with ARG that the subject building is not eligible for inclusion on the California Register individually or as a contributor to a potential historic district under Criterion 1.

4840 Mission Street was constructed in 1926 and assumed its current appearance largely as the result of a major expansion and renovation in 1959. Although the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral parlor is associated with San Francisco's historic Italian-American community, it is neither the oldest nor the longest continuously operating Italian-American business in San Francisco.³ By the time the funeral parlor was constructed in its current location in 1926, the Outer Mission/Excelsior area was long established as a prominent Italian-American neighborhood supporting numerous Italian-American enterprises and institutions, such as Corpus Christi Church (original building constructed in 1898). Furthermore, the building's current appearance essentially dates to 1959, which further distances it from the Italian American community's historic roots. Therefore the subject building does not possess the specific associations with the development of the Italian American community—both throughout San Francisco and more specifically within the Excelsior/Outer Mission neighborhood—necessary to support a finding of individual significance under Criterion 1.

As noted, the Excelsior/Outer Mission neighborhood does have historical associations with the Italian-American community. However, the neighborhood has undergone dramatic demographic changes that have reduced the size of the Italian-American community relative to other groups. Although several institutions with clear ties to the Italian-American community do remain in the neighborhood (e.g., the Sons of Italy Hall & Cultural Center, 5051 Mission St.; the Italian-American Social Club, 21-25 Russia St.), they are too geographically dispersed to cohere into a historic district eligible under Criterion 1.

³ Older continuously operating Italian-American businesses in San Francisco include Ghirardelli Chocolate Company (established 1852) and Fior d'Italia restaurant (established 1886).

Therefore the subject building does not appear eligible for listing in the CRHR either individually or as a contributor to a potential historic district under Criterion 1.

Criterion 2: Property is associated with the lives of persons important in our local, regional or national past.

Planning staff concurs with ARG's report that the subject building does not appear eligible for listing in the CRHR under Criterion 2. Although founding partner Frank Marini was a prominent philanthropist and community leader, he died seven years before the subject building assumed its current appearance in 1959.⁴ Records show that none of the other owners and operators of the funeral parlor was important in our local, regional, or national past. Therefore, 4840 Mission Street is not eligible under Criterion 2.

Criterion 3: Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values. Planning Staff concurs with ARG's conclusion that the subject building at 4840 Mission Street is eligible for individual listing in the CRHR under Criterion 3 as an outstanding intact example of a large-scale Midcentury Modern commercial building in San Francisco. Planning staff also finds that the subject building is not located in a CRHR-eligible historic district.

As noted in the HRE, the San Francisco Modern Architecture and Landscape Design 1935-1970 Historic Context Statement provides the following guidance for evaluating the individual significance under Criterion 3 of Midcentury Modern commercial properties:

In order to meet local and state registration requirements under Criterion 3 (architecture) as an individual resource, a commercial property would need to retain many of its character-defining features. Storefronts, even more so than residential or other commercial buildings, are subject to continuous alterations in order to appear up-to-date and as such there are relatively few storefronts that retain the full expression of Midcentury Modern style.⁵

According to this evaluative framework, the subject building appears eligible for individual listing in the CRHR under Criterion 3 due to its full expression of Midcentury Modern design, which remains essentially unaltered since the time of its construction in 1959. Intact features of the subject building that embody the Midcentury Modern style include its "flat roof, porcelain enamel panels forming a geometric grid across the façade, roman brick veneer water table, aluminum sash windows and doors, clean lines, and minimal exterior detailing largely limited to the sweeping belt course across the east façade and the projecting boxes enframing windows at the second story."⁶

⁴ Frank Marini is the namesake of Marini Plaza, a small park adjacent to Washington Square Park in the North Beach neighborhood. A bust of Marini was installed in the Plaza in 1954.

^{5 193-194.}

⁶ ARG Part 1 Report, 27.

Historic Resource Evaluation Response March 8, 2018

The finding of individual eligibility under Criterion 3 derives from the subject building's full embodiment of the Midcentury Modern style, and not from its status as the work of Otto G. Hintermann, who is not a recognized master architect. This finding also does not relate to the subject building's original design by architect John A. Porporato in the Spanish Colonial Revival style. Porporato is not a recognized master architect and the majority of the subject building's exterior features dating to this original phase of construction have been removed.

The Planning Department conducted additional analysis to determine if the subject building contributes to a potential historic district. The specific direction of the initial district analysis was suggested by one of the recommendations in the Neighborhood Commercial District (NCD) Historic Resource Survey, which states that "[a] larger cluster for [prioritized district analysis] could include all of the individually-identified Midcentury Modern buildings from c. 1935 to c. 1965."⁷

In examining this cluster, Planning staff finds that the Midcentury Modern buildings identified in the survey are too geographically dispersed to form a coherent historic district. This remains true even if one incorporates some of the less distinguished Midcentury Modern buildings on and around Mission Street that were not identified in the survey. Between the Midcentury Modern buildings, Mission Street in this area contains long stretches of commercial frontage that have been constructed in a wide range of architectural styles over a protracted period of time and display varying degrees of integrity.

In addition to the district analysis recommended by the Historic Resource Survey, Planning staff conducted additional analysis to determine if the area contains a district comprising a wider range of architectural styles. After examining a number of different permutations—a district comprising all representatives of the area's modern styles (Art Deco, Streamline Moderne, Midcentury Modern, New Formalist), a district comprising all of the architecturally distinct buildings identified in the NCD Historic Resource Survey (the modern buildings plus those designed in such styles as Beaux Arts, Renaissance Revival, Storybook, Mission Revival, etc.)—staff finds that no historic district eligible under Criterion 3 exists in the area. Under the evaluative framework that focuses on modern architecture, the architecturally notable buildings remain too widely dispersed to support the identification of a historic district. This issue persists under the more inclusive framework that takes in buildings of all historically significant architectural styles, with the added consideration that any such district would be too broadly defined to clearly represent any coherent architectural theme.

In conclusion, the subject building is eligible for individual listing in the CRHR under Criterion 3, but is not located in an eligible historic district.

Criterion 4: Property yields, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.⁸

7 31.

8

⁸ Assessment of archeological sensitivity is undertaken through the Department's Preliminary Archeological Review process.

Based upon a review of information in the Departments records, the subject property is not significant under Criterion 4 since this significance criterion typically applies to rare construction types when involving the built environment. The subject property is not an example of a rare construction type.

Step B: Integrity

To be a resource for the purposes of CEQA, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the California Register of Historical Resources criteria, but it also must have integrity. Integrity is defined as "the authenticity of a property's historic identity, evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the property's period of significance." Historic integrity enables a property to illustrate significant aspects of its past. All seven qualities do not need to be present as long the overall sense of past time and place is evident.

The subject property has retained or lacks integrity from the period of significance noted in Step A:



4840 Mission Street retains a high degree of integrity, having undergone no major alterations since the 1959 renovation and expansion that resulted in the building's current appearance. Overall, 4840 Mission Street conveys its significance as a historic resource that is individually eligible for listing in the CRHR under Criterion 3 due to its full expression of the Midcentury Modern architectural style.

Step C: Character Defining Features

If the subject property has been determined to have significance and retains integrity, please list the character-defining features of the building(s) and/or property. A property must retain the essential physical features that enable it to convey its historic identity in order to avoid significant adverse impacts to the resource. These essential features are those that define both why a property is significant and when it was significant, and without which a property can no longer be identified as being associated with its significance.

The character-defining features of the subject property include the following:

- Box form and overall massing
- Two-story height
- Horizontal orientation
- Orientation toward Mission Street and lack of setback from the sidewalk
- Flat roof with varying heights and parapet walls
- Combination brick and reinforced concrete construction
- Large square porcelain enamel panels and brick veneer cladding
- Fenestration dating to the 1959 remodel, including aluminum sash and glass block windows
- Projecting boxes enframing windows
- Aluminum frame glazed doors

Historic Resource Evaluation Response March 8, 2018

- Signage, including attached, projecting, and freestanding neon signs and painted signs
- Wood-clad belt course and awning on the east façade
- Porte-cochere on the south facade
- Enclosed walkway along the south façade
- Low tapered wall separating the driveway from the parking lot
- Landscaped beds along the east façade and the tapered wall

CEQA Historic Resource Determination

Historical Resource Present

- Individually-eligible Resource
- Contributor to an eligible Historic District
- Non-contributor to an eligible Historic District

No Historical Resource Present

PART I: PRINCIPAL PRESERVATION PLANNER REVIEW

Signature:

_Date: 3/8/18

M. Pilar LaValley, Acting Principal Preservation Planner

⊠ Demolition

PART II: PROJECT EVALUATION

Proposed Project

Alteration

Per Drawings Dated: _____02/07/2018_____

Project Description

The proposal is to demolish the existing historic resource, the adjacent non-historic supermarket building, and the buildings' affiliated parking lots and construct, in two phases, two new mixed-use buildings totaling approximately 715,800 gsf in size. The two new buildings would range from 69 to 85 feet in height (79 to 89 feet including rooftop appurtenances) and would include 428 dwelling units (comprising 175 below-market-rate units and 253 market-rate units), a replacement grocery story, a health center, other ground-floor retail and neighborhood services, and below-grade parking.

Project Evaluation

If the property has been determined to be a historical resource in Part I, please check whether the proposed project would materially impair the resource and identify any modifications to the proposed project that may reduce or avoid impacts.

Subject Property/Historic Resource:

- The project <u>will not</u> cause a significant adverse impact to the historic resource as proposed.
- The project <u>will</u> cause a significant adverse impact to the historic resource as proposed.

California Register-eligible Historic District or Context:

- The project <u>will not</u> cause a significant adverse impact to a California Register-eligible historic district or context as proposed.
- The project <u>will</u> cause a significant adverse impact to a California Register-eligible historic district or context as proposed.

Project Impacts

Demolition

The proposed project will have a significant impact on the individually eligible historic resource at 4840 Mission Street, which will be demolished. Demolition would remove all characterdefining features of the individually eligible building and would materially impair its ability convey its historic significance.

New Construction

Staff finds that the construction of the proposed Project would not affect offsite historic resources, including the City Landmarks at 35-45 Onondaga Avenue and 1000 Cayuga Avenue, and the buildings individually identified in the NCD Historic Resource Survey. Although the design and scale of the project will not be compatible in massing or details with nearby historic resources, the physical separation between new construction and such resources reduces the potential for direct or indirect impacts. The proposed project may alter the setting of some of these nearby individual buildings. However, the overall integrity of these resources will not be affected by the project.

PART II: PRINCIPAL PRESERVATION PLANNER REVIEW

Signature:

Date:

M. Pilar LaValley, Acting Principal Preservation Planner

cc: Virnaliza Byrd, Environmental Division/ Historic Resource Impact Review File Elizabeth White, Environmental Planner

Historic Resource Evaluation Response March 8, 2018

CASE NO. 2016-012545ENV 4840 Mission Street



Figure 1. 4840 Mission Street. Screenshot of 2017 Google Streetview.