A. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

At this time, members of the public may address the Commission on items of interest to the public that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission except agenda items. With respect to agenda items, your opportunity to address the Commission will be afforded when the item is reached in the meeting. Each member of the public may address the Commission for up to three minutes.

None
B. DEPARTMENT MATTERS

1. Director’s Announcements

None

2. Review of Past Events at the Planning Commission, Staff Report and Announcements

Tim Frye, Preservation Officer:
A few items to share with you, at last week’s Planning Commission hearing, the Planning Commission unanimously supported the Certification of the Central SoMa Draft EIR as well as the Amendments to Adopt the Central SoMa Area Plan. And just as a matter of housekeeping I wanted to remind you that at their June 7th hearing they will be providing Review and Comment on the pending district nominations that this Commission made as part of the Central SoMa Plan Preservation policies. We will keep you updated on that hearing and forward you a copy of their comments after that hearing. Also wanted to let you know that the Arts Commission has told us that they will be holding a hearing in early July to officially accept the Diamond Heights Safety sculpture into the collection and once that action is completed the Arts Commission will work with department of Public Works to create an MOU between the agencies outlining the responsibilities. So as soon as we have that completed in early July is likely when the safety wall landmark nomination will go to the Full Board for consideration.

Then finally, I wanted to make you aware of the cultural district legislation that has been introduced by Supervisor Ronen. It was originally introduced in October of last year, and as you know, has gone through several amendments. On Wednesday, the Rules Committee heard the proposed ordinance and at that hearing Supervisor Ronen introduced a large set of amendments to the ordinance. In particular, revising the ordinance to allow the sponsor of an ordinance proposing a cultural district to select three or more city departments to provide input to the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development and MOHCD is intended to be the city department that coordinates all the various city agencies and commissions for input and participation on the formation and the monitoring of those cultural districts. There were two other significant changes stemming from the amendments. One is to require that cultural district boundaries be contiguous and not overlap with other cultural districts and then second, a repeated emphasis that cultural districts are intended to assist communities at risk of displacement, gentrification including ethnic or minority communities. And there was a good deal of public testimony, about over an hour of public testimony, where speakers praised the ordinance as a means to keep vulnerable communities in the city. And similar commendation was given by members of the Rules Committee during its deliberation. However, there were questions from the Rules Committee centered on the mechanics of the ordinance including staffing level for the city family as well as timing on reporting and financing of the districts. And many sought clarification about the intent from the director of community development at MOHCD in addition to Supervisor Ronen. Supervisor Safai did ask the presiding city attorney whether the ordinance and its amendments needed a continuance or whether they could be passed out of committee at the hearing. The city attorney at that time responded that the scope of the amendments could be passed out of the committee at the hearing. The future Cultural Districts rising from the ordinance would need review by city Commissions including the Historic Preservation Commission in accordance with the city
charter. So at this point it doesn’t appear that the Board is prepared to forward the ordinance, the draft ordinance, to this body for Review and Comment, but we’re happy to keep you updated on the ordinance as it moves through the process. So that concludes my comments, and happy to answer any questions.

President Wolfram:
Yes, I am wondering since future cultural districts would be coming to the HPC, since this legislation does affect us, whether we could write a letter requesting that the Board forward the Ordinance to us for Review and Comment and perhaps postpone any vote on that? Is that something that would be an appropriate thing that we could do?

Tim Frye, Preservation Officer:
Yes, we would be happy to provide you a letter for your signature.

President Wolfram:
Commissioners at this time, do you concur with that?

Commissioner Matsuda:
I thought we were supposed to have an informational meeting on this.

Tim Frye, Preservation Officer:
That was our original intent. But we became aware of the revised - - the amended ordinance just last week, and then it started to move very quickly at the Board, so there wasn’t an opportunity for us to prepare anything for this hearing.

President Wolfram:
Yes, so, I think maybe, we should move forward with asking and writing a letter to request that we Review and Comment and since this does effect our work. Hopefully they will take that request seriously.

Commissioner Matsuda:
Yes.

Tim Frye, Preservation Officer:
Sure, happy to do that.

President Wolfram:
Alright, thank you.

Commissioner Matsuda:
Thank you.

C. COMMISSION MATTERS

2. President’s Report and Announcements

President Wolfram:
I have no report or announcement today. Oh, actually, I do have one, that is the California Preservation Foundation is having their annual conference at the end of this week in Palo Alto. So I encourage members of this Commission and members of the public to attend.
And San Francisco Heritage is having their annual soiree on Saturday night at Pier 70, so that is awesome. Encourage people to attend. Yes, the same weekend, the Preservation weekend. Oh yes, thank you. I do have another announcement, which is for the hearing of June 6th, I believe, is the next hearing date. We are going to replace two members on an interim basis on the Architectural Review Committee. Commissioners Hyland and Johnck will be replaced by Commissioners Johns and Black at that particular hearing due to quorum issues. So do you accept that interim appointment?

**Commissioner Black:**
Yes I do.

**Commissioner Johns:**
Yes.

**President Wolfram:**
Thank you.

**Commissioner Johnck:**
Thank you.

4. Consideration of Adoption:
   - [Draft ARC Minutes for February 21, 2018](#)
   - [Draft ARC Minutes for March 21, 2018](#)
   - [Draft HPC Minutes for May 2, 2018](#)

   **SPEAKERS:** None

   **ACTION:** Adopted

   **AYES:** Wolfram, Hyland, Johnck, Matsuda, Johns, Black

   **ABSENT:** Pearlman

5. Commission Comments & Questions

   None

D. **CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS PROPOSED FOR CONTINUANCE**

The Commission will consider a request for continuance to a later date. The Commission may choose to continue the item to the date proposed below, to continue the item to another date, or to hear the item on this calendar.

E. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

All matters listed hereunder constitute a Consent Calendar, are considered to be routine by the Historic Preservation Commission, and may be acted upon by a single roll call vote of the Commission. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a member of the Commission, the public, or staff so requests, in which event the matter shall be removed from the Consent Calendar and considered as a separate item at this or a future hearing.

F. **REGULAR CALENDAR**
6. **2018-004633PCA**

   **MAYOR’S PROCESS IMPROVEMENTS ORDINANCE – Adoption Hearing** to recommend action on an Ordinance introduced by Mayor Farrell (Board File No. 180423) that would amend the Planning Code to streamline review of 100% affordable housing projects, eliminate duplicative review processes for most large residential projects in downtown C-3 districts, consolidate and modernize notification requirements and procedures, and provide for expedited review of minor alterations to historical landmarks and in conservation districts.

   **Preliminary Recommendation:** Approve

   **SPEAKERS:**
   - Jacob Bintliff – Staff report
   - Tim Frye – Article 10 & 11 in notification procedures
   - Richard Frisbie – Historic District Guidelines
   - Georgia Schuttish – Post card notification versus printed plans

   **ACTION:** Adopted a Recommendation for Approval as amended to include reconsideration of posting requirements

   **AYES:** Wolfram, Hyland, Johnck, Matsuda, Johns, Black
   **ABSENT:** Pearlman
   **RESOLUTION:** 959

7. **2018-004346FED**

   **3333 CALIFORNIA STREET – 3333 CALIFORNIA STREET – south side of California Street between Presidio Avenue and Laurel Street, in Assessor’s Parcel 1032, Lot 003 (District 2) - Request for Review and Comment on the nomination of the property to the National Register of Historic Places for its association with the San Francisco insurance industry, as one of the principal embodiments of the postwar decentralization and suburbanization of San Francisco, as the work of three masters – the architect Edward B. Page, the engineering firm of John J. Gould & J.J. Degenkolb/Henry J. Degenkolb & Associates, and the landscape architectural firm of Eckbo, Royston, & Williams/Eckbo, Austin, Dean and Williams – and as an example of a corporate headquarters in San Francisco that reflects mid-twentieth-century modernist design principles. The subject property is located within a RM-1 Residential- Mixed, Low Density Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District.

   **Preliminary Recommendation:** Adopt a Resolution in support of the nomination, subject to revisions, to the National Register of Historic Places.

   (Continued from Regular hearing on May 2, 2018)

   **SPEAKERS:**
   - John Rahaim - Introduction
   - Desiree Smith – Staff presentation
   - Denise Bradley – Sponsor presentation
   - Kathy Devincenzi – Sponsor presentation
   - Speaker – Nomination effects on future development proposal
   - Greg Miller – Modification to the proposed nomination
   - Speaker – CEQA
   - Milo Trauss – Not the best use for the land
   - Richard Frisbie – Words taken out of context
   - Chelsea – Does not meet historical significance
   - Laura Clark – Bad precedent

   **ACTION:** Adopted a Recommendation in support of the nomination with modifications
AYES: Wolfram, Hyland, Johnck, Matsuda, Johns, Black
ABSENT: Pearlman
RESOLUTION: 960

8. 2017-012290DES
6301 THIRD STREET - Consideration to Recommend Landmark Designation of the Arthur H. Coleman Medical Center, Assessor's Parcel No. 4968, Lot 032, as an Article 10 Landmark pursuant to Section 1004.1 of the Planning Code. The subject property is significant for its association with Dr. Arthur H. Coleman, nationally prominent African American lawyer-physician and influential healthcare and civil rights advocate. Opening in 1960, the Arthur H. Coleman Medical Center reflected the style of the period and served as a modern symbol of community health, progress, and success. He recruited a team of African American physicians to join him in his vision of providing comprehensive health services to the area's low-income African American residents. Dr. Coleman was a local pioneer in the nationally significant community health center movement of the 1960s, a tireless advocate for racial equity within the healthcare system and the medical profession, and an advocate for the Bayview's African American community. The property at 6301 Third Street is located within the NC-3 – Neighborhood Commercial, Moderate Scale Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District.
Preliminary Recommendation: Approve

SPEAKERS: = Desiree Smith – Staff report
+ Rev. Aurelius Walker

ACTION: Approved
AYES: Wolfram, Hyland, Johnck, Matsuda, Johns, Black
ABSENT: Pearlman
RESOLUTION: 961

9. 2018-003700COA
WASHINGTON SQUARE - LM #226 – bounded by Columbus Avenue, Filbert, Stockton, Union and Powell Streets in the North Beach neighborhood of San Francisco (Assessor's Block 0102; Lot 001) (District 3). Request for Certificate of Appropriateness for the removal, replacement and addition of trees, ADA upgrades to pathways, including the replacement of all existing asphalt pathways with stained concrete, installation of perimeter cobble pavers at the lawn and planting bed edges, installation of a concrete curb along the planter beds, installation of perimeter low post and chain fencing on the outer planter bed edges, and the removal and replacement of the existing wood benches in-kind with new benches as needed. Washington Square is located within a P (Public) Zoning District and OS (Open Space) Height and Bulk limit. Washington Square was locally designated as San Francisco Landmark No. 226 under Article 10 of the Planning Code in 1999.
Preliminary Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

SPEAKERS: - Joan Wood – Request for continuance
- Mark Bruno – Opportunity to provide input
= Levi Conover – Neutral to matter of continuance
- Mills Martin – Support for continuance
= Elizabeth Gordon-Jonckheer – Staff report
+ Levi Conover – Project presentation
+ Dale Wagner – Needed renovation
- Mark Bruno - Outreach
ACTION: Approved with Conditions
AYES: Wolfram, Hyland, Johnck, Matsuda, Johns, Black
ABSENT: Pearlman
MOTION: 0340

10. 2016-004157OTH
(S. FERGUSON: (415) 575-9074)
MILLS ACT PROGRAM – Review and Comment on proposed Mills Act Program modifications based on a November 1, 2017 discussion of the Government Audit and Oversight Committee and as directed by HPC President Wolfram. The Mills Act authorizes local governments to enter into contracts with owners of private historical property who, through the historical property contract, assure the rehabilitation, restoration, preservation and maintenance of a qualified historical property. In return, the property owner enjoys a reduction in property taxes for a given period.

Preliminary Recommendation: Review and Comment

SPEAKERS: = Shannon Ferguson – Staff report
ACTION: Reviewed and Commented

ADJOURNMENT 3:30 PM
ADOPTED JUNE 6, 2018