Certificate of Appropriateness

Executive Summary

HEARING DATE: JANUARY 15, 2020

Record No.: 2017-001073COA
Project Address: 1701 FRANKLIN STREET
Landmark: No. 54: The Edward Coleman House
Zoning: RH-2 RESIDENTIAL-HOUSE, TWO FAMILY Zoning District
40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 0641/014
Project Sponsor: William Meyer, AIA
900 Kearny Street, Suite 299
San Francisco, CA 94133
Staff Contact: Jonathan Vimr - 415-575-9109
Jonathan.Vimr@sfgov.org

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

1701 FRANKLIN STREET is located on the west side of Franklin Street at its intersection with California Street. (Assessor’s Block 0641; Lot 014). The subject building is Landmark No. 54, locally designated under Article 10 of the Planning Code.

Historically known as the Edward Coleman house, the single-family residence was completed in 1896 from a design by Salfield and Kohlberg. The wood-framed building is an exemplary example of the American Queen Anne style, with a rusticated brownstone base, varied bay windows, towers at each corner of the attic level, and a prominent porticoed entry.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project involves various exterior alterations to the existing building and property, most predominantly the construction of a single-story, two-car garage addition (with additional storage space) at the rear, northwestern corner of the existing building. A deck and associated guard rails are proposed to be installed atop the new garage and at the adjacent yard. Work also includes the enclosure of an existing porch at the rear of the building, a new basement level window well and windows, replacement of the existing driveway (including a new entry gate), and excavation associated with the overall project.

COMPLIANCE WITH PLANNING CODE

Planning Code Development Standards.
Prior to Planning Department approval of a building permit, the project requires neighborhood notification pursuant to Section 311 of the Planning Code.

In order to proceed, a building permit from the Department of Building Inspection is required.
Applicable Preservation Standards.
The proposal overall, is appropriate for and consistent with the purposes of Article 10, meets the standards of Article 1006.6 of the Planning Code, and complies with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, in that:

- the overall character of the existing building will be maintained, with virtually no removal or destruction of historic materials and features;
- the kitchen porch proposed for enclosure and modifications is non-historic and non-visible from surrounding public rights-of-way;
- the new garage addition is limited to one-story in height and is deeply setback from the Franklin Street frontage at the rear, northwestern corner of the building;
- the new garage addition is designed with appropriate materials and a glass hyphen to transition from the historic structure; and
- the new guardrails and the driveway gate are compatible with but differentiated from the historic building as they feature simple designs while being largely composed of powder-coated metal.

The Department has determined that the proposed work will be in conformance with the requirements of Article 10 and the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*. Proposed work will not damage or destroy distinguishing or original qualities or character of the subject building. Most new work will be minimally visible from the surrounding public rights-of-way, with a simple glass hyphen introduced to provide a transition from the landmark building to the new garage, which will include a paneled, wooden garage door. All guard rails and gates will have simple designs of vertical pickets composed of appropriate materials and finishes.

**PUBLIC/NEIGHBORHOOD INPUT**

The Department has received no letters in support of or opposition to the project. One telephone call was received from an adjacent neighbor who had questions pertaining to the rear yard, size/location of the deck, and the structural integrity of an existing retaining wall.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

1) Prior to issuance of the building permit, the project sponsor shall continue to work with Planning Department preservation staff to refine the project design, materials, and details as needed while the project proceeds through the permit addenda process with the Department of Building Inspection. Any revisions shall be in conformance with the Historic Preservation Commission’s findings, and any substantial deviations shall require a new hearing and consideration before the Commission.

**ISSUES & OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

- As it was subdivided in 2016, the subject parcel contains two lots: 014 and 015 within Block 0641. All proposed work is strictly limited to Lot 014. Any potential work proposed for Lot 015 in the future would continue to be subject to the requirements of Article 10 of the Planning Code.
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW STATUS

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

BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION

The Department recommends APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS of the proposed project as it meets the provisions of Article 10 of the Planning Code regarding Major Alteration to an individually-landmarked property and the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation.

ATTACHMENTS

Draft Motion – Certificate of Appropriateness
Exhibit A – Conditions of Approval
Exhibit B – Plans and Renderings
Exhibit C – Environmental Determination
Exhibit D – Maps and Context Photos
Exhibit E - Designating Ordinance: Landmark No. 54
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HEARING DATE: JANUARY 15, 2020

Record No.: 2017-001073COA
Project Address: 1701 FRANKLIN STREET
Landmark: No. 54: The Edward Coleman House
Zoning: RH-2 RESIDENTIAL-HOUSE, TWO FAMILY Zoning District
40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 0641/014
Project Sponsor: William Meyer, AIA
900 Kearny Street, Suite 299
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ADOPTING FINDINGS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR MAJOR ALTERATIONS DETERMINED TO BE APPROPRIATE FOR AND CONSISTENT WITH THE PURPOSES OF ARTICLE 10 OF THE SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING CODE, AND TO MEET THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR’S STANDARDS FOR REHABILITATION, FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED ON LOT 014 IN ASSESSOR’S BLOCK 0641 IN A RH-2 (RESIDENTIAL-HOUSE, TWO FAMILY) ZONING DISTRICT AND A 40-X HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICT.

PREAMBLE

On January 12, 2017, William Meyer (hereinafter “Project Sponsor”) filed Application No. 2017-001073COA (hereinafter “Application”) with the San Francisco Planning Department (hereinafter “Department”) for a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations on a property located at Lot 014 in Assessor’s Block 0641, which is an individual landmark locally designated under Article 10 of the Planning Code.

The Project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) as a Class 1 categorical exemption. The Historic Preservation Commission (hereinafter “Commission”) has reviewed and concurs with said determination.

On January 15, 2020, the Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting on Certificate of Appropriateness Application No. 2017-001073COA.

The Planning Department Commission Secretary is the custodian of records; the File for Record No. 2017-001073COA is located at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California.
Draft Motion No. XXXX
January 15, 2020

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

MOVED, that the Commission hereby APPROVES WITH CONDITIONS the Certificate of Appropriateness, as requested in Application No. 2017-001073COA in conformance with the architectural plans dated September 20, 2019 and labeled Exhibit B based on the following findings:

FINDINGS

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

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

2. **Project Description.** The proposed project involves various exterior alterations to the existing building and property, most predominantly the construction of a single-story, two-car garage addition (with additional storage space) at the rear, northwestern corner of the existing building. A deck and associated guardrails are proposed to be installed atop the new garage. Work also includes the enclosure of an existing porch at the rear of the building, a new basement level window well and windows, replacement of the existing driveway (including a new entry gate), and excavation associated with the overall project.

3. **Property Description.** 1701 FRANKLIN STREET is located on the west side of Franklin Street at its northern intersection with California Street (Assessor’s Block 0641; Lot 014). The subject building is Landmark No. 54, locally designated under Article 10 of the Planning Code. Historically known as the Edward Coleman house, the single-family residence was completed in 1896 from a design by Salfield and Kohlberg. The wood-framed building is an exemplary example of the American Queen Anne style, with a rusticated brownstone base, varied bay windows, towers at each corner of the attic level, and a prominent porticoed entry.

4. **Surrounding Properties and Neighborhood.** Only a block west of Van Ness Avenue and the transition eastwards to downtown, the subject property is otherwise surrounded by single-family homes and apartment buildings. As noted in the landmark’s Designating Ordinance, the subject property helps signal the beginning of the Pacific Heights neighborhood and its association with prominent, architect-designed homes.

5. **Public Outreach and Comments.** The Department has no letters in support or opposition to the project at the date of publication. One telephone call was received from an adjacent neighbor who had questions pertaining to the rear yard, size/location of the deck, and the structural integrity of their existing retaining wall.

6. **Planning Code Compliance.** The Commission has determined that the proposed work is compatible with the exterior character-defining features of the subject property and meets the requirements of Article 10 of the Planning Code in the following manner:
A. **Article 10 of the Planning Code.** Pursuant to Section 1006.6 of the Planning Code, the proposed alteration shall be consistent with and appropriate for the effectuation of the purposes of this Article 10.

*The proposed project is consistent with Article 10 of the Planning Code.*

B. **Secretary of the Interior’s Standards.** Pursuant to Section 1006.6(b) of the Planning Code, the proposed work shall comply with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties for significant and contributory buildings, as well as any applicable guidelines, local interpretations, bulletins, or other policies. Rehabilitation is the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features that convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values. The Rehabilitation Standards provide, in relevant part(s):

1. **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.

   *There will be no alteration to the residential use of the property.*

2. **Standard 2:** The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

   *The property’s historic character will be preserved. A very limited amount of historic material would be removed to allow for new windows at the basement level on the south façade and to accommodate a new door at the north elevation. The basement windows will not be visible, and the historic window removed on the north elevation will be retained and stored to allow for potential reinstallation in the future (an additional window at the existing, non-historic porch addition will similarly be stored). These changes are minor in nature and the entire remainder of the existing, historic exterior will remain as is. The kitchen porch at the rear, northwestern corner of the building is a non-historic addition with limited visibility, thus its alteration would not change the historic character of the property.*

3. **Standard 3:** Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, shall not be undertaken.

   *No conjectural features or elements from other properties are proposed. The new garage features a glass hyphen to provide a transition from the historic building and is otherwise simple and compatible in design. The new entry gate, guardrails, and retaining walls are similarly restrained and do not include detailing or ornamentation that may create a false sense of history.*
(4) **Standard 4**: Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

Not applicable.

(5) **Standard 5**: Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of fine craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.

Distinctive features and finishes will be preserved. As discussed previously, only a limited amount of historic features/material are proposed for alteration and the overall character of the exterior will be retained.

(6) **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.

Not applicable.

(7) **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.

Not applicable.

(8) **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.

Not Applicable.

(9) **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.

The garage addition and other exterior alterations will be compatible with but overall differentiated from the historic structure. New windows and doors will be composed of wood, with the new south-facing basement level windows appropriately being double-hung. All guard rails and the new driveway entry gate feature simple, vertical picket designs and are largely composed of powder-coated metal to provide distinction from traditional wooden railing. The garage addition is limited to one-story in height and it is deeply setback from the Franklin Street frontage at the rear, northwestern corner of the building. Both the siting and limited height subordinate the addition while also restricting its visibility. A clear glass hyphen is proposed to provide a light, contemporary transition from the old to the new, while the garage and paneled garage door will be composed of
wood to relate to the cladding of the historic structure. Ventilation grilles will be of the minimal number and size required to meet other City code requirements. Set in below grade, the top of the new turntable will be flush with the driveway and therefore non-visible. Finally, while substantial excavation of the existing rear yard is proposed, the yard is not described as a character-defining feature in the landmark’s designating ordinance, it does not feature any ornamental landscaping, and the surface area of the yard will only be slightly reduced. Thus, the rear yard will continue to convey its presence and spatial relationship to the historic building.

(10) **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.

As the garage is proposed to be installed against another non-historic addition at the rear of the building, and the new south-facing window openings and windows are at the non-visible basement level, new work could be removed in the future without any impairment to the essential integrity of the property and its surroundings.

C. **Landmarks.** Article 10 of the Planning Code outlines specific findings for the Commission to consider when evaluating applications for alterations to Landmarks or within designated Historic Districts.

**Landmarks**

1. Pursuant to Section 1006.6(c) of the Planning Code, for applications pertaining to landmark sites, the proposed work shall preserve, enhance or restore, and shall not damage or destroy, the exterior architectural features of the landmark and, where specified in the designating ordinance pursuant to Section 1004(c), its major interior architectural features. The proposed work shall not adversely affect the special character or special historical, architectural or aesthetic interest or value of the landmark and its site, as viewed both in themselves and in their setting, nor of the historic district in applicable cases.

The project is in conformance with Article 10, and as outlined in Appendix A, the work shall not adversely affect the Landmark site. None of the character-defining features detailed in the designating ordinance would be altered or destroyed as a result of the project, new work is compatible with but differentiated from the old while also being fully reversible, and the rear yard will retain its presence and spatial relationship with the historic building.

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

**URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT**

THE URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT CONCERNS THE PHYSICAL CHARACTER AND ORDER OF THE CITY, AND THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PEOPLE AND THEIR ENVIRONMENT.
OBJECTIVE 1:
EMPHASIS OF THE CHARACTERISTIC PATTERN WHICH GIVES TO THE CITY AND ITS NEIGHBORHOODS AN IMAGE, A SENSE OF PURPOSE, AND A MEANS OF ORIENTATION.

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

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

Policy 2.4
Preserve notable landmarks and areas of historic, architectural or aesthetic value, and promote the preservation of other buildings and features that provide continuity with past development.

Policy 2.5
Use care in remodeling of older buildings, in order to enhance rather than weaken the original character of such buildings.

Policy 2.7
Recognize and protect outstanding and unique areas that contribute in an extraordinary degree to San Francisco’s visual form and character.

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

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

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

A) The existing neighborhood-serving retail uses will be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses will be enhanced:

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

B) The existing housing and neighborhood character will be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods:
The proposed project will strengthen neighborhood character by respecting the character-defining features of the building in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards.

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

The project will not affect the City’s affordable housing supply.

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

The proposed project will not result in commuter traffic impeding MUNI transit service or overburdening the streets or neighborhood parking. It will provide sufficient off-street parking for the proposed units.

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

The proposed project does not entail any commercial office development and will not displace any industrial or service sectors.

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

All construction will be executed in compliance with all applicable construction and safety measures.

G) That landmark and historic buildings will be preserved:

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

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

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

9. For these reasons, the proposal overall, appears to meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and the provisions of Article 10 of the Planning Code regarding Major Alterations.
DECISION

That based upon the Record, the submissions by the Applicant, the staff of the Department and other interested parties, the oral testimony presented to this Commission at the public hearings, and all other written materials submitted by all parties, the Commission hereby APPROVES WITH CONDITIONS a Certificate of Appropriateness for the subject property located at Lot 014 in Assessor’s Block 0641 for proposed work in conformance with the architectural submittal dated September 20, 2019 and labeled Exhibit B on file in the docket for Record No. 2017-001073COA.

APPEAL AND EFFECTIVE DATE OF MOTION: The Commission’s decision on a Certificate of Appropriateness shall be final unless appealed within thirty (30) days after the date of this Motion No. XXXX. Any appeal shall be made to the Board of Appeals, unless the proposed project requires Board of Supervisors approval or is appealed to the Board of Supervisors as a conditional use, in which case any appeal shall be made to the Board of Supervisors (see Charter Section 4.135). For further information, please contact the Board of Appeals in person at 1650 Mission Street, (Room 304) or call (415) 575-6880.

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

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

I hereby certify that the Historical Preservation Commission ADOPTED the foregoing Motion on January 15, 2020.

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES:
NAYS:
ABSENT:
ADOPTED: January 15, 2020
EXHIBIT A

AUTHORIZATION UPDATE
This authorization is for a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow alterations to a property located at 1701 Franklin Street, Block 0641, Lot 014 pursuant to Planning Code Section(s) 1006.6 within the RH-2 (Residential-House, Two Family) Zoning District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District; in general conformance with plans, dated September 20, 2019, and stamped “EXHIBIT B” included in the docket for Record No. 2017-001073COA and subject to conditions of approval reviewed and approved by the Historic Preservation Commission on January 15, 2020 under Motion No XXXX. This authorization and the conditions contained herein run with the property and not with a particular Project Sponsor, business, or operator.

PRINTING OF CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL ON PLANS
The conditions of approval under the ‘Exhibit A’ of this Historic Preservation Commission Motion No. XXXX shall be reproduced on the Index Sheet of construction plans submitted with the site or building permit application for the Project. The Index Sheet of the construction plans shall reference to the Certificate of Appropriateness and any subsequent amendments or modifications.

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

CHANGES AND MODIFICATIONS
Changes to the approved plans may be approved administratively by the Zoning Administrator. Significant changes and modifications of conditions shall require Historic Preservation Commission approval of a new Certificate of Appropriateness. In instances when Planning Commission also reviews additional authorizations for the project, Planning Commission may make modifications to the Certificate of Appropriateness based on majority vote and not required to return to Historic Preservation Commission.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
1. Prior to issuance of the building permit, the project sponsor shall continue to work with Planning Department preservation staff to refine the project design, materials, and details as needed while the project proceeds through the permit addenda process with the Department of Building Inspection. Any revisions shall be in conformance with the Historic Preservation Commission’s findings, and any meaningful deviations shall require a new hearing and consideration before the Commission.
Appendix B:

Plans and Renderings
EXHIBIT B
NEW TWO-CAR GARAGE
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

1701 FRANKLIN STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94123

Owner:

Architect:

1701 FRANKLIN STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94123

NEW TWO-CAR GARAGE
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Drawing Title:

SEPTEMBER 20, 2019

EXISTING EAST-WEST CROSS SECTION THROUGH DRIVEWAY AND GARAGE

PROPOSED EAST-WEST CROSS SECTION THROUGH DRIVEWAY AND GARAGE
NEW TWO-CAR GARAGE
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
1701 FRANKLIN STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94119

Owner:
PETER ACWORTH

Architect:
WILLIAM MEYER & CO
900 KEARNY ST, SUITE 299
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94133
(415) 433-8480, X202
FAX: (415) 398-4660
WMEYERARCH.COM

Drawing Title:
A11 NORTH-SOUTH CROSS-SECTION THROUGH GARAGE

EXCAVATION PLAN
NORTH-SOUTH CROSS-SECTION THROUGH GARAGE

SEE A12 FOR EXCAVATION DIMENSIONS

(E) HOUSE

(E) KITCHEN

(E) NEIGHBOR'S RETAINING WALL

(E) REAR YARD

EXCAVATION AREA

DEMO AREA

SEE 1A12 FOR EXCAVATION DIMENSIONS
Appendix C:

Environmental Determination
**CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination**

**PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Address</th>
<th>Block/Lot(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1701 FRANKLIN ST</td>
<td>0641003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Permit No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-001073PRJ</td>
<td>0641003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Addition/Alteration**
- **Demolition (requires HRE for Category B Building)**
- **New Construction**

**Project description for Planning Department approval.**

Certificate of Appropriateness: Garage and deck addition. Garage will hold two cars and is partially below grade and adjacent to rear of existing house. New kitchen patio doors will be added to the rear façade.

**STEP 1: EXEMPTION CLASS**

The project has been determined to be categorically exempt under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

- **Class 1 - Existing Facilities.** Interior and exterior alterations; additions under 10,000 sq. ft.
- **Class 3 - New Construction.** Up to three new single-family residences or six dwelling units in one building; commercial/office structures; utility extensions; change of use under 10,000 sq. ft. if principally permitted or with a CU.
- **Class 32 - In-Fill Development.** New Construction of seven or more units or additions greater than 10,000 sq. ft. and meets the conditions described below:
  (a) The project is consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations.
  (b) The proposed development occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than 5 acres substantially surrounded by urban uses.
  (c) The project site has no value as habitat for endangered rare or threatened species.
  (d) Approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.
  (e) The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.

**FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING USE ONLY**

- **Class ____**
### STEP 2: CEQA IMPACTS
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality:</strong></td>
<td>Would the project add new sensitive receptors (specifically, schools, day care facilities, hospitals, residential dwellings, and senior-care facilities within an Air Pollution Exposure Zone)? Does the project have the potential to emit substantial pollutant concentrations (e.g., backup diesel generators, heavy industry, diesel trucks, etc.)? (refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Air Pollution Exposure Zone)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Hazardous Materials:**  | If the project site is located on the Maher map or is suspected of containing hazardous materials (based on a previous use such as gas station, auto repair, dry cleaners, or heavy manufacturing, or a site with underground storage tanks): Would the project involve 50 cubic yards or more of soil disturbance - or a change of use from industrial to residential?  
  *if the applicant presents documentation of enrollment in the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) Maher program, a DPH waiver from the Maher program, or other documentation from Environmental Planning staff that hazardous material effects would be less than significant (refer to EP_ArcMap > Maher layer).* |
| **Transportation:**       | Does the project involve a child care facility or school with 30 or more students, or a location 1,500 sq. ft. or greater? Does the project have the potential to adversely affect transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle safety (hazards) or the adequacy of nearby transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities? |
| **Archeological Resources:** | Would the project result in soil disturbance/Modification greater than two (2) feet below grade in an archeological sensitive area or eight (8) feet in a non-archeological sensitive area? If yes, archeo review is required (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Archeological Sensitive Area) |
| **Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment:** | Does the project site involve a subdivision or lot line adjustment on a lot with a slope average of 20% or more? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography). If yes, Environmental Planning must issue the exemption. |
| **Slope = or > 25%:**     | Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 500 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required and Environmental Planning must issue the exemption. |
| **Seismic: Landslide Zone:** | Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 500 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required and Environmental Planning must issue the exemption. |
| **Seismic: Liquefaction Zone:** | Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 500 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones) If box is checked, a geotechnical report will likely be required and Environmental Planning must issue the exemption. |

**Comments and Planner Signature (optional):**  
Jonathan Vimr  
Planning department staff archaeologist cleared the project with no effects on 12/6/19.
**STEP 3: PROPERTY STATUS - HISTORIC RESOURCE**

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

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

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category A: Known Historical Resource. <strong>GO TO STEP 5.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category B: Potential Historical Resource (over 45 years of age). <strong>GO TO STEP 4.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category C: Not a Historical Resource or Not Age Eligible (under 45 years of age). <strong>GO TO STEP 6.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STEP 4: PROPOSED WORK CHECKLIST**

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

Check all that apply to the project.

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

Note: Project Planner must check box below before proceeding.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project is not listed. <strong>GO TO STEP 5.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project <strong>does not conform</strong> to the scopes of work. <strong>GO TO STEP 5.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project involves <strong>four or more</strong> work descriptions. <strong>GO TO STEP 5.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project involves <strong>less than four</strong> work descriptions. <strong>GO TO STEP 6.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STEP 5: CEQA IMPACTS - ADVANCED HISTORICAL REVIEW**

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

Check all that apply to the project.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Project involves a <strong>known historical resource (CEQA Category A)</strong> as determined by Step 3 and conforms entirely to proposed work checklist in Step 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Interior alterations to publicly accessible spaces.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Window replacement</strong> of original/historic windows that are not “in-kind” but are consistent with existing historic character.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Façade/storefront alterations</strong> that do not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Raising the building</strong> in a manner that does not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>Restoration</strong> based upon documented evidence of a building’s historic condition, such as historic photographs, plans, physical evidence, or similar buildings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. **Addition(s)**, including mechanical equipment that are minimally visible from a public right-of-way and meet the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.

8. **Other work consistent** with the *Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* (specify or add comments):

9. **Other work** that would not materially impair a historic district (specify or add comments):

   *(Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator)*

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

    - Reclassify to Category A
      - a. Per HRER or PTR dated
    - Reclassify to Category C
      - (attach HRER or PTR)
    - Other (specify):

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

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

**Comments (optional):**

Preservation Planner Signature: Jonathan Vimr

---

**STEP 6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION**

**TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

- No further environmental review is required. The project is categorically exempt under CEQA. There are no unusual circumstances that would result in a reasonable possibility of a significant effect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Approval Action:</th>
<th>Signature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit</td>
<td>Jonathan Vimr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12/10/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, an appeal of an exemption determination can only be filed within 30 days of the project receiving the approval action.

Please note that other approval actions may be required for the project. Please contact the assigned planner for these approvals.
STEP 7: MODIFICATION OF A CEQA EXEMPT PROJECT

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

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

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Address (If different than front page)</th>
<th>Block/Lot(s) (If different than front page)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1701 FRANKLIN ST</td>
<td>0641/003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Building Permit No.</td>
<td>New Building Permit No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Approval Action</td>
<td>New Approval Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Modified Project Description:

DETERMINATION IF PROJECT CONSTITUTES SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

Compared to the approved project, would the modified project:

- [ ] Result in expansion of the building envelope, as defined in the Planning Code;
- [ ] Result in the change of use that would require public notice under Planning Code Sections 311 or 312;
- [ ] Result in demolition as defined under Planning Code Section 317 or 19005(f)?
- [ ] Is any information being presented that was not known and could not have been known at the time of the original determination, that shows the originally approved project may no longer qualify for the exemption?

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

DETERMINATION OF NO SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

- [ ] The proposed modification would not result in any of the above changes.

If this box is checked, the proposed modifications are categorically exempt under CEQA, in accordance with prior project approval and no additional environmental review is required. This determination shall be posted on the Planning Department website and office and mailed to the applicant, City approving entities, and anyone requesting written notice. In accordance with Chapter 31, Sec 31.08j of the San Francisco Administrative Code, an appeal of this determination can be filed within 10 days of posting of this determination.

Planner Name: ________________________ Date: __________________________

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT
Appendix D:
Maps and Context Photos
The subject parcel was subdivided into two lots in 2016. The subject lot has a depth of 105'-3 ¾" rather than the full parcel depth of 137'-1/2" shown here.
The Sanborn Maps in San Francisco have not been updated since 1998, and this map may not accurately reflect existing conditions. The subject parcel was subdivided into two lots in 2016. The subject lot has a depth of 105'-3 ¾".
Site Photo*

*California Street elevation.

Certificate of Appropriateness
Case Number 2017-001073COA
1701 Franklin Street
Appendix E:

Designating Ordinance
FILE NO. 90-73-2

DESIGNATING THE EDWARD COLEMAN HOUSE AS A LANDMARK PURSUANT TO ARTICLE 10 OF THE
CITY PLANNING CODE,

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The Board of Supervisors hereby finds that the Edward Coleman House
at 1701 Franklin Street, being Lot 3 in Assessor's Block 641, has a special
character and special historical, architectural and aesthetic interest and value,
and that its designation as a Landmark will be in furtherance of and in conformance
with the purposes of Article 10 of the City Planning Code and the standards set
forth therein.

(a) Designation. Pursuant to Section 1004 of the City Planning Code,
Chapter II, Part 2 of the San Francisco Municipal Code, the Edward Coleman House
is hereby designated as a Landmark, this designation having been duly approved by
Resolution No. 6937 of the City Planning Commission, which Resolution is on file
with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors under File No. 90-73-2.

(b) Required Data. The location and boundaries of the landmark site, the
characteristics of the landmark which justify its designation, and the particular
features that should be preserved, described and included in the said Resolution,
are hereby incorporated herein and made a part hereof as though fully set forth.

Passed for Second Reading
Board of Supervisors, San Francisco
MAY 21 1973
Ayres Supervisors: Nicholas J. Feineman,
Frances E. Gonzalez, Kopp, Mendelsohn, Milano,
Falk & Tamaras von Bereldingen.

Read Second Time and Finally Passed
Board of Supervisors, San Francisco
MAY 23 1973
Ayres Supervisors: Barbara Gallo,
Feineman, Gonzalez, Kopp, Mendelsohn, Milano,
Falk & Tamaras von Bereldingen.

SENIOR SUPERVISOR
BARRAGELATA

90-73-2
JUN 6 1973
Approved
Mayor
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

RESOLUTION NO. 6957

WHEREAS, A proposal to designate the Edward Coleman House at 1701 Franklin Street as a Landmark pursuant to the provisions of Article 10 of the City Planning Code was initiated by the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board on October 18, 1972, and said Advisory Board, after due consideration, has recommended approval of this proposal; and

WHEREAS, The City Planning Commission, after due notice given, held a public hearing on January 18, 1973, to consider the proposed designation and the report of said Advisory Board; and

WHEREAS, The Commission believes that the proposed Landmark has a special character and special historical, architectural and aesthetic interest and value; and that the proposed designation would be in furtherance of and in conformance with the purposes and standards of the said Article 10;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, First, that the proposal to designate the Edward Coleman at 1701 Franklin Street as a Landmark pursuant to Article 10 of the City Planning Code is hereby APPROVED, the location and boundaries of the landmark site being as follows:

Beginning at the point of intersection of the westerly line of Franklin Street and the northerly line of California Street, thence northerly along the westerly line of Franklin Street for a distance of 137 feet six inches, thence at a right angle westerly for a distance of 77 feet six inches, thence at a right angle southerly for a distance of 137 feet six inches, thence at a right angle easterly along the northerly line of California Street for a distance of 77 feet six inches to the point of beginning; being Lot 3 in Assessor's Block 641, which property is known as and located at 1701 Franklin Street.

Second, That the special character and special historical, architectural and aesthetic interest and value of the said Landmark justifying its designation are set forth in the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board Resolution No. 72 as adopted on October 13, 1972, which Resolution is incorporated herein and made a part hereof as though fully set forth.

Third, That the said Landmark should be preserved generally in all of its particular exterior features as existing on the date hereof and as described and depicted in the photographs, case report and other material on file in the Department of City Planning in Docket LM72.7;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Commission hereby directs its Secretary to transmit the proposal for designation, with a copy of this Resolution, to the Board of Supervisors for appropriate action.
I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED by the City Planning Commission at its regular meeting of January 18, 1973.

Lynn E. Fio
Secretary

AYES: Commissioners Farrell, Miller, Porter, Ritchie, Rueda

NOES: None

ABSENT: Commissioners Fleishacker, Newman

PASSED: January 18, 1973
LANDMARKS PRESERVATION ADVISORY BOARD
CASE REPORT - September 14, 1972

OWNER: Floried Company

LOCATION: 1701 Franklin Street, northwest corner of Franklin and California Streets. The lot has a 77-foot 6-inch frontage on California Street and 137-foot 6-inch frontage on Franklin Street, being Lot 3 in Assessor's Block 641.

HISTORY: The house was designed by architects Staitfield and Kohlberg and built in 1895 for Edward Coleman, a successful miner, owner, and superintendent of the Idaho Mine at Grass Valley, California. Coleman was born in England in 1830 and, with his parents, moved to Canada. From Canada, he journeyed to New York, then to California, arriving in California in 1853. With his brother John, he discovered gold in Grass Valley and developed the Idaho Mine. When the Coleman brothers moved to San Francisco, the mine was sold to the Maryland group of miners and became known as the great Idaho-Maryland Mine.

Coleman married Louise Dunn, a native of Maine, in 1865. In 1895, being widowed and without children, he moved to San Francisco and bought the corner lot from Louis Glose, who resided at 1500 Van Ness Avenue. Coleman spent his years of retirement with his sister in this house. After his death in 1913, the house was used as a boarding house, lodging house, and a club for card players. The Branstens bought the house in 1920, thus preserving the original park-like openness formed by the gardens and the three neighboring Victorian mansions.

ARCHITECTURE: Castle-like in appearance, this three-story wooden frame Victorian is acclaimed in 

Here Today for its "triumphantly Queen Anne" motif. With two principal facades, the house expresses an air of solidarity and massiveness. The facade facing California Street is more balanced than the Franklin Street facade. The basic elements of the California Street facade: are the rusticated brownstone basement, bay windows on each of the principal floors, and towers at each corner of the attic story. These elements produce an impression of imposing grandeur. Two prominent features of the California Street facade are the hexagonal uphill tower on the west, and the round downhill tower on the east. Both towers are surrounded by a conical steep pitched roof.

The Franklin Street facade contains the front entrance, a corner tower, and a pedimented and dentillated gable. The front entrance, which occupies the center of this facade is a porch with balustrade railings and paired Ionic columns. The balustraded front stairway lies against the south side of the house. A balustrade railing above the porch roof forms a small balcony for the second story.

Large overhanging and pedimented gables cap both facades. In traditional Victorian style, the gables have ornate consoles, dentils, and horizontal wooden panels. Large wooden bands decorate the facades at floor levels. The second floor band is located immediately beneath the roof lines. It is dentillated and heavily moulded with a pattern of connecting garlands, torches, and wreaths. The lower story band contains carved wooden wreaths and garlands. The north facade, facing the gardens, also has projecting gables and bay windows; however, these elements are smaller and more subdued than those
ARCHITECTURE:
(CONTINUED)

on the street facades. The fenestration is regular with double hung rectangular windows. A pair of wooden colonnettes borders each window on the two principle floors. Slight consoles or brackets support the projecting upper story at either side of the California Street bay windows. On each facade, the pedimented and projecting gable ends contain small double-hung windows. On the California Street facade, these windows are flanked by pilasters and surmounted by a small frieze and a broken triangular pediment. The attic story of the gable encloses a Palladian window with pilasters separating each pane of glass.

ZONING AND SURROUNDING LAND USE:

The zoning of the lot and its surroundings are R-5. The surrounding land uses are residential, with low density prevailing to the south and high density apartment uses to the north. This house, and the neighboring Victorian mansions form an enclave of architecturally significant structures.