

Certificate of Appropriateness Executive Summary

HEARING DATE: FEBRUARY 19, 2020

Record No.:	2019-001318COA	
Project Address:	740 TENNESSEE STREET	
Landmark:	Contributor, Dogpatch Landmark District	
Zoning:	RH-2 (RESIDENTIAL- HOUSE, TWO FAMILY) Zoning District	
	40-X Height and Bulk District	
Block/Lot:	4043/006	
Project Sponsor:	Patrick O'Neill, O'Neill Construction, Inc.	
	19 Leona Drive	
	San Rafael, CA 94903	
Staff Contact:	Monica Giacomucci - 415-575-8714	
	Monica.Giacomucci@sfgov.org	

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

Reception: 415.558.6378

Fax: 415.558.6409

Planning Information: 415.558.6377

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

740 TENNESSEE STREET is located on the west side of Tennessee Street between 18th and 19th streets (Assessor's Block 4043; Lot 006). The subject building is a contributor to the Dogpatch Landmark District, locally designated under Article 10, Appendix L of the Planning Code.

The four-story, four-family vernacular residence was built circa 1878 as the Kentucky Street Methodist Episcopal Church, and the building remained in use as a church until 1904. In 1921, Mose Rebizzo, proprietor of a North Beach company that sold macaroni presses, filed for a permit to convert the vacant church structure into a pasta factory. Residential units were added at the second and third stories at an unknown date, likely at the same time that two square bays were added at the front façade. The building is clad in stucco at the front façade (also added at an unknown date) and original wood clapboards at the side facades. Distinctive architectural features include a scroll modillion cornice, half-moon window in the gable peak, dentil cornice above the window bays, and original wood multi-pane double-hung windows.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project includes construction of three new roof dormers, a new roof deck at the northwest corner of the roof, and new balconies at the rear façade. At the front façade, existing wood windows will be rehabilitated, the non-historic fire escape will be removed, and new siding will be installed. The first story will have a new entry door, storefront window, and garage door. At the rear, new wood windows and doors will be installed. The project also includes extensive interior renovations in four existing residential units and common areas. The project also abates Planning Enforcement Case No. 2019-004570ENF for work undertaken without a preservation entitlement and required Planning Department review and approval. Work undertaken includes removal of 100% of the rear elevation wall, 20% of the

existing stucco finish at the front façade, 100% of the interior walls, 100% of interior floor framing, and construction of a new projecting roof deck at the rear. Please see photographs and plans for details.

COMPLIANCE WITH PLANNING CODE

Planning Code Development Standards.

The proposed project is in compliance with all other provisions of the Planning Code.

In order to proceed, a building permit from the Department of Building Inspection is required.

Applicable Preservation Standards.

The overall proposal 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 proposal includes construction of three roof dormers set back a minimum of 20 feet from the front façade;
- the new roof deck at a corner of the roof will not be visible from a public right-of-way;
- the proposed rear balconies will not be visible from a public right-of-way;
- the proposal includes rehabilitation of existing wood windows and restoration of the former ground floor storefront;
- the proposal includes selective replacement of existing wood clapboarding on the side building facades;
- the proposal respects the character-defining features of the subject building;
- the architectural character of the subject building will be maintained and replacement elements will not affect the building's overall appearance;
- the integrity of distinctive stylistic features and examples of skilled craftsmanship that characterize the building shall be preserved; and,
- all new materials shall match the historic material in composition, design, color, texture, finish and other visual qualities and shall be based on accurate duplication of features.

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 original qualities or character of the subject building. The overall proposal includes construction of new dormers and decks, rehabilitation of existing historic windows and trims, and siding replacement to match the existing in terms of size, material, and finish. The Department finds that the historic character of the building will be retained and preserved and will not result in the removal of historic fabric.

PUBLIC/NEIGHBORHOOD INPUT

The Department has received one public inquiry for general information about the proposed project. No members of the public have expressed opposition to or support of the proposed project to Planning Department Staff. The Project Sponsor has presented the project to the Dogpatch Neighborhood Association on multiple occasions.

ISSUES & OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- The Project is fully code complaint and is supported by Department Staff.
- The property has active Enforcement under Planning Department Complaint No. 2019-004570ENF for work undertaken without a preservation entitlement and Planning Department review and approval. Specifically, construction has exceeded demolition thresholds pursuant Section 1005 of the Planning Code and construction of a projecting roof deck at the rear. The work proposed under this Record No. 2019-001318COA will abate the violation.
- The proposal includes removal of the existing stucco from the front façade of the building and replacement with wood clapboard siding. While wood siding is a character-defining feature of the Dogpatch Landmark District, Department staff recommends retention of the existing stucco. The Department's recommendation is based on the following:
 - *Physical Evidence.* The Project Sponsor has removed limited areas of stucco from the bays and the body of the front façade. On the body of the front façade, painted wood siding was observed beneath the stucco. On the bays, however, irregular wood sheathing was observed beneath the stucco. While the date of stucco application is not substantiated with building permits, physical evidence indicates that it was applied when the boxed bays were constructed, likely between 1921 and 1925.
 - Development History. The property was developed ca. 1878 as a church with a flat front façade. Sanborn Maps suggests building has maintained essentially the same footprint over time, and physical evidence indicates that the church was clad on all four facades with wood or painted wood clapboards. Two boxed bays were added sometime after the church use was abandoned in 1904, and residents begin to appear at 740 Tennessee Street in City Directories as early as 1925.

In San Francisco, bay windows were historically used to increase light infiltration and capture additional living space in residences. Use of bay windows on a church building in the late 19th century would have been extremely uncommon, if not nonexistent. As noted above, physical evidence indicates that the bays were never clad with wood clapboards, and the entire front façade was likely re-clad with stucco when the bays were constructed. The project would preserve the building's existing residential use, and the stucco-clad, two-bay façade has gained significance over time as an architectural expression of that residential use.

 Physical and Architectural Context. The existing scroll modillion cornice within the gable peak is likely original, suggesting the church was designed in a Greek Revival Style common for religious buildings of the 1870s. From the 1920s through the 1950s, many buildings designed in the late 19th century were renovated with textured stucco or smooth cement plaster to conform to popular styles of the day.

Four lots north of the subject property is 712 Tennessee, a Mediterranean Revival residential flat building with two octagonal bays on a stucco-clad facade. This building

was originally constructed in 1924 and is a contributor to the Dogpatch Landmark District. Maintaining the stucco on the front façade of the subject property would not be out of character with the Landmark District or with the subject street frontage, and there is precedent for a contributing resource with a stucco façade constructed within a few years of the stucco alteration at the subject property.

Period of Significance. The Period of Significance for the Dogpatch Landmark District is 1867 to 1945, as noted in Appendix L of Article 10 of the Planning Code and the designating ordinance. The building's appearance has changed significantly since its original religious use was abandoned, and the bay windows are a character-defining feature added during the Landmark District's Period of Significance. Accordingly, the subject property had its stucco façade when it was identified as a contributor to the Dogpatch Landmark District in 2003.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

- 1. Prior to Building Permit issuance, the Project Sponsor shall submit a construction schedule for review and approval by Planning Department Enforcement Staff.
- 2. The Project Sponsor shall submit monthly progress of construction to the Planning Department via email with description and photos of completed work. Planning Department Preservation and/or Enforcement staff shall conduct periodic site visits during construction to monitor and ensure proper detailing of rehabilitated windows, siding, and stucco, and to confirm abatement of the violation.
- 3. That prior to issuance of the architectural addendum, the Project Sponsor shall: 1) revise plans to include restoration and repair of the existing stucco at the front façade, and 2) prepare a mockup of the existing stucco finish for areas of loss for Department staff to review on-site.
- 4. If additional windows require repair or replacement beyond what is identified in the proposed plans, the Project Sponsor will submit a consultant-prepared Window Conditions Assessment for any windows found to be deteriorated beyond repair during the rehabilitation process for review and comment by Department Preservation Staff. This additional scope of work shall be documented in a new building permit application. Only those windows found to be deteriorated beyond repair in the Conditions Assessment will be eligible for full replacement in-kind.

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 a contributing resource in a Landmark District 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 Notice of Enforcement
- Exhibit E Maps and Context Photos



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Certificate of Appropriateness Draft Motion

HEARING DATE: FEBRUARY 19, 2020

Record No.:	2019-001318COA
Project Address:	740 TENNESSEE STREET
Landmark:	Contributor, Dogpatch Landmark District
Zoning:	RH-2 (RESIDENTIAL- HOUSE, TWO FAMILY) Zoning District
	40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot:	4043/006
Project Sponsor:	Patrick O'Neill
	19 Leona Drive
	San Rafael, CA 94903
Staff Contact:	Monica Giacomucci - 415-575-8714
	Monica.Giacomucci@sfgov.org

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

Reception: 415.558.6378

Fax: 415.558.6409

Planning Information: 415.558.6377

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 006 IN ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 4043 IN A RH-2 RESIDENTIAL- HOUSE, TWO FAMILY ZONING DISTRICT AND A 40-X HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICT.

PREAMBLE

On January 31, 2019, Patrick O'Neill of O'Neill Construction, Inc. (hereinafter "Project Sponsor") filed Application No. 2019-001318COA (hereinafter "Application") with the San Francisco Planning Department (hereinafter "Department") for a Certificate of Appropriateness for an exterior alterations at a subject building located on Lot 006 in Assessor's Block 4043, which is a contributing resource to Dogpatch Landmark District and locally designated under Article 10, Appendix L 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 February 19, 2020, the Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting on Certificate of Appropriateness Application No. 2019-001318COA.

The Planning Department Commission Secretary is the custodian of records; the File for Record No. 2019-001318COA is located at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California.

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. 2019-001318COA in conformance with the architectural plans dated December 17, 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 includes construction of three new roof dormers, a new roof deck at the northwest corner of the roof, and new balconies at the rear façade. At the front façade, existing wood windows will be rehabilitated, the non-historic fire escape will be removed, and new siding will be installed. The first story will have a new entry door, storefront window, and garage door. At the rear, new wood windows and doors will be installed. The project also includes extensive interior renovations in four existing residential units and common areas. The project also abates Planning Enforcement Case No. 2019-004570ENF for work undertaken without a preservation entitlement and required Planning Department review and approval. Work undertaken includes removal of 100% of the rear elevation wall, 20% of the existing stucco finish at the front façade, 100% of the interior walls, 100% of interior floor framing, and construction of a new projecting roof deck at the rear. Please see photographs and plans for details.
- 3. **Property Description.** 740 TENNESSEE ST is located on the west side of Tennessee Street between 18th and 19th streets (Assessor's Block 4043; Lot 006). The subject building is a contributor to the Dogpatch Landmark District, locally designated under Article 10, Appendix L of the Planning Code. The vernacular-style, four-story, four-family residence was built circa 1878 as the Kentucky Street Methodist Episcopal Church, and the building remained in use as a church until 1904. In 1921, Mose Rebizzo, proprietor of a North Beach company that sold macaroni presses, filed for a permit to convert the vacant church structure into a pasta factory. Residential units were added at the second and third stories at an unknown date, likely at the same time that two square bays were added at the front façade. The building is clad in stucco at the front façade (also added at an unknown date) and original wood clapboards at the side facades. Distinctive architectural features include a scroll modillion cornice, half-moon window in the gable peak, dentil cornice above the window bays, and original wood multi-pane double-hung windows.
- 4. **Surrounding Properties and Neighborhood.** The Dogpatch Landmark District is a nine-block enclave of early industrial workers' housing and related industrial buildings located in the Central Waterfront area. The neighborhood is primarily comprised of single-family residential cottages and multi-family residential flats, as well as commercial, industrial, and civic buildings. Dogpatch is significant as San Francisco's oldest and most intact surviving concentration of Victorian-era

housing for industrial workers and as one of the city's last remaining mixed-use industrial and residential areas. Most of the early residents of Dogpatch were American-born skilled craftsmen employed at Potrero Point's boatyards or as foremen at large waterfront industrial outfits such as San Francisco Cordage or the Pacific Rolling Mill Company. Dogpatch became a small, self-contained community with a "company town" feel, leading to the establishment of neighborhood-serving shops concentrated along commercial corridors such as Solano Street (now 18th Street) and Sierra Street (now 22nd Street).

Between 18th and 19th Streets, Tennessee Street is characterized by a mixture of residential and industrial buildings constructed between ca. 1880 and 1999. Located at the center of the block, the subject property separates a cluster of industrial buildings to the immediate south from a cluster of residential buildings to the immediate north. The property immediately north of the subject property at 732 Tennessee Street is a two-family residential flat constructed circa 1880 and designed in the Italianate Style. To the south of the subject property is a small parking lot which serves a four-building, one-story, brick-faced industrial complex constructed between 1948 and 1956.

- 5. **Public Outreach and Comments.** The Department has received one public inquiry for general information about the proposed project. No members of the public have expressed opposition to or support of the proposed project to Planning Department Staff. The Project Sponsor has presented the project to the Dogpatch Neighborhood Association on multiple occasions.
- 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. Although 100% of the interior walls were removed without benefit of a permit, the project's structural engineer, Patrick Buscovich Engineers, confirmed that no internal structural framework existed within the building interior. Instead, all structural members were located within the building envelope, and therefore this project meets the demolition thresholds outlined in Section 1005.

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.

The subject property was constructed circa 1878 as the Kentucky Street Methodist Episcopal Church, and it remained in religious use until 1904. In 1921, the ground floor of the building was converted to a pasta factory. Although it is not known exactly when the upper stories were converted for residential use, City Directories indicate that tenants were residing at the subject property as early as 1925. It is likely that the bay windows were added to the front façade as part of that residential conversion, and extant physical evidence suggests that the bay windows date to the 1920s or early 1930s, well within the Period of Significance for the Dogpatch Landmark District (1867-1945). Although the building was originally non-residential, it has been in residential use since at least 1925. The proposal would maintain the property's current use as a four-family dwelling.

Bay windows have historically been used on residential buildings. Use of bay windows on a church in the late 19th century would have been extremely uncommon, if not nonexistent. The building was in residential use when the Dogpatch Landmark District was designated in 2003, and the subject property was identified as a contributor.

(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 proposal would add three roof dormers and a roof deck, balconies at the rear façade, relocate some existing windows on the side facades, and selectively replace siding that has been deteriorated beyond repair. The property's characteristic features are primarily concentrated at the front façade, where work, including rehabilitation of existing multi-lite bay windows, will be restorative in nature. The dormers and roof deck do not remove the roof's characteristic gable pitch, and are set back significantly from the front façade so as to minimize visibility from the street. At this property, the stucco on the front façade represents a ca. 1921-1925 alteration that occurred in response to a residential change of use. The project proposes to preserve the building's existing residential use, and the stucco-clad, two-bay façade is an architectural expression of that residential use. It is a character-defining feature which demonstrates the property's unique development history. The building's character-defining features will not be removed or altered as part of the proposed project.

(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.

The proposed shed dormers have been designed so as to be deferential to and differentiated from the building's historic fabric. Two of the dormers (on the south side of the gable pitch) will have wood casement windows to differentiate them from the historic double-hung wood windows found elsewhere on the building. The third dormer (on the north side of the gable pitch) will house an elevator, and therefore has no fenestration. Likewise, the deck and balconies will have cable railings to provide visual lightness and to prevent replication of historic wood or iron railings.

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

Based on physical evidence observed on-site, the front façade was originally flat and clad with painted wood clapboards when the building was in use as a church. At some point after 1904, when the last congregation left the subject property, the building was converted to a commercial use at the ground floor with residential units above. The addition of two boxed window bays at the second and third floors likely coincided with the new residential use, as bays would allow valuable additional living space within residential units. On several site visits, unfinished and irregular wood sheathing was observed beneath the metal lathe and stucco at multiple locations on the bays, indicating that they were not clad with wood clapboarding.

The Project Sponsor proposes to remove the stucco and install wood clapboard siding across the front façade as part of the proposed project. However, the Commission recommends retention of the stucco on the exterior façade. The stucco has gained historic significance over time as a visible indication of the property's ca. 1921-1925 adaptive reuse from a vacant church to a mixed-use, commercial and residential development. In this case, stucco is a material expression of the change in land use that occurred at the subject property. Likewise, this change of use occurred well within the Dogpatch Landmark District's Period of Significance, and there are other examples of ca. 1920s residential buildings with stucco facades elsewhere in the immediate neighborhood, most notably four lots north of the subject property at 712 Tennessee Street. The subject property had its existing stucco façade when the Dogpatch Landmark District was designated in 2003. Installation of clapboard siding at the front façade of the subject property would convey a false sense of historical development, tantamount of adding conjectural features. The Commission adopts a Condition of Approval related to retention of the existing stucco front façade in Exhibit A of this Motion.

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

The distinctive features and finishes of the building will be retained and preserved. The typical front façade bay window configuration includes a central, large double-hung wood window with ogee lugs flanked on either side by a narrower double-hung wood window with ogee lugs. These narrower windows have a horizontal muntin dividing the upper sashes into two panes, which is a distinctive multi-lite configuration rarely seen on buildings in this neighborhood. The proposal would rehabilitate these windows, as well as the front façade's scroll modillion cornice at the gable peak and dentil cornice above the bays. Each of these features is proposed for rehabilitation and repair as part of the project, thereby ensuring preservation of character-defining architectural elements of the subject property.

(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.

The proposal includes rehabilitation and repair of existing historic architectural elements that are character-defining, including a scroll modillion cornice, dentil cornice, and distinctive wood windows. Only those features which are deteriorated beyond repair will be replaced. If replacement of specific decorative members is required, new members will match the existing in-kind in terms of material, finish, texture, and size.

(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.

The existing stucco at the front façade is soiled after years of neglect and requires cleaning. A cleaning program for the stucco will prohibit use of harsh physical treatments to limit damage to the stucco's distinctive, dimensional surface texture.

(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 project proposes to construct three new shed dormers and a roof deck at the roof level, as well as balconies at the rear of the building. The building's character-defining features are concentrated at the front of the building, primarily on the front façade. New features are deliberately located at the rear of the building so as to prevent any impacts to original and/or character-defining features and to limit their visibility from the street.

(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.

The proposed work will not destroy historic materials or features that characterize the building. The new dormers and deck are located at the rear of the property and do not compromise the roof's gable pitch. Therefore, these new elements could easily be reversed by re-roofing the building. The building's essential form and integrity will remain intact as part of the proposed project.

- C. **Findings in the Dogpatch Landmark District.** Appendix L of Article 10 of the Planning Code outlines specific findings for the Commission to consider when evaluating applications for alterations to buildings within the boundaries of the Dogpatch Landmark District.
 - 1. Pursuant to Section 1006.6(d) of the Planning Code, for applications pertaining to property in historic districts, other than on a designated landmark site, any new construction, addition or exterior change shall be compatible with the character of the historic district as described in the designating ordinance; and, in any exterior change, reasonable efforts shall be made to preserve, enhance or restore, and not to damage or destroy, the exterior architectural features of the subject property which are compatible with the character of the historic district.

The project is in conformance with Article 10, and as outlined in Appendix A, as the work shall not adversely affect the Landmark site.

2. Pursuant to Section 1006.6(e) of the Planning Code, for applications pertaining to all property in historic districts, the proposed work shall also conform to such further standards as may be embodied in the ordinance designating the historic district.

The project is in conformance with Article 10, and as outlined in Appendix L, as the work is compatible with the Landmark District. Specifically, the Project meets the standards for review of Residential – Alterations and New Construction, as described in Section 7(b) of Appendix L of Article 10 of the Planning Code, as follows:

1. <u>False Historicism</u>. False historicism and the conjectural replication of historic styles and details is discouraged; if restoration is the selected alteration approach, historic documentation through original architectural plans, historic photographs, or physical investigation will be required. Where original plans or historic photographs are unavailable, close physical examination of the building and existing scar traces, along with a comparison to buildings of the same age and style in the neighborhood, may be sufficient to reveal evidence necessary to guide the restoration.

The project does not include full restoration; rather, existing historic windows, siding, and stucco will be rehabilitated and/or selectively replaced. Physical investigation at the project site produced evidence which has guided analysis of the project by Department Staff.

2. <u>Materials</u>. Horizontal rustic wood siding is the traditional cladding material in the district and its use is encouraged over other cladding materials, including wood shingles (except where appropriate).

Existing wood siding will be repaired and selectively replaced at the side and rear facades. Based on physical evidence of its existence from the 1920s onward, Department staff has determined that the front façade's stucco finish contributes to the building's significance and should therefore remain in place. 3. <u>Fenestration</u>. Fenestration should be proportionate and in scale with traditional patterns within the district. Double-hung wood sash windows are encouraged over vinyl or metal sash windows. "Slider" windows of vinyl or aluminum construction are discouraged, especially on primary facades. True divided lites, rather than snap-in or faux muntins, are encouraged when divided lite wood windows are appropriate.

Existing wood double-hung windows will be relocated throughout the side facades. At the rear, new wood windows have been selected for their compatibility with the original windows. However, new windows at the rear and at the dormers are not double-hung in configuration, contrasting with the building's historic fenestration pattern.

4. <u>Style</u>. New construction in a contemporary, yet compatible, idiom is encouraged.

The project does not propose new construction.

5. <u>Scale and Proportion</u>. New construction must be compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural details of residential resources found in the district.

Not Applicable.

6. <u>Setbacks</u>. New construction should conform to existing setback patterns found in the district.

Not Applicable.

7. <u>Roofline</u>. Gabled roof forms and raised parapets are encouraged on new construction.

Not Applicable.

8. <u>Detailing</u>. Detailing on new construction should relate to the simple, traditional vernacular forms found in the district.

Not Applicable.

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 existing 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 will not have a direct impact on the displacement of industrial and 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 006 in Assessor's Block 4043 for proposed work in conformance with the architectural submittal dated December 17, 2019 and labeled Exhibit B on file in the docket for Record No. 2019-001318COA.

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. XXXXXX. 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 October 2, 2019.

Jonas P. Ionin Commission Secretary

AYES:

NAYS:

ABSENT:

ADOPTED: February 19, 2020

EXHIBIT A

AUTHORIZATION UPDATE

This authorization is for a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow Alterations located at 740 Tennessee Street pursuant to Planning Code Section(s) **1006.6** within the **RH-2** District and a **40-X** Height and Bulk District; in general conformance with plans, dated **December 17, 2019**, and stamped "EXHIBIT B" included in the docket for Record No. **2019-001318COA** and subject to conditions of approval reviewed and approved by the Historic Preservation Commission on **February 19, 2020** under Motion No **XXXXXX**. 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. **XXXXXX** 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 Building Permit issuance, the Project Sponsor shall submit a construction schedule for review and approval by Planning Department Enforcement Staff.
- 2. The Project Sponsor shall submit monthly progress of construction to the Planning Department via email with description and photos of completed work. Planning Department Preservation and/or Enforcement staff shall conduct periodic site visits during construction to monitor and ensure proper detailing of rehabilitated windows, siding, and stucco, and to confirm abatement of the violation.
- 3. That prior to issuance of the architectural addendum, the Project Sponsor shall: 1) revise plans to include restoration and repair of the existing stucco at the front façade, and 2) prepare a mockup of the existing stucco finish for areas of loss for Department staff to review on-site.

4. If additional windows require repair or replacement beyond what is identified in the proposed plans, the Project Sponsor will submit a consultant-prepared Window Conditions Assessment for any windows found to be deteriorated beyond repair during the rehabilitation process for review and comment by Department Preservation Staff. This additional scope of work shall be documented in a new building permit application. Only those windows found to be deteriorated beyond repair in the Conditions Assessment will be eligible for full replacement in-kind.

TENNESSEE RESIDENCE 740 tennessee street

EXISTING FACADE



PROJECT DIRECTORY			SHEET	TINDEX	
OWNER: STRUCTURAL ENGINEER: TENNESSEE CRASHPAD LLC PATRICK BUSCOVICH & ASS 740 TENNESSEE STREET STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS & A SAN FRANCISCO, CA. 94107 225 MONTGOMERY STREET CONTACT: ROBERT PURCELL SUITE 1140 (415) 525-8913 SAN FRANCISCO, CA. 94104 CONTACT: MR. PAT BUSCOV TEL: 415.760.0636	ARCHITECT O'NEILL CONSTRUC 19 Leona Drive San Rafael. Ca 049 Tel: 415.716.1678	SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103			
SYMBOL LEGEND	PROJECT DATA			ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS A01 COVER SHEET/ PROJECT INFO.	_
ROOM NAME GARAGE - ROOM NAME [117] - ROOM NUMBER WALL TYPE - 99A		NNESSEE RESIDENCE Sidential remodel		Image:	
door type 📵	DESCRIPTION OF WORK: TA Re Ex Re	0 TENNESSEE STREET KE OF NON ORIGINAL STUCCO FARK OR NEW WOOD SIDING TO MATCH ISTING DUTCH LAP SIDING. ISTORED WINDOWS THROUGHOUT BUILDING. DWFRT FKISTING ATTIC STORAGE TO STUDY, PLAYROOM		A2 1ST FLOOR PLAN. EXISTING AND PROPOSED Image: A3 2ND FLOOR PLAN. EXISTING AND PROPOSED Image: A4 3RD FLOOR PLAN. EXISTING AND PROPOSED Image: A4 3RD FLOOR PLAN. EXISTING AND PROPOSED Image: A5 4TH FLOOR PLAN. EXISTING AND PROPOSED	
WINDOW TYPE 99 RCP ELEVATION E9-64	(3) (1) CU CR	NVERT EXISTING ATTIC STORAGE TO STUDY/ PLAYROOM ND MEDITATION ROOM NEW DORMERS. IN EW BULK HEAD FOR ELEVATOR. JT BACK EXISTING ATTIC STORAGE ROOF TO REATE NEW DECK.		Image: Constraint of the second se	
FINISH FLOOR 9-61 ELEVATION	FR <u>Building Data:</u> Applicable building codes: 20 20 20	DTE: EXISTING DETAILS TO REMAIN ON ONT 16 CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE (CBC) 16 CALIFORNIA PUUMBING CODE (CPC) 16 CALIFORNIA MECHANICAL CODE (CMC)		A9 EXISTING SOUTH EXTERIOR ELEVATION Image: A10 PROPOSED SOUTH EXTERIOR ELEVATION Image: A11 EXISTING WEST EXTERIOR ELEVATION Image: A12 PROPOSED WEST EXTERIOR ELEVATION	
ELEVATION	20 20 20 20 20 20	16 CALIFORNIA FLECTRICAL CODE (CEC 16 CALIFORNIA FRE CODE (CEC) 16 GREEN BUILDING CODE 16 CALIFORNIA ENERGY CODE 16 SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE AMENDMENTS 16 SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE AMENDMENTS 16 SAN FRANCISCO MECHANICAL CODE AMENDMENTS			
	20 20 20 Type of construction: Ty	16 SAN FRANCISCO ELECTRICAL CODE AMENDMENTS 16 SAN FRANCISCO GREEN BUILDING CODE AMENDMENTS 16 SAN FRANCISCO HOUSING CODE AMENDMENTS PE 5B		All All Mindowice sectors of a All All Moor Schedule	
ELEVATION 1/A.1	OCCUPANCY TYPE/ USE: AP. ASSESSOR'S BLOCK/ LOT: 40-	RINKLER ON SEPARATE PERMIT ARTMENTS 43/ 006 1-2			
COLUMN GRIDLINE 99	NO. OF STORIES: 4 E BUILDING HT: 43	EXISTING, 3 PROPOSED EXISTING, 4 PROPOSED -9 3/4" Arage (Non-Habitable): 1560 SF			
addendum 4	FII SE TH TC TC	NAUEL (NOVELIARDITABLE: JBOO SF COND LEVEL (HABITABLE: IBOO SF TINL (HABITABLE: IBOO SF TIAL (HABITABLE: SP32 SF TAL (HABITABLE: A129 SF TAL (NOVELIARDITABLE: 1560 SF ROSS TOTAL: 5752 SF			
	АР АР АР АР	ARTMENT NO.1 EXISTING: 402 SF ARTMENT NO.1 PROPOSED: 323 SF ARTMENT NO.2 EXISTING: 402 SF ARTMENT NO.2 PROPOSED: 323 SF ARTMENT NO.3 EXISTING: 695 SF			
	AP.	ARTMENT NO.3 PROPOSED: 652 SF ARTMENT NO.4 EXISTING: 1755 SF			_

FACADES OF SUBJECT PROPERTY







BUILDINGS ON THE SAME SIDE OF THE STREET

2 740 TENNESSEE STREET- SIDE



3 732 TENNESSEE- NORTH ADJACENT NEIGHBOR





4 750 TENNESSEE- SOUTH ADJACENT NEIGHBOR





5 777 TENNESSEE- ACROSS TENNESSEE NEIGHBOR

6 755 TENNESSEE- ACROSS TENNESSEE NEIGHBOR



7 NEIGHBORHOOD MAP





REVISIONS
Δ
STUDIONAHEMOWDESIGN 510 - 7th Street San Francisco, ca 94103 415.621-7236.0 415.621-7238.F studionahemow.com
740 TENNESSEE STREET San Francisco, California
SHEET CONTENTS EXISTING/PROPOSED
DATE 12.17.19
Scale 1/4" = 1'-0"
DRAWN RWH COPYRIGHT (C) 2019 STUDIO
COPYRIGHT (C) 2019 STUDIO NAHEMOW DESIGN LLC PLANS ARE PROVIDED FOR THE FAR AGENT IN COMPLETING THE AGENT IN COMPLETING THE PROJECT AS LISTED WITHIN THIS CONTRACT, DESIGN FANG REMAIN THE PROPERTY OF STUDIO NAHEMOW DESIGN AND WILLOW NAHEMOW DESIGN.
SHEET NO.
A.03



A.04 SITE PLAN/ PROPOSED

REVISIONS
Δ
STUDIONAHEMOWDESIGN 510 - 7TH 5TREET SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103 415.621-7236.0 415.621-7238.F STUDIONAHEMOW.COM
NNESSEE STREET RANCISCO, CALIFORNIA
740 TE SAN FI
EXISTING/PROPOSED
DATE 12.17.19 Scale 1/4" = 1-0"
SCALE 1/4" = 1-3" DRAWN RWH COPYRIGHT (0, 2019 STUDIO NAMEWW PESGAL DE FLAGR MASE MTHE CLENT OF HIS AGENT IN COMPLETING THE AGENT IN COMPLETING THE THIS CONTRACT. DESIGN PLAGE STUDIO WHENDOW DESIGN. SHEET NO.
A.04

740 TENNESSEE STREET HEIGHT: 43'-9 3/4" 3 STORIES LOT SIZE= 5000 SQ. FT. BUILDING SIZE= 1926.5 SQ. FT. ASSESSOR'S BLOCK/LOT 4043/006



























Revisions Δ
STUDIONAHEMOWDESIGN 510 - 7th Street San Francisco. ca 94103 415.621-7236.0 415.621-7238.F studionahemow.com
740 TENNESSEE STREET San Francisco, California
SHEET CONTENTS Existing.proposed
DATE 12.17.19 SCALE 1/4" = 1'-0" DRAWN RWH COPYRIGHT (2).2019.5TUDIO ANALEWOV DESIGN LLD FANSK MARKEN ANALEWOV DESIGN LLD FANSK MARKEN AVEC BY THE CLEHT OF HIS ANGENT IN COMPLETING THE PROJECT AS LISTED WITTIN ANGENT HER PROJECT AS LISTED WITTIN



Δ
Δ
STUDIONAHEMOWDESIGN 510 - 7th Street San Francisco, ca 94103 415,621-7236.0 415,621-7238.F studionahemow.com
\bigvee
740 TENNESSEE STREET San Francisco, California
740 TENNESSEE STREET SAN FRANCISCO, CALII
740 TENNESSEE STREET SAN FRANCISCO, CALII



	STUDIONAHEMOWDESIGN
TOTAL HEIGHT=43'-4 3/4" RIDGELINE: HEIGHT=42'-5"	TUDIONAH 510 - 7th Street S 415.621-7236 studiona
	740 TENNESSEE STREET San Francisco, california
-	SHEET CONTENTS EXISTING/PROPOSED
	Date 12,17,19 Scale 14" = 142" Drawn RWH Correlider (2), 2019 State 10, 2019 Apprint 10, 2019 State 10, 2019



1 PROPOSED SOUTH ELEVATION A.10 1/4"=1"-0"

CODE 1005; THERE IS NO WATERPROOFING ON SIDES OF THIS BUILDING. REMOVE EXISTING SIDING AND INSTALL SHEATHING AND WATER-PROOFING BARRIER: RE-INSTALL EXISTING SIDING WHERE POSSIBLE AND ADDITIONAL SIDING PROFILE TO MATCH IN KIND.





Revisions Δ
STUDIONAHEMOWDESIGN 510 - 7th Street San Francisco, ca 94103 415.621-7236.0 415.621-7238.F studionahemow.com
740 TENNESSEE STREET San Francisco, California
SHEET CONTENTS EXISTING, PROPOSED DATE 12,17,19 SCALE 1/4" = 140" DRAWN RWH COPPYIGHT (2) 219 STUDIO NAMENOW DESIGN LLC FLANS AGENT IN COMPLETING THE PROJECT AS LICED WITHIN ANS REMAIN THE PROPERTY OF STUDIO NAMENOW DESIGN. AND WITHOUT PERMISSION OF STUDIO NAMENOW DESIGN.
OF



	Revisions △ I △ I △ I △ I □ I □ I □ I □ I □ I □ I
	STUDIONAHEMOWDESIGN 510 - 7TH STREET SAN FRANCISCO. CA 94103 415.621-7236.0 415.621-7238.F studionahemow.com
/2"	
	740 TENNESSEE STREET San Francisco, California
	SHEET CONTENTS EXISTING/PROPOSED DATE 12,17,19 SCALE 1/4" = 140" DRAWN ROMENDER OF NEW COPPENDIT 00,2012 21100 WES PWH COPPENDIT 00,2012 21100 COPPENDIT 00,2012 21100 1/4" = 140" DRAWN REPROVIDED FOR THE FAIR 1/2" = 1100 1/4" = 140" COPPENDIT SUBTO 1/4" = 140" 1/4" = 140" COPPENDIT COLLETT OF HIS 1/4" = 140" 1/4" = 140" COPPENDIT SUBTO 1/4" = 140" 1/4" = 140" COPPENDIT SUBTO 1/4" = 140" 1/4" = 140" STRUET NELET NO. A.12 0/4"








Revisions Δ Δ Δ Δ Δ Δ
STUDIONAHEMOWDESIGN 510 - 7TH STREET SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103 415.621-7236.0 415.621-7238.F studionahemow.com
740 TENNESSEE STREET San Francisco, California
SHEET CONTENTS EXISTING/PROPOSED DATE 12.17.19 SCALE 14" = 1-0" DRAVIN RWH COOPYRIGHT (2.010) STUDIO NAMEWOW DESCON, CO. 2100 STUDIO STUDIO NAMEWOW DESCON, SHEET NO, A.16
OF

EAVE: HEIGHT=30'-9 1/2"

SCHEDULES



SCHEDULES

	,	
DOOR SCHEDULE		
box box <th>TYPE 0 $TYPE 0$ $TYPE R$ $TYPE R$</th> <th></th>	TYPE 0 $TYPE 0$ $TYPE R$	

Δ Δ Δ
 Z "
STUDIONAHEMOWDESIGN 510 - 7th Street san francisco. ca 94103 415.621-7236.0 415.621-7238.f studionahemow.com
STUDI 510 - 711 510 - 711
740 TENNESSEE STREET San Francisco, California
SHEET CONTENTS
DATE 12.17.19 SCALE 1/4" = 1*0" DRAWN RWH DOWN DESON LLC PLANS ARE PROVIDE ON THE FARS ARE PROVIDE TOR THE FARS RECTOR SUBJECT ON THE FARS RECTOR SUBJECT ON THE FARS RECTOR SUBJECT ON THE FARS RECTOR SUBJECT ON THE FARS SUBJECT AS USED OR REVISED WITHOUT PERMISSION OF STUDIO INMEDIATION DESIGN. SHEET NO.
A.18



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Address		Block/Lot(s)
740 TENNESSEE ST		4043006
Case No.		Permit No.
2019-001318PRJ		201901311775
Addition/ Alteration	Demolition (requires HRE for Category B Building)	New Construction
Project description for	Planning Department approval.	
WINDOWS THROUGH	NAL STUCCO & SHINGLES, INSTALL EXISTING T OUT BUILDING.NEW BULK HEAD FOR ELEVA GYM/OFFICE, NEW DORMERS. NEW ROOF DEC	ATOR. CONVERT EXISTING

STEP 1: EXEMPTION CLASS

-	project has been determined to be categorically exempt under the California Environmental Quality 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.
	Class

STEP 2: CEQA IMPACTS TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

	Air Quality: 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.)? (<i>refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Air Pollution Exposure Zone</i>)
	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 (<i>refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Archeological Sensitive Area</i>)
	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? (<i>refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography</i>). 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? (<i>refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography</i>) 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.
Com	ments and Planner Signature (optional): Monica Giacomucci

STEP 3: PROPERTY STATUS - HISTORIC RESOURCE TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

PROP	ERTY IS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING: (refer to Property Information Map)
	Category A: Known Historical Resource. GO TO STEP 5.
	Category B: Potential Historical Resource (over 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 4.
	Category C: Not a Historical Resource or Not Age Eligible (under 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 6.

STEP 4: PROPOSED WORK CHECKLIST

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

Check	all that apply to the project.
	1. Change of use and new construction. Tenant improvements not included.
	2. Regular maintenance or repair to correct or repair deterioration, decay, or damage to building.
	3. Window replacement that meets the Department's Window Replacement Standards. Does not include storefront window alterations.
	4. Garage work. A new opening that meets the <i>Guidelines for Adding Garages and Curb Cuts</i> , and/or replacement of a garage door in an existing opening that meets the Residential Design Guidelines.
	5. Deck, terrace construction, or fences not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
	 Mechanical equipment installation that is not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
	7. Dormer installation that meets the requirements for exemption from public notification under <i>Zoning</i> Administrator Bulletin No. 3: Dormer Windows.
	8. Addition(s) 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.
Note: F	Project Planner must check box below before proceeding.
	Project is not listed. GO TO STEP 5.
	Project does not conform to the scopes of work. GO TO STEP 5.
	Project involves four or more work descriptions. GO TO STEP 5.
	Project involves less than four work descriptions. GO TO STEP 6.

STEP 5: CEQA IMPACTS - ADVANCED HISTORICAL REVIEW

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

Chec	k all that apply to the project.
	1. Project involves a known historical resource (CEQA Category A) as determined by Step 3 and conforms entirely to proposed work checklist in Step 4.
	2. Interior alterations to publicly accessible spaces.
	3. Window replacement of original/historic windows that are not "in-kind" but are consistent with existing historic character.
	4. Façade/storefront alterations that do not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.
	5. Raising the building in a manner that does not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.
	6. Restoration based upon documented evidence of a building's historic condition, such as historic photographs, plans, physical evidence, or similar buildings.

		nanical equipment that are minimally Interior's Standards for Rehabilitatio	
	8. Other work consistent with Properties (specify or add comn	h the Secretary of the Interior Standa nents):	rds for the Treatment of Historic
	corner of the roof, and new ba be rehabilitated, the non-histo	Iconies at the rear façade. At the from ric fire escape will be removed, and r	ners, a new roof deck at the northwest nt façade, existing wood windows will new siding will be installed. The first hor. At the rear, new wood windows and
	9. Other work that would not r	materially impair a historic district (sp	pecify or add comments):
	(Requires approval by Senior	Preservation Planner/Preservation C	Coordinator)
	10. Reclassification of prope <i>Planner/Preservation</i>	rty status . (Requires approval by Se	enior Preservation
	Reclassify to Category	A	Reclassify to Category C
	a. Per HRER or PTR o	lated	(attach HRER or PTR)
	b. Other <i>(specify)</i> :		
	Note: If ANY box in S	TEP 5 above is checked, a Preserv	vation Planner MUST sign below.
		egorical exemption review. The pro proceed with categorical exemption	
Comm	ents (<i>optional</i>):		
Preser	vation Planner Signature:	Monica Giacomucci	
	P 6: CATEGORICAL EXE	MPTION DETERMINATION PLANNER	

Project Approval Action:	Signature:
Building Permit	Monica Giacomucci
f Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, he Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project.	02/07/2020
Droce signed or stamped and dated, this document constitutes a categorical e 10f the Administrative Code.	exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines and Chapter
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. Pleas	se 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

Project Address (If different than front page)		Block/Lot(s) (If different than front page)	
740 TENNESSEE ST		4043/006	
Case No.	Previous Building Permit No.	New Building Permit No.	
2019-001318PRJ	201901311775		
Plans Dated	Previous Approval Action	New Approval Action	
	Building Permit		
Modified Project Description:			

DETERMINATION IF PROJECT CONSTITUTES SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

Result in expansion of the building envelope, as defined in the Pl	
	anning Code;
Result in the change of use that would require public notice under Sections 311 or 312;	r Planning Code
Result in demolition as defined under Planning Code Section 317	7 or 19005(f)?
Is any information being presented that was not known and could at the time of the original determination, that shows the originally 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 wo	tion would not result in any of the above changes.		
approva website with Ch	al and no additional environmental revie and office and mailed to the applicant,	ons are categorically exempt under CEQA, in accordance with prior project ew is required. This determination shall be posted on the Planning Department City approving entities, and anyone requesting written notice. In accordance acco Administrative Code, an appeal of this determination can be filed within 10		
Plan	ner Name:	Date:		



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

NOTICE OF ENFORCEMENT

May 7, 2019

Property Owner

Tn Crash Pad Llc

San Rafael, CA 94901

19 Leona Drive

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

Reception: 415.558.6378

Fax: 415.558.6409

Planning Information: 415.558.6377

Site Address:	740 Tennessee St
Assessor's Block/Lot:	4043/ 006
Zoning District:	RH-2, Residential- House, Two Family
Complaint Number:	2019-004570ENF
Code Violation:	Section 174: Unpermitted Alteration, Exceeding Approved Scope of Work
	Section 1005: Demolition, and Conformity and Permits in a Designated
	Historic District
Administrative Penalty:	Up to \$250 Each Day of Violation
Response Due:	Within 15 days from the date of this Notice
Staff Contact:	Kelly Wong, (415) 558-6393, kelly.wong@sfgov.org

The Planning Department has received a complaint that a Planning Code violation exists on the above referenced property that needs to be resolved. As the owner of the subject property, you are a responsible party. The purpose of this notice is to inform you about the Planning Code Enforcement process so you can take appropriate action to bring your property into compliance with the Planning Code. Details of the violation are discussed below:

DESCRIPTION OF VIOLATION

The violation pertains to the proposed rehabilitation of the subject property, an identified historic building located within the Dogpatch Landmark District, without benefit of required Planning Department review or approval. Alterations to properties within a landmark district are subject to Planning Code Article 10 requirements, and subject to review by Preservation staff. The subject property was issued several building permits for interior remodel work, and one Building Permit Application (No. 2019.0131.1737) for the seismic upgrade of the building.

Pursuant Planning Code Section 1005(a), "No person shall carry out or cause to be carried out on a designated landmark site or in a designated historic district any construction, alteration, removal or demolition of a structure or any work involving a sign, awning, marquee, canopy, mural or other appendage, for which a City permit is required, except in conformity with the provisions of this Article 10. In addition, no such work shall take place unless all other applicable laws and regulations have been complied with, and any required permit has been issued for said work."

On March 18, 2019, Planning Staff met with your Contractor Patrick O'Neill and his staff and conducted a site visit of the property. Staff observed a large quantity of removal of original historic

www.sfplanning.org

fabric at both the interior and exterior of the building. Specifically, majority of existing floor plates, interior walls, along with the entire west (rear) elevation wall had been already removed. Additionally, historic stucco at the front façade appeared to have been removed at the ground floor level. Planning Staff discussed with your Contractor Planning Department requirements for alterations to historic buildings within a landmark district including submitting demolition calculations for review and updating the proposed drawings within the preservation entitlement.

On March 19, 2019, Preservation Planner Monica Giacomucci requested demolition calculations from your Contractor for review. On April 1, 2019, your Contractor submitted a final set of demolition calculations to the Planning Department for review.

Pursuant to Planning Code Section 171 structures and land in appy zoning district shall be used only for the purposes listed in this Code as permitted in that district, and in accordance with the regulations established for that district. Further, pursuant to Planning Code Section 174, every condition, stipulation, special restriction, and other limitation under the Planning Code shall be complied with in the development and use of land and structures. Failure to comply with any of Planning Code provisions constitutes a violation of Planning Code and is subject to enforcement process under Code Section 176.

HOW TO CORRECT THE VIOLATION

A suspension has been placed on Building Permit Application No. 2019.0131.1737 and will remain active until the following are submitted:

- 1. **Project Application.** This form must be submitted for any work requiring Planning Department review including projects that seek an entitlement, such as a Certificate of Appropriateness. A Project Application can be found on our website at: http://forms.sfplanning.org/Project_Application.pdf
- 2. Revisions to Building Permit Application No. 2019.0131.1775. Revise the scope and drawings for Building Permit Application 2019.0131.1775 for the restoration of the building exterior, interior renovation including installation of elevator, conversion of the existing attic to office use, installation of new dormers and new roof deck. The permit shall include all scopes of work required for Planning Department review including all building rehabilitation work. Drawings shall include plans, exterior elevations, and details showing three conditions: 1) prior to work, 2) previously approved permitted work, and 3) proposed work. Submitted building permits will be reviewed for compliance with current Planning Code requirements.
 - a. **Notations.** Include the following notations on the permit form description and cover sheet of the permit drawings.

Comply with Planning Enforcement Case No. 2019-004570ENF. Revisions to building permit application no. 2019.0131.1775 for the rehabilitation of the existing building, interior remodel including installation of an elevator, roof replacement, construction of new dormers, and new roof deck. Conversion of attic from storage to office use. Demolition calculations provided.

Please address the following comments of your submitted plans:

b. Demolition Calculations and Drawings. The demolition calculations and associated diagrams submitted on April 1, 2019 are incomplete. Diagrams are missing. Provide a revised and complete set of demolition calculations and diagrams on the permit drawings showing removal percentages pursuant Section 1005 of the Planning Code for the entire building (basement, first, second, and third floors, and roof). Show graphically on drawings how demolition calculations were obtained. Label clearly associated demolition calculation numbers. The Planning Code can be accessed online at: http://library.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/planning/planningcode?f=templates

\$fn=default.htm\$3.0\$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca\$anc=JD_Planning

- Missing Drawings. Please update the drawings to include all plans including the c. basement, first, second, and third floors, and roof, so the Planning Department can review all work undertaken at the building, in one complete set. Please also include all exterior elevations, including the three conditions specified in Item 2 above.
- d. Representation of Removal. Based on site visit observations and the proposed scope of work, removal of interior and exterior walls, doors, floor plates, and roof are not shown accurately. Please update the drawings to show removal of all walls, doors, and floor plates on existing plans and elevations. For clarity, existing walls and doors removed shall be shown as dashed lines, and existing floor plates and roof removed shown as a hatch. New walls shall be shown with a dark hatch to differentiate existing and what walls.

1005(f)(1): All "public facing" exterior v	valls			Max. Permitted	Meet Code?
Elevation	(E) SF	Removal SF	% Removed		
East (Front) Façade	0	0	0.0%		
South Elevation, if applicable	0	0	0.0%		
West (Rear) Elevation, if applicable	0	0	0.0%		
North Elevation, if applicable	0	0	0.0%		
			0.00/		Y / N?
Total	0	0	0.0%	25.0%	I / IN ;
1005(f)(2): All Exterior Walls from func walls	tion as ex	terior		25.0% Permitted	Code?
1005(f)(2): All Exterior Walls from func			0.0% % Removed		
1005(f)(2): All Exterior Walls from func walls	tion as ex	terior Removal	%		
1005(f)(2): All Exterior Walls from func walls Elevation	tion as ex (E) SF	terior Removal SF	% Removed	Permitted	Code?
1005(f)(2): All Exterior Walls from func walls Elevation East (Front) Façade	tion as ex (E) SF 0	terior Removal SF 0	% Removed 0.0%	Permitted	Code?
1005(f)(2): All Exterior Walls from func- walls Elevation East (Front) Façade South Elevation	(E) SF 0 0	terior Removal SF 0 0	% Removed 0.0% 0.0%	Permitted	Code?

Example Matrix: Section 1005 of the Planning Code

1005(f)(3): External Walls that function as either external or internal walls

Elevation	(E) SF	Removal SF	% Removed
East (Front) Façade	0	0	0.0%
South Elevation	0	0	0.0%
West (Rear) Elevation	0	0	0.0%
North Elevation	0	0	0.0%
Total	0	0	0.0%

25.0% Y/N?

1005(f)(4):

Horizontal Elements

Floor Plate	(E) SF	Removal SF	% Removed
Ground Floor (excluded per code)	n/a	n/a	n/a
Basement	0	0	0.0%
First Floor	0	0	0.0%
Second Floor	0	0	0.0%
Third Floor	0	0	0.0%
Roof	0	0	0.0%
Total	0	0	0.0%

75.0% Y / N?

OR

OR

Internal Structural Framework

Walls	(E) LF	Removal	%
Ground Floor (included in code)	0	LF 0	Removed 0.0%
Basement	0	0	0.0%
First Floor	0	0	0.0%
Second Floor	0	0	0.0%
Third Floor	0	0	0.0%
Total	0	0	0.0%

75.0% Y / N?

You may also need to obtain a building permit application for any alterations undertaken at the property. Please contact the Department of Building Inspection (DBI), 1660 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94103, telephone: (415) 558-6088, website: www.sfgov.org/dbi, regarding the Building Permit Application process. Please visit the Planning Information Counter located at the first floor of 1660 Mission Street or website: www.sf-planning.org for any questions regarding the planning process.

TIMELINE TO RESPOND

The responsible party has <u>fifteen (15) days from the date of this notice</u> to contact the staff planner noted at the top of this notice and submit evidence to demonstrate that the corrective actions have been taken to bring the subject property into compliance with the Planning Code. A site visit may also be required to verify the authorized use at the above property. The corrective actions shall be taken as early as possible. Any unreasonable delays in abatement of the violation may result in further enforcement action by the Planning Department.

PENALTIES AND APPEAL RIGHTS

Failure to respond to this notice by abating the violation or demonstrating compliance with the Planning Code <u>within fifteen (15) days from the date of this notice</u> will result in issuance of a <u>Notice</u> <u>of Violation</u> by the Zoning Administrator. Administrative penalties of up to <u>\$250 per day</u> will also be assessed to the responsible party for each day the violation continues thereafter. The Notice of Violation provides appeal processes noted below.

- 1) Request for Zoning Administrator Hearing. The Zoning Administrator's decision is appealable to the Board of Appeals.
- 2) Appeal of the Notice of Violation to the Board of Appeals. The Board of Appeals may not reduce the amount of penalty below \$100 per day for each day the violation exists, excluding the period of time the matter has been pending either before the Zoning Administrator or before the Board of Appeals.

ENFORCEMENT TIME AND MATERIALS FEE

Pursuant to Planning Code Section 350(g)(1), the Planning Department shall charge for 'Time and Materials' to recover the cost of correcting Planning Code violations and violations of Planning Commission and Planning Department's Conditions of Approval. Accordingly, the responsible party may be subject to an amount of \$1,395 plus any additional accrued time and materials cost for Code Enforcement investigation and abatement of violation. This fee is separate from the administrative penalties as noted above and is not appealable.

OTHER APPLICATIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION

The Planning Department requires that any pending violations be resolved prior to the approval and issuance of any new applications that you may wish to pursue in the future. Therefore, any applications not related to abatement of the violation on the subject property will be placed on hold until the violation is corrected. We want to assist you in ensuring that the subject property is in full compliance with the Planning Code. You may contact the enforcement planner as noted above for any questions.

cc: Tina Tam, Code Enforcement Manager

Parcel Map

18TH



19 TH

Ð

Sanborn Map*



*The Sanborn Maps in San Francisco have not been updated since 1998, and this map may not accurately reflect existing conditions.



Zoning Map





Aerial Photo



SUBJECT PROPERTY



Site Photo



SUBJECT PROPERTY PRIOR TO WORK



Site Photo



SUBJECT PROPERTY AS VIEWED FROM THE SOUTH

 $\mathbf{\mathbf{i}}$

Site Photo



SUBJECT PROPERTY AS VIEWED FROM THE NORTH

