

# SAN FRANCISCO HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION



## Meeting Minutes

Commission Chambers, Room 400  
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

**Wednesday, August 15, 2018**  
**11:30 a.m.**  
**Architectural Review Committee**  
**Meeting**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Hyland, Johnck, Pearlman

**THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY COMMISSIONER PEARLMAN AT 11:35 PM**

**STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:** Stephanie Cisneros, Robin Abad, Seung Yen Hong, Jonas P. Ionin – Commission Secretary

**SPEAKER KEY:**

- + indicates a speaker in support of an item;
- indicates a speaker in opposition to an item; and
- = indicates a neutral speaker or a speaker who did not indicate support or opposition.

### **A. COMMITTEE MATTERS**

1. Committee Comments & Questions

None

**B. REGULAR**

2. [2016-010079COA](#) (S. CISNEROS: (415) 575-9186)  
3620 BUCHANAN STREET – located at the south end of block 0459, lot 003 at the southeast corner of North Point Street and Buchanan Street (District 2). **Review and Comment** by the Architectural Review Committee regarding the proposal to demolish a one-story garden house adjacent to the Merryvale Antiques/S.F. Gas Light Co. Building (City Landmark No. 58) and construct a new, four-story, eight-unit residential building. Subject property is located in a NC-2 (Neighborhood Commercial, Small Scale) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District.

*Preliminary Recommendation: Review and Comment*

**SPEAKERS:**

- = Stephanie Cisneros – Staff report
- + Maggie Smith – Project presentation
- + Ian Birchel – Design presentation
- Charles Olsen – Opposed, entire site landmarked
- Gee Gee Platt – Landmarked components
- Stewart Morten
- = Speaker – Air right
- Sharon Hefky – Opposed
- Michael Cohen – Opposition
- Mark Conroe – Gardens
- Speaker - Opposition

**ACTION:** Reviewed and Commented

**ARC COMMENTS**

1. **General.** The Commissioners expressed concern that there was not sufficient information provided in the hearing packet for them to understand the history of the property and overall context of the proposed project in order to formally and accurately comment on the design of the proposed project. The information that they expressed was missing from the packet included the following:

- The overall history of the site and development of the garden house and garden as separate entities and in relation to the development of the S.F. Gas Light Company building. Specifically, the Page & Turnbull Historic Resource Evaluation report.
- Explanation of the context of the 1973 Landmark Designation Ordinance and how the designation ordinance can and should be legally interpreted.
- Commissioner Hyland commented that the landmark ordinance for the subject property was not sufficiently detailed, as landmark cases typically weren't at the time, and was not as detailed as it would be if done today. Therefore, analysis for both buildings should be completed. If analysis has been done, the ARC should determine if they agree with that finding.

- Information regarding the level of environmental review in progress and/or completed for the garden house and adjacent garden and the level of environmental review required for the proposed project in relation to the site as a landmark.
- Commissioner Hyland questioned whether CEQA analysis was conducted for the Garden House that analyzed and conclusively determined it was not a Historic Resource. If the Historic Resource Evaluation was focused on the main house being the Landmark, as opposed to the entire site, and didn't evaluate a potential second period of significance, he was concerned that the analysis may be wrong or lacking. He questioned whether there might be a second period of significance associated with the Merryvale Antiques shop.
- Commissioner Johnck stated that there should be a cultural landscape analysis of the site, with particular attention to the garden and relationship to the structures.

## **2. Scale and Proportion.**

- Commissioner Hyland expressed concern that the height of the new construction was too tall in relation to the existing Merryvale Antiques/San Francisco Gas Light Company (S.F. Gas Light Co.) building and was also concerned that the new construction was an inappropriate addition to the site. He questioned the possibility of altering the existing one-story garden house to accommodate the program of the new construction.
- Commissioner Pearlman stated that the height of the proposed new construction was relatable to the surrounding context but did agree that the appropriateness of the new construction on the site was questionable.

## **3. Fenestration**

- Commissioner Pearlman felt that overall, the fenestration of the proposed new construction was appropriate and liked the punched openings.

## **4. Materials.**

- Commissioner Pearlman agreed with Staff's recommendation that the proposed brick at the horizontals should be articulated to better relate to the stringcourse of the Merryvale Antiques/San Francisco Gas Light Company (S.F. Gas Light Co.) building.

## **5. Architectural Details.**

- Commissioner Hyland expressed concern about the amount of the existing brick garden wall that would be demolished as part of the proposed project. He stated

that the wall was a community asset and there was insufficient information provided to understand how the wall would be altered.

- Commissioner Pearlman also expressed concern about the amount of the existing brick garden wall to be demolished and asked that this be re-examined to result in a reduction of the amount of the existing wall that would be removed. He stated that it might be a good idea to connect the garden to the street.
- Commissioner Pearlman agreed with Staff's recommendation regarding the primary entryway; that the entryway should be studied further to establish a stronger relationship to the formal entryways of the Merryvale Antiques/San Francisco Gas Light Company (S.F. Gas Light Co.) building. He suggested that a frame or border around the entryway of the new construction be studied as a means of accomplishing this recommendation.

3. [2015-001821GPA](#) (R. ABAD: (415) 575-9123)  
**THE CENTRAL WATERFRONT - DOGPATCH PUBLIC REALM PLAN – Informational Presentation** on THE CENTRAL WATERFRONT – DOGPATCH PUBLIC REALM. - The Central Waterfront - Dogpatch Public Realm Plan is an interagency framework for guiding public investment of streetscape and open space infrastructure projects in the Central Waterfront Plan Area. Beginning in the spring of 2016 and continuing through the fall of 2017, the interagency team led a series of focus group discussions and public workshops to create the guiding framework for investments in complete streets, parks and open spaces within the Plan Area and develop design ideas for priority projects. A draft Central Waterfront Public Realm Plan was presented to the public in January 2018, and a revised draft plan based on community feedback was released in June 2018. On June 28, 2018, the Planning Commission initiated the General Plan amendments to adopt by reference the Central Waterfront – Dogpatch Public Realm Plan. The adoption hearing is scheduled for August 23, 2018.

*Preliminary Recommendation: None -Informational*

SPEAKERS: Robin Abad – Staff presentation  
 Seung Yen Hong – Staff presentation  
 ACTION: None - Informational

ADJOURNMENT 12:52 PM  
 ADOPTED OCTOBER 3, 2018