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BACKGROUND

The Academy of Art University (the “Academy”) is a private, for-profit post-secondary academic institution that currently occupies, either in part or in full, 40 properties within the City and County of San Francisco (“City”) for its existing educational programs, recreational activities, and student housing. In 2007, the Academy occupied 34 properties, in 12 of which, the Academy had implemented various building modifications without benefit of required building permits, Administrative Certificates of Appropriateness (Admin COA), and/or Certificates of Appropriateness (COA) entitlements, and/or Minor Permit to Alter, and/or Permit to Alter (PTA) entitlements. In 28 of the buildings occupied by the Academy in 2007, the Academy had implemented various tenant improvements, façade alterations and changes of use without benefit of required conditional uses, building permits or other entitlements. In order to evaluate the potential impacts associated with bringing these 28 buildings into compliance with the San Francisco Planning Code and to analyze the Academy’s then-proposed plans for growth, an environmental impact report (“EIR”) and an Existing Sites Technical Memorandum (“ESTM”) were prepared between 2010 and 2016. During this period, one or more LLC Parties acquired an additional six buildings beyond the 34 already occupied, bringing the total number of properties owned or occupied by the Academy to 40. The Planning Commission approved the ESTM and certified the Final EIR, which collectively analyzed the 40 properties, on July 28, 2016.

On May 6, 2016, the City Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco (the “City Attorney”), on behalf of the City and the People of the State of California, commenced litigation against the Academy and certain LLC Parties in People v. Stephens Institute, et. al, San Francisco Superior Court Number CGC-16-551-832 (the “Lawsuit”). In the Lawsuit, the City Attorney alleged violations of the City’s Administrative Code,
Planning Code, Building Code and the State Unfair Competition Law, Business and Professions Code Section 17200 et seq. (the “UCL”). Following court-supervised settlement discussions to resolve the Lawsuit, the Academy and City entered into a Term Sheet for Global Resolution (“Term Sheet”) on November 15, 2016, and a non-binding Supplement to Term Sheet for Global Resolution, dated July 10, 2019 (the “Supplement”) (the Initial Term Sheet and the Supplement are referred to collectively as the “Term Sheet”). The Term Sheet was intended to provide a basis to resolve all of the outstanding issues relating to the Lawsuit with respect to land use matters and to establish appropriate principles and processes for land use compliance by the Academy.

On July 25, 2019, the Planning Commission accepted as complete the Academy’s Institutional Master Plan, which was informed by the Term Sheet and Settlement Agreement.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed Project is the settlement of the Lawsuit, including payment to the City of a substantial Affordable Housing Public Benefit; payment of Planning Code and UCL penalties for past violations; agreements regarding the Academy’s provisions of housing to its students; the withdrawal and cessation of all further use at nine (9) of the Academy’s properties; legalization of Academy uses at the remaining 31 original properties; and approval of new uses at 3 additional properties. The Project also includes internal and external building modifications to remove unpermitted work, legalize and or modify unpermitted work, and to implement the legalization of uses, including signage.

The Project involves 12 historic properties owned or leased by the Academy of Art University. Of these, three (3) historic properties are Article 10 Individual Landmarks; one (1) is a Contributor within an Article 10 Landmark District; and eight (8) historic properties are located within Article 11 Conservation Districts. Consistent with the Term Sheet and Supplement to the Term Sheet for Global Resolution, the Project seeks to perform and/or legalize building modifications at these properties to generally abate all Planning Code violations and bring the buildings, individually and collectively, into greater conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards.

A full list of the 12 properties, site-specific zoning information, and proposed building modifications to be considered under the Project may be found in: Table A (Overview of Project Sites), Appendix A (Property and Project Descriptions), Exhibit B (Plans and Renders), and Exhibit E (Maps and Context Photos).
**PROPERTY DESCRIPTION**

**KEY FOR REVIEW TYPES:** □ - Over the Counter (“OTC”) Review; □ - Administrative COA (“ACOA) for Article 10 Properties or Minor PTA for Article 11 Historic properties; ■ - Full COA or PTA subject to the HPC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Review Type</th>
<th>Cross Street(s)</th>
<th>Block / Lot</th>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Article 10 Landmark No., Landmark District, or Article 11 Conservation District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58-60 Federal St.</td>
<td>COA</td>
<td>2nd St., Delancey St.</td>
<td>3774 / 074</td>
<td>MUO, 65-X</td>
<td>Article 10 – South End Landmark District Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491 Post St.</td>
<td>ACOA</td>
<td>Mason St.</td>
<td>0307 / 009</td>
<td>C-3-G, 80-130-F</td>
<td>Article 10 – Landmark No. 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601-625 Polk St.</td>
<td>ACOA</td>
<td>Turk St.</td>
<td>0741 / 002</td>
<td>NC-3, 130-E</td>
<td>Article 10 – Landmark No. 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2151 Van Ness St.</td>
<td>ACOA</td>
<td>Broadway St.</td>
<td>0575 / 015</td>
<td>RC-4, 80-D</td>
<td>Article 10 – Landmark No. 252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-79 New Montgomery St.</td>
<td>Minor PTA</td>
<td>Mission St., Jessie St.</td>
<td>3707 / 014</td>
<td>C-3-O(SD), 150-S</td>
<td>Art. 11 - Category I; New Montgomery-Mission-2nd St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 New Montgomery St.</td>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>Howard St., Natoma St.</td>
<td>3722 / 022</td>
<td>C-3-O(SD), 150-S</td>
<td>Article 11 - Category IV; New Montgomery-Mission-2nd St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620 Sutter St.</td>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>Mason St.</td>
<td>0283 / 004A</td>
<td>C-3-G, 80-130-F</td>
<td>Article 11 - Category I; Kearny- Market-Mason-Sutter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625-629 Sutter St.</td>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>Mason St.</td>
<td>0297 / 014</td>
<td>C-3-G, 80-130-F</td>
<td>Article 11 - Category II; Kearny- Market-Mason-Sutter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655 Sutter St.</td>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>Mason St., Taylor St.</td>
<td>0297 / 012</td>
<td>C-3-G, 80-130-F</td>
<td>Article 11 - Category V; Kearny- Market-Mason-Sutter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>680-688 Sutter St.</td>
<td>OTC</td>
<td>Taylor St.</td>
<td>0283 / 007</td>
<td>C-3-G, 160-F</td>
<td>Article 11 - Category IV; Kearny- Market-Mason-Sutter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410 Bush St.</td>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>Kearny St., Pine St.</td>
<td>0270 / 007</td>
<td>C-3-O, 80-130-F</td>
<td>Article 11 - Category V; Kearny- Market-Mason-Sutter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540 Powell St</td>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>Anson Pl.</td>
<td>0285 / 009</td>
<td>C-3-R, 80-130-F</td>
<td>Article 11 - Category I; Kearny- Market-Mason-Sutter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REQUIRED COMMISSION ACTION

In order for the Project to proceed, the Historic Preservation Commission must act on the following items:

- Adoption of CEQA Findings.
  The Planning Commission certified the Final EIR for the Project on July 28, 2016. An Addendum to the FEIR was prepared for the Project and was published on October 9, 2019. Prior to any other action, the Commission must adopt CEQA Findings and a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Project to proceed.

- Planning Code Amendment and Development Agreement.
  The Historic Preservation Commission must issue a written determination regarding the proposed ordinance adopting the Development Agreement between the Academy of Art University and its various LLCs and the City and County of San Francisco.

- Certificate of Appropriateness.
  Planning Code Section 1006 requires the Historic Preservation Commission to review all Certificates of Appropriateness (COA) for alterations to Landmark structures. Through the proposed Master COA, the Academy of Art University seeks to authorize modifications at 4 Article 10 Landmarks or Landmark District properties.

- Permit to Alter.
  Planning Code Section 1110 requires the Historic Preservation Commission to review all Permits to Alter (PTA) for alterations to structures within Conservation Districts. Through the proposed Master PTA, the Academy of Art University seeks to authorize modifications at 8 properties within Article 11 Conservation Districts.

ISSUES AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- Public Comment & Outreach.
  As of the writing of this report, staff has not received public comment on the Preservation entitlements.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

The Department recommends Conditions of Approval for the performance, compliance, monitoring, and reporting of the project, in conformance with the architectural plans dated October 11, 2019, labelled Exhibit B. Specific conditions are outlined within the Conditions of Approval, labeled Exhibit A.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

On February 25, 2015, the Department published a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) and published a Notice of Availability (NOA) for the DEIR.

On July 28, 2016, the Commission reviewed and considered the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) and on July 28, 2016 the FEIR was certified by adoption of its Motion No. 19704.
On October 9, 2019, the Planning Department issued an Addendum to the FEIR, in which it determined that the actions contemplated in the DA and the accompanying ordinance comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.); that no supplemental or subsequent environmental review is required, as there are no substantial changes to the proposed Project, or to the circumstances under which the Project will be undertaken, involving new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified environmental effects; and that there is no new information of substantial importance that shows that the Project will have one or more effects not discussed in the FEIR, that the previously identified effects will be more severe, or that there are mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce such effects, but the Project proponents refuse to adopt them.

**BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION**

The Department recommends APPROVAL of the proposed project as it appears, on balance, to be consistent with the provisions of Article 10 and 11 of the Planning Code and the Objectives and Policies of the General Plan. The project is the culmination of more than a decade of review and enforcement action by the Planning Department and City, and the improvements to the Article 10 and 11 buildings occupied by the Academy will improve, overall, the Academy’s conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s standards. The required modifications to the buildings within the Project are part of a larger global settlement, through which the City will receive significant Affordable Housing and other public benefits.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Table A – Overview of Project Sites  
Appendix A – Property and Project Descriptions  
Draft Master COA Motion  
  - Exhibit A – COA Motion Conditions of Approval  
Draft Master PTA Motion  
  - Exhibit A – PTA Motion Conditions of Approval  
Draft Master CEQA Motion  
  - Attachment A – CEQA Findings  
Exhibit B – Plans and Renderings  
Exhibit E – Maps and Context Photos
APPENDIX A
PROPERTY AND PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

CONTENTS:
KEY FOR REVIEW TYPES: □ - Over the Counter ("OTC") Review, □ - Staff / Administrative COA; □ - HPC / COA.

- 58-60 FEDERAL ST
- 491 POST ST
- 625 POLK ST
□ 2151 VAN NESS ST

PROJECT SITES:

Project Overview:
□ 491 Post Street

Property Overview:

- Constructed between 1913-1920
- Designed by James and Merritt Reid
- Historically known as the First Congregational Church
- Identified:
  ▪ As eligible for The National Register of Historic Places
  ▪ In the Foundation for San Francisco Architectural Heritage
  ▪ In the Junior League Inventory (1976)
  ▪ In Here Today (1968)
  ▪ In the LGBTQ Historic Context Statement

Project Overview:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Condition to be Altered</th>
<th>Existing Building Modifications to be Legalized As-Is.</th>
<th>Proposed Building Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remove existing lighting above statues, mount new light in same location reusing existing junction box</td>
<td>Existing wall signs Two sets of double doors leading to basement level Two light fixtures, one adjacent to each set of basement stairs Two vents in front façade window openings Skateboard deterrents Metal chain stanchion Screen in side façade window openings Fence above basement stairs (sign will be removed)</td>
<td>Install AAU business sign in wall sign Install interpretive panel on the building’s history Key card access Existing camera housing painted to match building with conduit adapter installed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove conduit and backbox on side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
58-60 Federal Street

Property Overview:

- Constructed between 1910-1912
- Designed by architects Perseo Righetti & August G. Headman
- Historically known as the Rincon Warehouse
- Identified in the:
  - South End Historic District National Register Certification (as contributor)
  - South of Market Area Plan
  - Foundation for San Francisco Architectural Heritage

Existing Condition to be Altered

- Main entrance glass door to be replaced with a steel frame door that is installed level with the façade of the building instead of current recessed location that can mimic the appearance of the former main entry
- Juliet balconies to be removed
- Front façade windows to be replaced with steel windows with true divided lites to match original size and historic fenestrations.
- Portion of one front façade window filled to match historic height
- Security camera and flex conduit to be removed.
- Removal of address sign
- Removal of protruding PVC pipe
- Removal of projecting bolt
- Removal of projecting light fixture

Existing Building Modifications to be Legalized As-Is

- Front façade window openings
- Three ground story metal roll-up doors with barrel housing (two on front façade, and one on rear)
- Five street lamps
- Fire stand pipe
- Southernmost metal door
- Vent pipe
- Metal door on second story of rear façade
- Ventilation grate in window opening on second story
- Roof line railing

Proposed Building Modifications

- Installation of two dome cameras with conduit
- Primary and secondary business signs
- Rear façade drain pipe relocated to interior.
625 Polk Street

Property Overview:
- Constructed in 1912
- Designed by architect Frederick Meyer.
- Historically known as the California Hall
- Identified:
  - In the Foundation for San Francisco Architectural Heritage
  - In the Junior League Inventory (1976)
  - In Here Today (1968)
  - In the LGBTQ Historic Context Statement

Project Overview:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Condition to be Altered</th>
<th>Existing Building Modifications to be Legalized As-Is.</th>
<th>Proposed Building Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retrofit historic light fixtures with LED lamps</td>
<td>Three sets of steel folding security gates</td>
<td>Install linear light features with concealed conduit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove exterior lights with conduit</td>
<td>Legalize wall sign (with modification that attachment’s align to building’s mortar joints)</td>
<td>Install security cameras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove bullet style security cameras with conduit, and back box or junction box</td>
<td></td>
<td>Install indirectly illuminated blade sign and two non-illuminated wall signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair building penetrations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Property Overview:

- Constructed in 1896, with additions in 1902-1904, 1930, 1943-1947, and 1965
- Designed by architects William and Frank Shea
- Historically known as St. Brigid’s Church
- Identified:
  - As eligible for The National Register of Historic Places
  - In the Van Ness Area Plan
  - In the Junior League Inventory (1976)
  - In Here Today (1968)

Project Overview:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Condition to be Altered</th>
<th>Existing Building Modifications to be Legalized As-Is.</th>
<th>Proposed Building Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remove existing sign</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Install non-illuminated free standing sign to Broadway-side fence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change the existing wall sign at the right secondary entrance door to an AAU sign with indirect illumination inside at top of cabinet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A
PROPERTY AND PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

CONTENTS:
KEY FOR REVIEW TYPES: □ - Over the Counter (“OTC”) Review; ■ - Staff / Minor PTA; ▲ - HPC / Major PTA.

- 77-79 NEW MONTGOMERY
- 180 NEW MONTGOMERY
- 620 SUTTER
- 625-629 SUTTER
- 655 SUTTER
- 680-688 SUTTER
- 410 BUSH
- 540 POWELL

PROJECT SITES:

- 77-79 New Montgomery Street

Property Overview:
- Constructed in c. 1920
- Designed by architect Mel I. Schwartz
- Historically known as the Crossley Building
- Identified in the:
  - San Francisco Modern Architecture and Landscape Design Historic Context Statement
  - SoMa Pilipinas Filipino Cultural Heritage District Context Statement

Project Overview:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Condition to be Altered</th>
<th>Existing Building Modifications to be Legalized As-Is</th>
<th>Proposed Building Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing wall-mounted luminaries along Jessie Street (secondary facade) will have their conduits internally routed. Existing awnings shall remain, but their copy / logo will be removed.</td>
<td>Upper-story windows. The (3) atelier signs shall not have any additional AAU logo, sublettering, or general branding, but shall remain in place and be used to showcase student work.</td>
<td>N/A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
180 New Montgomery Street

Property Overview:
- Constructed in c. 1920
- Designed by architect Kenneth MacDonald Jr.
- Historically known as the San Francisco Furniture Exchange for the Sharon Estate
- Identified:
  - As eligible for The National Register of Historic Places
  - In the Foundation for San Francisco Architectural Heritage
  - In the Transit Center District Historic Resource Survey Update
  - In the SoMa Pilipinas Filipino Cultural Heritage District Context Statement

Project Overview:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Condition to be Altered</th>
<th>Existing Building Modifications to be Legalized As-Is.</th>
<th>Proposed Building Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Painted (black) base will be repainted (beige) to match the existing exterior walls.</td>
<td>Natoma Alley YBCBD improvements, murals, and street activation furniture. Upper-story windows (with tinting). Fire alarm on exterior of structure.</td>
<td>Existing lights to be removed and new lights shall be inserted as recessed bulbs within the existing bay’s soffits, with internally routed conduits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The punctures and exterior damages to be repaired and patched.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where the metal paneling has been removed and replaced with tinted glazing, it shall be restored to have metal paneling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

620 Sutter Street

Property Overview:
- Constructed in 1918
- Designed by architect Lewis Hobart; Interior Design by Julia Morgan.
- Historically known as the Young Women’s Christian Association (YWCA)
- Identified:
  - As eligible for The National Register of Historic Places
  - In the Foundation for San Francisco Architectural Heritage

Project Overview:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Condition to be Altered</th>
<th>Existing Building Modifications to be Legalized As-Is.</th>
<th>Proposed Building Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The damaged YWCA engraving shall be restored. Patch and repair work of damaged stone base.</td>
<td>Upper-story vents in the windows. Freeform dome security camera.</td>
<td>Existing lights to be removed and new, recessed lights within the existing (3) entries, and exterior, wall-mounted lights on either side of the main entry (two fixtures total, mounted within mortar joints).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
625-629 Sutter Street

Property Overview:
- Constructed in 1921
- Designed by architects Samuel Hyman and Abraham Appleton
- Historically known as the Academy of Art College
- Identified:
  - As eligible for The National Register of Historic Places
  - In the Foundation for San Francisco Architectural Heritage

Project Overview:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Condition to be Altered</th>
<th>Existing Building Modifications to be Legalized As-Is.</th>
<th>Proposed Building Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awnings and lights to removed and the original transom windows revealed and restored.</td>
<td>Projecting sign to remain in existing location.</td>
<td>3 new light fixtures shall be installed: one recessed bulb within the main entry and one on either side of entry (2 total), wall-mounted to face of building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

655 Sutter Street

Property Overview:
- Constructed in 1912
- Designed by Frederick Herman Meyer
- Identified:
  - As eligible for The National Register of Historic Places
  - In the Foundation for San Francisco Architectural Heritage

Project Overview:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Condition to be Altered</th>
<th>Existing Building Modifications to be Legalized As-Is.</th>
<th>Proposed Building Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The (2) storefronts shall be repainted to be compatible with the KMMS Conservation District. The gooseneck lights and the linear lights over the (left) storefront shall be removed.</td>
<td>The sign over the main entry. The recessed lights above the (left) storefront.</td>
<td>(2) Small projecting signs (one for each business / storefront). New linear lights above the (right) storefront.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
680-688 Sutter Street

Property Overview:
- Constructed in 1918
- Designed by architect C.A. Meussdorffer
- Historically known as the Sutter Street Apartments
- Identified:
  - As eligible for The National Register of Historic Places
  - As eligible for the Apartment Hotel Historic District
  - In the California Register of Historic Places
  - In the Foundation for San Francisco Architectural Heritage

Project Overview:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Condition to be Altered</th>
<th>Existing Building Modifications to be Legalized As-Is.</th>
<th>Proposed Building Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The slider window at the ground floor shall be removed and replaced with a compatible window. Patch and repair work of damaged façade(s).</td>
<td>Existing “historic” AAU plaque.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

410 Bush Street

Property Overview:
- Constructed in 1915; later remodeled in 1946.
- Designed by O’Brien Brothers Inc. (1915); later remodeled by Albert F. Roller (1946), who is called out as a Master Architect in the San Francisco modern Architect and Landscape Design Historic Context Statement.

Project Overview:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Condition to be Altered</th>
<th>Existing Building Modifications to be Legalized As-Is.</th>
<th>Proposed Building Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Painted tiles (back and red at the corner of Bush St. and St. George Alley) shall be repainted to match the historic color of the tile. Former painted sign areas with no copy shall be painted to match the building color (on St. George Alley and Pine St. facades).</td>
<td>Upper-story aluminum windows on St. George Alley façade. Fences along pine and St. George Alley to be legalized (with the removal of barbed wire).</td>
<td>Existing lighting to be removed and new lighting, with internally routed conduits shall be installed along St. George Alley.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
540 Powell Street

Property Overview:
- Constructed in 1918
- Designed by Alexander Aimwell Cantin
- Historically known as the Elks Buildings
- Identified:
  - As Eligible for The National Register of Historic Places
  - In the Foundation for San Francisco Architectural Heritage
  - In the LGBTQ Historic Context Statement

Project Overview:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Condition to be Altered</th>
<th>Existing Building Modifications to be Legalized As-Is.</th>
<th>Proposed Building Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The existing, projecting sign shall be relocated below the belt course on the southern corner of the Powell façade (adjacent to the parking structure). All awnings will be removed. The marquee above the main (Powell) entry will be restored. The building façade and entry will be repaired and patched, where damaged.</td>
<td>Anson Place (secondary façade) windows to be legalized.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADOPTING FINDINGS FOR A MASTER CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR ALTERATIONS DETERMINED TO BE APPROPRIATE FOR AND CONSISTENT WITH THE PURPOSES OF ARTICLE 10 OF THE SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING CODE, AND THE OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES OF THE GENERAL PLAN, FOR FOUR (4) PROPERTIES OWNED OR LEASED BY THE ACADEMY OF ART UNIVERSITY (“THE ACADEMY”) WITHIN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO (“CITY”), CONSISTENT WITH THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT AND THE TERM SHEET FOR GLOBAL RESOLUTION BETWEEN THE CITY AND THE ACADEMY, AND TO ADOPT FINDINGS UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT. THE FOUR PROPERTIES ARE AS FOLLOWS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Review Type*</th>
<th>Cross Street(s)</th>
<th>Block / Lot</th>
<th>Zoning District/ Height and Bulk District</th>
<th>Landmark District or Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58-60 Federal St.</td>
<td>☐ COA</td>
<td>2nd St., Delancey St.</td>
<td>3774/074</td>
<td>MUO (Mixed Use-Office), 65-X</td>
<td>South End Landmark District Contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491 Post St.</td>
<td>☐ Admin COA</td>
<td>Mason St.</td>
<td>0307/009</td>
<td>C-3-G, (Downtown-General), 80-130-F</td>
<td>Landmark Number 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601-625 Polk St.</td>
<td>☐ Admin COA</td>
<td>Turk St.</td>
<td>0742/002</td>
<td>NC-3 (Neighborhood Commercial, Moderate Scale) 130-E</td>
<td>Landmark Number 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2151 Van Ness St.</td>
<td>☐ OTC</td>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>0575/015</td>
<td>RC-4 (Residential-Commercial, High Density), 80-D</td>
<td>Landmark Number 252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*KEY FOR REVIEW TYPES: ☐ - Over the Counter (“OTC”) Review, ☐ - Staff / Administrative COA; ☐ - HPC / COA.

www.sfplanning.org
BACKGROUND

The Academy of Art University (the “Academy”) is a private, for-profit post-secondary academic institution that currently occupies, either in part or in full, 40 properties within the City and County of San Francisco (“City”) for its existing educational programs, recreational activities, and student housing. In 2007, the Academy occupied 34 properties. In 12 of which, the Academy implemented various building modifications without benefit of required building permits, Administrative Certificates of Appropriateness (Admin COA), and/or Certificates of Appropriateness (COA) entitlements, and/or Minor Permit to Alter, and/or Permit to Alter (PTA) entitlements. In 28 of the 34 properties occupied in 2007, the Academy had implemented various tenant improvements, façade alterations and changes of use without benefit of required conditional uses, building permits or other entitlements. In order to evaluate the potential impacts associated with bringing these 28 buildings into compliance with the San Francisco Planning Code and to analyze the Academy’s then-proposed plans for growth, an environmental impact report (“EIR”) and an Existing Sites Technical Memorandum (“ESTM”) were prepared between 2010 and 2016. During this period, one or more LLC Parties acquired an additional six buildings beyond the 34 already occupied, bringing the total number of properties owned or occupied by the Academy to 40.

On February 25, 2015, the Department published the Draft Environmental Impact Report and held a fully advertised public hearing on said Draft Environmental Report on April 16, 2015 at which opportunity for public comment was given. On July 28, 2016, the Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting on Environmental Application No. 2008.0586E and the Final Environmental Impact Report was adopted in Motion No. 19704.

On May 6, 2016, the City Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco (the “City Attorney”), on behalf of the City and the People of the State of California, commenced litigation against the Academy and certain LLC Parties in People v. Stephens Institute, et. al, San Francisco Superior Court Number CGC-16-551-832 (the “Lawsuit”). In the Lawsuit, the City Attorney alleged violations of the City’s Administrative Code, Planning Code, Building Code and the State Unfair Competition Law, Business and Professions Code Section 17200 et seq. (the “UCL”). Following court-supervised settlement discussions to resolve the Lawsuit, the City and the Academy entered into a non-binding Term Sheet for Global Resolution dated November 15, 2016 (the “Initial Term Sheet”), and a non-binding Supplement to Term Sheet for Global Resolution, dated July 10, 2019 (the “Supplement”) (the Initial Term Sheet and the Supplement are referred to collectively as the “Term Sheet”). The Term Sheet was intended to provide a basis to resolve all of the outstanding issues relating to the Lawsuit with respect to land use matters and to establish appropriate principles and processes for land use compliance by the Academy. The settlement of the Lawsuit includes payment to the City of a substantial Affordable Housing Public Benefit; payment of Planning Code and UCL penalties for past violations; agreements regarding the Academy’s provisions of housing to its students; the withdrawal and cessation of all further use at nine (9) of the Academy’s existing properties; legalization of Academy uses at the remaining 31 original properties; and approval of new uses at 3 additional properties. The Project also includes internal and external building modifications to remove unpermitted work, legalize and or modify unpermitted work, and to implement the legalization of uses, including signage.

On July 25, 2019, the Planning Commission accepted as complete the Academy’s Institutional Master Plan, which was informed by the Term Sheet and Settlement Agreement.
On October 9, 2019, the Planning Department issued an Addendum to the FEIR, in which it determined that the actions contemplated as part of the Settlement Agreement (as implemented principally by a Development Agreement) and the accompanying ordinance comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.); that no supplemental or subsequent environmental review is required, as there are no substantial changes to the proposed Project, or to the circumstances under which the Project will be undertaken, involving new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified environmental effects; and that there is no new information of substantial importance that shows that the Project will have one or more effects not discussed in the FEIR, that the previously identified effects will be more severe, or that there are mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce such effects, but the Project proponents refuse to adopt them.

On November 20, 2019, the Commission adopted findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines, and a Statement of Overriding Considerations. Those findings are incorporated herein by reference.

PREAMBLE

Pursuant to the Term Sheet, the Settlement Agreement and the Development Agreement, on October 09, 2019, Jim Abrams of J. Abrams Law (hereinafter “Project Sponsor”) filed Application No. 2019-012970COA (hereinafter “Application”) with the San Francisco Planning Department (hereinafter “Department”) for a Master Certificate of Appropriateness (hereafter “COA”) to establish and legalize building modifications (hereafter “Project”) to four (4) properties (hereafter “Project Sites”) which are owned or leased by the Academy of Art University (hereafter “the Academy”) within locally designated Landmark Districts or individual Landmarks under Article 10 of the Planning Code.

On November 20, 2019, the Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting on Permit to Alter Application No. 2019-012970COA.

The Planning Department Commission Secretary is the custodian of records; the File for Record No. 2019-012970 COA 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 Master Certificate of Appropriateness, as requested in Application No. 2019-012970COA in conformance with the architectural plans dated October 11, 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. **Property Description.** Each of the project site’s descriptions are listed beneath their respective Project Site address, below.

3. **Project Description.** The proposed project involves legalizing the building modifications at the project sites, per the plans dated October 11, 2019. The scopes of work for each proposed project are listed beneath their Project Site address, below.
Property Description

Constructed between 1910 and 1912, in advance of the 1914 opening of the Panama Canal, 58-60 Federal Street was commissioned by M.J. Hawley of the Rincon Warehouse Company for an estimated cost of $200,000. Designed by Perseo Righetti & August G. Headman, the building was “one of the largest and most costly warehouses in the city” at the time of its construction. The site was particularly promising, given its proximity to both the harbor and adjacent rail lines, an advantage that had become “recognized within the last two weeks by capitalists, who bought two valuable holdings in the same warehouse districts.” The building was originally occupied by Weston Basket and Barrel Company, which utilized the space for offices, storage, and manufacturing operations.¹

The cohesive, industrial character of the adjacent area reflects “the development of warehouses over a 120-year period along the southern waterfront” of San Francisco. The interdependence of architecture and history can be seen from a look at the evolution of warehouse forms along the southern waterfront. Unlike most other areas of the San Francisco waterfront, the South End district contains an extraordinary concentration of buildings from almost every period of San Francisco’s maritime history. Several street fronts…are characterized by solid walls of brick and reinforced concrete warehouses. With this harmony of scale and materials, the South End Historic District is clearly a visually recognizable place. …The buildings of the South End Historic District represent a rich and varied cross-section of the prominent local architects and builders of the period.²

The warehouse is five stories in height and rectangular in plan, with steel-reinforced concrete construction. The property is built out to fill the lot and set flush with the sidewalk. Utilitarian in design, the building is capped with a flat roof, terminating in a shallow copping along the sixth story. Centered atop the fifth story of the property is a one-story sixth floor. The façade is characterized by an asymmetrical, purpose-driven design, with little evident or extant ornamental detailing on the exterior.³

On the primary elevation, the entrance consists of paired glass doors with a single-light transom, deeply recessed within the wall plane. Framing the entrance portico is a Classical Revival-inspired pediment and door surround. (The main entrance, currently located in the north portion of the façade, was originally centered on the façade.) On the primary elevation, access is provided through a series of roll-up doors of various sizes, as well as single and paired

¹ Appendix HR: Historic Resource Evaluations
² San Francisco Planning Code, Article 10, Appendix I, South End Historic District
³ Appendix HR: Historic Resource Evaluations
doors with simple wood frames. Fenestration consists of a variety of window configurations and types, with multi-light, fixed, and casement steel-frame windows.\(^4\)

As with the primary elevation, the northeast elevation exhibits a series of roll-up doors on the first and second stories. Fenestration consists of varying window types, including steel-frame multi-light, fixed, casement, and sliding windows. On the northwest elevation, the overall pattern of window openings is asymmetrical and program-driven. Metal railings have been added in front of some of the larger sliding windows.\(^5\)

Project Description:

The proposed project at 58-60 Federal St. includes replacement of the main entrance recessed glass doors, installed without benefit of a permit, to a door which more closely matches the original appearance and recess; removal of windows and juliette balconies installed without benefit of permit, replacing these with new steel windows with true divided lights to match historic fenestration; and work to legalize/authorize exterior changes including metal rollup doors, security cameras, and signage. Work is proposed on the subject property’s front southwest façade and rear northeast façade. The proposed scope of work related to each façade that the HPC will review is the following:

- Southwest elevation – Unpermitted recessed glass doors will be removed at primary entrance and replaced with new steel frame doors to more closely match historic appearance and recess. All juliette balconies will be removed. Windows will be removed from several sets of windows and replaced with steel windows with true divided lites to match original size and historic fenestrations, and window openings will be legalized. On the top story, the window closest to the northernmost column of center bay, will be removed, and the opening will be filled to match the historic window height. Bullet style security camera and exterior flex conduit will be removed. Two sets of metal roll-up doors with barrel housing on exterior will be legalized. Installation of a small form factor dome camera above the northernmost door will be authorized with conduit routed above the electrical gutter. Installation of a single small form factor panoramic dome camera just right of the northernmost street lamp will be authorized. The proposed identifying sign on the existing glazed transom above the entrance will be authorized as secondary sign. The proposed indirectly illuminated the Academy business wall sign painted on the roll-up door will be authorized as primary sign. The existing address sign will be removed. PVC piping projecting out of the wall will be removed. The existing fire stand pipe, southernmost metal door, and vent pipe will be legalized. The projecting bolt above the entrance door will be removed, and façade will be restored to match. Projecting light fixtures will be removed.

- Northeast elevation – The metal roll-up door on ground story with barrel housing on exterior will be legalized. The existing metal door on second story will be legalized. The existing ventilation grate in window opening on second story will be legalized.

\(^4\) Appendix HR: Historic Resource Evaluations

\(^5\) Appendix HR: Historic Resource Evaluations
The existing railing on roof line will be legalized. The existing drainpipe will be relocated to the interior.

Please see photographs and plans (Exhibit B) for details.

491 Post Street

Property Description

Designed by James and Merritt Reid, 491 Post Street was constructed between 1913 and 1915 as the home of the First Congregational Church of San Francisco. This building replaced the group’s earlier Gothic Revival-style church constructed on the site in 1870 and destroyed in the 1906 earthquake and fire. The First Congregational Church owned and occupied the building from the 1910s for nearly 90 years, until 2001, when the building was sold due to the congregation’s declining numbers and need for a smaller space. On the occasion of the building’s sale, the San Francisco Chronicle noted that the First Congregational Church had been established in 1850 by a former missionary determined to bring God to the godless masses of a Gold Rush boomtown. Members first met in a small, wooden building on Jackson Street, between Stockton and Powell streets, before moving to the current site, at the corner of Mason and Post streets. Its main hall, with a gently sloping floor and U-shaped balcony, can seat 1,200 comfortably.  

As recently as the 1960s, the article noted, the congregation’s numbers held steady, with more than 700 well into the postwar period. As the years wore on, however, congregation members “drifted off to the suburbs or other parts of the city. The crowds—even supplemented by tourists wandering in from their hotels—shrank. The church now [as of 2001] has about 60 active members.”

The property was identified in the LGBTQ Historic Context Statement, as San Francisco Bay Area Gay Fathers met there in the late 1970s. The group’s membership included about 40 gay fathers, including founder Bill Jones, reportedly the first single gay man to adopt a child in the U.S. While the group’s initial efforts centered on radical gender politics, over time they also focused on organizing assistance around custody and visitation.

The building was purchased by the Academy in 2001. 

Exhibiting a Neoclassical/Italian Renaissance-inspired design, and made of steel-reinforced concrete with terra cotta ornament, the building displays a monumental scale and symmetrical design composition. The primary entrance faces Post Street, with the secondary elevation extending southward along Mason Street. The focal point of the design is a series of giant order Corinthian columns on the facade, fluted and clad in terra cotta. The Mason Street elevation is defined by arched, deeply recessed window openings, separated by giant order attached columns.

---
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7 Appendix HR: Historic Resource Evaluations
8 Page 218 of the LGBTQ Historic Context Statement
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Corinthian columns. Along the roof line, a bold, stepped cornice line defines the horizontal axis and balances the overall design.\textsuperscript{10}

On Post Street, the main entrance consists of a recessed entry portico, accessed via a broad stairway. Five bays span the façade, with paired, wood-paneled doors on the ground floor and large multi-light windows recessed within arched, decorative openings on the second floor. Two entrances are sheltered beneath triangular pediments, and the other three are framed beneath lintels. In addition to the giant order Corinthian columns, ornament on the façade includes attached, fluted pilasters, keystones, and other applied ornament. Windows are generally multi-light stained glass windows with aluminum awning inserts. The congregation name appears in scored concrete above the three center doors. On either side of the primary elevation, paired metal doors lead to the basement level.\textsuperscript{11}

Project Description:

The proposed project at 491 Post Street is to legalize existing signage, and replace security cameras, lighting, and associated conduit, legalize two sets of double doors allowing basement level access, legalize skateboard deterrents, authorize keycard access, legalize a metal chain stanchion, and fence, and legalize an existing screen and vent. While the majority of the proposed project includes scopes of work delegated to Planning Department Preservation staff through the Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness process per Motion No 0376, adopted by the HPC on May 15, 2019, the work is being reviewed as part of a master application, as outlined in the Development Agreement, and requires HPC’s review. The subject property has two street-facing facades on Post Street to the north and Mason Street to the east. The proposed scope of work related to each façade that the HPC will review is the following:

- **North elevation** – Two sets of double doors, one on each side of the façade, leading to basement level will be legalized. Existing lighting above the statues will be removed, and new minimized lighting will be mounted in the same location reusing the existing junction box. Two existing enclosures with light fixtures, one adjacent to each set of basement stairs, will be legalized. Two existing church wall fixture signs will be legalized, one for the Academy business sign with indirect illumination and the other for an interpretive panel on the building’s history (to be reviewed/approved by Planning Department Preservation staff) with indirect illumination. Two sets of existing vents will be legalized, one on the top row of windows on the westernmost bay, and the other on the top row of windows on the easternmost bay.

- **West elevation** — The existing skateboard deterrents will be legalized. The existing metal chain stanchion spanning the five columns will be legalized. The existing screen filling the most northerly set of window openings will be legalized. The existing fence above the basement stairs will be legalized, with the existing sign removed. Key card access at the door on Mason Street for the purposes of Class I bike parking access will be authorized. Conduit and a backbox at the Mason Street door will be removed, and

\textsuperscript{10} Appendix HR: Historic Resource Evaluations

\textsuperscript{11} Appendix HR: Historic Resource Evaluations
the existing camera housing will be painted to match building color with a conduit adapter installed to feed directly into the camera body.

Please see photographs and plans (Exhibit B) for details.

**625 Polk Street**

**Property Description**

Designed by Frederick Meyer, 625 Polk Street was constructed in 1912 as the California Hall. Said to have been inspired by Heidelberg Castle, this building is variously described as teutonic baroque or German renaissance, in either case a style rarely seen in San Francisco. The building was financed by funds collected by German societies. The hall, originally named Das Deutsches Haus, opened with an elaborate celebration that included a message of personal best wishes from Kaiser Wilhelm. It was long a social center for the large local German community which was concentrated in the area. When built, it was the finest ethnic hall in San Francisco. It has a flamboyantly elaborate terra cotta facade. The rusticated terra cotta base has its cornice supported by a band of square medallions. Each of the other three stories has its own cornice and highly decorated frieze in a different style. A heavier cornice with block modillions supports the mansard roof, which sports heavily ornamented dormers. The original grand glass and iron marquee survives. The interior features a central grand ballroom with balcony; in the lower level is a restaurant with wooden booths and a long bar, all in dark wood paneling.\(^\text{12}\)

The property was identified in the LGBTQ Historic Context Statement, and is potentially significant under the National Register of Historic Places Criterion A // California State Register of Historic Places Criterion 1 for its association with Council on Religion and the Homosexual’s New Year’s Eve Mardi Gras in 1964 where one of the worst cases of police harassment in history occurred. Additionally, in 1956 the Daughters of Bilitis, the nation’s first lesbian-rights organization, held its first public event here in 1956. \(^\text{13}\)

**Project Description:**

The proposed project at 625 Polk Street is to legalize three sets of steel folding security gates, legalize existing and authorize new signage, replace existing security cameras, lighting, and associated conduit, and repair existing penetrations. While the majority of the proposed project includes scopes of work delegated to Planning Department Preservation staff through the Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness process per Motion No 0376, adopted by the HPC on May 15, 2019, the work is being reviewed as part of a master application, as outlined in the delegation agreement, and requires HPC’s review. The subject property has two front

\(^{12}\) https://sfplanninggis.org/pim/

\(^{13}\) Pages 129, 144, and 335 of the LGBTQ Historic Context Statement
facades on Polk Street to the east and Turk Street to the south. The proposed scope of work related to each façade that the HPC will review is the following:

- **East elevation** – Existing steel folding security gates, one set at the primary entrance, and one set at the secondary entrance to the right, will be legalized. Four historic light fixtures will be retrofitted with LED lamps. Six sets of exterior lights and associated conduit will be removed, as well as two bullet style security cameras with associated conduit, back box or junction box. Eight linear light fixtures will be installed, with conduit concealed and connected to J-Box within the groove. Three small form factor dome cameras will be installed, with cable installed within the camera housing, and painted to match the exterior building color. An existing wall sign to the left of the primary entrance will be legalized, with a modification that the attachments align to the façade’s mortar joints. One indirectly illuminated blade sign, and one non-illuminated wall sign will be installed.

- **South elevation** – One set of existing steel folding security gates will be legalized. Seven sets of exterior lights and associated conduit will be removed, as well as three bullet style security cameras with conduits, camera backbox and junction box. Existing penetrations shall be appropriately repaired. Three small form factor dome cameras will be installed, with cable installed within the camera housing, and painted to match the exterior building color. One non-illuminated wall sign will be installed. Seven pairs of linear light fixtures will be installed, with conduit concealed and connected to J-Box within the groove.

Please see photographs and plans (Exhibit B) for details.

### 2151 Van Ness Avenue

**Property Description**

The Romanesque-Richardsonian church at 2151 Van Ness Avenue was constructed by the San Francisco’s Roman Catholic Archdiocese for the parish of St. Brigid. The parish was founded in 1862 with the construction of the current church building beginning in 1896. The church was originally designed by the architectural firm of Shea and Shea. Additions in 1902-1904, 1930, 1943-1947, and 1965 have turned the building into the irregular shaped building seen today. Located on a rectangular, sloped lot and set flush to the sidewalk, the building has a primary elevation fronting Van Ness Avenue and secondary elevations facing the neighboring properties and Broadway Street.14

Comprised of varying volumes and heights, the Gothic-Richardsonian Romanesque style building displays an interweaving of Celtic and Romanesque themes throughout. The primary volume features a cross-gable roof, rounded half dome above the apse, and a flat roof on the sacristy addition to the west. Clad in masonry, granite curbstones, and terra cotta wall cladding, the church has a five-story northeast corner of the lot and two-story flat roof tower.

14 Appendix HR: Historic Resource Evaluations
on the southeast corner. The rooflines are marked by arcading. Characteristic of the style, the structure features detailed ornamentation of the entry portals, arched windows, and rose and arched windows.\textsuperscript{15}

A central main entry with a detailed double-panel doors and a decorative stone surround with five concentric arches is featured on the primary elevation. Above the main entry is a row of deco style statues in arched niches, with the center niche standing taller than the rest, and a border molding. A rose window encircled by granite blocks is centered above the statues. Secondary entries flank the main entry on the ground floor of each tower with a pair of arched stained glass windows separated by a column above. Single narrow arched windows flank the main entry and define the upper stories of the northeastern tower. Ornamental Lombard bands are present on the gable ends and between the towers.\textsuperscript{16}

Secondary elevations are visible on the north, south, and west elevations. The north and south elevations feature tall arched arcades stained glass windows with surrounds along the nave. Smaller arcades of arched stain glass windows are located on the upper story of the north and south elevation along the nave and wrapping around the chancel on the west elevation. Rose windows with granite surrounds are located on the wings extending from the sanctuary. On the northern elevation, above the rose window is a V-shaped row of statues in arched niches with a border molding. Underneath the windows of the nave are single doors leading to the basement; there are four on the north elevation and one on the south elevation. Security fencing has been added in front of the nave between the towers and extending wings along the north and south elevations, restricting access to the basement doors. Access to the western elevation is restricted by a chain-link metal fence with an inset door. On the ground story of the western elevation, in the northern corner, is a metal double-door which currently functions as the primary entry. Stained glass windows in circular, rose, and arched window openings are found on the secondary elevations in various configurations.\textsuperscript{17}

Citing dwindling attendance and the need to seismically upgrade the building, the Archdiocese closed the parish in 1994. The building sat vacant for 11 years prior to the Academy’s occupancy in 2005.\textsuperscript{18}

Project Description:

The proposed project at 2151 Van Ness Avenue is to authorize the installation of a non-illuminated freestanding sign attached to the north elevation Broadway-side fence, to change the existing wall sign at the right secondary entrance door to an the Academy sign with indirect illumination inside at top of cabinet, and remove existing sign on fence on the East Elevation Van Ness side. While the proposed project can be authorized through an over-the-counter
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permit, pursuant to Planning Code Section 1006(e)(6), the work is being reviewed as part of a master application, as outlined in the delegation agreement, and requires HPC review.

Please see photographs and plans (Exhibit B) for details.

4. Surrounded Properties and Neighborhood:

58 Federal Street: South End Historic District

58 Federal Street is a Contributory building to the South End Historic District, a district which is particularly notable due to its extraordinary concentration of buildings from almost every period of San Francisco’s maritime history. The historic district’s period of significance is 1867-1935, and its characteristic street fronts lined with in-tact solid walls of brick and reinforced concrete warehouses contribute to its visual uniqueness. Ranging from earlier one-story buildings to three-story buildings which became more common after the 1906 earthquake, a varied cross-section of prominent local architects and builders are represented throughout the district. The close proximity to Oracle Park, nearby Caltrain station, and mixed-use office zoning have all lended to the neighborhood’s current vibrancy.

491 Post Street: Landmark 177

This property falls within the C-3 Zoning district, which covers the western portions of downtown and is composed of a variety of uses: retail, offices, hotels, entertainment, clubs and institutions, and high-density residential. While an Article 10 Individual Landmark, 491 Post Street also falls within the Article 11 Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter Conservation District. This district covers a large area whose historic buildings were built in less than 20 years, and constructed in similar styles and structural technologies under architects schooled in the classical Beaux Arts traditions. It’s buildings are small-scaled, light-colored, and predominantly four to eight stories in height with compatible detailing, colors, materials, massing and scale. Ornament was derived from Classical, Renaissance, Gothic and Romanesque sources, as well as limited Spanish Colonial models.

625 Polk Street

This property falls within the NC-3 (Neighborhood Commercial, Moderate Scale) Zoning District. NC-3 districts are linear districts located along heavily trafficked thoroughfares which also serve as major transit routes. Surrounding lot sizes are generally large with buildings ranging in height from two to five stories, with occasional taller structures. Falling within a two-block radius of Van Ness Avenue, much of the surrounding building stock can be characterized by its association with the Van Ness automotive district. The Van Ness Auto Row Support Structures Survey was adopted by the SF HPC in 2010 and concluded that the largest concentration of SF’s auto-related buildings fall within the district, including showrooms, garages and repair shops built with reinforced concrete. Many of the buildings have undergone adaptive reuse, though still retain characteristics reflecting their historic auto-associated uses. Other nearby buildings include features common to the nearby Uptown Tenderloin National Register historic district such as brick or concrete exterior walls, bay windows on the street facades, flat roofs surrounded by parapets, and fire escapes.
2151 Van Ness Street
This property falls within the RC-4 (Residential-Commercial, High Density) Zoning District. These districts are intended to preserve predominant residential uses, while supporting neighborhood-serving commercial uses generally at the ground floor, and function as compact, walkable, transit-oriented neighborhoods. Nearby buildings range from one to four stories, with occasional taller structures. Several nearby lots are larger in size relative to other lots throughout the neighborhood and city. While there is a diversity of surrounding architectural styles, a number of nearby buildings include bay windows, flat roofs surrounded by parapets, and brick and/or stucco exteriors. Still buildings with other features including pitched roofs, recessed windows, and/or wood siding are not uncommon in the nearby vicinity.

5. Public Outreach and Comments. To date, staff has not received public comment on the Preservation entitlements.

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(b) of the Planning Code, the proposed alterations shall be consistent with and appropriate for the effectuation of the purposes of this Article 10.

The proposed project is consistent with Article 10.

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 will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces and spatial relationships.

(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.

(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, will not be undertaken.
(4) **Standard 4:** Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

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

(6) **Standard 6:** Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

(7) **Standard 7:** Chemical or physical treatments, if possible, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

(8) **Standard 8:** Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

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

(10) **Standard 10:** New additions and adjacent or related new construction will 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 proposal at each of the four (4) Article 10 Project Sites will not remove distinctive materials, nor irreversibly alter features that characterize the buildings. The proposed alterations at each building retains the existing appearance, distinctive features and finishes, and restores material impairments. If any building modifications are proposed, the work offers a compatible (in material, feature, size, scale, and finish), but differentiated, proposal. Staff has conducted site visits and reviewed the alterations, legalizations, and proposed scopes of work, and confirms that distinctive features and finishes will be preserved. On balance, the project does not impair the buildings’ ability to convey its significance and work shall be performed in a manner which restores and retains each project site’s integrity. Therefore, the proposal conforms to the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation.

C. **Appendix I of Article 10: South End Historic District.** Section 7 of the South End Historic District includes specific standards and guidelines for the review of new construction and certain alterations. The project subject to the specific standards outlined in Appendix I is: 58
Federal Street. The Commission finds the proposed alterations to 58 Federal Street are compatible with the pertinent provisions of Section 7 as follows:

a. Character of the Historic District. The standards for review of all applications for the Certificate of Appropriateness are set forth in Section 1006.7 of Article 10. For purposes of review pursuant to these standards, the character of the historic district shall mean the exterior architectural features as well as the historic brick and stone paving materials described in Section 6 of this ordinance.

The subject building does not include historic brick or stone paving. Exterior architectural features of the subject property, including the main entry doors, windows, and fenestration patterns are being restored to more closely resemble their historic character.

b. Alterations. It is recognized that certain alterations to the exteriors of buildings within the Historic District may be necessary in order to accommodate adaptive reuse of, and to provide sufficient light and air in, such buildings. Substantial alterations to Principal Facades, as defined in Planning Code Section 102, should be discouraged. Substantial alterations to non-principal facades, not originally intended to be viewed from the street, may be appropriate, provided such alterations maintain the character of the historic district.

Several non-historic features will be removed from the façade, and façade restoration will be required in locations where such features are removed. Alterations to the exterior will be limited to necessary accommodations for the building to function under its current use as an Academy of Arts facility. Alterations will not impact the character of the historic district including its overall form and continuity, or the building’s scale and proportion. Several building features will be restored to more closely match historic fenestration and materials.

7. General Plan Compliance. The proposed Permit to Alter 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 Master 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 respect the neighborhood character by strengthening the character-defining features of the buildings.

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

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

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

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

The proposed projects 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.

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 provisions of Article 10 of the Planning Code.
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 Master Certificate of Appropriateness for four properties’ proposed work in conformance with the architectural submittal dated October 11, 2019 and labeled Exhibit B on file in the docket for Record No. 2019-012970COA.

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 that period of time as specified pursuant to the Development Agreement. The Department of Building Inspection shall have issued Building Permits or Site Permits to construct the project and/or commence the approved scope of work within the performance period as specified in the Development Agreement.

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 November 20, 2019.

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES:

NAYS:

ABSENT:

ADOPTED: November 20, 2019
EXHIBIT A

AUTHORIZATION UPDATE

This authorization is for a permit to allow alterations and building modifications at four (4) properties owned or leased by the Academy of Art University (“the Academy”) within the City and County of San Francisco (“City”) pursuant to Planning Code Article 10; consistent with the proposed Development Agreement and the Term Sheet for Global Resolution between the City and the Academy; in general conformance with plans, dated October 11, 2019, and stamped “EXHIBIT B” included in the docket for Record No. 2019-012970COA; and subject to conditions of approval reviewed and approved by the Historic Preservation Commission on November 20, 2019 under Motion No XXXX. This authorization and the conditions contained herein run with the property and not with a particular Project Sponsor, business, or operator.

PRINTING OF CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL ON PLANS

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

SEVERABILITY

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

CHANGES AND MODIFICATIONS

Changes to the approved plans may be approved administratively by the Zoning Administrator or Planning Department Historic Preservation staff if work is determined to be of “Minor” scope, pursuant to the identification and delegation of building modifications outlined in Motion No. 0376, and consistent with Article 10 of the Planning Code. 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. Changes to the approved plans are also subject to the controls stipulated in the Development Agreement, as adopted through resolution 2019-012970DVA.

Conditions of Approval, Compliance, Monitoring, and Reporting

PERFORMANCE

1. Validity. The authorization and right vested by virtue of this action is valid for that period of time as specified pursuant to the Development Agreement. The Department of Building Inspection shall
have issued Building Permits or Site Permits to construct the project and/or commence the approved uses within the performance period as specified in the Development Agreement.

2. **Expiration and Renewal.** Should a Building or Site Permit be sought after the three (3) year period has lapsed, the project sponsor must seek a renewal of this Authorization by filing an application for an amendment to the original Authorization or a new application for Authorization. Should the project sponsor decline to so file, and decline to withdraw the permit application, the Commission shall conduct a public hearing in order to consider the revocation of the Authorization. Should the Commission not revoke the Authorization following the closure of the public hearing, the Commission shall determine the extension of time for the continued validity of the Authorization.

3. **Diligent Pursuit.** Once a site or Building Permit has been issued, construction must commence within the timeframe required by either the Department of Building Inspection or the Schedule of Performance as specified in the Development Agreement, whichever is less, and be continued diligently to completion. Failure to do so shall be grounds for the Commission to consider revoking the approval if more than three (3) years have passed since this Authorization was approved.

4. **Extension.** All time limits in the preceding three paragraphs may only be extended pursuant to the remedies afforded through the Development Agreement.

5. **Conformity with Current Law.** No application for Building Permit, Site Permit, or other entitlement shall be approved unless it complies with all applicable provisions of City Codes in effect at the time of such approval.

### ADDITIONAL APPROVALS REQUIRED

6. The Project Sponsor must obtain approval through the Master Permit to Alter from the Historic Preservation Commission, pursuant to Articles 11 and the Development Agreement. The Project Sponsor must obtain approval through the Master Conditional Use Authorization from the Planning Commission, pursuant to the Development Agreement pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 304.6. The Project must obtain authorization through Board of Supervisors approval of an ordinance amending the Planning Code in order to implement the Project pursuant to the Settlement Agreement and Term Sheet, and adopting the Development Agreement between the Academy and City and making findings of consistency with the provisions of Administrative Code Sections 41 and 56. The conditions set forth below are additional conditions required in connection with the Project. If these conditions overlap with any other requirement imposed on the Project, the more restrictive or protective condition or requirement, as determined by the Zoning Administrator, shall apply.

### DESIGN - COMPLIANCE AT PLAN STAGE

7. **Final Materials.** The Project Sponsor shall continue to work with Planning Department on the building design. Final materials, glazing, color, texture, and detailing shall be subject to Department staff review for conformance with the plan sets and approval. This final review and approval includes, but is not limited to, review by historic preservation staff on final window materials, security camera and lighting fixtures, location and means of attachment, and methods.
of conduit concealment. The architectural addenda shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department prior to issuance.

8. **Fixture Plan.** The Project Sponsor shall submit additional exterior lighting and security fixture detail in its building permit applications prior to Planning Department approval of the building/site permit application.

9. **Signage.** The Project Sponsor shall provide additional detail in its building permit applications regarding the copy, method of attachment, and installation for the new signage approved as part of the Project, which detail shall be subject to review and approval by Planning Department staff for conformance with the Secretary’s Standards and any other City standards, as applicable.

**MITIGATION**

10. **Mitigation Measures.** Mitigation measures described in the Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP) attached as Exhibit C are necessary to avoid potential significant effects of the proposed project and have been agreed to by the project sponsor. Their implementation is a condition of project approval.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

11. **Confirmation of Contractor Qualification.** Prior to Planning Department approval of the building application, the Project Sponsor’s architect shall submit a written confirmation that the project sites selected general contractor and subcontractors (“Contractors”) meet the technical specifications qualifications and have completed work of a similar scale and scope required to perform the rehabilitation and restoration work required. This written confirmation from the architect will include the names of the Contractor(s), their roles in the project, list of preservation projects with property addresses undertaken by the contractor of similar scale and scope, the number of years of successful experience doing this work, and confirmation that the architect has reviewed and verified this experience.

12. **Site Inspections.** The Project Sponsor’s architect shall submit a schedule of site inspections, to be coordinated and completed with Department Staff regarding each project site undergoing work pursuant to the Schedule of Performance in the Development Agreement and consistent with the scope of work outlined in the architectural plans dated October 11, 2019, labelled Exhibit B. The schedule shall succinctly summarize the architect’s on-site inspection and confirmation that work is being completed in conformance with the approved plans.

13. **Interpretive Panel at 491 Post Street.** The Project Sponsor shall continue to work with Planning Department Preservation staff to refine the content and design of the interpretive panel proposed for 491 Post Street that ensures consistency and quality in the interpretation of the building’s history. Draft content and mock-ups proposed for the panel shall be subject to review and required for approval by Planning Department Preservation staff before submitting any building permits for the Project.
14. **Restoration Work.** The building permit applications shall contain the following detail regarding requirements to protect historic features of the building in conformance with the Secretary’s Standards and provisions of Article 10:

   a. Specification Sheets for replacement windows; and
   b. Detailed construction drawings for attachment mechanisms whereas any fixture or feature attached, affixed, or recessed within an exterior material shall be done so through a mortar joint and meet the Secretary of the Interior Standards;

In addition, the Project Sponsor’s architect shall send the Planning Department required subcontractor submittals, including submittals regarding product data, samples and schedules for concurrent review and comment by the Planning Department to be provided by the Planning Department to the Project Sponsor’s architect within two weeks of receipt. The details for such submittals may, as applicable, include, but not be limited to the following:

   a. Product data sheets used for the cleaning and protection of exterior historic elements;
   b. Product sheets used for solvents and equipment used to remove and/or repair elements;
   c. Sample of replacement and/or repair material for stone and masonry;
   d. Sample of repointing mortar;
   e. Sample of replacement historic elements such as masonry, metal awning, windows, etc.;
   f. Shop drawings for reproduction of decorative terra cotta, masonry, or stone elements at exterior, if any such elements are to be restored, conserved, replaced or if any such elements are damaged in the removal and/or installation of other elements;
   g. Shop drawings for replacement windows;
   h. Work schedule for the containment of hazardous materials during construction, cleaning, conservation, repair, and restoration work at each property site to ensure safeguarding the structure and mitigating hazardous particulates from occupants and the public; and
   i. Stabilization schedule and product data sheets for elements used to protect and retain the existing extant elements from damage during construction that takes place at the project sites reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission on November 20, 2019.

**MONITORING - AFTER ENTITLEMENT**

15. **Enforcement.** Violation of any of the Planning Department conditions of approval contained in this Motion or of any other provisions of Planning Code applicable to this Project shall be subject to the enforcement procedures and administrative penalties set forth under Planning Code Section 176 or Section 176.1. The Planning Department may also refer the violation complaints to other city departments and agencies for appropriate enforcement action under their jurisdiction.

16. **Monitoring.** The Project requires monitoring of the conditions of approval in this Motion. The Project Sponsor or the subsequent responsible parties for the Project shall pay fees as established under Planning Code Section 351(e) (1) and work with the Planning Department for information about compliance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address*</th>
<th>Review Type**</th>
<th>Cross Street(s)</th>
<th>Block / Lot</th>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Article 11 Category; Landmark District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77-79 New Montgomery</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Mission St., Jesse St.</td>
<td>3707 / 014</td>
<td>C-3-O(SD), 150-S</td>
<td>Category I; New Montgomery-Mission-2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 New Montgomery</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Howard St., Natoma St.</td>
<td>3722 / 022</td>
<td>C-3-O(SD), 150-S</td>
<td>Category IV; New Montgomery-Mission-2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620 Sutter St.</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Mason St.</td>
<td>0283 / 004A</td>
<td>C-3-G, 80-130-F</td>
<td>Category I; Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625-629 Sutter St.</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Mason St.</td>
<td>0297 / 014</td>
<td>C-3-G, 80-130-F</td>
<td>Category II; Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655 Sutter St.</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Mason St., Taylor St.</td>
<td>0297 / 012</td>
<td>C-3-G, 80-130-F</td>
<td>Category V; Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>680-688 Sutter St.</td>
<td>OTC</td>
<td>Taylor St.</td>
<td>0283 / 007</td>
<td>C-3-G, 160-F</td>
<td>Category IV; Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410 Bush St.</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Kearny St., Pine St.</td>
<td>0270 / 007</td>
<td>C-3-O, 80-130-F</td>
<td>Category V; Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540 Powell St.</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Anson Pl.</td>
<td>0285 / 009</td>
<td>C-3-R, 80-130-F</td>
<td>Category I; Kearny-Market Mason-Sutter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*491 Post Street is subject to both Article 10 and 11. Article 10 supersedes Article 11; therefore, please see 2019-012970COA.

**KEY FOR REVIEW TYPES: □ - Over the Counter ("OTC") Review; ▼ - Staff / Minor PTA; ▲ - HPC / Major PTA.
BACKGROUND

The Academy of Art University (the “Academy”) is a private, for-profit post-secondary academic institution that currently occupies, either in part or in full, 40 properties within the City and County of San Francisco (“City”) for its existing educational programs, recreational activities, and student housing. In 2007, the Academy occupied 34 properties. In 12 of which, the Academy implemented various building modifications without benefit of required building permits, Administrative Certificates of Appropriateness (Admin COA), and/or Certificates of Appropriateness (COA) entitlements, and/or Minor Permit to Alter, and/or Permit to Alter (PTA) entitlements. In 28 of the 34 properties occupied in 2007, the Academy had implemented various tenant improvements, façade alterations and changes of use without benefit of required conditional uses, building permits or other entitlements. In order to evaluate the potential impacts associated with bringing these 28 buildings into compliance with the San Francisco Planning Code and to analyze the Academy’s then-proposed plans for growth, an environmental impact report (“EIR”) and an Existing Sites Technical Memorandum (“ESTM”) were prepared between 2010 and 2016. During this period, one or more LLC Parties acquired an additional six buildings beyond the 34 already occupied, bringing the total number of properties owned or occupied by the Academy to 40.

On February 25, 2015, the Department published the Draft Environmental Impact Report and held a fully advertised public hearing on said Draft Environmental Report on April 16, 2015 at which opportunity for public comment was given. On July 28, 2016, the Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting on Environmental Application No. 2008.0586E. The Planning Commission approved the ESTM and certified the Final Environmental Impact Report in Motion No. 19704.

On May 6, 2016, the City Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco (the “City Attorney”), on behalf of the City and the People of the State of California, commenced litigation against the Academy and certain LLC Parties in People v. Stephens Institute, et. al, San Francisco Superior Court Number CGC-16-551-832 (the “Lawsuit”). In the Lawsuit, the City Attorney alleged violations of the City’s Administrative Code, Planning Code, Building Code and the State Unfair Competition Law, Business and Professions Code Section 17200 et seq. (the “UCL”). Following court-supervised settlement discussions to resolve the Lawsuit, the City and the Academy entered into a non-binding Term Sheet for Global Resolution dated November 15, 2016 (the “Initial Term Sheet”), and a non-binding Supplement to Term Sheet for Global Resolution, dated July 10, 2019 (the “Supplement”) (the Initial Term Sheet and the Supplement are referred to collectively as the “Term Sheet”). The Term Sheet was intended to provide a basis to resolve all of the outstanding issues relating to the Lawsuit with respect to land use matters and to establish appropriate principles and processes for land use compliance by the Academy. The settlement of the Lawsuit includes payment to the City of a substantial Affordable Housing Public Benefit; payment of Planning Code and UCL penalties for past violations; agreements regarding the Academy’s provisions of housing to its students; the withdrawal and cessation of all further use at nine (9) of the Academy’s properties; legalization of Academy uses at the remaining 31 original properties; and approval of new uses at 3 additional properties. The Project also includes internal and external building modifications to remove unpermitted work, legalize and or modify unpermitted work, and to implement the legalization of uses, including signage.

On July 25, 2019, the Planning Commission accepted as complete the Academy’s Institutional Master Plan, which was informed by the Term Sheet and Settlement Agreement.
On October 9, 2019, the Planning Department issued an Addendum to the FEIR, in which it determined that the actions contemplated as part of the Settlement Agreement (as implemented principally by a Development Agreement) and the accompanying ordinance comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.); that no supplemental or subsequent environmental review is required, as there are no substantial changes to the proposed Project, or to the circumstances under which the Project will be undertaken, involving new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified environmental effects; and that there is no new information of substantial importance that shows that the Project will have one or more effects not discussed in the FEIR, that the previously identified effects will be more severe, or that there are mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce such effects, but the Project proponents refuse to adopt them.

On November 20, 2019, the Commission will adopt findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) and the CEQA Guidelines, and a Statement of Overriding Considerations. Those findings are incorporated herein by reference.

PREAMBLE

Pursuant to the Term Sheet and the Settlement Agreement and the Development Agreement, on October 9, 2019, Jim Abrams of J. Abrams Law (hereinafter “Project Sponsor”) filed Application No. 2019-012970PTA (hereinafter “Application”) with the San Francisco Planning Department (hereinafter “Department”) for a Master Permit to Alter (hereafter “PTA”) to establish and legalize building modifications (hereafter “Project”) to eight (8) properties (hereafter “Project Sites”) which are owned or leased by the Academy of Art University (hereafter “The Academy”) within locally designated Conservation Districts under Article 11 of the Planning Code.

On November 20, 2019, the Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting on Permit to Alter Application No. 2019-012970PTA.

The Planning Department Commission Secretary is the custodian of records; the File for Record No. 2019-012970PTA 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 Master Permit to Alter, as requested in Application No. 2019-012970PTA in conformance with the architectural plans dated October 12, 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. **Property Description.** Each of the project site’s descriptions are listed beneath their respective Project Site address, below.

3. **Project Description.** The proposed project involves legalizing the building modifications at the project sites, per the plans dated October 12, 2019. The scopes of work for each proposed project are listed beneath their Project Site address, below.
77-79 New Montgomery Street

Property Description:

77-79 New Montgomery Street is located on the east side of New Montgomery Street between Mission and Jessie Street, and is a contributing building to New Montgomery-Mission-2nd Street Conservation District. The subject property was constructed in 1920 by architect Mel I. Schwartz and was historically known as the Crossley Building. It is identified in the San Francisco Modern Architecture and Landscape Design historic Context Statement and in the SoMa Pilipinas Filipino Cultural Heritage District Context Statement.

Exhibiting a Renaissance Revival-influenced style, 77-79 New Montgomery Street is a five-story commercial building in the Article 11-designated New Montgomery-Mission-Second Street Conservation District. Spanning eight bays on New Montgomery Street and six on Mission Street, the building displays a symmetrical design composition, with continuous bands of windows, separated by recessed spandrel panels accented with applied ornament. The building is nearly square in plan and set flush to the sidewalk, on a flat lot. The primary elevation faces New Montgomery Street, with secondary elevations fronting Mission Street and Jesse Street. The building is capped with a flat roof, terminating in a stepped cornice. On the primary (New Montgomery Street) elevation, the first floor features a deeply recessed main entry, trimmed with marble walls and flooring and unadorned, paired glass doors and transom windows, set flush with the floor. This entrance represents a 1960 remodel carried out by renowned San Francisco architect Gardner A. Dailey for Allied Properties. (In a career spanning over 40 years, from the 1920s until his death in 1967, Dailey designed and completed numerous celebrated and award-winning commissions throughout the Bay Area.)

Flanking the main entry are large storefront windows, sheltered beneath slim projecting awnings. Dividing the second and third floors is a prominent belt course, which appears to mark the original 1913 construction of the first two stories, with the upper three stories added in 1920. Encircling the building are wood double-hung windows, slightly recessed in the wall plane. The fourth story windows are articulated with segmental arched openings and keystone accents. The secondary elevations are virtually identical to the primary elevation, which the exception of in-filled openings and a roll-up door installed on the eastern portion of the lot, on Jesse Street. The entrance leads to a rectangular lobby with a marble floor. Three elevator bays stand opposite the main entry; the elevators appear to date to the Dailey remodel in 1960. The lobby appears to retain features from both the original interior as well as subsequent remodeling, with updated features combined with remnants of the original lobby, including a chandelier, intact crown molding, and Classic Revival-inspired decorative features.

77-79 New Montgomery was constructed in 1913 as a two-story commercial building designed to be expanded in phases up to eight stories. This commission replaced the Crossley Building, which originally occupied the site but was destroyed in the 1906 earthquake and fire. In the initial phase of construction, the first two stories were designed by San Francisco architect

---

1 Appendix HR: Historic Resource Evaluations (submitted as part of the Academy’s application)
Sylvain Schnaittacher (1874-1926), for an estimated cost of $150,000. The property was commissioned by Central Realty Company and its principal stockholder, A. Aronson, “one of the ablest realty operators in the city.” The phased building plan was due to the size and divisions of the parcel, which consisted of three separate lots. As building plans were announced in May 1913, the San Francisco Chronicle thus described 77-79 New Montgomery:

Among the new building announcements made this week the most interesting is that of a Class A structure at the northeast corner of Mission and New Montgomery streets [sic]. …The site of the new building was recently acquired by A. Aronson in an exchange of properties from Mrs. Oelrichs. The building is intended to be eventually the first two stories and basement of a big office structure of eight stories. ...The plans have been so laid out that in the event of a purchaser acquiring either one of the three buildings he could add six stories and be independent of the other buildings.

While the architect listed for the 1920 expansion of the property is Mel Schwartz, it appears that the plans and design had already been determined in Schnaittacher’s 1913 plans. The 1920 addition brought three more stories, bringing the building to its current five-story massing (rather than the original planned eight stories).²

Ownership and tenancy in the building appears to have changed hands on several occasions through the years. Owners/tenants included Associated Oil Company, which occupied the building as early as the 1920s through the mid-1950s, Allied Properties as of the late 1950s, which commissioned the Gardner Dailey remodel of the entrance, and Crocker National Bank/Crocker Properties, which occupied at least a portion of the property from as early as 1960 through the late 1980s. As of 1968, Pacific Telephone and Telegraph occupied office space as a tenant.³

The subject property is an important corner building with a textural facade and a strongly rhythmic fenestration pattern. It was enlarged from two stories to five in 1920. The once unified composition has been altered as stucco has been applied to the two-story base section (1980’s). The three upper stories are characterized by closely spaced fenestration of single window bays and brick patterning. Brick zipper molding frames the entire series of window bays. The thick but shallow metal cornice has egg-and-dart molding and a series of fleur-des-lis. The use of color to create a polychrome facade brings out much of the detailing. The two-story base consists of modern store fronts at the ground level, and a second story with unadorned fenestration of the same rhythm as above. The facade is smooth stucco. A simple string course picked out in paint marks the transition to the upper portion of the building. This building is part of an excellent masonry and brick landscape along Montgomery street extending from Market to Howard streets; one of the best streets south of market. Notable buildings of consonant massing include the pacific telephone and the Sheraton Palace Hotel. There is a fine relationship with the rialto building (3722/71) across the street.⁴

² Appendix HR: Historic Resource Evaluations
³ Appendix HR: Historic Resource Evaluations
⁴ https://sfplanninggis.org/pim/
Project Description:

The proposed project at 77 New Montgomery Street is to memorialize and legalize the three atelier wall signs in their existing locations with the condition that no sub-lettering or logo be added to their form; remove all logos from the existing awnings; internally route all wall-mounted luminary on the Jessie Street façade and repair any building damage; and to memorialize and legalize the windows at all upper stories which have been infilled (two windows at the northeast corner of Jessie Street on the fifth story), replaced without benefit of permit, and/or had reflective film applied to the window’s glazing. While the majority of the proposed project includes scopes of work delegated to Planning Department Preservation staff through the Minor Permit to Alter process per Motion No. 0376, adopted by the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) on May 15, 2019, the work is being reviewed as part of a master application, as outlined in the Development Agreement, and requires HPC’s review. The subject property has three visible façades, with New Montgomery to the south (considered the primary façade), Mission Street to the east, and Jessie Street to the west. The proposed scope of work related to each façade that the HPC will review is the following:

- **New Montgomery Street (South) elevation** – the primary elevation shall have all logo decals removed from the glazing adjacent to the front entry, and all logos removed from the seven (7) black awnings above the aluminum storefront windows. Conduits for the signs and security cameras shall be internally routed and any building damage repaired. The two existing atelier signs, approximately 18-inches by 32-inches, shall be legalized as is and used as display cabinets for student exhibits and work; general advertising and the Academy branding shall not be added to the existing atelier signs. The upper-story window replacements and addition of tinted film, which creates a reflecting glazing, shall be legalized as is. The ground floor’s window boxes shall be removed, as well as the partitions directly behind the window boxes which are parallel to the exterior building wall face.

- **Mission Street (East) elevation** – the six (6) existing black awnings shall have their logos removed. The applied, tinted film which creates reflective glazing on the upper-story windows shall be legalized as is. The ground floor’s window boxes shall be removed, as well as the partitions directly behind the window boxes which are parallel to the exterior building wall face.

- **Jessie Street (West) elevation** – The infilled windows at the fifth story to the northeast shall be legalized as is. The four (4) existing black awnings shall have their logos removed. The two (2) security cameras shall have their conduits internally routed and the five (5) wall-mounted lights shall also have their conduits internally routed. The frosted glazing and decals on the northern entry shall be removed or replaced and transparency into the active space reinstated. The existing atelier sign, approximately 18-inches by 32-inches, shall be legalized as is, but will remain as display cabinets for student exhibits and work; general advertising and the Academy branding shall not be added to the existing atelier sign. The garage door shall be legalized as is.

Please see photographs and plans (Exhibit B) for details.
180 New Montgomery Street

Property Description:

180 New Montgomery Street is located on the south side of New Montgomery Street between Natoma and Howard Street, and is a contributing building to New Montgomery-Mission-2nd Street Conservation District. The subject property was constructed in 1920 by architect Kenneth MacDonald Jr., and was historically known as the San Francisco Furniture Exchange for the Sharon Estate.

Constructed as a mid-rise office building in 1920, 180 New Montgomery is rectangular in plan and set flush to the sidewalk. The primary elevation, which spans 11 bays, faces New Montgomery Street. Secondary elevations front Howard Street (with eight bays), Natoma Street (nine bays), and a small service lot adjacent to Howard Street. The building displays a Renaissance/Classical Revival-influenced style, the building has a symmetrical design composition, with bands of windows defining the horizontal axis, and bold corner piers marking the vertical axis. The building is capped with a flat roof, terminating in a terra cotta cornice, accented with decorative panels. On the primary elevation, the oversized ground-story displays a recessed main entry with terrazzo sheathing on the floor and walls. Former large storefront windows, separated by columns, have been in-filled or the extant glass overpainted. Above the first floor, parallel bands of rectangular fixed windows are separated by ornamental terra cotta spandrel panels. On the secondary elevations, fenestration patterns match those of the primary elevation. Along Howard Street, all windows are fixed. Natoma Street elevation retains its original steel-frame casement windows. The ground-floor storefront windows along Howard and Natoma Street have either been in-filled or overpainted/covered. No fenestration is located on the southwest elevation; however, a stair tower has been added.⁵

Designed by architect Kenneth MacDonald, Jr., 170-180 New Montgomery Street was constructed in 1920 to serve as the San Francisco Furniture Exchange. The building was constructed for an estimated cost of $700,000 and commissioned by the Sharon Estate and Henry J. Moore, head of the city’s Furniture Exchange. Upon its construction, the building was heralded in the San Francisco Chronicle as offering “a practical solution of what has been one of the city’s greatest commercial problems”—namely, that previously “foreign buyers landing at any Pacific Coast port and representatives of Western houses” had been “compelled to make a long trip East to inspect furniture stocks.” Once completed, space in the building went quickly, with “practically all the large manufacturers of furniture in the United States represented” in the Furniture Exchange. By the late 1960s, for at least twenty years, the building served as one of several locations in San Francisco for the offices of Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Company/Pacific Bell.⁶

180 New Montgomery was identified as eligible for the National Register of historic Places, was surveyed by the Foundation for San Francisco Architectural Heritage and the Transit Center District Historic Resource Survey Update and was included in the SoMa Pilipinas Filipino Cultural Heritage District Context Statement. The subject property is a massive rectangular block with structural articulation. The first two floors are articulated with pilasters.

---
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The upper floors are cleanly pierced by deep-set windows creating a rich textural wall for the street. The spandrels are richly ornamented with terra cotta panels. The cornice is represented by an ornamental terra cotta band. Considerable ornament has been removed, and the ground floor bays walled in, as the building was remodeled for use by the telephone company.7

Project Description:

The project at 180 New Montgomery Street is to memorialize and legalize the Yerba Buena Community Benefit District’s alley activation mural and street furniture along Natoma Street; legitimize the unpermitted window replacements at the upper stories which contain tinted film upon their glazing; the fire alarm affixed to the structure’s exterior; and the scattered array of bolts that protrude from the structure’s upper stories. The project also proposes to remove a wall sign along Natoma Street; repair a broken window and building punctures along Howard Street; repaint the storefront panels to be more compatible with the district’s color scheme at the first and last bays along Howard and New Montgomery; to install a single recessed bulb within each of the existing bay’s soffits; and provide consistency along the Howard and New Montgomery façade’s storefront fenestration and paneling. The subject property has three visible facades. The proposed scope of work related to each façade that the HPC will review is the following:

- New Montgomery Street (Northeast) elevation – the primary, northeastern elevation will legalize a rooftop railing, which runs parallel to the front building wall, and the all the windows and glazing film at the upper stories. The existing, nonconforming projecting signs were installed with permits and shall remain as is. The existing, wall-mounted flood lights with exposed conduits shall be removed and replaced with a single recessed bulb within each of the existing eleven (11) bay’s soffits, and all fixtures conduits – lights, security cameras, and signage – shall be internally routed at mortar joints. The painted storefront panels at the façade’s corner bays shall be repainted in a neutral beige color, to comply with Article 11 color scheme standards, and the two (2) metal panels which have been removed without benefit of permits shall be reinstated through historic evidence and restorative methods.

- Howard Street (Southeast) elevation – the existing, projecting security cameras shall be replaced with freeform dome cameras and internally routed conduits, within the existing openings. The painted storefront panels at the façade’s corner bays shall be repainted in a neutral beige color, and the eight (8) metal panels which have been removed and replaced with tinted glazing without benefit of permits shall be reinstated with metal panels that match the originals, or the seven (7) extant metal panels will be replaced with tinted glazed windows; with either option creating a consistent, uniform, and compatible design composition at the ground story. The existing, wall-mounted flood lights with exposed conduits shall be removed and replaced with a single recessed bulb within each of the existing eight (8) bay’s soffits with internally routed conduits. Facade damages will be patched and repaired with in-kind materials.

7 https://sfplanninggis.org/pim/
Natoma Street (Northwest) elevation – The “Park” wall sign shall be removed, and any material damages repaired. The existing, wall-mounted flood lights with exposed conduits shall be removed and replaced with two recessed bulbs within each of the existing nine (9) bay’s soffits (totaling 18 typical fixtures) with internally routed conduits, and one recessed downlight fixture to the south. The projecting sign is legal, nonconforming and shall remain as is; along with the mural and street furniture that is affixed within the nine (9) bays which were done through the Yerba Buena Community Benefit District’s Street Life and Alley Activation Plan. The storefront panel within the northernmost bay, which features a mural, shall also be legalized as is.

Please see photographs and plans (Exhibit B) for details.

620 Sutter Street

Property Description:

620 Sutter Street is located on the north side of Sutter Street between Taylor and Mason Streets, and is a Category I, contributing building to the Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter (KMMS) Conservation District. The subject property was constructed in 1918 by architect Lewis Hobart and the interiors were designed by Julia Morgan. The structure was purpose-built and historically known as the Young Women’s Christian Association building. It is identified as eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, was surveyed by the Foundation for San Francisco Architectural Heritage, and is considered a significant, unaltered contributor to the KMMS Conservation District.

The former YWCA at 620 Sutter Street is a mid-rise, Georgian Revival style building constructed in 1918. It features rectilinear massing and is set to flush to the sidewalk on a rectangular, sloped lot. Constructed of stone and brick, it is nine bays wide and has a tripartite design composition that is articulated by bolder ornamentation and forms on the lower and upper stories. The building has a flat roof and a parapet, which terminates in a shallow copping. The primary elevation’s tall first story is covered in stone and has a centered, recessed main entry. Rectangular multi-light casement and double-hung windows are arranged symmetrically on the elevation. The windows on the first, second, and seventh stories are bordered by detailed arched and rectangular stone surrounds. While there are window openings on the second through seventh stories of the eastern bay of the elevation, there are no window frames installed in the openings, which appears to be original to the building’s construction. Stone medallions are located above windows on the second and seventh story. Decorative metal railings are located above windows on the second and seventh story. Awnings have been added over the main entry and the eastern personnel door on the first story. A portion of the eastern elevation is visible from the second story to the seventh story. The patterns in fenestration and materials usage established on the primary elevation have been retained on all visible portions of the secondary elevation. Through the main entry is a large rectangular lobby that has been largely altered with modern materials. It is bordered by open rooms, which previously housed a nonoriginal bar and hair salon. Other communal spaces located off the lobby include an indoor pool and a performance theater. Although the theater has been altered,
the pool appears largely intact both in materials and design. With the exception of the second and seventh floors, which feature dining accommodations and a dance studio respectively, the upper floors are residential and have identical floor plans. Character-defining features found throughout the interior include decorative molding, and original doors, transoms, frames, and wainscot.  

620 Sutter Street was constructed in 1918 for an estimated cost of $230,000. The seven-story building, with basement, was designed by architect Lewis P. Hobart (1873-1954). A native of St. Louis, Missouri, Hobart received his degree in architecture from the University of California and after practicing in New York for two years returned to California in 1906. He remained in San Francisco until his death, designing a number of notable buildings in the city including Jeweler’s Building (1908), Grace Cathedral (designed in 1910), the Academy of Sciences (1915-1931), and the Union Square Macy’s Department Store (1928). In his design for the new YWCA building, the San Francisco Chronicle detailed Hobart’s approach:

Everything possible has been done by the architect, Lewis P. Hobart to make this building homelike in every respect on the theory that a structure of its kind should be in character of a large complex home rather than as a type of hotel. This though is worked out in the general interior arrangement, which separates the living-rooms from the public part of the building.

The main entrance vestibule will open into a large living-room, which will among other interesting features will have a great open fireplace carved into Bedford stone… In the rear will be an auditorium with a seating capacity of 500 persons: also a gymnasium and swimming pool, the latter decorated in warm Popeian wall colors.

Across the entire front of the second story will be a cafeteria to be open to the public at all times… Executive offices, classes and club and rest rooms will be arranged on the third floor.

The next three floors will be devoted exclusively to hotel rooms for members having permanent residence in the building and for visiting members. Separate living-rooms, serving and tea rooms will be in this section.

On the seventh floor will be the library, supper and board rooms, all convertible into a large room for parties or theatrical parties.

The YWCA would occupy the building for the following 70 years, during which time they would complete a number of alterations to the building consistent with its ongoing use. In 1988, the building was sold to William Ferndon who converted the building for use as a hotel. Ownership subsequently transferred to Union Square Hotels in 2000 before the property was eventually purchased by the Academy in 2005 (building permits).  

The subject property is a brick box of tripartite organization with differentiated end bays. The facade has nine bays. In the rusticated terra cotta base is an arched central entrance flanked by alternating blind arches and rectangular openings. The second story is characterized by tall recessed windows with terra cotta surrounds and lintels. The four-story shaft is pierced by
simple rectangular openings with 3/3 wood sash. The seventh story is distinguished by a window arcade and ornamental iron balconies. A brick balustrade rises above the terra cotta stringcourse with medallions, marking the absent cornice, to crown the building. The building is three bays deep and the parapets on its ends are shaped and ornamented with a central medallion. The interior includes an auditorium, swimming pool and gymnasium. The building forms a fine pair with the metropolitan club next door.\textsuperscript{10}

Project Description:

The project at 620 Sutter Street seeks legalize the first and second story vents which were installed within the window openings without benefit of permits; retain freeform dome camera; remove existing light and install new, consistent light fixtures within each of the recessed entries; and conduct a robust repairment plan to address damages inflicted on the Yong Women’s Christina Association (YWCA) engraving on the beltcourse, the surface impairments and punctures peppered across the entire front façade, and any damages that may take place while removing the existing, exposed conduits. The subject property has only one visible façade, along Sutter. This primary façade’s proposed scope of work, which the HPC shall review, includes the following:

- Sutter Street (South) elevation – The central awning above the main entry shall remain as is, however the eastern awning will be removed. The existing, wall-mounted flood lights with exposed conduits shall be removed and replaced with a single recessed bulb within each of the existing three (3) entry bays, with internally routed conduits. Other fixture proposals include: installing two (2) freeform dome cameras within mortar joints within the central, main entry; install one (1) freeform done camera on the building’s western building face, with an internally routed conduit at a mortar joint; and the installation of a wall-mounted lighting sconce on either side of the main entry (2 total fixtures). The damaged building face and YWCA engraving shall be repaired by a qualified Preservation professional or architect\textsuperscript{11} in conformance with the Secretary’s Standards, as outlined in the Conditions of Approval, labelled Exhibit A.

Please see photographs and plans (Exhibit B) for details.

\textbf{625-629 Sutter Street}

Property Description:

625-629 Sutter Street is located on the south side of Sutter Street between Taylor and Mason Streets, and is a Category II, contributing building to the Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter

\begin{footnotes}
\item[10] https://sfplanninggis.org/pim/
\end{footnotes}
(KMMS) Conservation District. It is identified as eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, was surveyed by the Foundation for San Francisco Architectural Heritage, and is considered a significant, minimally altered contributor to the KMMS Conservation District.

Constructed in 1921, 625-629 Sutter Street has a rectangular plan and set flush to the sidewalk. Set on a rectangular, sloped lot the building has a primary elevation facing Sutter Street and a secondary elevation fronting the alley behind the building. The four-story building exhibits a Spanish Colonial and Churrigueresque style, constructed in concrete and covered in stucco. The asymmetrical and balanced design has a defied western bay. The building is capped with a flat roof with a stepped parapet over the western bay and projecting eave with decorative brackets over the rest of the building. The primary elevation features an elaborated, centered recessed main entry centered in the eastern portion of the building and surrounded by Churrigueresque detailing. On either side of the main entry is a storefront with a recessed entry and transom widows above that are currently boarded with plywood. A third storefront is located on the first story of the western bay. A cornice line divides the commercial first story from the upper stores. Four rectangular windows are spaced evenly across each story, one in the western bay and the other three spaced throughout the eastern portion. The windows on the eastern bay feature pediments and sidelights on the second story and surrounds on the fourth story. On the western bay, Churrigueresque ornamentation surrounds the second and third story windows, and a decorative surround and sea shell details are featured on the fourth story. A wide band with Churrigueresque details and recessed panels separate the third and fourth story.\(^\text{12}\)

Window types utilized on the primary elevation include original wood and nonoriginal aluminum double-hung, multi-light, large fixed storefront windows, and fixed transom windows. Noncontributing awnings have been added over the storefronts. A secondary elevation is visible from the alley. A metal stair provides access to the upper floors over the early one-story addition. Brick and board form concrete are visible on the elevation. Windows used in a variety of configurations include rectangular vinyl double-hung and casement windows.\(^\text{13}\)

625-629 Sutter Street was designed in 1921 by architects Samuel Lightner Hyman (1885-1948) and Abraham Appleton (1887-1981). Appleton studied architecture at the University of California, Berkeley, Columbia University, and the École des Beaux Arts, before settling in San Francisco and establishing the firm of Hyman and Appleton in the early 1920s. One of the firm’s frequent clients was Laurence A. Meyers, a developer with whom the firm designed numerous buildings, including 302 Silver Avenue (Jewish Home for the Aged, 1923), 2100 Pacific Avenue (apartments, 1926), 1501 Divisadero Street (Sinai Memorial Chapel, 1938), 301 Leland Avenue (Visitation Valley School, 1937), and Portals of Eternity Mausoleum and Chapel (Hills of Eternity Memorial Park, 1934). In 1921, Meyers commissioned the firm to design 625-629 Sutter. When it was completed in 1925, four years later, the San Francisco Chronicle reported that:
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[the building, which is the workmanship of Samuel Lightner Hyman and Abraham
Appleton, architects, is a new departure in store buildings, representing a rich, old Spanish
structure appealing to the aesthetic rather than the commercial taste.

Ownership of the building changed on numerous occasions in subsequent decades, with
various improvements undertaken by each occupant. Building permits indicate that, as of 1929,
the building was owned by F.M Gilberd, who in April of that year added a one-story addition
to the rear. By October of 1929, D.R. Eisenbach was listed as the owner; ten years later, in 1939,
it was owned by S. Weisser. During the 1940s, the American Red Cross and the U.S. Army
leased the building. The building was owned by Herbert W. and Barbara F. Richards by April
of 1946 before it transferred again to new owners Walter & Ross in October of that year. By
1959, U.P. Channon had taken ownership of the building. As of 1962, the building was owned
by George B. McDonald and occupied at least partially by the June Terry Finishing School. In
1968, the Academy took ownership of the building; since that time, they have completed a
number of alterations, most notably to the storefronts on the ground level of the main (north)
elevation.14

The subject property is a unique downtown San Francisco design in a three-part vertical
composition with a single strongly articulated end bay. Built as a single-story building, with a
three-story addition in 1925, all by the same architects. The ground level has an off-center
entrance with a decorative Spanish-style arch, presently obscured by an awning. Ground level
piers, including those flanking the entry, are topped with arched niches. A simple frieze and
stringcourse separate the ground level from the upper stories. The upper stories have quoin
detailing. The second story has ornate, broken pedimented lintels over windows
flanked by side lights; the third story has a lintel system of ornate relief panels flanked by
brackets which are interlocked with an antefixa stringcourse. The third story wall surface is
also adorned with a shell motif. The fourth story is terminated by the bracketed, low-pitched
tile roof. The right corner pavilion is decorated with churriguereque window surrounds;
mullions are defined by molded ornamentation; its windows are capped with parapet-like
paneling which reflects the mission revival parapet at the roof-line of the pavilion. This eclectic
blend of Baroque and Spanish Colonial was obviously the inspiration for the lower part of the
facade of 609 Sutter (297/1), adjacent easterly. The two buildings are exceptionally
complementary to one another, even though 625 Sutter is less than 1/3 the height of its
neighbor. Abraham Appleton (1892-c.1960) was educated in the beaux arts tradition at U.C.
Berkeley. Renderings of his student work appeared in architect and engineer. He had a
successful practice in partnership with Samuel Lightner Hyman and together they provided
architectural services to a number of prominent San Francisco Jewish families. He designed a
number of familiar buildings which exhibit a wide range of styles, as well as private residences.
Please see: the Jewish Community Center (1021/6); the Crown Zellerbach building (239/2); the
Hall of Flowers in Golden Gate Park (1700/0); San Francisco Academy of Art (297/14); The
Marina Branch Library (469/1); Sinai Memorial Chapel (1079/3); Weinstein’s Department Store
(3703/70).15

---
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Project Description:

The project at 625 Sutter Street will legalize and retain the existing projecting sign, while removing the existing awnings and restoring the windows at all stories. The existing flood lights shall be removed and more sensitive, recessed and wall-mounted fixtures will be installed. The subject property’s only visible façade is along Sutter Street. This primary façade’s proposed scope of work, which the HPC shall review, includes the following:

- Sutter Street (North) elevation – The three (3) awnings shall be removed (along with the linear light fixtures and conduits mounted beneath the awnings) and the storefront and door transoms restored. The existing, projecting sign shall remain as is and its conduit internally routed. Window decals shall be affixed to two (2) storefront windows’ glazing. The unpermitted upper-story windows will be removed and restored to their historic configuration, operation, design, and material. The flood lights and their conduits shall be removed, and a single, recessed bulb will be mounted within each of the four (4) entry vestibules, along with wall-mounted sconces on either side of the front entry (2 fixtures total).

Please see photographs and plans (Exhibit B) for details.

---

655 Sutter Street

Property Description:

655 Sutter Street is located on the south side of Sutter Street between Taylor and Mason Streets, and is a Category V, unrated building to the Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter (KMMS) Conservation District.

Designed by Frederick Herman Meyer, 655 Sutter Street was constructed in 1912, originally as apartments. By 1933, according to city directory research, the building had been at least partially converted to commercial/office space. With a T-shaped building plan, the six-story property is set flush to the sidewalk on a rectangular, sloped lot, with its primary elevation facing Sutter Street. 655 Sutter Street exhibits a symmetrical, Renaissance Revival design, with a relatively spare ornamental program on the ground story, finer detailing through the middle stories, and elaborate ornamentation on the top story. The building is sheathed in brick and smooth stucco and capped with a flat roof, terminating in an ornamental cornice accented with modillions and dentils.

The primary elevation’s tall first story features a centered, recessed main entry with storefronts on either side. The main entry is composed of paired aluminum doors with side lights and a large transom window, which appears to date to 1962. The walls of the recessed entry are sheathed in marble and framed on the exterior by thin aluminum surrounds. Each storefront feature large windows and a recessed entrance. The eastern storefront was extensively altered in 1986 through the installation of the multi-light fixed window, and more recently with the addition of a black-tiled bench and lighting fixture. Among the storefronts, the westemmost segment appears to retain the highest degree of integrity to the circa 1933 conversion (and the

---
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character-defining features of this storefront are considered to have gained significance in their own right. The western storefront exhibits centered glass entry doors, with single-pane glazing and signage above. Minimal ornamentation on the first story includes scrolled brackets adjacent to the storefronts. A simple cornice line divides the first story from the upper stories. Fenestration patterns are symmetrical, with paired and single wood-framed windows spanning each story of the façade. The nuances of the building’s vertical design composition include decorative spandrel panels dividing fenestration through the middle stories, and arched window openings on the fifth story. A molded course spans the façade below the top story, providing an ornamental accent and dividing line between the lower and upper stories.

Windows on the top story are separated by ornamental pilasters. A metal fire escape is centered on the building. Secondary elevations are visible from the alley behind the structure. The rear section of the T-shape is constructed of brick with recessed windows. The flat roof is capped in a shallow coping at the eave line. The window types utilized include single-hung windows in a variety of configurations. A metal fire escape is located on the southern elevation. The main entry leads to a small lobby, which features terrazzo floor tiles, mirrored walls, elevators, and staircase. The original design appears to have included a lobby; since its original construction, however, the lobby has been configured several times, to include ground-floor commercial spaces. The double-loaded corridor spatial arrangement of the upper stories appears to be intact, however, the original materials appear to have been largely replaced with drywall, metal doors, and carpeting.

Frederick Herman Meyer designed the apartment building at 655 Sutter Street for H.O. Trowbridge and W.F. Perkins. According to the San Francisco Chronicle article, published 23 October 1913:

The suits of apartments are arranged in two and three rooms, each having a private hall and bathroom. Wall beds will be placed in all apartments. The bathrooms are to have tiled floors and tiled wainscot, with recess tubs. Dining-rooms will be wainscoted, and all the walls covered with selected papers. A spacious lobby will lend character to the house, and its finish, to be in keeping with this idea, will be in tiled floor, marble wainscots and a ceiling decorated with ornamental plaster.

Meyer (1876-1961), a San Francisco native, had no formal training when he joined the architecture firm of Campbell and Pettus in 1896.77 Two years later, he was hired by the firm of Samuel Newsom and became a partner. By 1902, Meyer had partnered with Smith O’Brien before opening his own office in 1908. Meyer was later appointed to design a plan for the construction of the Civic Center with John Galen Howard and John Reid, Jr.; the three would also collaborate on the Auditorium for the 1915 Panama-Pacific International Exposition (now named the Bill Graham Auditorium). Along with the Exposition Auditorium, Meyer designed several notable buildings throughout the city including, 2480 Broadway (Pacific Heights residence, 1902), 116 New Montgomery (Rialto Building, 1906), 380 Eddy Street (Cadillac Hotel, 1906), 785 Market Street (Humboldt Bank Building, 1908), and 2375 Vallejo (residence, 1910).
655 Sutter was completed in 1913 and would have numerous owners and tenants over the following decades. As of 1946, the property was owned by Dr. Francis B. Quinn. By 1955, Quinn had converted the apartment building into an office building, primarily oriented towards medical offices. Quinn renovated the entrance and lobby in 1962; by 1963, ownership transferred to Neil Thompson. Subsequent owners included Anthony Martino and Gilmer Anselmo, T. Knight, Sutter Medical, and Draper Financial Corporation. A number of tenants occupied spaces within the building, including the American Institute of Wine and Food, Paralegal Training and Resource Center, and an unknown bar that altered the eastern ground-level storefront and interior in 1986. Since the Academy took ownership of the building in 1999, the Academy changed the use of the property from office to residential and completed multiple alterations including installation of a box sign and new lighting, and materials along the eastern ground-level storefront.²⁰

**Project Description:**

The project at 655 Sutter Street will repaint the two (2) storefronts in a neutral beige, per the provisions of the KMMS District’s color scheme, and will remove all flood-, gooseneck-, and projecting-lighting fixtures. Recessed bulbs in the existing storefront soffits shall be legalized as is; as well as the existing, illuminated sign above the main entry, with its conduit internally routed. The subject property’s only visible façade is along Sutter Street. This primary façade’s proposed scope of work, which the HPC shall review, includes the following:

- Sutter Street (North) elevation – The storefronts shall be repainted to match the main building’s color scheme, in conformance with the KMMS Conservation District’s color palette. The current lighting fixtures shall all be removed except for the (5) recessed bulbs at the eastern storefront (d.b.a. “Art Café”). Linear lights shall be installed to illuminate the western storefront (d.b.a. “Student Store” or “Shop657”), as well as a single recessed bulb within the main entry and two (2) downlight fixtures mounted just below the beltcourse within the projecting fire escape. The existing illuminated sign above the main entry shall have its conduit internally routed and legitimized. Each of the two (2) storefronts shall have a small projecting sign with specific and individual copies.

Please see photographs and plans (Exhibit B) for details.
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western elevation. A small open area is located at the rear of the property. Set on a rectangular, sloped lot, flush to the sidewalk, the building’s primary elevation fronts Sutter Street. The distinctive building was constructed in the Swiss Chalet Bungalow style and features reinforced concrete construction with a stucco façade. A prominent front-gabled roof, sheathed in red clay tile, caps the building. Centered under the roof gable is a large escutcheon. On the primary portion of the building, the roof line terminates in wide overhanging eaves accented beneath with ornamental triangular knee braces and exposed decorative rafter ends. The rear portion of the building exhibits a flat roof with no eaves.

The first story on the primary wing features a nonoriginal main entry with an arched transom and an arched window to the left, both accented with decorative keystones. A prominent projecting cornice line separates the ground floor from upper stories. Projecting bays with paired rectangular windows are located above the cornice on the second through fifth stories. As was typical for multifamily properties of this era, a fire escape is prominently positioned on the center of the building’s primary elevation. On the recessed eastern bay of the primarily elevation is a large wood door with glass lights and an ornate stone surround providing access to the residential units upstairs. A brick wall separates the entry way from the neighboring parking lot. The entry has been modified with the addition of a security gate and long awning, making the residential entry less visible from the street. Stacked above the residential entry are bay windows with a defining cornice line above and below the sixth story bay window. Windows types visible on this elevation are original wood multi-light casement windows, and nonoriginal vinyl double-hung, fixed windows and aluminum sliders. Secondary elevations are visible on the north, east, and west elevations. The east elevation is comprised of two sections. The southern section has a column of the same projecting paired rectangular windows seen on the primary elevation. Adjacent to the projecting windows are two columns of single, rectangular windows, a design element that is replicated on the northern section of the east elevation. A smooth stucco finish on the southern section is present, while on the northern section board-formed concrete is visible underneath the stucco. The north elevation is divided into three bays with horizontal bands separating each story. The west and east bays have pairs of windows while the center bay has a single window. The west elevation is only visible from the street where it extends above the adjoining property. Board-formed concrete is visible as is one small window. Utilized throughout the secondary elevations are vinyl single-hung, wood multi-light casement, and fixed windows used in a variety of configurations. The residential entry leads to a small lobby featuring decorative pilasters, marble floors, and a vaulted ceiling with decorative molding. A decorative railing and a marble fireplace are also present on the first floor. The building’s upper floors have short hallways along an open, central courtyard. Original doors, frames, decorative picture rails, and base moldings are extant through the upper floors. The nonoriginal commercial entry off Sutter Street, leads to a small office space that features a short interior stairway and open space bordered by individual rooms.

In 1918, Conrad Alfred Meussdoffer constructed 680 Sutter Street for I. Goodfriend. Although little information was available on I. Goodfriend, he is presumed to be Isidor Goodfriend, the president and manager of the Goodfriend Hotel, located on 245 Powell Street. A San Francisco native, Meussdoffer began his career at the architectural firm of Salfield & Kohlberg in 1892.

---
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Three years later, in 1895, he partnered with Victor de Prosse before opening his own firm two years later in 1897. Early in his career, Meussdoffer designed a number of single-family residences in the Pacific Heights area, including 3016 Clay Street (1897), 3051 Clay Street (1902), 3320 Jackson Street (1906), and a pair of flats at 3353 and 3355 Jackson Street (1906). Meussdoffer later moved towards multi-family residences with some of his designs including 1925 Gough Street (1906), 2145 Franklin Street (1917) and 2100 Jackson (1923) among others. 

After 680 Sutter was completed in 1918, the building changed ownership on numerous occasions. Goodfriend owned the building through 1924, at which time it transferred to Ralph McLeran. By 1934, the building again changed hands, when T. Fahrenkrog acquired it and re-sold the same year to the Panama Realty Company. Between 1935 and 1962, available building permits show several names listed under the owners/lessees, including Hale Bros. Realty Company (1935), M. Rabonovitch (1948), Richard King (1960), and Don Faulkner and Associates (1962). By 1965 the building was owned by Roy Christie, who would retain the building until 1973. Christie is the last known owner prior to the Academy acquisition of the building in 1982.

The subject property is a unique design of a vertical box with two slightly projecting front bays, with 6/3 windows, in the shaft. Another single bay, with angled bay windows with 6/3 windows, is recessed to the right and houses the entrance. The main facade terminates with an ornately bracketed, red-tiled, gable. A large escutcheon adorns the wall under the gable. A fire escape spans the center of the facade. It relates well to other buildings on the block. This is representative of the work designed by the architect of The Family Club (284/1) and the little building at 1 United Nations Plaza.

Project Description:

The project at 680 Sutter Street seeks to memorialize and legalize the Academy wall-mounted plaque and light fixtures on the main façade, while restoring the main entry, the historic fenestration pattern, and repairing material impairment where unpermitted alterations and signs were installed. The subject property has two visible facades. The proposed scope of work related to each façade that the HPC will review is the following:

- Sutter Street (South) elevation – The slider window at the ground story shall be replaced with an appropriate, operable window, and the unpermitted upper-story windows will be removed and restored to their historic configuration, operation, design, and material. The entrance awning shall be removed, and the original entrance appearance shall be restored, including the ornamental door surround. The unpermitted sign which has already been removed, shall have its bracketing taken down and any/all damages repaired. The three (3) wall-mounted light fixtures shall be legalized as is. A small, indirectly illuminated sign will be affixed below the infilled window, adjacent to the storefront entry.

---
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Parking Lot (East) elevation – the visible secondary façade will feature an unilluminated painted wall sign and will patch and repair the exterior punctures and penetrations.

Please see photographs and plans (Exhibit B) for details.

410 Bush Street

Property Description:

410 Bush Street is located on the north side of Bush Street, at the intersection of St. George Alley, between Grant Avenue and Kearny Street. The structure is a Category V, unrated building within the Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter (KMMS) Conservation District, as its stylistic qualities fall outside of the period of significance for the district.

Originally designed as a parking garage, 410 Bush Street is a 1913 concrete building redesigned and remodeled as an International Style-inspired office building in 1946. The building is rectangular in plan and set flush to the sidewalk. It occupies a long rectangular, sloped lot that runs the length of the city block, extending along St. George Alley north to Pine Street. The primary elevation faces Bush Street.26

The building is capped with a flat roof, terminating in shallow copping along the roofline. Spanning the façade, a cantilevered, unadorned wall projection divides the ground-floor entrance and windows with the smooth stucco-clad walls on the top stories. Characteristic of the style, the structure features smooth, unornamented wall surfaces with minimal detailing. On the first floor, the primary elevation consists of a recessed storefront entrance, with full-length aluminum-framed windows and paired entrance doors, in the western portion of the façade. Two smooth, stucco-clad piers flank the storefront and entrance. On the southeast corner of the building are recessed panels clad in decorative tile (based on historic photos, the tiles appear to have been glazed and possibly earth-toned in color; the tiles were painted over at an unknown date). Directly above the first story is a boxed overhang, which turns the corner and partly extends along the secondary elevation in the alley. The second and third stories are clad in smooth stucco with no fenestration. The smooth-stucco sheathing of the primary elevation extends on the side (eastern) elevation partially, approximately one bay deep. On the east elevation, the first floor displays ribbon windows on the first and second stories, with each set enclosed by a stucco-clad frame. East elevation fenestration generally consists of single, rectangular, flushed casement windows and aluminum sliders. Exterior walls along the eastern and northern (rear) elevation, facing Pine Street, display traces of board-formed concrete. The rear elevation along Pine Street has a one-story portion featuring three roll-up doors of varying sizes and a mansard roofline. The traces of board-formed concrete are visible throughout the rear elevation. A metal chain-link fence restricts access to the roll-up doors from Pine Street.27

According to building permits on file with the San Francisco Planning Department, 410 Bush Street was initially designed and constructed in 1915 as the St. George Garage. This date falls within the era of rapid, post-fire construction within the Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter
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Conservation District, with most of the district’s architecturally significant buildings constructed between 1907 and 1918. Made of reinforced concrete and rising 41 feet, the building was commissioned by Charles F. Haoulou. San Francisco architects the O’Brien Brothers, Inc. constructed the property at a cost of $25,000 in early 1915, with additional structural work carried out by the O’Brien Brothers in July 1915. The O’Brien Brothers completed numerous commissions in San Francisco, with a focus on commercial and automobile-related designs in the 1910s and 1920s. By 1933 and into the early 1940s, the property, now owned by the Grant Company, continued operating as a garage. All floors of the building, including the basement, were originally utilized for parking.\textsuperscript{28}

In the immediate postwar period, in 1946/1947, the St. George Garage was converted to office space by the Westinghouse Electric Company. The early-twentieth-century appearance and features of the building were replaced, and the façade underwent a $150,000, Mid-Century Modern make-over by San Francisco architect Albert F. Roller, in collaboration with contractors Barrett & Hilp. A native of San Francisco, Roller (1891-1981) worked in the offices of Coxhead & Coxhead, Ward & Blohme, among others, before opening his open practice in 1926. Roller’s many commissions in San Francisco include 100 California Street (Bethlehem Steel Building, 1959), completed by Roller and Welton Becket in 1959, 444 Taylor Street (National Broadcasting Company Studios, 1941), 1111 California Street (Masonic Auditorium, 1958), and 155 Hayes Street (AAA Building, 1959). As presented in Architect and Engineer in November 1949, “The Westinghouse Electric Corporation’s new three-story building at 410 Bush Street in San Francisco now provides a thoroughly modern, centrally located, office headquarters for the company’s engineering sales and executive personnel… The new quarters affords ample space to meet current and immediate future office space requirements and fills a long need for consolidation in one downtown, central location.” Following the remodel, the building spanned approximately 40,000 square feet, with the 40-foot storefront facing Bush Street.\textsuperscript{29}

By 1967, the property was owned and occupied by Commercial Union Insurance Group, which remained in the building through at least 1975. At the time of the 1978 San Francisco Architectural Quality Survey, 410 Bush Street still retained signage for Commercial Union Company and appeared to be for sale at the time (see figure below). Until the Academy occupied the property in 1994, a variety of tenants appear to have occupied its office space, including a San Francisco branch of the United Way, which operated in the building from the early 1980s until 1994. In the postwar period, Roller served on the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency between 1951 and 1953, as well as the San Francisco Art Commission between 1955 and 1958. According to the San Francisco Modern Architecture and Landscape Design 1935-1970 Historic Context Statement, Roller is recognized as a master architect in San Francisco. As presented in Architect and Engineer in November 1949, “The Westinghouse Electric Corporation’s new three-story building at 410 Bush Street in San Francisco now provides a thoroughly modern, centrally located, office headquarters for the company’s engineering sales and executive personnel… The new quarters affords ample space to meet current and immediate future office space requirements and fills a long need for consolidation
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in one downtown, central location.” Following the remodel, the building spanned approximately 40,000 square feet, with the 40-foot storefront facing Bush Street.  

410 Bush Street is currently a Category V property within the Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter Conservation District. In addition to the property’s status within the Conservation District, the property (which is primarily a post-World War II remodel) is eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). In terms of the CRHR, the property was found ineligible as an individual resource, but was found to be of interest to local planning (California Historic Resources Status Code 6L), as an example of a Mid-Century Modern remodeling project by modern master architect Albert Roller and as an example of a low-rise International Style commercial building in downtown San Francisco.

**Project Description:**

The proposed project at 410 Bush Street is to memorialize and legalize the aluminum window replacements along St. George Alley; the retaining wall and chain-link fence along Pine Street; and the fire alarm, security camera, enclosed planter clad in black tile. The scope of work also proposes painting all nonconforming tile and signage to match the historic appearance of the structure, and reconfiguring the lighting, conduit, and security camera scheme to be more compatible with the District’s design features. The subject property has three visible facades, with Bush Street to the south (considered the primary façade), St. George Alley to the east, and Pine Street to the west. The proposed scope of work related to each façade that the HPC will review is the following:

- **Bush Street (South) Elevation** – the primary elevation shall largely remain unchanged and legalized as is, apart from the painted tile, which shall be painted a neutral medium grey in a restorative effort to bring the facade into greater compliance with its historic appearance and the district’s design standards.

- **St. George Alley (East) Elevation** – the existing flood lights and exposed conduits shall be removed and minimal lighting and security fixtures, with internal conduits, shall be installed. The two (2) painted garage doors to the north and the two (2) recessed tiled bays to the south shall be painted a neutral medium grey (to match the proposed painted tile on the primary, Bush Street façade) to bring the structure into greater compliance with its historic appearance and the district’s design standards. The chain-link fence shall be legalized as is, for security purposes, however, the barbed wire will be removed.

- **Pine Street (North) Elevation** – the chain-link fence shall remain, but its barbed wire cornice shall be removed. The painted signage on the circulation tower shall be removed and the area painted to match the building’s body. The existing security camera and concealed conduit shall be legalized as is but painted to match the wall-face’s coloring.
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540 Powell Street

Property Description:

540 Powell Street is located on the east side of Powell Street, at the intersection of Anson Place, between Bush and Sutter Streets, and is a Category I, contributing building to the Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter (KMMS) Conservation District. It is identified as eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, was surveyed by the Foundation for San Francisco Architectural Heritage, was identified for its association with San Francisco’s LGBTQ history in the LGBTQ Historic Context Statement, and is considered a significant, unaltered contributor to the KMMS Conservation District. It historically was referred to as the Elks Building and was designed by Alexander Ainwell Cantin.

Rectangular in plan and set flush to the sidewalk, 540 Powell Street was constructed in 1909 for the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks. The four-story building occupies a rectangular, steeply sloped lot, with the primary elevation facing Powell Street and secondary elevation fronting Anson Place. The building also has a subterranean basement level.

Drawing on the Spanish Renaissance/Mission Revival styles, the building displays a symmetrical design composition and differentiated treatment of the ground story and upper stories. On the façade and visible secondary elevation, the primary design motif is the repeating use of arched wall openings, accented with decorative sills, dentil courses, and spandrel panels. The ground story generally consists of broad, unadorned expanses of smooth stucco-clad walls, punctuated with three large arched openings. A granite-clad base provides the foundation of the building the level of the sidewalk. The focal point of the ground story is the centered entry portico, flanked by two arched window openings. The center stories are characterized by a progression of attached columns and rows of double-hung windows, with ornamental detailing varying on each floor.

The building is capped with a flat roof and stepped parapet, accented with scroll work and centered medallion, facing Powell Street. The tall first story features a centered, recessed main entry adorned with marble. The main entrance appears to retain its original wood double-doors; the doors have beveled vertical windows, stylized metal sheeting at the bottom, and transom windows above. Arched windows trimmed with molded frames are located on either side of the main entry, which are partially covered by dome window awnings. A cornice line above the first story has a central large medallion. Second, third, and fourth story windows are accented with recessed spandrel panels, engaged Corinthian columns, and ornamental detailing. The windows are nonoriginal vinyl, with original wood-framed double-hung windows on the upper stories, and original fixed and hopper wood-framed windows on the first story. A nonoriginal glass and metal door in the southernmost corner of the facade leads to the basement. Along Anson Street, the secondary elevation has a fire escape at the eastern end with various types of personnel doors and a wheelchair ramp on the first story. Windows on this elevation feature decorative sills, hood molds with keystones, and frames with

31 Pages 188 and 245 of the LGBTQ Historic Context Statement for its association with the National Sex Forum and Erotic Museum.
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keystones. Other decorative features include recessed panels and trim above the second floor. Rectangular and arched double-hung windows in a variety of configurations are displayed on the elevation. Similar to the façade, the windows on the second and third floors have been replaced with vinyl. Metal security bars have been added over the first story windows. The main entry leads to a small lobby, with a hallway extending towards the rear (east) of the building. Each of the upper floors features a similar floorplan consisting of a narrow hallway bordered by classrooms on either side. Each floor is accessed via a curved wooden staircase or an original Otis elevator. The basement level has been altered through early partitions, which have divided what was originally an open floor plan. Character-defining features found within the interior spaces include original wood elements and accents such as doors, framing, and floors, as well as original wainscot, fireplaces with paneled chimneys, transom windows, light fixtures, coffered ceilings, and paneled walls.

Construction of 540 Powell Street commenced with a ground-breaking ceremony in November 1908. The San Francisco Lodge, No. 3, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks commissioned the building after its members raised $150,000 for the construction through the sale of stock. The Spanish Renaissance/Mission Revival-style building was designed by well-regarded and prolific San Francisco architect (and Elks lodge member), Alexander Aimwell Cantin. A native of New York, Cantin received his license to practice architecture in 1901 and remained in active practice for nearly half a century. His San Francisco and Bay Area commissions included numerous post-Reconstruction era buildings, as well as movie theaters, including the Del Mar Theater (San Leandro, 1941), Orinda Theater (Orinda, 1941), and State Theater (Red Bluff, 1946). In the post-World War II era, Cantin worked in partnership with his son, A. Mackenzie Cantin. The San Francisco Chronicle, in an article published on October 2, 1908, heralded the amenities and details of the new Elks building:

The basement will be fitted up as a “jinksroom” and ballroom, with heavy timbered beams, clinker brick walls and high wainscot. The demands of the social side of the lodge, which are exacting, will be met on the first floor, which is to be luxuriously furnished and arranged as a lounging room with nooks and cozy corners, a large dining room, billiard-rooms, library, writing-rooms, telephone and hat rooms and office. The second floor will be exclusively devoted to living-rooms with baths, as will be the front part of the third and fourth floors. In the rear of the third and fourth floors will be richly wainscoted to a height of twelve feet and the walls and ceiling will be decorated and topped by a grand dome. The furnishings throughout will be on a par with the style of the building itself, which will be used exclusively by the lodge as a club and for fraternal purposes and also for its numerous social functions.

Following its founding in 1876, BPOE Lodge No. 3 occupied several rented spaces in downtown San Francisco. At the time of the 1906 earthquake and fire, the organization was located at 223 Sutter Street; the building and lodge possessions were destroyed in the fire, with the exception of a few records. Upon completion of 540 Powell Street, the lodge began
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occupying its new home in March 1910, where it remained until 1924, when a growing membership hastened relocation to a new space at 450 Post Street.\textsuperscript{36}

By 1927, 540 Powell Street had been purchased by the University of California, which used the property as an extension space. A major remodel of the building took place in 1927, consisting of nearly $50,000 of work carried out by architect W.P. Stephenson; these alterations appear to have included the construction of classrooms. According to available building permits, the building’s decorative, overhanging cornice line, which appears in historic photographs, was removed by the University of California in 1943. By circa 1970, San Francisco State College began occupying the building. Prior to the Academy’s 1977 acquisition of the property, a portion of the building was occupied by the Erotic Art Museum.\textsuperscript{37}

In addition to being a Category I contributing property in the Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter Conservation District, 540 Powell Street appears to be individually eligible for the CRHR under Criterion 1, as an example of institutional architecture in downtown San Francisco in the post-1906 Earthquake Reconstruction period. The property also qualifies individually under CRHR Criterion 3, as an excellent example of the Spanish Renaissance/Mission Revival style applied to institutional/commercial architecture in downtown San Francisco; and may qualify for Criterion 1, for its role in local and regional LGBTQ history.

A handsome but curious hybrid composition with a mixture of stylistic references. Built as a fraternal hall, it was vacated by the elks upon completion of their new building by Meyer and Johnson at 450-460 post (q.V. 296/9) in 1924. It has since been occupied by a variety of tenants. The building consists of an enframed pavilion over a high arched base, with two-story engaged Corinthian columns on pedestals in the pavilion. The columns frame five arched window bays. The pedestals are enriched with blind panels in the dados or dies. Iron balconies on brackets are inserted between the columns. The parapet is treated in the mission revival style with vestigial hipped-roof towers at the corners and a central scrolled gable. The ground level has three round-arched openings, the center being the entrance. This is adorned with a large scrolled cartouche. A dentilated string course defines the base. The curvilinear moldings above the ground level arches and a tiled pent roof cornice have been removed, but the handsome metal entrance marquee is intact (ca. 1976). The interior has several features of character, including the basement with its "jinks room"-- a large but partitioned space with a corbelled stage and rich foliate proscenium; the first floor coffered ceilings and unusual brick fireplaces; the third floor hall at the rear which is two stories high with arched windows, small stage, pilaster order, and an oval stained glass sky-lit dome with rich moldings. The building is an important element on upper Powell Street, relating to surrounding buildings by similar use of materials, ornament and scale.

**Project Description:**

The proposed project at 540 Powell Street includes removing and restoring the windows at the upper stories to their historic configuration, operation, design, and material. The arched
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transoms at the ground story shall be restored and their awnings removed. The existing sign shall be relocated on the Powell Street façade to a code-compliant, southern location. The subject property has two visible facades, with Powell Street to the west (considered the primary façade), and Anson Place to the north. The proposed scope of work related to each façade that the HPC will review is the following:

- **Powell Street (West) Elevation** – the primary elevation shall undergo the following restorative efforts: replace the nonoriginal second and third story windows with windows that match the historic pattern, based on photographic evidence; remove the curved awnings and restore the arched transom windows; and patch and repair material impairments and surface punctures along the front building wall and within the centralized entry. The existing, projecting sign shall be delicately removed, any damages repaired, and relocated to the southern (down sloping) side of the Powell façade for code compliancy. The existing, projecting security camera will be removed, and a freeform dome camera installed with an internally routed conduit.

- **Anson Place (North) Elevation** – the existing projecting security cameras at the western and eastern building corners shall be removed, and a freeform dome camera installed in its existing building penetration. The two (2) infilled windows at the eastern, fourth story are seeking memorialization and legalization as is. The ground story windows and arched transoms clad in metal bars, and the windows replaced at the upper stories without the benefit of permits, shall be legalized as is.

4. **Surrounding Properties and Neighborhood:**

   **Article 11, Appendix E – Kearny-Market-Mission-Sutter Conservation District:**

   (a) **History of the District.** The Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter District covers a large area with individual streets within the district that have unique histories which have often changed dramatically over time. Changing land-use patterns have been determined by the movement of high-quality retail stores. Throughout the years, the closing or movement of larger department stores has often provided new space for smaller stores as well as the relocations of the hotel and theater districts.

   (b) **Basic Nature of the District.** The pattern of development is one of small-scaled, light-colored buildings predominantly four to eight stories in height. The height and scale provide for a streetscape which is attractive to the pedestrian because of the comfortable scale and sunlit sidewalks. This dense area is the heart of San Francisco’s retail and tourist sectors, containing a concentration of fine shops, department stores, theaters, hotels, and restaurants. As such, it is one of the main attractions to tourists from around the country and world, as well as the prime retail district in the Bay Area. The District is further defined by the location of Union Square in its heart. This square is, in many ways, the premier public open space in the City, as well as a primary public forum.

   (c) **Architectural Character.** The character of the area is determined by the many fine quality structures, among the best in the City, and supported by a number of contributory buildings. Since the entire area was built in less than 20 years, and the major portion in less than 10 years, buildings
were constructed in similar styles and structural technology. Perhaps even more importantly, architects were of like backgrounds, schooled in the classical Beaux Arts tradition.

In addition to their individual architectural features, the scale and design of buildings in the district related very well with neighboring buildings, streets and open spaces. This effect was achieved in large part by the alignment of cornice and belt course lines. The buildings used compatible detailing, colors, materials, massing, and scale. Ornament was derived from Classical, Renaissance, Gothic and Romanesque sources. In a limited number of examples, ornament was developed from early Spanish Colonial models.

(d) Uniqueness and Location. The District’s character, although it has many buildings of recent vintage, is largely intact. It is one of the few homogeneous collections of early Twentieth Century commercial architecture of its type in the United States. At the time of designation in 1985, this District included 324 buildings, 114 of which were identified as architecturally significant and 140 as contributory. Only 98 buildings were not rated. Subsequent amendments to the District and recategorization of individual buildings have resulted in a greater concentration of architecturally significant properties. Union Square, an integral part of the District, is a unique resource and ranks with the finest open spaces in the country. The area is centrally located and easily accessible to the Financial District, Nob Hill, the Tenderloin, and the South of Market, as well as outlying districts of the City. The Powell Street Cable Car lines is a unique feature which relates the area to the entire northeastern quadrant of the City and attracts tourists to the area.

(e) Visual and Functional Unity. The character of the area is determined by a series of buildings whose compositions and use of materials and ornament are complementary, as well as by the regular street pattern which creates interesting views and vistas down the streets. Within the District, several subareas increase the variety and complexity of the District while retaining its essential architectural character.

(f) The exterior architectural features of the Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter Conservation District are as follows:

(1) Massing and Composition. The compositions of the building facades reflect the different architectural functions of the building. For the most part, building facades in the district are two- or three-part vertical compositions consisting either of a base and a shaft, or a base, a shaft and a capital. In more elaborate designs, transitional stories create a stacked composition, but the design effect is similar.

In addition, the facade of a building is often divided into bays expressing the structure (commonly steel and reinforced concrete) beneath the facade. This was accomplished through fenestration, structural articulation or other detailing which serves to break the facade into discrete segments. A common compositional device in the District is an emphasis placed upon either the end bays or the central bay.

The massing of the structures is usually a simple vertically oriented rectangle with a ratio of width to height generally from 1:2 to 1:4. This vertically oriented massing is an important
characteristic of the District. In addition, continuous streetwall heights are a characteristic of most blockfronts.

Almost without exception, the buildings in the Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter Conservation District are built to the front property line and occupy the entire site. Where buildings have not followed this rule, they do not adequately enclose the street. The massing of structures often reflects unique or prominent site characteristics. Corner buildings often have rounded corner bays to express the special requirements of the site and to tie its two blockfronts together.

(2) **Scale.** The buildings are of small to medium scale. The bay width is generally from 20 feet to 30 feet. Heights generally range from four to eight stories on lots 40 feet to 80 feet wide, although a number of taller buildings exist. The wider frontages are often broken up by articulation of the facade, making the buildings appear narrower. The base is generally delineated from the rest of the building giving the District an intimate scale at the street.

(3) **Materials and Colors.** Buildings are usually clad in masonry materials over a supporting structure. The cladding materials include terra cotta, brick, stone and stucco. Wood, metal and metal panels are not facade materials, although painted wood and metal are sometimes used for window sash and ornament.

The materials are generally colored light or medium earth tones, including white, cream, buff, yellow, and brown. Individual buildings generally use a few different tones of one color.

To express the mass and weight of the structure, masonry materials are used on multidimensional wall surfaces with texture and depth, which simulates the qualities necessary to support the weight of a load-bearing wall.

(4) **Detailing and Ornamentation.** This area has been the heart of the retail district since it was reconstructed after the fire. Buildings use the expression of texture and depth on masonry material (e.g., rustication, deep window reveals) to simulate the appearance of load-bearing walls. The buildings are not constructed in a single style, but with ornament drawn from a variety of historical sources, primarily Classical and Renaissance. Gothic detailing is also well represented. Popular details include, arches, columns, pilasters, projecting bracketed cornices, multiple belt-courses, elaborate lintels and pediments, and decorated spandrels. Details were used to relate buildings to their neighbors by repeating and varying the ornament used in the surrounding structures.

**Article 11, Appendix F – New Montgomery-Mission-Second Street Conservation District:**

(a) **History of the District.** The core of the New Montgomery-Mission-Second Street Conservation District is a product of the post-1906 reconstruction of downtown San Francisco. Rebuilt between 1906 and 1933 this district represents a collection of masonry commercial loft buildings that exhibit a high level of historic architectural integrity and create a cohesive district of two-to-eight story masonry buildings of similar scale, massing, setback, materials, fenestration pattern, style, and.
architectural detailing. Montgomery Street was the most important commercial street in the 1870's; thus, New Montgomery Street was planned as a southern extension from Market Street to the Bay. The New Montgomery corridor was comprised of convenient financial and retail services off Market Street; Second Street contained wholesaling, commercial loft structures, and office support services; and the alleyways south of Howard Street supported a rich culture of small industrial uses. Cumulatively, within the boundaries of the New Montgomery-Mission-Second Street Conservation District, the area was transformed into a southerly extension of downtown. This growth was reflected in the large number of multi-story structures built along both Mission and Market streets, with the intersection of 3rd and Mission evolving into the most important intersections in the survey area.

(b) Basic Nature of the District. New Montgomery Street is characterized by large buildings that often occupy an entire section of a block defined by streets and alleys or a major portion of these subblocks. The buildings are of a variety of heights, but the heights of most of the buildings range from five to eight stories. Second Street is characterized by smaller, less architecturally significant buildings, but, because of their continuous streetwall, they form a more coherent streetscape. Without some sort of protection for the less significant buildings, the quality of the district would be lost due to pressure from the expanding office core.

(c) Architectural Character. Most of the contributing buildings are designed in the American Commercial Style and feature facades divided into a tripartite arrangement consisting of a base, shaft, and capital. Although the scale and size of the structures on New Montgomery Street are somewhat monumental, the area remains attractive for pedestrians. There are a number of outstanding buildings concentrated on New Montgomery, such as the Palace Hotel, the Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Building tower, and the Sharon Building. Ornamentation of district contributors is most often Renaissance-Baroque with later examples of Spanish, Colonial, Gothic Revival Styles, and Art Deco. Examples of the styles range from the Gothic skyscraper massing and Art Deco detailing of the Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Building to the Renaissance Palazzo style of the Palace Hotel. The primary building materials are earthtone bricks, stone or terra cotta, with ornamental details executed in a variety of materials including terra cotta, metal, stucco and stone.

With the exceptions of corner buildings, Second Street, Mission and Howard Streets have a smaller, more intimate scale. While on New Montgomery Street, buildings typically occupy an entire subblock, on Second Street, three or four small buildings will occupy the same area. The buildings are generally mixed-use office and retail structures, two-to-seven stories in height, with Renaissance-influenced ornament.

The two streets are unified by several elements, including an architectural vocabulary which draws from similar historical sources, similar materials, scale, fenestration, color, stylistic origins, texture, and ornament.

(d) The exterior architectural features of the New Montgomery-Mission-Second Street District are as follows:
(1) **Massing and Composition.** Almost without exception, the buildings in the New Montgomery-Mission-Second Conservation District are built to the front property line and occupy the entire site. Most buildings are either square or rectangular in plan, some with interior light courts to allow sunlight and air into the interiors of buildings. Nearly all cover their entire parcels, and their primary facades face the street. Building massings along New Montgomery and Second Streets have different directional orientations. For the most part, the large buildings on New Montgomery Street are horizontally oriented, since they are built on relatively large lots, often occupying an entire blockface. Their horizontal width often exceeds their height. The buildings on Second Street are built on much smaller lots, and hence have a vertical orientation. An exception on New Montgomery is the tower of the Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Building, whose soaring verticality is unique for that street.

To express the mass and weight of the structure, masonry materials are used on multi-dimensional wall surfaces with texture and depth, which simulates the qualities necessary to support the weight of a load-bearing wall.

Despite their differing orientation, almost all buildings share a two or three-part compositional arrangement. In addition, buildings are often divided into bays which establish a steady rhythm along the streets of the District. The rhythm is the result of fenestration, structural articulation or other detailing which breaks the facade into discrete segments. A common compositional device in the District is the emphasis placed upon either the end bays or the central bay.

(2) **Scale.** More than two-thirds of the contributing buildings are three-to-eight story brick or concrete commercial loft buildings constructed during the five years after the 1906 Earthquake and Fire. The scale of the District varies from the small buildings on Howard, Mission, Natoma, and Second Streets, such as the Phoenix Desk Company Building at 666 Mission Street, the Burdette Building at 90 Second Street, and the Emerson Flag Company Building at 161 Natoma Street; to medium-scaled structures on Mission and New Montgomery Streets, such as the Veronica Building at 647 Mission Street, and the Standard Building at 111 New Montgomery Street; to large-scale buildings on New Montgomery Street, such as the Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Building at 140 New Montgomery. On New Montgomery Street, the large facades are not commonly divided into smaller bays, establishing a medium scale when combined with the five- to eight-story height of the buildings. Similarly, the use of elaborate ornament on many of the buildings breaks their large facades into smaller sections and accordingly reduces their scale. Second Street is characterized by much smaller buildings with more frequent use of vertical piers whose scale is very intimate for the South of Market area.

(3) **Materials and Color.** Various forms of masonry are the predominant building materials in the district. A number of buildings on the northern end of New Montgomery use brown or buff brick. Terra cotta is also used as a facing material, and is frequently glazed to resemble granite or other stones. On Second and Mission Streets, several buildings are faced in stucco. To express the mass and weight of the structure, masonry materials are often rusticated at the ground and second story to increase the textural variation and sense of depth. Several buildings along Howard Street are noteworthy
because they are clad in brick in warm earth tones, exhibit fine masonry craftsmanship, and remain unpainted.

The materials are generally colored light or medium earth tones, including white, cream, buff, yellow, and brown. Individual buildings generally use a few different tones of one color.

(4) Detailing and Ornamentations. Buildings range from industrial brick and stucco office/warehouses to ornately decorated office buildings. The details on the latter buildings are generally of Classical/Renaissance derivation and include projecting cornices and belt courses, rustication, columns and colonnades, and arches. Industrial commercial buildings are noted by their utilitarian nature, with limited areas or ornament applied at the cornice entablature and around windows.

5. Public Outreach and Comments. To date, staff has not received public comment on the Preservation entitlements.

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 11 of the Planning Code in the following manner:

A. Article 11 of the Planning Code. Pursuant to Section 1111.6(a) of the Planning Code, the proposed alteration shall be consistent with and appropriate for the effectuation of the purposes of this Article 11.

The proposed project is consistent with Article 11.

B. Alterations. Article 11 of the Planning Code outlines specific findings for the Commission to consider when evaluating applications for Alterations.

Pursuant to Section 1111.6(c) of the Planning Code, for Significant Buildings/Properties (Categories I and II) and for Contributory Buildings (Categories III and IV), proposed alterations of structural elements and exterior features shall be consistent with the architectural character of the building, and shall comply with the following specific requirements:

(1) The distinguishing original qualities or character of the building may not be damaged or destroyed. Any distinctive architectural feature which affects the overall appearance of the building shall not be removed or altered unless it is the only feasible means to protect the public safety.

(2) The integrity of distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship that characterize a building shall be preserved.

(3) Distinctive architectural features which are to be retained pursuant Paragraph (1) but which are deteriorated shall be repaired rather than replaced, whenever possible. In
the event replacement is necessary, the new material shall match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture and other visual qualities. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features shall be based on accurate duplication of features, substantiated by historic, physical or pictorial evidence, if available, rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures. Replacement of non-visible structural elements need not match or duplicate the material being replaced.

(4) Contemporary design of alterations is permitted, provided that such alterations do not destroy significant exterior architectural material and that such design is compatible with the size, scale, color, material and character of the building and its surroundings.

The proposed project is consistent with Article 11. For Unrated Buildings (Category V), this Section does not apply (within Conservation Districts, all major exterior alterations, of Category V Buildings, shall be compatible in scale and design with the District as set forth in Sections 6 and 7 of the Appendix which describes the District).

C. Appendix E of Article 11: Kearny-Market-Mason Sutter Conservation District. Section 7 of the Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter Conservation District includes specific standards and guidelines for the review of new construction and certain alterations. The projects subject to the specific standards outlined in Appendix E are: 540 Powell; 410 Bush; 620 Sutter; 625 Sutter; 655 Sutter; and 680 Sutter. The Commission finds the proposed alterations to these project sites be compatible as follows:

a. Composition and Massing. The proposal is consistent with the Composition and Massing of this Conservation District. The massing of the existing buildings will remain unchanged, with their compositions also largely remaining as is.

b. Scale. The proposal is consistent with the Scale of this Conservation District. For all properties, building size and scale will remain the same. Alterations will not diminish the overall building scale.

c. Materials and Color. The proposal is consistent with the Materials and Color of this Conservation District. Existing exterior surface materials and color will not be diminished and in some cases will be restored or repaired.

d. Detailing and Ornamentation. The proposal is consistent with the Detailing and Ornamentation of this Conservation District. Overall complexity of detailing will not be diminished.

The projects subject to these specific standards outlined in Appendix F are: 79 New Montgomery and 180 New Montgomery. The Commission finds the proposed alterations to these project sites be compatible as follows:

a. Composition and Massing. The proposal is consistent with the Composition and Massing of this Conservation District. The massing of the existing buildings will remain intact and the compositions will largely be retained as is or restored.

b. Scale. The proposal is consistent with the Scale of this Conservation District. Both properties within this district will retain their size and scale, and alterations will not diminish the overall buildings’ scale and presence.

c. Materials and Color. The proposal is consistent with the Materials and Color of this Conservation District. The overall surface material and color will not be irreversibly diminished.

d. Detailing and Ornamentation. The proposal is consistent with the Detailing and Ornamentation of this Conservation District. The overall composition of ornament and building detail will largely remain as is.

E. Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. Pursuant to Section 1111.6(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 will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces and spatial relationships.

(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.

(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, will not be undertaken.

(4) **Standard 4**: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.
(5) **Standard 5:** Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of fine craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

(6) **Standard 6:** Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

(7) **Standard 7:** Chemical or physical treatments, if possible, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

(8) **Standard 8:** Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

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

(10) **Standard 10:** New additions and adjacent or related new construction will 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 proposal at each of the eight (8) Article 11 Project Sites will not remove distinctive materials, nor irreversibly alter features that characterize the buildings. The proposed alterations at each building retains the existing appearance, distinctive features and finishes, and restores material impairments. If any building modifications are proposed, the work offers a compatible (in material, feature, size, scale, and finish), but differentiated, proposal. Staff has conducted site visits and reviewed the alterations, legalizations, and proposed scopes of work, and confirms that distinctive features and finishes will be preserved. On balance, the project does not impair the buildings’ ability to convey its significance and work shall be performed in a manner which restores and retains each project site’s integrity. Therefore, the proposal conforms to the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation.*

7. **General Plan Compliance.** The proposed Permit to Alter 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 Permit to Alter 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 Master Permit to Alter 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 respect the neighborhood character by strengthening the character-defining features of the buildings.
C) The City’s supply of affordable housing will be preserved and enhanced:  

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

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

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

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

*The proposed projects 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 11 of the Planning Code.*

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 provisions of Article 11 of the Planning Code.
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 Master Permit to Alter for eight properties’ proposed work in conformance with the architectural submittal dated October 12, 2019 and labeled Exhibit B on file in the docket for Record No. 2019-012970PTA.

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

Duration of this Permit to Alter: This Permit to Alter is issued pursuant to Article 11 of the Planning Code and is valid for that period of time as specified pursuant to the Development Agreement. The Department of Building Inspection shall have issued Building Permits or Site Permits to construct the project and/or commence the approved scope of work within the performance period as specified in the Development Agreement.

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 November 20, 2019.

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES:
NAYS:
ABSENT:
ADOPTED: November 20, 2019
EXHIBIT A

AUTHORIZATION UPDATE

This authorization is for a permit to alter to allow alterations and building modifications at eight (8) properties owned or leased by the Academy of Art University ("The Academy") within the City and County of San Francisco ("City") pursuant to Planning Code Article 11; consistent with the proposed Development Agreement and the Term Sheet for Global Resolution between the City and the Academy; in general conformance with plans, dated October 12, 2019, and stamped "EXHIBIT B" included in the docket for Record No. 2019-012970PTA; and subject to conditions of approval reviewed and approved by the Historic Preservation Commission on November 20, 2019 under Motion No XXXX. This authorization and the conditions contained herein run with the property and not with a particular Project Sponsor, business, or operator.

PRINTING OF CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL ON PLANS

The conditions of approval under the 'Exhibit A' of this Historic Preservation Commission Motion No. XXXX shall be reproduced on the Index Sheet of construction plans submitted with the site or building permit application for the Project. The Index Sheet of the construction plans shall reference to the Permit to Alter 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 or Planning Department Historic Preservation staff if work is determined to be of "Minor" scope, pursuant to the identification and delegation of building modifications outlined in Motion No. 0376, and consistent with Sections 1111.1 of the Planning Code. Significant changes and modifications of conditions shall require Historic Preservation Commission approval of a new Permit to Alter. In instances when Planning Commission also reviews additional authorizations for the project, Planning Commission may make modifications to the Permit to Alter based on majority vote and not required to return to Historic Preservation Commission. Changes to the approved plans are also subject to the controls stipulated in the Development Agreement, as adopted through resolution 2019-012970DVA.

Conditions of Approval, Compliance, Monitoring, and Reporting

PERFORMANCE

1. Validity. The authorization and right vested by virtue of this action is valid for that period of time as specified pursuant to the Development Agreement. The Department of Building Inspection shall
have issued Building Permits or Site Permits to construct the project and/or commence the approved uses within the performance period as specified in the Development Agreement.

2. **Expiration and Renewal.** Should a Building or Site Permit be sought after the three (3) year period has lapsed, the project sponsor must seek a renewal of this Authorization by filing an application for an amendment to the original Authorization or a new application for Authorization. Should the project sponsor decline to so file, and decline to withdraw the permit application, the Commission shall conduct a public hearing in order to consider the revocation of the Authorization. Should the Commission not revoke the Authorization following the closure of the public hearing, the Commission shall determine the extension of time for the continued validity of the Authorization.

3. **Diligent Pursuit.** Once a site or Building Permit has been issued, construction must commence within the timeframe required by either the Department of Building Inspection or the Schedule of Performance as specified in the Development Agreement, whichever is less, and be continued diligently to completion. Failure to do so shall be grounds for the Commission to consider revoking the approval if more than three (3) years have passed since this Authorization was approved.

4. **Extension.** All time limits in the preceding three paragraphs may only be extended pursuant to the remedies afforded through the Development Agreement.

5. **Conformity with Current Law.** No application for Building Permit, Site Permit, or other entitlement shall be approved unless it complies with all applicable provisions of City Codes in effect at the time of such approval.

**ADDITIONAL APPROVALS REQUIRED**

6. **Additional Project Authorization.** The Project Sponsor must obtain approval through the Master Certificate of Appropriateness from the Historic Preservation Commission, pursuant to Articles 10 and the Development Agreement. The Project Sponsor must obtain approval through the Master Conditional Use Authorization from the Planning Commission, pursuant to the Development Agreement pursuant to Planning Code Sections 303 and 304.6. The Project must obtain authorization through Board of Supervisors approval of an ordinance amending the Planning Code in order to implement the Project pursuant to the Settlement Agreement and Term Sheet, and adopting the Development Agreement between the Academy and City and making findings of consistency with the provisions of Administrative Code Sections 41 and 56. The conditions set forth below are additional conditions required in connection with the Project. If these conditions overlap with any other requirement imposed on the Project, the more restrictive or protective condition or requirement, as determined by the Zoning Administrator, shall apply.

**DESIGN – COMPLIANCE AT PLAN STAGE**

7. **Final Materials.** The Project Sponsor shall continue to work with Planning Department on the building design. Final materials, glazing, color, texture, and detailing shall be subject to Department staff review for conformance with the plan sets and approval. This final review and
approval includes, but is not limited to, review by historic preservation staff on final window materials, security camera and lighting fixtures, location and means of attachment, and methods of conduit concealment. The architectural addenda shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department prior to issuance.

8. **Fixture Plan.** The Project Sponsor shall submit additional exterior lighting and security fixture detail in its building permit applications prior to Planning Department approval of the building/site permit application.

9. **Signage.** The Project Sponsor shall provide additional detail in its building permit applications regarding the copy, method of attachment, and installation for the new signage approved as part of the Project, which detail shall be subject to review and approval by Planning Department staff for conformance with the Secretary’s Standards and any other City standards, as applicable.

**MITIGATION**

10. **Mitigation Measures.** Mitigation measures described in the Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP) attached as Exhibit C are necessary to avoid potential significant effects of the proposed project and have been agreed to by the project sponsor. Their implementation is a condition of project approval.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

11. **Confirmation of Contractor Qualification.** Prior to Planning Department approval of the building application, the Project Sponsor’s architect shall submit a written confirmation that the project sites selected general contractor and subcontractors (“Contractors”) meet the technical specifications qualifications and have completed work of a similar scale and scope required to perform the rehabilitation and restoration work required. This written confirmation from the architect will include the names of the Contractor(s), their roles in the project, list of preservation projects with property addresses undertaken by the contractor of similar scale and scope, the number of years of successful experience doing this work, and confirmation that the architect has reviewed and verified this experience.

12. **Site Inspections.** The Project Sponsor’s architect shall submit a schedule of site inspections to be coordinated and completed with Department Staff regarding each project site undergoing work pursuant to the Schedule of Performance in the Development Agreement and consistent with the scope of work outlined in the architectural plans dated October 12, 2019, labelled Exhibit B. The schedule shall succinctly summarize the architect’s on-site inspection and confirmation that work is being completed in conformance with the approved plans.

13. **Restoration Work.** The building permit applications shall contain the following detail regarding requirements to protect historic features of the building in conformance with the Secretary’s Standards and provisions of Article 10:
a. Specification Sheets for replacement windows; and
b. Detailed construction drawings for attachment mechanisms whereas any fixture or feature attached, affixed, or recessed within an exterior material shall be done so through a mortar joint and meet the Secretary of the Interior Standards;

In addition, the Project Sponsor’s architect shall send the Planning Department required subcontractor submittals, including submittals regarding product data, samples and schedules for concurrent review and comment by the Planning Department to be provided by the Planning Department to the Project Sponsor’s architect within two weeks of receipt. The details for such submittals may, as applicable, include, but not be limited to the following:

a. Product data sheets used for the cleaning and protection of exterior historic elements;
b. Product sheets used for solvents and equipment used to remove and/or repair elements;
c. Sample of replacement and/or repair material for stone and masonry;
d. Sample of repointing mortar;
e. Sample of replacement historic elements such as masonry, metal awning, windows, etc.;
f. Shop drawings for reproduction of decorative terra cotta, masonry, or stone elements at exterior, if any such elements are to be restored, conserved, replaced or if any such elements are damaged in the removal and/or installation of other elements;
g. Shop drawings for replacement windows;
h. Work schedule for the containment of hazardous materials during construction, cleaning, conservation, repair, and restoration work at each property site to ensure safeguarding the structure and mitigating hazardous particulates from occupants and the public; and
i. Stabilization schedule and product data sheets for elements used to protect and retain the existing extant elements from damage during construction that takes place at the project sites reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission on November 20, 2019.

**MONITORING - AFTER ENTITLEMENT**

14. **Enforcement.** Violation of any of the Planning Department conditions of approval contained in this Motion or of any other provisions of Planning Code applicable to this Project shall be subject to the enforcement procedures and administrative penalties set forth under Planning Code Section 176 or Section 176.1. The Planning Department may also refer the violation complaints to other city departments and agencies for appropriate enforcement action under their jurisdiction.

15. **Monitoring.** The Project requires monitoring of the conditions of approval in this Motion. The Project Sponsor or the subsequent responsible parties for the Project shall pay fees as established under Planning Code Section 351(e) (1) and work with the Planning Department for information about compliance.

PREAMBLE

The Academy of Art University (the “Academy”) is a private, for-profit post-secondary academic institution that currently occupies, either in part or in full, 40 properties within the City and County of San Francisco for its existing educational programs, recreational activities, and student housing. In 2007, the Academy occupied 34 properties, in 28 of which, the Academy had implemented various tenant improvements and changes of use without benefit of required conditional uses, building permits or other entitlements. In order to evaluate the potential impacts associated with bringing those 28 properties into compliance with the San Francisco Planning Code and to analyze the Academy’s then-proposed plans for growth, an Environmental Evaluation application was filed with the Planning Department (“Department”) for preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The Planning Department published a Notice of Preparation (“NOP”) for the project on September 29, 2010.
Draft Motion No. XXXXX

On February 25, 2015, the Department published a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Academy of Art University Project and published a Notice of Availability (NOA) for the DEIR. The NOA identified a public comment period on the DEIR from February 25, 2015, through April 27, 2015. On April 16, 2015, the Planning Commission conducted a duly advertised public hearing on the DEIR, at which opportunity for public comment was given, and public comment was received on the DEIR. The period for commenting on the EIR ended on April 27, 2015. The Department prepared responses to comments on environmental issues received during the 62 day public review period for the DEIR, prepared revisions to the text of the DEIR in response to comments received or based on additional information that became available during the public review period, and corrected clerical errors in the DEIR.

Between approximately 2010 and 2016, the Academy acquired an additional six properties, bringing the total number of properties owned or occupied by the Academy and its affiliates to 40. On May 4, 2016, the Academy Existing Sites Technical Memorandum (ESTM) was prepared by the Department in connection with the discretionary approvals necessary to legalize the Academy’s use of 28 of its 34 existing sites. The ESTM may be used by the Historic Preservation and Planning Commissions for information in considering all the Academy applications to legalize past unauthorized changes and its ongoing operations. Unlike the EIR, the ESTM is not required to go through a certification process by the Historic Preservation and Planning Commissions, and its recommendations to decision makers are not binding until approval of the conditions as part of any entitlements for each Academy property.

On June 30, 2016, the Department published a Responses to Comments document. A Final Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter “FEIR”) has been prepared by the Department, consisting of the DEIR, any consultations and comments received during the public review process, any additional information that became available, and the Responses to Comments document, all as required by law. The Responses to Comments document was distributed to the Planning Commission and all parties who commented on the DEIR, and made available to others at the request of Planning Department staff.

On July 28, 2016, the Planning Commission reviewed and considered the FEIR and found that the contents of said report and the procedures through which the FEIR was prepared, publicized, and reviewed comply with the provisions of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. The FEIR was certified by the Commission on July 28, 2016 by adoption of its Motion No. 19704.

On May 6, 2016, the City Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco (the “City Attorney”), on behalf of the City and the People of the State of California, commenced litigation against the Academy and the affiliated LLC Parties in People v. Stephens Institute, et. al, San Francisco Superior Court Number CGC-16-551-832 (the “Lawsuit”). In the Lawsuit, the City Attorney alleged violations of the City’s Administrative Code, Planning Code, Building Code, and the State Unfair Competition Law, Business and Professions Code Section 17200 et seq. (the “UCL”). During court-supervised settlement discussions to resolve the Lawsuit, the Academy and the LLC Parties expressed their commitment to bring the Academy’s existing uses into compliance with the Planning Code; relocate existing Academy uses or change Academy uses in buildings in accordance with applicable laws in those specific instances where the Planning Department has determined that legalization is not appropriate or the Academy has agreed to withdraw its use; compensate the City for past violations, including providing affordable housing public benefits to the City; legalize or reverse alterations to bring its buildings into compliance City codes, and work cooperatively with the City in planning for future Academy growth in a manner that accounts for the urban nature of the Academy’s campus, without
adversely impacting the City’s affordable or rent-controlled housing stock, or burdening its transportation system, including, as part of that plan, building new housing for its students on property that is zoned for such use.

As a result of those discussions, and under the auspices of the court, the Academy and the City entered into a non-binding Term Sheet for Global Resolution, dated November 15, 2016, as amended by that certain Supplement to Term Sheet for Global Resolution, dated July 10, 2019 (collectively, the “Term Sheet”), intended to provide a basis to resolve all of the outstanding issues relating to the Lawsuit and other land use matters, and to establish appropriate principles and processes for land use compliance by the Academy.

As contemplated by the Term Sheet, the City, the Academy, and the LLC Parties have entered into a comprehensive consent judgment that they will file with the Superior Court seeking the Court’s approval and entry of judgment (the “Consent Judgment”). The Consent Judgment contains four main parts: (1) a Settlement Agreement (the “Settlement Agreement”), which includes obligations of the LLC Parties to make payments to the City (including the Affordable Housing Benefit); (2) a Stipulated Injunction (the “Injunction”), which is an exhibit to the Settlement Agreement and provides a mechanism for judicial enforcement of the Academy’s and the LLC Parties’ obligations under the Settlement Agreement and this Agreement, and (3) the Development Agreement, which is also an exhibit to the Settlement Agreement. Also critical to the global resolution that the Consent Judgment would achieve is the instrument securing the LLC Parties’ financial obligations under the Settlement Agreement and this Agreement. The obligations of the LLC Parties to make the full settlement payments under the Settlement Agreement will be secured by a Guaranty (the “Guaranty”) from the Stephens Family Trust, the Elisa Stephens Trust, the Scott Stephens Trust, Elisa Stephens, Scott Stephens, Richard A. Stephens, and Susanne Stephens.

As contemplated by the Term Sheet, the Academy will vacate nine (9) of the previously occupied properties; bring the remaining 31 previously occupied properties owned by the LLC Parties and used by the Academy into compliance with the Planning Code by legalizing previously unpermitted changes in use and alterations and permitting work to reverse other previously unpermitted work; and obtain authorization for changes of use and other alterations at three (3) new properties not previously occupied by the Academy. (“Project”). The Project requires the City’s approval of a variety of permits and authorizations, including (i) legislation approving the Development Agreement, amending the Planning Code and granting exceptions to the Administrative Code; (ii) approval of a Master Conditional Use authorization by the Planning Commission to reflect the approval of the use of thirty-four (34) properties (primarily in the northeast quadrant of the City) and to grant certain exceptions to the Planning Code, (iii) the approval of a Master Permit to Alter and Master Certificate of Appropriateness by the Historic Preservation Commission, and (iv) a variety of other building alterations and street improvements including without limitation the removal and installation of signage, removal and repair of nonconforming awnings and exterior alterations, the installation Class 1 and Class 2 bike racks, the removal of curb cuts, and the replacement of certain windows.

On October 9, 2019, the Academy filed a complete application with the City’s Planning Department for approval of a development agreement relating to the Project Site (the “Development Agreement”) under Chapter 56. As set forth in the Development Agreement, the Academy requests legalization of the proposed uses of all 34 properties, and of the previous alterations made to the buildings and facilities on these sites, as well as approval of the work necessary to bring these properties into compliance with the San Francisco Planning Code and, where applicable, the Secretary of the Interior Standards for buildings subject to Planning Code Articles 10 and 11. The Development Agreement requires the Academy to obtain all
necessary permits to perform corrective work at the 34 properties and complete the work to bring these buildings into compliance with the Planning Code pursuant to the Schedule of Performance set forth as Exhibit E to the Development Agreement. While the Development Agreement is between the City, acting primarily through the Planning Department, and Academy, other City agencies retain a role in reviewing and issuing certain later approvals for the Project. Later approvals include approval of building permits, streetscape permits, and permits to allow for the installation of Class 2 bicycle racks. As a result, affected City agencies have consented to the Development Agreement.

On October 9, 2019, the Academy filed complete applications with the City’s Planning Department for required entitlements pursuant to the Term Sheet and Development Agreement. These applications are the consolidated master applications for Conditional Use Authorization, Certificate of Appropriateness and Permit to Alter.

On October 9, 2019, the Planning Department issued an Addendum to the FEIR, in which it determined that the actions contemplated in this ordinance comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.); that no supplemental or subsequent environmental review is required, as there are no substantial changes to the proposed Project, or to the circumstances under which the Project will be undertaken, involving new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified environmental effects; and that there is no new information of substantial importance that shows that the Project will have one or more effects not discussed in the FEIR, that the previously identified effects will be more severe, or that there are mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce such effects, but the Project proponents refuse to adopt them.

On November 20, 2019, the City, acting through the Historic Preservation Commission, made and adopted findings of fact and decisions regarding the Project description and objectives, significant impacts, significant and unavoidable impacts, mitigation measures and alternatives, and a statement of overriding considerations (“CEQA Findings”), based on substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding and pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, California Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq. (“CEQA”), particularly Section 21081 and 21081.5, the Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq. (“CEQA Guidelines”), Section 15091 through 15093, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code (“Chapter 31”) pursuant to this Motion No. XXXX. The Historic Preservation Commission adopted the CEQA Findings as required by CEQA, separate and apart from the Planning Commission’s certification of the Project’s Final EIR, which the Planning Commission certified prior to the Historic Preservation Commission’s adoption of these CEQA findings.

On November 20, 2019, the Historic Preservation Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting regarding Master Certificate of Appropriateness and Permit to Alter applications (Planning Record Nos. 2019-012970COA and 2019-012970PTA) and approved these applications by Motion Nos. XXXX and XXXX, having heard and considered the testimony presented to it at the public hearing and further considered written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of the applicant, Department staff and other interested parties, and the record as a whole. The Historic Preservation Commission also considered and commented upon the legislation approving the Development Agreement between the Academy and City.

The Planning Department’s Commission Secretary is the custodian of records; all pertinent documents are located in the File for Case No. 2019-012970PRJ, at 1650 Mission Street, Fourth Floor, San Francisco, California.
MOVED, that the Historic Preservation Commission hereby adopts findings under the California Environmental Quality Act, including rejecting alternatives as infeasible and adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and adopts the MMRP attached as Attachment B, based on the findings attached to this Motion as Attachment A as though fully set forth in this Motion, and based on substantial evidence in the entire record of this proceeding.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Motion was ADOPTED by the Historic Preservation Commission at its regular meeting of November 20, 2019.

Jonas P. Ionin  
Commission Secretary

AYES:  
NAYS:  
ABSENT:  
DATE: November 20, 2019
Attachment A
California Environmental Quality Act Findings

PREAMBLE

In determining to approve the project described in Section I, Project Description below, the City, acting through the Historic Preservation Commission (“Commission”), makes and adopts the following findings of fact and decisions regarding mitigation measures and alternatives, and adopts the statement of overriding considerations, based on substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding and under the California Environmental Quality Act, California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq. (“CEQA”), particularly Sections 21081 and 21081.5, the Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sections 15000 et seq. (“CEQA Guidelines”), particularly Sections 15091 through 15093, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administration Code. The Commission adopts these findings in conjunction with the Approval Actions described in Section I(c), below, as required by CEQA, separate and apart from the Commission’s certification of the Project’s Final EIR, which the Commission certified prior to adopting these CEQA findings.

These findings are organized as follows:

Section I provides a description of the project (the “Proposed Project”) as analyzed in the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Project (“FEIR”), as well as the revisions to the project (the “Revised Project”) as described in the Addendum to the Environmental Impact Report (“Addendum”; the Proposed Project, together with the revisions described the Revised Project, hereinafter, the “Project”), the environmental review process for the Project, and the approval actions to be taken and the location of records;

Section II identifies the impacts found not to be significant that do not require mitigation;

Section III identifies potentially significant impacts that can be avoided or reduced to less-than significant levels through mitigation and describes the mitigation measures;

Section IV identifies significant impacts that cannot be avoided or reduced to less-than-significant levels and describes any applicable mitigation measures;

Section V evaluates the different Project alternatives and the economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations that support approval of the Project and the rejection of the alternatives, or elements thereof; and

Section VI presents a statement of overriding considerations setting forth specific reasons in support of the Commission’s actions and its rejection of the alternatives not incorporated into the Project.
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Academy of Art University

The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (“MMRP”) for the mitigation measures that have been proposed for adoption is attached with these findings as Attachment B to this Motion. The MMRP is required by CEQA Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091. Attachment B provides a table setting forth each mitigation measure listed in the FEIR, as revised by the Addendum, that is required to reduce or avoid a significant adverse impact. Attachment B also specifies the agency responsible for implementation of each measure and establishes monitoring actions and a monitoring schedule. The full text of the mitigation measures is set forth in Attachment B. These findings are based upon substantial evidence in the entire record before the Commission. The references set forth in these findings to certain pages or sections of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (“DEIR”) or the Responses to Comments document (“RTC” or “Responses to Comments”) in the FEIR are for ease of reference and are not intended to provide an exhaustive list of the evidence relied upon for these findings.

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

A. Project Description

a. Project Location

The Academy of Art University (“Academy”), located within the City and County of San Francisco (the “City”), is a private for-profit postsecondary academic institution established in 1929 that currently occupies 40 buildings in the City (predominantly in the northeast quadrant) for its existing educational programs, recreational activities, and student housing. In 2007, the Academy occupied 34 buildings; in 28 of those buildings, the Academy had implemented various tenant improvements and changes of use without obtaining required building permits or other entitlements. In order to evaluate the potential impacts associated with bringing these 28 buildings into compliance with the San Francisco Planning Code and to analyze Academy’s then-proposed plans for growth, an environmental impact report was prepared between 2010 and 2016. During this period, affiliates of the Academy acquired an additional six buildings beyond the 34 already occupied, bringing the total number of properties owned or occupied by Academy and its affiliates to 40. The Planning Commission certified the FEIR, which analyzed the 40 properties, on July 28, 2016. The 40 properties are identified on Table 1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Property</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2340 Stockton Street</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1900 Jackson Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2295 Taylor Street</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1916 Octavia Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2151 Van Ness Avenue</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1153 Bush Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1849 Van Ness Avenue</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1080 Bush Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>950 Van Ness Avenue</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>860 Sutter Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1069 Pine Street</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>817-825 Sutter Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>740 Taylor Street</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>736 Jones Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>625-629 Sutter Street</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1055 Pine Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>491 Post Street</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>680-688 Sutter Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>540 Powell Street</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>620 Sutter Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>410 Bush Street</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>655 Sutter Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>77-79 New Montgomery Street</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>560 Powell Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>180 New Montgomery</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>575 Harrison Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As part of the Project, the Academy intends to vacate nine of its existing campus properties, and convert and occupy three new properties, and thereby occupy a total of 34 properties in the City (predominantly in the northeast quadrant) for education programs, recreational activities, and student housing. The Academy’s San Francisco campus under the Project, will be comprised of 34 properties is shown on Figure 1.

**Figure 1. Proposed Academy Campus**
Institutional Sites
1. 601 Brannan St.
2. 410 Bush St.
3. 58-60 Federal St.
4. 2501 Leavenworth St.
5. 77-79 New Montgomery St.
6. 180 New Montgomery St.
7. 625 Polk St.
8. 481 Post St.
9. 540 Powell St.
10. 625-629 Sutter St.
11. 740 Taylor St.
12. 466 Townsend St.
14. 2151 Van Ness Ave.
15. 1946 Van Ness Ave.
16. 1142 Van Ness Ave.

Clusters
1. Van Ness Transit Corridor
2. Union Square
3. Financial District
4. South of Market

Residential Sites
17. 1080 Bush St.
18. 1153 Bush St.
19. 575 Harrison St.
20. 1900 Jackson St.
21. 736 Jones St.
22. 1727 Lombard St.
23. 1916 Octavia St.
24. 560 Powell St.
25. 620 Sutter St.
26. 655 Sutter St.
27. 680-688 Sutter St.
28. 817-831 Sutter St.
29. 960 Sutter St.
30. 2209 Van Ness Ave.
31. 2211 Van Ness Ave.
32. 2550 Van Ness Ave.

Other
33. 2225 Jerrold Ave.
(Commercial Storage & Private Parking Garage
and latl with Accessory Office: Community Facilities)
34. 950 Van Ness Ave. 963 O’Farrell St.
Private Parking Garage with ground floor classic
car museum ancillary to museum located at
1849 Van Ness Ave.
In addition to the existing Academy properties, the DEIR identified 12 geographic areas ("Study Areas") where the Academy could occupy existing buildings to accommodate the program-level growth described below. The DEIR analyzed all Study Areas in its programmatic analysis of the Proposed Project. The 12 Study Areas generally included the following: Study Area ("SA") 1: Lombard Street/Divisadero Street; SA-2: Lombard Street/Van Ness Avenue; SA-3: Mid Van Ness Avenue; SA-4: Sutter Street/Mason Street; SA-5: Mid-Market Street; SA-6: Fourth Street/Howard Street; SA-7: Rincon Hill East; SA-8: Third Street/Bryant Street; SA-9: Second Street/Brannan Street; SA-10: Fifth Street/Brannan Street; SA-11: Sixth Street/Folsom Street; and SA-12: Ninth Street/Folsom Street. The Study Areas are shown on Figure 2.

**Figure 2. Study Areas**
b. Proposed Project Description

The Proposed Project analyzed in the DEIR consisted of four general components: program-level growth, project-level growth, legalization of prior unauthorized changes, and shuttle expansion, as explained below:

1. Program-level growth consisted of approximately 110,000 net square feet ("sf") of additional residential uses (to house approximately 400 students, equivalent to about 220 rooms) and 669,670 sf of additional institutional space in the 12 Study Areas.

2. Project-level growth consisted of six additional buildings that had been occupied, identified, or otherwise changed by the Academy since publication of the September 2010 Notice of Preparation ("NOP") for the DEIR, but for which one or more City approvals had not yet been issued. These six project sites included 393,537 sf of institutional uses and 17,533 sf of recreational uses. The six project sites included the following addresses: Project Site 1 ("PS-1"): 2801 Leavenworth Street (The Cannery); PS-2: 700 Montgomery Street; PS-3: 625 Polk Street; PS-4: 150 Hayes Street; PS-5: 121 Wisconsin Street; and PS-6: 2225 Jerrold Avenue.

3. The legalization of pre-NOP changes through the necessary approvals ("Legalization Approvals"). The list of analyzed approvals can be found in the DEIR: Table 3-2, Existing Institutional Facilities, p. 3-9; Table 3-3, Existing Residential Facilities, p. 3-10; and Section 3.6, Intended Uses of the EIR, p. 3-148.2. The DEIR analyzed the existing conditions, in which the Academy had already changed the applicable use or appearance of the building which required the Legalization Approvals, and therefore such legalizations were found to have had no impact.

4. The shuttle expansion consisted of an extension of the Academy’s shuttle service, under its Shuttle Bus Service Policy, to four of the project sites and potential extension to the 12 study areas in which program-level growth is anticipated.

c. Revised Project

The Academy has revised the Proposed Project, as analyzed by the Planning Department in the Addendum. The Proposed Project changed in light of a Term Sheet for Global Resolution entered into by the City and the Academy on November 15, 2016, as updated by a Supplement to Term Sheet dated July 10, 2019 (collectively, “Term Sheet”), the Academy’s withdrawal and cessation of all further use at nine (9) of the Academy’s properties, and the decrease in Academy student enrollment as compared to the projected increase that was studied by the Planning Department in the DEIR. Specifically, where the Department’s analysis in the FEIR was based on an increase in the Academy’s on-site student enrollment of approximately 6,100 students (or approximately five percent (5%) per year) and an anticipated increase of 1,220 staff members by 2020, the actual total reported on-site student enrollment for 2018 was 6,710 students. This number represents a decline of 4,471 students from the FEIR’s project enrollment figure, and less than one half of the 16,062 on-site students that were projected in the Proposed Project for 2020. To account for these disparate enrollment numbers, the Addendum revised its projected enrollment increases to a three percent (3%) annual growth rate, resulting in a total on-site enrollment of 7,119 students in 2020, less than one half of the 17,282 students projected for in the Proposed Project.
The Revised Project would result in the reduced Academy San Francisco campus shown and described in Figure 1 above. In addition, the Revised Project consists of four general components as follows:

1. The program-level growth in the Proposed Project of 669,670 net sf of additional institutional uses and 110,000 net sf of additional residential uses has not yet occurred and under the Revised Project is not proposed to occur.

2. Project-level growth consisting of the addition of three buildings the Academy intends to convert to Academy use. These three project sites include 75,261 sf of institutional uses and 76,402 sf of recreational uses. The addresses of the three additional buildings are: 1946 Van Ness Avenue, 1142 Van Ness Avenue, and 2550 Van Ness Avenue. Under the Revised Project, 2801 Leavenworth Street and 2225 Jerrold Avenue, analyzed in the FEIR, would remain part of the Academy campus, but the ground floor of 2801 Leavenworth would contain no institutional uses and 2225 Jerrold Avenue would include a new community facility.

3. The legalization of pre-NOP changes through the necessary approvals ("Legalization Approvals"). The Legalization Approvals would result in the full legalization of all 34 Academy campus sites described and shown in Figure 1 above. The comprehensive list of the 34 Academy properties and the corresponding proposed changes and/or modifications are identified on Appendix A of the Addendum.

4. The revised project would modify some elements of the existing shuttle service provided by the Academy. Existing shuttle service stops would be removed at 150 Hayes Street, 2340 Stockton Street, 168 Bluxome Street, 1069 Pine Street and 1055 Pine Street due to the Academy vacating these properties. However, the Academy would add new shuttle stops to the “M” route at 1604 Broadway and 1916 Octavia Street. In addition, the Academy has prepared a Shuttle Management Plan in compliance with the EIR Mitigation Measure M-TR-3.1 Shuttle Demand, Service Monitoring, and Capacity Utilization Performance Standard and EIR Improvement Measure I-TR-2 the Academy Shuttle Activities Monitoring.

B. Project Objectives

The FEIR discusses several Project objectives identified by the Academy. The objectives are as follows:

- Project Objective #1 - Operate in an urban context, where academic programs can contribute to and draw from the cultural wealth of the local communities.

- Project Objective #2 - Create opportunities for students to interact with the urban community (i.e., facilitate the “urban experience”) by maintaining facilities throughout the City rather than creating a consolidated campus.

- Project Objective #3 - Offer on-site residential housing for new full-time students who desire to live in Academy housing.

- Project Objective #4 - Consolidate administrative and classroom functions for each academic discipline in the same buildings so that students and faculty do not have to travel from building to building unnecessarily.
• Project Objective #5 - Manage facilities in a flexible manner to ensure availability of space to meet changing needs of academic programs.

• Project Objective #6 - Enable long-range programs and service planning to meet the needs of the community.

• Project Objective #7 - Occupy and use space in buildings and properties near existing Academy facilities, where possible.

• Project Objective #8 - Locate future facilities to:
  a. Provide proximity between buildings so students can walk between classes.
  b. Provide a sense of campus unity while still maintaining the benefits of a dispersed urban campus as the learning environment for Academy students.
  c. Locate the Academy facilities so that they are easily accessible to all Academy students and faculty/staff, allowing professors to teach and work in close proximity to students’ daily activities.

• Project Objective #9 - Locate future facilities in proximity to existing Academy shuttle stops or public transit to discourage use of private automobiles.

• Project Objective #10 - Occupy and utilize space in existing historic or culturally interesting buildings in need of renovation and/or revitalization.

C. Project Approvals

The Project requires the following Board of Supervisors approvals:

• Review and approval of an ordinance approving a Development Agreement, finding conformity with or waiving provisions of Administrative Code Sections 41 and 56; and adopting Planning Code Text Amendments.

• Adopting CEQA findings (including a Statement of Overriding Considerations), and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

The Project requires the following Planning Commission approvals:

• Adopting CEQA findings (including a Statement of Overriding Considerations), and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

• Approval of a Master Conditional Use Authorization, and a determination that the Project is consistent with the General Plan and complies with the City’s Priority Policy Findings.
Review and recommendation to the Board of Supervisors of an ordinance approving a Development Agreement, finding conformity with or waiving provisions of Administrative Code Sections 41 and 56; and adopting Planning Code Text Amendments.

The Project requires the following Historic Preservation Commission approvals:

- Approval of a Master Certificate of Appropriateness
- Approval of a Master Permit to Alter
- Review and provide comments on an ordinance approving a Development Agreement, finding conformity with or waiving provisions of Administrative Code Sections 41 and 56; and adopting Planning Code Text Amendments.

Actions by Other City Departments and State Agencies

- San Francisco Department of Public Works
  - Various permits and approvals related to streetscape improvement plans
- San Francisco Department of Building Inspection
  - Building permits for each property described in Figure 1 above
- San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
  - Various permits and approvals related to curb striping and Class 2 bike rack installation.

D. Environmental Review

Pursuant to and in accordance with the requirements of Section 21094 of the Public Resources and Sections 15063 and 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, the San Francisco Planning Department, as lead agency, prepared a Notice of Preparation (“NOP”) on September 29, 2010. The NOP was distributed to the State Clearinghouse and mailed to governmental agencies with potential interest, expertise, and/or authority over the Project; interested members of the public; and occupants and owners of real property surrounding the project area.

The Planning Department held a Public Scoping Meeting on October 26, 2010 to receive oral comments on the scope of the EIR. In total, during the scoping period the Planning Department received comments from two agencies, three non-governmental organizations, and three individuals. The Notice of Preparation, Revised NOP, and Summary of NOP Comments are included as Appendix A to the DEIR.

A Notice of Completion was filed with the State Secretary of Resources via the State Clearinghouse on February 25, 2015.

On February 25, 2015, the Planning Department published the DEIR and circulated the same to local, state, and federal agencies and to interested organizations and individuals. The DEIR was made available for public review at the following locations: (i) San Francisco Planning Department, Planning Information
Counter, 1660 Mission Street; (ii) San Francisco Main Library, 100 Larkin Street; (iii) San Francisco State University Library, 1630 Holloway Avenue; and (iv) Hastings College of Law-Library, 200 McAllister Street. Electronic copies were also available for review or download on the Planning Department’s web page.

Also, on February 25, 2015, the Planning Department distributed notices of availability of the DEIR by (i) publishing notice in a newspaper of general circulation in San Francisco; (ii) posting the notice of availability at the San Francisco County Clerk’s office; and (iii) posting notices at locations near the project sites. The distribution list for the DEIR, as well as all documents referenced in the DEIR, were also available for review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California 94103.

On April 8, 2015, the Planning Department distributed revised notices of availability of the DEIR, published revised notification of its availability in a newspaper of general circulation in San Francisco, posted the revised notice of availability at the San Francisco County Clerk’s office, and posted revised notices at locations near the Proposed Project and in a 300-foot buffer of 2550 Van Ness Avenue. The notice was revised to address a specific site in Study Area 2 (Lombard/Van Ness Avenue) at 2550 Van Ness Avenue (Assessor’s block/lot: 0526/021). This additional site is within the proposed identified uses in Study Area 2 of up to 220 rooms or 400 beds, as described in the DEIR.

During the DEIR public review period, the Planning Department received written comments from five public agencies, one Planning Commission member, 45 non-governmenal organizations, and 35 individuals (or groups of individuals). During the public review period, the Department conducted a public hearing to receive verbal comments on the DEIR. Verbal comments were received from five Planning Commission members, nine non-governmenal organizations, and 13 individuals (or groups of individuals). The public hearing was held before the San Francisco Planning Commission on April 16, 2015, at San Francisco City Hall.

The San Francisco Planning Department then prepared the responses to comments on environmental issues received during the 62-day public review period for the DEIR, prepared revisions to the text of the DEIR in response to comments received or based on additional information that became available during the public review period, and correct errors in the DEIR. That document, which also includes written responses to each comment received on the DEIR, was published on June 30, 2016.

The Department prepared the FEIR consisting of the DEIR, any consultations and comments received during the review process, any additional information that became available, and the Comments and Responses document as required by law.

The Planning Commission reviewed and considered the FEIR and all of the supporting information and certified the FEIR on July 28, 2016. In certifying the FEIR, this Planning Commission found that the contents of said report and the procedures through which the FEIR was prepared, publicized, and reviewed comply with the provisions of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code. Further, the Planning Commission determined that the FEIR does not add significant new information to the DEIR that would require recirculation of the FEIR under CEQA, because the FEIR contains no information revealing (1) any new significant environmental impact that would result from the Project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented, (2) any substantial increase in the severity of a previously
identified environmental impact, (3) any feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed that would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the Project, but that was rejected by the Project’s proponents, or (4) that the DEIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

In addition to the above documents, the Planning Department also prepared an Existing Sites Technical Memorandum ("ESTM") on May 4, 2016. The ESTM evaluates the Academy’s use at the 34 properties that were occupied by the Academy at the time of publication of the NOP. The Commission may use the ESTM for information in considering all Academy applications to legalize past, unauthorized changes and its ongoing operations, as consistent with the Settlement Agreement. Unlike the FEIR, however, the ESTM is not required to go through a certification process by the Commission, and its recommendations to decision makers are not binding until approval of the conditions as part of any entitlements for each Academy property.

Prior to considering approval of the Project, the Commission must determine that the Project proposed for approval has been sufficiently assessed under CEQA. Changes to the project have been proposed since the Planning Commission certified the FEIR on July 28, 2016. Once an EIR has been certified, CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 provide the rules for determining whether the certified EIR provides a sufficient analysis of the modified Project or if subsequent assessment is required. If such analysis is sufficient, but certain changes to a certified EIR are needed, the changes can be in the form of an addendum to the certified EIR. An "addendum" can be used if some changes or additions to the certified EIR are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 above have occurred. An addendum need not be circulated for public review and comment, and public participation in the decision to utilize an addendum (rather than a supplement or subsequent EIR) is not required. The Planning Department determined the Revised Project qualified for analysis through the addendum process and issued the Addendum on October 9, 2019.

E.  Content and Location of Record

The record upon which all findings and determinations related to the adoption of the proposed Project are based include the following:

- The FEIR, and all documents referenced in or relied upon by the FEIR, including the Addendum;
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) provided by City staff to the City relating to the FEIR and Addendum, the proposed approvals and entitlements, the Project, and the alternatives set forth in the FEIR;
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) presented to the City by the environmental consultant and subconsultants who prepared the FEIR and Addendum, or incorporated into reports presented to the City;
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) presented to the City from other public agencies relating to the Project, the FEIR, or Addendum;
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- All applications, letters, testimony, and presentations presented to the City by the Project Sponsor and its consultants in connection with the Project;

- All information (including written evidence and testimony) presented at any public hearing related to the EIR;

- The MMRP;

- the ESTM, and,

- All other documents comprising the record pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21167.6(e).

The public hearing transcripts and audio files, a copy of all letters regarding the FEIR received during the public review period, the administrative record, and background documentation for the FEIR are located at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, 4th Floor, San Francisco. The Planning Department, Jonas P. Ionin, is the custodian of these documents and materials.

F. Findings About Significant Environmental Impacts of the Project and Mitigation Measures

The following Sections II, III and IV set forth the City’s findings about the FEIR, as modified by the Addendum, determinations regarding significant environmental impacts of the project and the mitigation measures proposed to address them. These findings provide the written analysis and conclusions of the City regarding the environmental impacts of the Project and the mitigation measures included as part of the FEIR and Addendum and adopted by the City as part of the Project. To avoid duplication and redundancy, and because the Commission agrees with, and hereby adopts, the conclusions in the FEIR and Addendum, these findings will not repeat the analysis and conclusions in either the FEIR or Addendum, but instead incorporates them by reference herein and relies upon them as substantial evidence supporting these findings.

In making these findings, the City has considered the opinions of Planning Department and other City staff and experts, other agencies, and members of the public. The Commission finds that: the determination of significance thresholds is a judgment decision within the discretion of the City and County of San Francisco; the significance thresholds used in the FEIR, as modified by the Addendum, are supported by substantial evidence in the record, including the expert opinion of the EIR preparers and City staff; and the significance thresholds used in the FEIR provide reasonable and appropriate means of assessing the significance of the adverse environmental effects of the Project.

These findings do not attempt to describe the full analysis of each environmental impact contained in the FEIR and Addendum. Instead, a full explanation of these environmental findings and conclusions can be found in the FEIR and Addendum and these findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in the FEIR and Addendum supporting the determination regarding the Project impacts and mitigation measures designed to address those impacts. In making these findings, the City ratifies, adopts and incorporates in these findings the determinations and conclusions of the FEIR and Addendum relating to environmental impacts and mitigation measures, except to the extent any such determinations and conclusions are specifically and expressly modified by these findings.
As set forth below, the City adopts and incorporates the mitigation measures set forth in the FEIR, the Addendum, and the attached MMRP to substantially lessen or avoid the potentially significant and significant impacts of the Project. The City intends to adopt the mitigation measures proposed in the FEIR, as revised in the Addendum. Accordingly, in the event a mitigation measure recommended in the FEIR, as revised in the Addendum, has inadvertently been omitted in these findings or the MMRP, such mitigation measure is hereby adopted and incorporated in the findings below by reference. In addition, in the event the language describing a mitigation measure set forth in these findings or the MMRP fails to accurately reflect the mitigation measures in the FEIR, as revised in the Addendum, due to a clerical error, the language of the policies and implementation measures as set forth in the FEIR, as revised in the Addendum, shall control. The impact numbers and mitigation measure numbers used in these findings reflect the information contained in the FEIR, as revised by the Addendum.

In the Sections II, III and IV below, the same findings are made for a category of environmental impacts and mitigation measures. Rather than repeat the identical finding dozens of times to address each and every significant effect and mitigation measure, the initial finding obviates the need for such repetition because in no instance is the Planning Commission rejecting the conclusions of the FEIR, and Addendum, or the mitigation measures recommended in the FEIR, as revised by the Addendum, for the Project.

II. IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT AND THUS DO NOT REQUIRE MITIGATION

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.). Based on the evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, the City finds that, the Project described in the DEIR, and as revised in the Addendum, will not result in any significant impacts, on a Program-Level, Project-Level, or Proposed-Project Level, in the below areas and that these impact areas therefore do not require mitigation.

Land Use
- Impact LU-1.1/1.2/1.3: Physically divide an established community.
- Impact LU-2.1/2.2/2.3: Result in a substantial adverse impact on the existing character of the vicinity.
- Impact LU-3.1/3.2/3.3: Conflict with any applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact.
- Impact C-LU-1: Cumulative impact on land use resulting from implementation of the Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity.

Aesthetics
- Impact AE-1.1/1.2/1.3: Result in a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.
- Impact AE-2.1/2.2/2.3: Substantially damage visual resources, including, but not limited to, tree, rock outcroppings, and other features of the built or natural environment which contribute to a scenic public setting.
- Impact AE-3.1/3.2/3.3: Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area or which would substantially impact other people or properties
- Impact C-AE-1: The implementation of the Project, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant aesthetic impact.

Population, Housing, and Employment
• **Impact PH-1.1/1.2/1.3:** Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly.

• **Impact PH-2.2:** The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing units or create demand for additional housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, or displace a substantial number of businesses or employees.

**Cultural and Paleontological Resources**

• **Impact CP-1.1/1.2/1.3:** Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical architectural resource.

• **Impact CP-2.2:** The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resources pursuant to Section 15064.5.

• **Impact CP-3.1/3.2/3.3:** Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature.

• **Impact CP-4.2:** The Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites would not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

• **Impact C-CP-1:** The Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative historical, archeological, or paleontological resources impact, or to a significant cumulative disturbance of human remains.

**Transportation and Circulation**

• **Impact TR-1.1/1.2/1.3:** Result in a substantial adverse impact at any of the study intersections during the peak hours, or cause major traffic hazards.

• **Impact TR-2.1/2.2/2.3:** Result in a substantial increase in local or regional transit demand that could not be accommodated by local or regional transit demand that could not be accommodated by local or regional transit capacity; nor would it affect transit operating conditions such that adverse impacts to local or regional transit service could occur.

• **Impact TR-4.1/4.2/4.3:** Result in substantial overcrowding on public sidewalks or otherwise interfere with pedestrian accessibility, or create potentially hazardous conditions for pedestrians.

• **Impact TR-5.1/5.2/5.3:** Result in potentially hazardous conditions for bicyclists, nor otherwise substantially interfere with bicycle accessibility to the site and adjoining areas.

• **Impact TR-6.1/6.2/6.3:** Would not substantially increase loading demand and would, therefore, have a less-than-significant commercial loading impact.

• **Impact TR-7.1/7.2/7.3:** Would not substantially increase parking demand nor would it cause unsafe or delayed conditions for other transportation activities.

• **Impact TR-8:** Result in inadequate emergency access.

• **Impact TR-9:** Result in construction-related transportation impacts because of their temporary and limited duration.

• **Impact C-TR-1.1/1.2/1.3:** The Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not cumulatively result in a substantial adverse impact at any of the study intersections, or cause major traffic hazards.

• **Impact C-TR-2.1b/2.2b/2.3b:** The Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively substantial increase in regional transit demand that could not be accommodated by regional transit capacity under 2035 Cumulative plus Project conditions.

Implementation of the following improvement measures will ensure the above impacts remain less-than-significant:

**Improvement Measure I-TR-1 – Implement Transportation Demand Management Strategies to Reduce Single-Occupancy Vehicle Trips.**
Improvement Measure I-TR-2 – Academy Shuttle Activities Monitoring.

Improvement Measure I-TR-3 – Improvement of Pedestrian Conditions at PS-6, 2225 Jerrold Avenue.

Improvement Measure I-TR-4 – Improvement of Bicycle Parking Conditions at Academy Facilities.

Improvement Measure I-TR-5 – Academy Monitoring of Commercial Loading Activities.

Improvement Measure I-TR-6 – Construction Truck Deliveries during Off-Peak Periods.

Improvement Measure I-TR-7 – Additions to the Construction Management Plan.

Noise

- **Impact NO-1.1/1.2/1.3:** Cause a temporary increase in noise levels substantially in excess of ambient levels resulting from construction activities.
- **Impact NO-2.2:** Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the San Francisco General Plan or Noise Ordinance (Police Code Article 29) or result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels.
- **Impact NO-3.1/3.2/3.3:** Create excessive groundborne vibration levels in existing residential neighborhoods adjacent to the study area.

Air Quality

- **Impact AQ-1.1/1.2/1.3:** Generate fugitive dust or criteria air pollutants, from construction activities, that would violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants.
- **Impact AQ-3.1/3.2:** Result in emissions of criteria air pollutants from operations but not at levels that would violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants.
- **Impact AQ-4.2:** Generate new emissions of toxic air contaminants from operation, including diesel particulate matter, and therefore would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations.
- **Impact AQ-5.1/5.2/5.3:** Conflict with, or obstruct implementation of, the 2010 Clean Air Plan.
- **Impact AQ-6.1/6.2/6.3:** Create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- **Impact C-GG-1.1/1.2/1.3:** Generate greenhouse gas emissions at levels that would result in a cumulatively considerably impact on the environment or conflict with any policy, plan, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Wind and Shadow

- **Impact WS-1.1/1.2/1.3:** Alter wind in a manner that would substantially affect public areas.
- **Impact WS-2.1/2.2/2.3:** Create new shadow in a manner that could substantially affects outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas.

Recreation

- **Impact RE-1.1/1.2/1.3:** Increase the use of or physically degrade existing recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of those facilities would occur or be accelerated or require construction or expansion of recreational facilities in a way that would adversely affect the environment.
- **Impact C -RE-1**: Considerably contribute to a significant cumulative impact on recreational use to existing public parks or recreational facilities.

**Utilities and Services Systems**

- **Impact UT-1.1/1.2/1.3**: Require or result in the construction of substantial new water treatment facilities, and the City would have sufficient water supply available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, and would not require new or expanded water supply resources or entitlements.
- **Impact UT-2.1/2.2/2.3**: Require or result in the expansion or construction of new wastewater treatment or stormwater facilities, exceed capacity of the wastewater treatment provider when combined with other commitments, or exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- **Impact UT-3.1/3.2/3.3**: Result in increased generation of solid waste that could not be accommodated by existing landfill capacity and comply with federal, state and local statues and regulations related to solid waste.
- **Impact C -UT-1**: The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact on utilities.

**Public Services**

- **Impact PS-1.1/1.2/1.3**: Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered fire or police protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire and police protection.
- **Impact PS-2.1/2.2/2.3**: Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered school facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives for schools.
- **Impact PS-3.1/3.2/3.3**: Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered library facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives for libraries.
- **Impact C -PS-1**: The implementation of the Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a significant cumulative impact on public services.

**Biological Resources**

- **Impact BI-1.1/1.2/1.3**: Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- **Impact BI-2.1/2.2/2.3**: Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.
- **Impact C -BI-1**: Implementation of the Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, could make a considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact on biological resources.

**Geology and Soil**

- **Impact GE-1.1/1.2/1.3**: Expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic groundshaking and seismic-related ground failure such as liquefaction.
Impact GE-2.1/2.2/2.3: Would not be located on geologic or soil units that are unstable, or that could become unstable as a result of the Proposed Project.

Impact GE-3.1/3.2/3.3: Would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, and, therefore, would not create substantial risks to life or property.

Impact C-GE-1: The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a cumulative impact on geology and soils.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Impact HY-1.1/1.2/1.3: Violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.

Impact HY-2.1/2.2/2.3: Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on site or off site, or create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm sewer systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

Impact HY-3.1/3.2/3.3: Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other authoritative flood hazard delineation map, or place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows.

Impact HY-4.1/4.2/4.3: Expose people or structures to inundation by tsunami.

Impact C-HY-1: The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a cumulative impact on hydrology and water quality.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Impact HZ-1.1/1.2/1.3: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

Impact HZ-3.1/3.2/3.3: Expose the public or the environment to unacceptable levels of known or newly discovered hazardous materials as a result of a site being located on a hazardous materials list site.

Impact HZ-4.1/4.2/4.3: Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

Mineral and Energy Resources

Impact ME-1.1/1.2/1.3: Encourage activities that result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use these in a wasteful manner.

Impact C-ME-1: Result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to wasteful use of energy.

Agriculture and Forest Resources

Project will have no impact on agricultural or forest resources.

III. FINDINGS OF POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS THAT CAN BE AVOIDED OR REduced TO A LESS-THaN-SIGNIFICANT LEVEL THROUGH MITIGATION

CEQA requires agencies to adopt mitigation measures that would avoid or substantially lessen a project’s identified significant impacts or potential significant impacts if such measures are feasible (unless mitigation to such levels is achieved through adoption of a project alternative). The findings in this Section
III and in Section IV concern mitigation measures set forth in the EIR. These findings discuss mitigation measures identified in the DEIR to mitigate the potentially significant impacts of the proposed project. As described in Section 4 of the Addendum, the severity of the impacts of the Revised Project is the same or less than for the Proposed Project, and as described in this Section the potentially significant impacts of the project also would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level by the same mitigation measures identified in the DEIR for the Original Project (or minor variations of the same mitigation measures to be specific to the Revised Project). The full text of the mitigation measures is contained in the FEIR, Addendum and in Attachment B, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. The City finds that the impacts of the Revised Project identified in this Section III would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of the mitigation measures contained in the FEIR and Addendum, included in the Revised Project, or imposed as conditions of approval and set forth in Attachment B.

This Commission recognizes that some of the mitigation measures are partially within the jurisdiction of other agencies. The Commission urges these agencies to assist in implementing these mitigation measures, and finds that these agencies can and should participate in implementing these mitigation measures.

Impact CP-2.1: With mitigation, the Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resources pursuant to Section 15064.5.

Impact CP-2.3: With mitigation, the Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resources pursuant to Section 15064.5.

In the Proposed Project the Academy would revises the utilization of its City campus through occupation and change of use of existing buildings for institutional and student residential uses. The FEIR conservatively estimated that as a result of the occupation and change of use some of the existing buildings may require seismic retrofits or other renovations or modifications to be compatible with the proposed use, which in turn may require minor excavation causing ground-disturbing activities. Mitigation Measure M-CP-2.1, requiring a project-specific preliminary archaeological assessment for individual project components involving ground-disturbing activities within the 12 studies areas, reduces the Proposed Project’s impact on archaeological resources to a less than significant level. The Addendum found the Revised Project did not change these facts and conclusions.

Mitigation Measure M-CP-2.1 – Project-Specific Preliminary Archaeological Assessment

Impact CP-4.1: With mitigation, the Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would likely not disturb human remains including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Impact CP-4.3: With mitigation, the Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would likely not disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

As explained above, the Proposed Project is unlikely to cause any ground disturbances outside of shallow depth excavation associated with any potential seismic retrofits or renovations and modifications.
compatible with proposed building use. In the outside chance such ground disturbances could disturb
human remains, Mitigation Measure M-CP-2.1, requiring a project-specific preliminary archaeological
assessment for individual project components involving ground-disturbing activities within the 12 studies
areas, reduces the Proposed Project’s impact to a less than significant level. The Addendum found the
Revised Project did not change these facts and conclusions.

Mitigation Measure M-CP-2.1 – Project-Specific Preliminary Archaeological Assessment

Impact C-TR-3: With mitigation, the Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the
six project sites, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the
vicinity of the study areas and project sites, would likely not have less-than-significant with mitigation
cumulative Academy shuttle impact.

Impact TR-3.1: With mitigation, the Proposed Project, including growth within the 12 study areas, would
likely not result in a substantial increase in shuttle demand that could not be accommodated by planned
shuttle capacity so as to avoid an impact to the City’s transit or transportation system; and would not
cause substantial conflicts with traffic, public transit, pedestrian, bicycles, or commercial loading.

Impact TR-3.2: With mitigation, the Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would
likely not result in a substantial increase in shuttle demand that could not be accommodated by planned
shuttle capacity so as to avoid an impact to the City’s transit or transportation system; but would not
cause substantial conflicts with traffic, public transit, pedestrian, bicycles, or commercial loading.

Impact TR-3.3: With mitigation, the Proposed Project, including growth within the 12 study areas and
at the six project sites, would likely not result in a substantial increase in shuttle demand that could not
be accommodated by planned shuttle capacity so as to avoid an impact to the City’s transit or
transportation system; but would not cause substantial conflicts with traffic, public transit, pedestrian,
bicycles, or commercial loading.

As existing in 2010, the capacity of the Academy’s shuttle routes are not adequate to accommodate all
Project development as envisioned by the projected growth in the Proposed Project. Such growth could
therefore result in an increased burden on the City’s transit or transportation system. Specifically, the
Proposed Project projects growth in the 12 study areas to generate a demand of up to 642 PM peak hour
shuttle bus trips. Growth in individually study areas would range from 15 (in SA-12) to 502 PM peak hour
shuttle trips (in SA-5). Maximum demand for several study areas could exceed 100 PM peak hour shuttle
trips, depending on the conceptual development option of the shuttle program, including SA-5 (up to 502),
SA-7 (up to 296), SA-4 (up to 168), SA-6 (up to 140), SA-2 (up to 147), and SA-3 (up to 131 PM peak hour
shuttle trips).

The above projected growth could therefore result in an increased burden on the City’s transit or
transportation system. The implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-3.1 – Shuttle Demand, Service
Monitoring and Capacity Utilization Performance Standard, along with the ongoing analysis and
monitoring to meet an established performance standard would ensure that the shuttle demand could be
met and any impact to the City’s transit or transportation system would be reduced to a less-than-
significant level.
As analyzed in the Addendum, the growth projected in the Proposed Project, reiterated above, has not occurred and future projected growth has been significantly reduced to three percent per year. The Addendum found the Revised Project did not change the facts and conclusions in the FEIR as analyzed in connection with Impact TR-3.1.

*Mitigation Measure M-TR-3.1 – Shuttle Demand, Service Monitoring, and Capacity Utilization Performance Standard.*

**Impact NO-2.1:** With mitigation, the Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas would like not expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the San Francisco General Plan or Noise Ordinance (Police Code Article 29) or result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels.

**Impact NO-2.3:** With mitigation, the Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would likely not expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the San Francisco General Plan or Noise Ordinance (Police Code Article 29) or result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels.

As part of the Proposed Project, the Academy could propose changes of use of currently nonresidential buildings in study areas to residential use, thereby placing noise-sensitive land uses in a noise environment that may be incompatible with that sensitive use. Specifically, the traffic-generated noise levels along most major streets throughout the Proposed Project area exceed 70 dBA, above the San Francisco General Plan guidelines of 60 dBA. The majority of the new residential units would be subject to state Title 24 noise requirements contained in the California Noise Insulation Standards, thus such units would have interior noise levels at 45dBA. For residential development not subject to the California Noise Insulation Standards, where traffic noise in the Project Area has the potential to result in a significant effect, implementation of Mitigation Measures M-NO-2.1a – Interior Noise Levels for Residential Uses and M-NO-2.1b – Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses, would reduce the impact of exposure to noise levels in excess of the San Francisco General Plan recommendations to a less-than-significant level.

The Academy uses in the study area could add fixed noise sources such as pumps, fans, air-conditioning apparatus or refrigeration machines. Section 2909 of the City’s Noise Ordinance prohibits “any machine or device, music or entertainment or any combination of same” located on residential or commercial/industrial property from emitting noise that is 5 dBA or 8 dBA (commercial/industrial) above the local ambient noise at any point outside the property plan of use containing noise source, as well has allowing any fixed noise source to cause noise level measured inside any sleeping or living room in any dwelling unit located on residential property to exceed 45 dBA between the hours of 10:00pm to 7:00am or 55 dBA between the hours of 7:00 am to 10:00 pm with windows open. The Academy intends to comply with all such guidelines in all designs, but without such adequate designs, significant impact on such uses could result from noise levels generated by fixed sources. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-2.1c – Siting of Noise-Generating Equipment would reduce this impact to less-than-significant level.

The Addendum found the Revised Project did not change the facts and conclusions in the FEIR as analyzed in connection with Impacts NO-2.1 and NO-2.3.

*Mitigation Measure M-NO-2.1a – Interior Noise Levels for Residential Uses.*
Mitigation Measure M-NO-2.1b – Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses.

Mitigation Measure M-NO-2.1c – Siting of Noise-Generating Equipment.

Impact C-NO-1: With mitigation, the implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would not contribute considerably to a cumulative impact associated with noise and vibration.

Without mitigation the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably would have a less than significant impact associated with vibration and noise caused by cumulative traffic noise or construction activities. It is not anticipated that the Academy stationary noise sources would cause significant off-noise impacts to off-site receptors in the study areas due to the City’s Noise Ordinance and anticipated consistency with the San Francisco General Plan, but significant impacts from such uses could occur without adequate design. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-2.1c – Siting of Noise-Generating Equipment would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

It is possible that with cumulative development, the ambient noise level will increase in study areas where the Academy might seek changes of use to accommodate student housing. For residential development not subject to the California Noise Insulation Standards, traffic noise in the Project Area has the potential to result in a significant effect. Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-NO-2.1a – Interior Noise Levels for Residential Uses and M-NO-2.1b – Siting of Noise Sensitive Uses the potential conflict between the cumulative noise environment and the Academy residential uses would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

The Addendum found the Revised Project did not change the facts and conclusions in the FEIR as analyzed in connection with Impact C-NO-1.

Mitigation Measure M-NO-2.1a – Interior Noise Levels for Residential Uses.

Mitigation Measure M-NO-2.1b – Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses.

Mitigation Measure M-NO-2.1c – Siting of Noise-Generating Equipment.

Impact AQ-2.1: With mitigation, construction in the 12 study areas would likely not generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter that would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Impact AQ-2.2: With mitigation, construction at the six project sites, would likely not generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, but would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Impact AQ-2.3: With mitigation, construction of the Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, that would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
Several Study Areas are located completely or partially in areas that already experience poor air quality and tenant improvements associated with the Proposed Project would generate additional air pollution, adversely affecting nearby sensitive receptors that are already exposed to high levels of air pollution. Uncontrolled diesel equipment operating in connection with this construction would cause a significant impact. Compliance with Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2.1 – Construction Emissions Minimization with an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone requires cleaner diesel equipment and would reduce the impact form renovation activities on nearby sensitive receptors to a less-than-significant level.

The Addendum found the Revised Project did not change the facts and conclusions in the FEIR as analyzed in connection with Impacts AQ-2.1, AQ 2.2, and AQ 2.3.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2.1 – Construction Emissions Minimization within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone.

Impact AQ-3.3: With mitigation, operation of the Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would result in emissions of criteria air pollutants, but not at levels that would violate an air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants.

The Academy renovations of 200,000 sf of development is a significant source of ROG emissions due to architectural coating, but implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3.3 – Maximum Daily Construction Activities would reduce emissions of ROGs to less-than-significant levels by limiting construction activities to the renovation (including architectural coating) of a maximum of 100,000 sf of building space at a time.

The Addendum found the Revised Project did not change the facts and conclusions in the FEIR as analyzed in connection with Impact AQ-3.3.

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3.3 – Maximum Daily Construction Activities.

Impact AQ-4.1: With mitigation, operation of the 12 study areas would likely not generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, and could expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations.

Impact AQ-4.3: With mitigation, operation of the Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would likely not generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, and could expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations.

There is a potential for Academy buildings, in the Study Areas, will require the installation of a new emergency back-up generator or a boiler, both of which have the potential to add pollutant concentrations. Generations of such additional pollutants within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zones would be a significant impact, but implementation of Mitigation Measures M-AQ-4.1a – Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Generators, and M-AQ-4.1b – Best Available Control Technology for Boilers, at study area sites within Air Pollutant Exposure Zones when the occupation of that site requires the installation of a new generator or boiler will reduce impacts from new stationary sources to less-than-significant levels. When the Academy occupies a new site within study area that is partially within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, the Planning Department will review the specific location to determine applicability of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2.1 – Construction Emissions Minimization within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone.
Six of the Study Areas have the potential to house resident students which is considered a sensitive land use, or these, five study areas have the potential to place student residences partially within Air Pollutant Exposure Zones. Siting sensitive land use within Air Pollutant Exposure Zones could expose residents within student housing to elevated levels of air pollution, resulting in a significant impact, but implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4.1c – Air Filtration Measures within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, would reduce impacts to new sensitive receptors to less-than-significant levels.

The Addendum found the Revised Project did not change the facts and conclusions in the FEIR as analyzed in connection with Impacts AQ-4.1 and AQ-4.3.

*Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4.1a – Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Generators.*

*Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4.1b – Best Available Control Technology for Boilers.*

*Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4.1c – Air Filtration Measures within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone.*

**Impact C-AQ-1:** With mitigation, the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would likely not result in a considerable contribution to a cumulative regional criteria air pollutant impact.

The project-level thresholds for criteria air pollutants are based on levels at which new sources are not anticipated to contribute to an air quality violation or result in a considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. The Proposed Project’s construction and operational emissions would not exceed the project-level thresholds for criteria air pollutants NOx, PM10, and PM2.5. However unmitigated emissions under Impact AQ-3.3 would exceed ROG thresholds. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3.3 – Maximum Daily Construction Activities impacts from ROG for Impact AQ-3.3 would be reduced to below the significance thresholds; therefore, the Proposed Project would not be considered to result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to regional air quality impacts.

The Addendum found the Revised Project did not change the facts and conclusions in the FEIR as analyzed in connection with Impact C-AQ-1.

*Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3.3 – Maximum Daily Construction Activities.*

**Impact C-AQ-2:** With mitigation, the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would likely not contribute considerably to cumulative health risk impacts.

The Proposed Project would add new sensitive land uses and new sources of TACs (e.g., construction, new shuttle trips and potentially stationary sources) within some areas already adversely affected by air quality, resulting in a contribution to cumulative health risk impacts on sensitive receptors. This would be a significant cumulative impact, but the Proposed Project would be required to implement Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2.1 – Construction Emissions Minimization within Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, which could reduce construction period emissions by as much as 94 percent; Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4.1a –
Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Generators, which requires best available control technology to limit emissions from any new emergency back-up generator; Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4.1b – Best Available Control Technology for Boilers, which limits emissions from any new boilers; and Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4.1c – Air Filtration Measures Within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, which requires that enhanced ventilation be provided for buildings converted to residential use, designed to reduce outdoor infiltration of fine particulate matter indoors by 80 percent. Implementation of these mitigation measures would minimize the Proposed Project’s contribution to cumulative air quality impacts, and other projects in the vicinity would be required to implement similar measures to avoid or minimize their contributions to the degradation of air quality. Therefore, with mitigation this impact would be less than significant.

The Addendum found the Revised Project did not change the facts and conclusions in the FEIR as analyzed in connection with Impacts C-AQ-2.

*Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2.1 – Construction Emissions Minimization within Air Pollutant Exposure Zone.*

*Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4.1a – Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Generators.*

*Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4.1b – Best Available Control Technology for Boilers.*

*Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4.1c – Air Filtration Measures Within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone.*

Impact HZ-2.1: With mitigation, the Proposed Project, including the growth in the 12 study areas, would likely not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous building materials into the environment, including within 0.25 mile of a school.

Impact HZ-2.2: With mitigation, the Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, would likely not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous building materials into the environment, including within 0.25 mile of a school.

Impact HZ-2.3 The Proposed Project, including growth in 12 study areas and at the six project sites, could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous building materials into the environment, including within 0.25 mile of a school.

The Proposed Project, including the growth within the 12 study areas, would involve the occupation and change of use of existing buildings. Most construction activities would consist of interior tenant improvements. Growth in the study areas could also involve some limited ground disturbance to complete exterior seismic upgrades. Therefore, the Proposed Project could result in a reasonably foreseeable upset or accident conditions, including limited disturbance of hazardous building materials and contaminated soil. Materials containing PCBs could pose both a human health and environmental hazard which would be a significant impact, but implementation of Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2.1 would reduce this impact of the Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, to a less-than-significant level.
The Addendum found the Revised Project did not change the facts and conclusions in the FEIR as analyzed in connection with Impacts HZ-2.1, HZ-2.2, and HZ-2.3.


Impact C-HZ-1: With mitigation, the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative hazard and hazardous materials impacts.

Implementation of the Proposed Project, with incorporation of Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2.1 – Testing and Removal of Hazardous Building Materials, would have a less-than-significant hazardous materials impact on the public and the environment in the vicinity of the study areas and project sites. Any other development in the Project vicinity would be required to comply with the same or similar regulatory framework as the Proposed Project. Adherence to these regulations would minimize exposure and ultimately result in removing hazardous materials from the region. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not contribute considerably to any significant cumulative impacts with respect to hazardous materials.

The Addendum found the Revised Project did not change the facts and conclusions in the FEIR as analyzed in connection with Impact C-HZ-1.


IV. SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS THAT CANNOT BE AVOIDED OR REDUCED TO A LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

Based on substantial evidence in the whole record of these proceedings, the Commission finds that, where feasible, changes or alterations have been required, or incorporated into, the Project to reduce the significant environmental impacts as identified in the FEIR, Addendum and listed below. The Commission finds that the mitigation measures in the FEIR, Addendum and described below are appropriate, and that changes have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21002 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, may substantially lessen, but do not avoid (i.e., reduce to less-than-significant levels), the potentially significant environmental effects associated with implementation of the Project that are described below. The Commission adopts all of the mitigation measures and improvement measures set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP), attached as Attachment B. The Commission further finds, however, for the impacts listed below, despite the implementation of feasible mitigation measures, the effects remain significant and unavoidable.

Based on the analysis contained within the FEIR, Addendum, other considerations in the record, and the significance criteria identified in the FEIR and Addendum, the Commission finds that because some aspects of the Revised Project could cause potentially significant impacts for which feasible mitigation measures are not available to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level, those impacts are significant and unavoidable. The Commission recognizes that for certain significant impacts, although mitigation measures are identified in the FEIR and Addendum that would reduce those impacts to a less-than-significant level, the measures are uncertain or infeasible for reasons set forth below, and therefore those impacts remain significant and unavoidable or potentially significant and unavoidable.
The Commission determines that the following significant impacts on the environment, as reflected in the FEIR and Addendum, are unavoidable, but under Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3) and (b), and CEQA Guidelines 15091(a)(3), 15092(b)(2)(B), and 15093, the Commission determines that the impacts are acceptable due to the overriding considerations described in Section VII below. This finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record of this proceeding.

Impact PH-2.1: The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, would displace substantial numbers of people, or existing housing units, or create demand for additional housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, or displace a substantial number of businesses or employees.

Impact PH-2.3: The Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, would displace substantial numbers of people, or existing housing units or create demand for additional housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, or displace a substantial number of businesses or employees.

Impact C-PH-1: The implementation of the Proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity, would contribute considerably to a cumulative impact on population and housing.

Based on the growth projections of the Proposed Project, the FEIR projected the Proposed Project would result in 4,209 new student residents and 525 new faculty/staff residents in San Francisco. The FEIR projects 2,203 units of housing within San Francisco are required to accommodate this population growth. The 2,203 units of housing were in addition to The Academy’s projected growth of 400 Academy supplied student housing beds. The FEIR concludes that this population growth would not displace substantial numbers of people, or existing housing units, or displace a substantial number of businesses or employees, and that as to each of those elements the Proposed Project’s impact is less than significant.

The FEIR concludes that Proposed Project would not result in displacement of existing residents because Planning Code Section 317 prohibits the conversion of existing residential uses, and change of use of group housing and SROs to student housing. In addition, Ordinance 188-12 prohibits the conversion of residential housing stock into student housing in most cases. Displacement of employees could occur if the Academy were to occupy a nonvacant building whose employees were not able to relocate within the city or region, however, given the regions current prospective job growth employees are likely to be able to find replacement jobs or relocate with the city or region.

The Proposed Project’s projected growth requiring 2,203 units of houses would create demand for additional housing that is significant and unavoidable. The FEIR notes the 2010 vacancy rate is about 31,250 units of housing. Additionally, the FEIR notes approximately 58,000 new units that could be developed under various areawide planning efforts and redevelopment plans identified in the 2009 Housing Element. The FEIR notes that it is unknown whether these vacant units and new developments could accommodate the increased demand. There is no feasible mitigation for this impact, and it would therefore be significant and unavoidable.
The Addendum does not disagree with the FEIR’s conclusion, but notes the substantial reduction of projected growth from the level analyzed in the FEIR. This reduced projected growth reduces demand for additional housing.

In addition to such a reduction, the Academy has agreed to commit to the provision of student housing to 36 percent of its full-time student population (students taking up to one class online) by July 1, 2022, 38 percent of its full time student population (students taking up to one class online) by July 1, 2023 and to use good faith efforts to house 45 percent of its full-time students (students taking up to one class online) by July 1, 2023. Further, the Academy would provide an affordable housing benefit to the city in the form of an in-lieu fee for the equivalent of 160 units of affordable housing (anticipated to be $37,600,000.00). The Revised Project would continue to create a substantial demand for additional housing, although the demand would be less than what was analyzed in the FEIR due to the decreases in existing and projected enrollment. As with the Proposed Project, the addition of residential uses to sufficiently mitigate this impact or reduction of institutional growth sufficient to avoid any increase in housing demand would fundamentally alter the Revised Project. There is no feasible mitigation for this impact. Therefore, as with the Proposed project, the Revised Project’s impact on housing demand would be significant and unavoidable. The Revised Project would not change the conclusions reached in the FEIR regarding housing demand.

Impact C-TR-2.1a: Even with mitigation, the Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity of the study areas, could result in a substantial increase in local transit demand that could not be accommodated by adjacent Muni transit capacity at the Kearny/Stockton and Geary corridors under 2035 Cumulative plus Project conditions.

Impact C-TR-2.2a: Even with mitigation, the Proposed Project, including growth at the six project sites, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity of the project sites, could result in a substantial increase in local transit demand that could not be accommodated by adjacent Muni transit capacity at the Kearny/Stockton corridor and Geary corridor under 2035 Cumulative plus Project conditions.

Impact C-TR-2.3a: Even with mitigation, the Proposed Project, including growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity of the study areas and project sites, could result in a substantial increase in local transit demand that could not be accommodated by adjacent Muni transit capacity at the Kearny/Stockton corridor and Geary Corridor under 2035 Cumulative plus Project conditions.

The FEIR concluded that the Proposed Project would result in significant impacts on local transit demand on the Kearny/Stockton corridor and Geary corridor due to increases in capacity utilization exceeding 85 percent. Therefore, Mitigation Measure C-M-TR-2.1a would be applicable and would require the Academy to make a fair share contribution to corridor. However, because the source or sources of additional funding for transit service improvements are unknown at this time the feasibility of these improvements are uncertain the project-related impacts on local transit demand at the Kearny/Stockton corridor and Geary corridor would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation.
The Addendum found the Revised Project did not change the facts and conclusions in the FEIR as analyzed in connection with Impacts C-TR-2.1a, C-TR-2.2a, and C-TR-2.3a.


V. EVALUATION OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

This section describes the EIR alternatives and the reasons for rejecting the alternatives as infeasible. The CEQA Guidelines, section 15126.6(a), state that an EIR must describe and evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the Project that would feasibly attain most of the Project’s basic objectives, but that would avoid or substantially lessen any identified significant adverse environmental effects of the project. An EIR is not required to consider every conceivable alternative to a proposed project. Rather, it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public participation.

The Planning Department considered a range of alternatives in Chapter 6 of the FEIR. The FEIR analyzed the No Project Alternative (“Alternative A”), the Centralized Growth Alternative (“Alternative B”), the Reduced Growth Alternative (Alternative C), and the Reduced Institutional Growth Alternative (Alternative D). Each alternative is discussed and analyzed in these findings, in addition to being analyzed in Chapter 6 of the FEIR.

The Commission certifies that it has independently reviewed and considered the information on the alternatives provided in the FEIR and in the record. The FEIR reflects the City’s independent judgment as to the alternatives.

The City rejects the alternatives listed below because the Commission finds that there is substantial evidence, including evidence of economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations described in this Section, in addition to those described below under CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), that make these alternatives infeasible. In making these determinations, the Commission is aware that CEQA defines “feasibility” to mean “capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors.” The Commission is also aware that under CEQA case law the concept of “feasibility” encompasses (i) the question of whether a particular alternative promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project; and (ii) the question of whether an alternative is “desirable” from a policy standpoint to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors. The Commission finds that the Revised Project provides the best balance between satisfaction of Project objectives and mitigation of environmental impacts to the extent feasible, as described and analyzed in the FEIR and as modified by the Addendum.

A. Alternatives Considered and Rejected

The following alternatives were considered during the EIR scoping period, but, for the reasons set forth in the FEIR and in these findings, these alternatives were not carried forward for full analysis in the EIR.

1. Alternative Location
CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(f)(2) states that alternative locations should be considered if they would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects.

- Other Locations within the City Alternative. This alternative consists of locating all of the Academy’s future growth in areas not analyzed in the FEIR and requires the Academy to vacate project sites requiring a change of use authorization. The study areas analyzed in the FEIR are those most suited to future Academy growth within the city. Given the Academy’s practice of occupying buildings similar to the ones that would be vacated, any feasible alternative location is likely already within the study areas. For most impacts, occupancy of alternative study areas or project site locations would likely be similar to those of the Proposed Project and would by necessity be located further from the existing Academy facilities. Given this increased distance, transportation needs may have greater impacts as compared to the Proposed Project. Therefore, development at other locations within the City would not avoid or substantially lessen the impacts identified for the Proposed Project. For these reasons this alternative was rejected from further consideration.

Other Locations outside the City Alternative. This alternative consists of the Academy providing all future growth outside of San Francisco. Such growth area would be limited by the Academy’s need to be situated in a major city with a thriving arts and cultural community. This alternative would likely require that the Academy create two distinctly separate campuses and may force the Academy to organize its coursework along disciplines across those separate campuses, diminishing the interaction of students from various art disciplines. This alternative would not avoid or substantially lessen most of the Proposed Project’s identified significant impacts because these impacts would likely occur in any new location adequately suited to the Academy’s operations. This alternative may worsen transportation-related environmental impacts if students and staff were required to commute the increased distances between such campuses. The reduced campus cohesion also fails to meet the following basic project objectives: Objective 1, 5, 7, 8, and 9. For these reasons this alternative was rejected from further consideration.

The Commission concurs with the findings in the EIR and rejects these location alternatives because they would not (i) avoid significant impacts of the Revised Project, and (ii) fails to meet several of the Project’s basic objectives.

2. Commitment to Only Interior Construction Activities in the Study Areas Alternative

This alternative was identified to address public concerns regarding the effect on historic resources and other Academy occupied buildings. It requires the Academy not make any exterior modifications to future occupied buildings in the study areas. Instead, improvements would be limited to interior construction activities, fire sprinkler/fire alarm upgrades, and seismic retrofit work. Under this alternative the Academy could not implement San Francisco Building Code (“SFBC”) life safety requirements. This concept was rejected due to regulatory limitations which could require exterior modifications consisted with the SFBC or to promote safety. Additionally, this alternative would not reduce or avoid any identified significant impacts.
The Commission concurs with the findings in the EIR and rejects this alternative because it (i) would not avoid significant impacts of the Project, and (ii) is infeasible due to the requirements of the SFBC.

### 3. Building Construction Growth Alternative

This alternative was identified to address public concerns that (i) the Academy converts existing housing into student housing reducing the supply of housing in the City and (ii) the Academy is not developing its own facilities. It requires the Academy to accommodate the Project’s projected growth by either (i) acquiring a large parcel and developing a number of new buildings, or (ii) accumulating contiguous parcels, demolishing the existing buildings, and developing a number of new buildings.

There does not appear to currently be a large enough parcel in San Francisco capable of accommodating the Project’s projected growth, making this alternative infeasible. If this alternative involves demolition and replacement of existing buildings, it could cause greater impacts to archaeological resources, historical architectural resources, and human remains; result in increased generation of toxic air contaminants, criteria air pollutant emissions and greenhouse gases, and increase releases of hazardous building materials into the environment compared to the Proposed Project. Therefore, this alternative was rejected from further consideration.

The Commission concurs with the findings in the EIR, and rejects this alternative because it (i) would not avoid significant impacts of the Project, and (ii) could create no or greater physical impacts.

### B. Alternatives Considered in the EIR

The following Alternatives were fully considered and compared in the FEIR:

#### 1. Alternative 1: No Project Alternative

As required by CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(e), a no project alternative is provided to allow decision-makers to compare the environmental effects of approving the proposed project with the effects of not approving the project. The no project alternative is "the circumstance in which the Project does not proceed." (CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(e)(3)(B).)

Under Alternative 1, the Academy would not occupy and change the use of 110,000 sf (220 rooms) of residential uses, 669,670 sf of institutional uses, and 17,533 sf of community facility use. Alternative 1 would result in a net loss of occupied space by the Academy of 225,460 sf of institutional uses at three project sites and 164 to 399 rooms. The Academy would continue to operate in its existing 27 sites (34 existing sites minus the seven potentially vacated residential sites) and at three of the six project sites.

Alternative 1 would not fulfill the Project’s basic objectives. Specifically, the alternative would not meet Objectives 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10. Alternative 1 prohibits the Academy from occupying the facilities necessary for its growth and would severely hamper its ability to accommodate its current enrolled students. While Alternative 1 could provide an avenue for future Academy growth as individual projects are proposed (each subject to future environmental review, compliance with the City’s zoning code, and any IMP requirements), such avenue is infeasible in the near future due to the disruption caused by the City’s requirement to vacate several buildings while simultaneously prohibiting student housing use at many of the Academy’s current properties applicable in the Alternative 1 scenario. Without the growth
provided in the Project, the Academy would be unable to provide accessible world class art education to all students seeking it and would be forced to reduce admissions. The reduction in future art students would significantly reduce the amount of artistic activity occurring in San Francisco, as well as limited opportunities for the Academy students’ integration into the city.

The Academy would also be unable to meet the student housing demand associated with any growth in enrollment, potentially increasing housing demand in the broader city. In addition, under Alternative 1, the Academy would not provide commitments to the City to house a larger percentage of its full-time student population than any other higher education institution in the city. The Academy would also not provide the large affordable housing in-lieu payment to the City. It is assumed, however, that this alternative would meet the objectives related to the Academy’s operation in an urban context.

The Commission concurs with these findings in the EIR, and rejects this alternative as infeasible because it fails to meet several of the basic Project Objectives. For this reason the Commission rejects Alternative 1 in favor of the Revised Project.

2. Alternative 2: Centralized Growth Alternative

Alternative 2 would focus 110,000 sf of residential (400 rooms serving 220 students), and 669,670 sf of institutional, of the Academy’s future growth along transit corridors including Market, Mission and Fourth Streets as well as the Van Ness Avenue corridor. This alternative would consolidate the Academy’s residential and institutional program-level growth in: SA-3 – Mid Van Ness Avenue; SA-4 – Sutter Street/Mason Street; SA-5 – Mid Market Street; SA-6 – Fourth Street/Howard Street; and SA-10 – Fifth Street/Brannan Street. Residential growth would be limited to SA-3 and SA-4, and institutional growth would be limited to SA-4, SA-5, SA-6, and SA-10. The rationale for locating the future Academy campus in the study areas proposed under Alternative 2 include: (i) creation of a more compact Academy campus, and (ii) permitting students to walk or use transit instead of cars or an expanded shuttle system.

Alternative 2 would not avoid any significant impact identified for the Project, although it would lessen the severity of the following impact, reducing a portion of it from significant and unavoidable to less than significant:

- Significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts on local transit in the Kearny/Stockton Corridor, but not in the Geary Corridor, would be reduced to less than significant due to the reduction in transit trips.

Alternative 2 would not meet Objectives 5, and 6, preventing the Academy from managing facilities in a flexible manner to ensure availability of space to meet changing needs of academic programs, and to enabling long-range programs and service planning to meet the needs of the community. The alternative would meet Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, and 10.

As analyzed in the Addendum, under the Revised Project the Academy would immediately vacate nine of its existing 40 campus properties. In addition to the 31 existing properties set to continue as Academy use, three properties not currently occupied by the Academy would be converted to Academy use for educational programs and student housing. The Revised Project increases the centralization of the Academy’s campus to existing buildings on the Van Ness corridor. The Revised Project is also consolidates
the Academy’s campus into four clusters, identified in the IMP, which generally correspond to: (i) Van Ness Transit Corridor, (ii) Union Square, (iii) Financial District, and (iv) South of Market. While these clusters do not align with the Alternative 2 study areas, they centralized the Academy’s campus compared to the Proposed Project. This centralization accomplishes Alternative 2’s rationales by created a more compact campus and by increasing pedestrian walk trips. Under the Revised Project therefore, the objectives of Alternative 2 have, in part, been met.

The Commission concurs with these findings in the EIR, and rejects this alternative as infeasible because it (i) would fail to avoid several significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project, (ii) fails to meet some of the Project Objectives to the same extent as the Project, and (iii) the Revised Project accomplished significant centralization of the Academy campus. For these reasons, each of which is independently sufficient, the Commission rejects Alternative 2 in favor of the Project.

3. Alternative 3: Reduced Growth Alternative

Alternative 3 would reduce program-level growth by 50 percent in 12 study areas, resulting in a maximum growth of 110 beds/200 rooms, 335,000 sf of institutional use and 17,533 sf of community facility use in the 12 study areas, with the use and improvements at the project sites remaining the same as under the Proposed Project.

The 50 percent reduction in growth in Alternative 3 would also reduce the cumulative impacts on local transit in the Kearny/Stockton Corridor by a comparable 50 percent reduction of local transit trips. This reduction of local transit trips would result in reducing this impact from significant and avoidable to less-than-significant. Such reduction, however, would not extend to the cumulative transit impacts of the Geary Corridor, which would remain a significant and unavoidable impact. Alternative 4 would also not avoid any other significant impact identified for the Project, all of which would remain substantially similar.

The Reduced Growth Alternative would meet most of the Project objectives, including Objectives 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, and 10. However, it would not meet any of the Project’s primary objectives relating to occupying new buildings to provide flexibility in programming due to the reduce growth allowance.

The Commission concurs with these findings in the EIR and rejects this alternative as infeasible because it (1) would fail to avoid significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project, and (2) would fail to meet some of the Project Objectives to the same extent as the Project. For these reasons, each of which is independently sufficient, the Commission rejects Alternative 3 in favor of the Project.

4. Alternative 4: Reduced Institutional Growth Alternative

Alternative 4 would reduce program-level institutional growth by 50 percent in 12 study areas, resulting in growth of 110,000 sf (400 beds/220 rooms) of residential use and 335,000 sf of institutional use, with the use and improvements at the project sites remaining the same as under the Proposed Project. This alternative would result in approximately 72 percent of the total growth (including half the institutional growth in the study areas, all the residential growth in the study areas, and all of the growth at the project sites) compared to the Proposed Project.
Under Alternative 4, the housing demand impact would be reduced because the Academy would provide the same number of residences as under the Proposed Project, but the reduced institutional use would reduce student, faculty, and staff housing demands. However, the reduced student, faculty, and staff housing demands would not reduce the cumulative impacts related to housing demand to a less-than-significant level. Alternative 4 would also not avoid any other significant impact identified for the Project, all of which would remain substantially similar, although it would lessen the severity of the following impact, reducing a portion of it from significant and unavoidable to less than significant:

- Significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts on local transit in the Kearny/Stockton Corridor, but not in the Geary Corridor, would be reduced to less than significant due to the reduction in transit trips.

Alternative 4 would meet, or partially meet, most of the Project objectives, including Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, and 10. However, it would not meet any of the Project’s primary objectives relating to occupying new buildings to provide flexibility in programming due to the reduce industrial growth allowance.

The Commission concurs with these findings in the EIR and rejects this alternative as infeasible because it (1) would fail to avoid significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project, and (2) would fail to meet some of the Project Objectives to the same extent as the Project. For these reasons, each of which is independently sufficient, the Commission rejects Alternative 4 in favor of the Project.

VI. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Pursuant to CEQA section 21081 and CEQA Guideline 15093, the Commission hereby finds, after consideration of the FEIR, Addendum, and the evidence in the record, that each of the specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological and other benefits of the Project as set forth below independently and collectively outweighs the significant and unavoidable impacts and is an overriding consideration warranting approval of the Project. Any one of the reasons for approval cited below is sufficient to justify approval of the Project. Thus, even if a court were to conclude that not every reason is supported by substantial evidence, the Commission will stand by its determination that each individual reason is sufficient. The substantial evidence supporting the various benefits can be found in the preceding findings, which are incorporated by reference into this Section, and in the documents found in the Record of Proceedings, as defined in Section I.

On the basis of the above findings and the substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, the Commission specially finds that there are significant benefits of the Project in spite of the unavoidable significant impacts, and therefore makes this Statement of Overriding Considerations. The Commission further finds that, as part of the process of obtaining Project approval, all significant effects on the environment from implementation of the Project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible. The Commission has determined that any remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable are acceptable due to the specific overriding economic, technical, legal, social and other considerations set forth below.

The Project will include the following benefits:
1. Resolve extended enforcement and related litigation concerning past noncompliance by the Academy with the Planning Code at its properties, including the provision of a Consent Judgment and Injunction to provide enforcement mechanisms for any future noncompliance;

2. Payment by the Academy of an anticipated $37,600,000.00 in-lieu affordable housing benefit to the City as well as payment by the Academy of an estimated $8.2 million into the City’s Small Sites Program to assist low-moderate income tenants;

3. Preservation of historic properties in a manner generally consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties;

4. Addition of approximately 29 student housing beds to the City’s housing stock helping the City to meet its housing demand;

5. Addition of 8 Single Room Occupancy hotel room units regulated under Chapter 41 of the San Francisco Administrative Code;

6. Commitment by the Academy that (i) by July 1, 2022, the Academy will house in San Francisco at least 36 percent of its full-time students taking up to one class online; (ii) by July 1, 2023, the Academy will house in San Francisco at least 38 percent of its full-time students taking no more than one class online; (iii) after July 1, 2023, the Academy will use good faith efforts to house in San Francisco at least 45 percent of its full-time students taking no more than one class online;

7. The legalization of, and compliance by the Academy with, the agreed upon Existing Sites Technical Memorandum conditions of approval correcting any previously unauthorized changes of use and/or alterations;

8. Development and implementation of a Shuttle Demand Management Plan intended to address the Academy meeting the peak hour transportation needs of Academy students and staff through its shuttle service such that unmet shuttle demand does not impact the city’s transit and transportation system, submittal by the Academy of an annual report documenting actual traveled shuttle routes, ridership numbers, and received complaints, and implementation of a Transportation Demand Management Program that seeks to minimize the number of single-occupancy vehicle trips generated by the Project for the lifetime of the Project;

9. Development of a more consolidated and “clustered” Academy campus that will contribute to walking, bicycling and use of public transportation, and minimize the impacts and use of private automobiles due to the withdrawal of the Academy from nine existing Academy properties, resulting in a footprint that is the same size as that occupied by the Academy in 2007;

10. Implementation of all EIR mitigation measures, and improvement measures, in accordance with the approved Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

Having considered the above, the Commission finds that the benefits of the Project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects identified in the FEIR and Addendum, and that those adverse environmental effects are therefore acceptable.
## MITIGATION MEASURES AGREED TO BY PROJECT SPONSOR

### CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

#### Mitigation Measure M-CP-2.1 – Project-Specific Preliminary Archaeological Assessment.  [Applies to growth in the 12 study areas: Impacts C-4.1 and CP-4.3]

This archeological mitigation Department measure shall apply to any project involving any soils-disturbing archeologist or or soils-improving activities including excavation, utilities qualified installation, grading, soils remediation, compaction/chemical archeological grouting to a depth of two feet below ground surface (bgs) or consultant; greater within the following study areas: SA-2, Lombard Environmental Street/Van Ness Avenue, SA-5, Mid Market Street; SA-6, Fourth Review Officer Street/Howard Street; SA-7, Rincon Hill East; SA-8, Third (ERO) Street/Bryant Street; SA-9, Second Street/Brannan Street; and SA-12, Ninth Street/Folsom Street; to a depth of four feet bgs or greater and located within properties within the remaining study areas (SA-1, Lombard Street/Divisadero Street; SA-3, Mid Van Ness Avenue; SA-4, Sutter Street/Mason Street; SA-10, Fifth Street/Brannan Street; and SA-11, Sixth Street/Folsom Street); or to the thresholds identified in the Area Plan EIR Archeological Mitigation Zones outlined in Table 4.5-2, Area Plan EIR Archeological Resources Mitigation Measures, p. 4.5-59, for projects covered by those Zones.

Projects to which this mitigation measure applies shall be subject to Preliminary Archeology Review (PAR) by the San Francisco Planning Department archeologist, or a Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Study (PASS) may be required in consultation with the San Francisco Planning Department archeologist. The PASS shall be prepared by an archeological consultant from the pool of qualified archeological consultants maintained by the Planning Department archeologist. The PASS shall contain the following:

#### Exhibit 2-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adopted Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Mitigation Schedule</th>
<th>Mitigation Action</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project sponsor; Planning Preliminary Archaeological Assessment</td>
<td>Project sponsor, archaeologist and Environmental Review Officer (ERO)</td>
<td>The project archeologist to consult with the ERO as indicated. Considered complete after review and approval of the Final Archeological Resources Report by the ERO.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the PAR or PASS, the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) shall determine if an Archeological Research Design Treatment Plan (ARDTP) shall be required to more definitively identify the potential for California Register-eligible archeological resources to be present at the project site and determine the appropriate action necessary to reduce the potential effect of the project on archeological resources to a less-than-significant level. The scope of the ARDTP shall be determined in consultation with the ERO and consistent with the standards for archeological documentation established by the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) for purposes of compliance with CEQA (OHP Preservation Planning Bulletin No. 5). If the PAR or PASS adequately identifies the potential for California Register-eligible archeological resources to be present at the project site, the ERO shall determine the appropriate action necessary to reduce the potential effect of
### Adopted Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adopted Mitigation Measures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitored and reported the project on archeological resources to a less-than-significant level. Actions may include an archeological testing program, archeological monitoring program, archeological data recovery program, accidental discovery measures/worker training, final reporting, curation, consultation with descendant communities, and interpretation undertaken in consultation with the Planning Department archeologist by an archeological consultant from the pool of qualified archeological consultants maintained by the Planning Department archeologist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure M-TR-3.1 – Shuttle Demand, Service Monitoring, and Capacity Utilization Performance Standard.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[Applies to growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites: Impacts TR-3.1, TR-3.2, TR-3.3, and C-TR-3]</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAU shall develop, implement, and provide to the City a shuttle management plan to address meeting the peak hour shuttle demand needs of its growth. The shuttle management plan shall address the monitoring, analysis, and potential correction such that unmet shuttle demand would not impact the City’s transit and transportation system. Analysis of shuttle bus demand and capacity utilization shall occur at least on an annual basis, or as needed to address shuttle demand. Specifically, analysis and adjustments shall be made on any AAU shuttle routes to reduce shuttle peak hour capacity utilization when the performance standard of 100 percent capacity utilization is regularly observed to be exceeded on any of the AAU shuttle routes.(^1) Additionally, the shuttle management plan shall address how shuttle demand at the six project sites will be provided. As additional project sites are added the shuttle management plan would be adjusted to reflect up-to-date shuttle routes, stops and services, as well as a capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^1\) The 100 percent performance standard was derived from the local and regional transit operational performance standards. Since AAU’s vehicles and operations vary from transit service (e.g., not all shuttle buses allow for standing passengers), AAU may propose alternate performance standards that could equivalently meet this goal while addressing the specific design of their fleet.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adopted Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Mitigation Schedule</th>
<th>Mitigation Action</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>utilization analysis, as needed to, indicate that the proposed demand for shuttle services could be met and avoid potential mode shifts to other travel modes. AAU shall report annually to the City on capacity utilization and alter its schedules and/or capacity, as necessary to avoid regular exceedances of the capacity utilization standard.</td>
<td>Project sponsor</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a building permit</td>
<td>Payment of fair-share transit fee to SFMTA</td>
<td>Project Sponsor, ERO, and SFMTA</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mitigation Measure C-M-TR-2.1a – AAU Fair Share Contribution to Cumulative Transit Impact.** [Applies to growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites: Impacts C-TR-2.1a, C-TR-2.2a, and C-TR-2.3a] AAU shall be required to make a fair share contribution to mitigate the cumulative transit demand impact related to AAU growth in transit ridership on the Kearny/Stockton corridor of the Northeast screenline and on the Geary corridor of the Northwest screenline to SFMTA.

AAU’s fair share contribution shall be made in addition to the applicable Transportation Sustainability Fee (TSF) for Non-Residential, except Hospitals and Health Services, 800-99,999 GSF and Non-Residential, except Hospitals and Health Services, all GSF above 99,999 GSF and for Residential or any successor fee that supersedes this fee.

AAU’s fair share contribution fee will be calculated by determining the discount for existing uses that would otherwise be permitted by Section 411A.4, or any successor fee ordinance. Rather than discount such amounts, the amount of such discount will be paid as a fair share contribution fee (“Fair Share Fee”). The Fair Share Fee will be calculated based on the total square footage of use in the EIR for each project site and for the proposed square footage of use when a project in one of the study areas is proposed. Payment of the Fair Share Fee is due prior to the issuance of a building permit for the project or portion of the project. The City shall account for the expenditure of funds to support additional transit in the affected corridors. The payment...
of the Fair Share Fee shall satisfy the AAU’s fair share contribution obligations for all projects where the mitigation measure applies.

AAU may apply to the ERO to reduce, adjust, or modify this fee prior to a project approval based on substantial evidence supporting the absence of any reasonable relationship between the impact of the AAU use on cumulative transit demand and the amount of fee charged.

NOISE

Mitigation Measure M-NO-2.1a – Interior Noise Levels for Residential Uses. [Applies to growth in the 12 study areas: Impacts NO-2.1a, NO-2.3, and C-NO-1] For new development including conversion of non-noise-sensitive to noise-sensitive uses located along streets with noise levels above 60 dBA (L_{dn}), where such development is not already subject to the California Noise Insulation Standards in California Code of Regulations Title 24, the project sponsor of future individual developments within the study areas shall conduct a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements. Such analysis shall be conducted by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering. Noise-insulation features identified and recommended by the analysis shall be included in the design, as specified in the San Francisco General Plan Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Community Noise to reduce potential interior noise levels to the maximum extent feasible. Additional noise attenuation features may need to be incorporated into the building design where noise levels exceed 70 dBA (L_{dn}) to ensure that acceptable interior noise levels can be achieved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adopted Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Mitigation Schedule</th>
<th>Mitigation Action</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project sponsor; qualified acoustical consultant</td>
<td>During project design</td>
<td>Detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements</td>
<td>Planning Department; Department of Building Inspection</td>
<td>Considered complete upon approval of building permit plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Adopted Mitigation Measures

**Mitigation Measure M-NO-2.1b – Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses.** [Applies to growth in the 12 study areas: Impacts NO-2.1a, NO-2.3, and C-NO-1] To reduce potential conflicts between existing noise-generating uses and new sensitive receptors, for qualified new residential development and development that includes other acoustical noise-sensitive uses (primarily, residences, and also including consultant schools and child care, religious, and convalescent facilities and the like), the San Francisco Planning Department shall require the preparation of an analysis that includes, at a minimum, a site survey to identify potential noise-generating uses within 900 feet of, and that have a direct line-of-sight to, the project site, and including at least one 24-hour noise measurement (with average and maximum noise level readings taken so as to be able to accurately describe maximum levels reached during nighttime hours) prior to the first project approval action. The analysis shall be prepared by persons qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering and shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that Title 24 standards, where applicable, can be met, and that there are no particular circumstances about the individual project site that appear to warrant heightened concern about noise levels in the vicinity. Should the Planning Department conclude that such concerns be present, the Planning Department may require the completion of a detailed noise assessment by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering prior to the first project approval action, in order to demonstrate that acceptable interior noise levels consistent with those in the Title 24 standards can be attained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION AND REPORTING PROGRAM</th>
<th>MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adopted Mitigation Measures</strong></td>
<td><strong>Responsibility for Implementation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure M-NO-2.1b – Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses.</td>
<td>Project sponsor; Planning Department;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Applies to growth in the 12 study areas: Impacts NO-2.1a, NO-2.3, and C-NO-1]</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a building permit analysis of site noise-generating uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reduce potential conflicts between existing noise-generating uses and new sensitive receptors, for qualified new residential development and development that includes other acoustical noise-sensitive uses (primarily, residences, and also including consultant schools and child care, religious, and convalescent facilities and the like), the San Francisco Planning Department shall require the preparation of an analysis that includes, at a minimum, a site survey to identify potential noise-generating uses within 900 feet of, and that have a direct line-of-sight to, the project site, and including at least one 24-hour noise measurement (with average and maximum noise level readings taken so as to be able to accurately describe maximum levels reached during nighttime hours) prior to the first project approval action. The analysis shall be prepared by persons qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering and shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that Title 24 standards, where applicable, can be met, and that there are no particular circumstances about the individual project site that appear to warrant heightened concern about noise levels in the vicinity. Should the Planning Department conclude that such concerns be present, the Planning Department may require the completion of a detailed noise assessment by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering prior to the first project approval action, in order to demonstrate that acceptable interior noise levels consistent with those in the Title 24 standards can be attained.</td>
<td>Project sponsor; Planning Department;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Considered complete upon approval of building permit plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopted Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Responsibility for Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure M-NO-2.1c – Siting of Noise-Generating Equipment. [Applies to growth in the 12 study areas: Impacts NO-2.1a, NO-2.3, and C-NO-1] If AAU proposes, as part of a change of use (as opposed to replacement) mechanical qualified equipment or ventilation units that would be expected, to increase acoustical ambient to noise levels by 5 dBA or more, either short-term, at nighttime, or as 24-hour average, in the proposed Project site vicinity, the San Francisco Planning Department shall require the preparation of an analysis that includes, at a minimum, a site survey to identify potential noise-sensitive uses (primarily, residences, and also including schools and child care, religious, and convalescent facilities and the like) within 900 feet of, and that have a direct line-of-sight to, the project site, and at least one 24-hour noise measurement (with average and maximum noise level readings taken so as to be able to accurately describe maximum levels reached during nighttime hours), prior to the first project approval action. The analysis shall be conducted prior to issuance of a building permit. The analysis shall be prepared by persons qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering and shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that the proposed equipment would not cause a conflict with the use compatibility requirements in the San Francisco General Plan and would not violate Noise Ordinance Section 2909. If necessary to meet these standards, the proposed equipment shall be replaced with quieter equipment, deleted entirely, or mitigated through implementation of site-specific noise reduction features or strategies.</td>
<td>Project sponsor; Planning Department; qualified acoustical consultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AIR QUALITY

Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2.1 – Construction Emissions Minimization within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone. [Applies to growth in the 12 study areas and at PS-1, PS-3, and PS-4: Impacts AQ-2.1, AQ-2.2, and AQ-2.3] This mitigation measure is applicable to renovation activities occurring within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone and where off-road diesel powered equipment is required and would operate for more than 20 total hours over the duration of construction at any one site.

A. Construction Emissions Minimization Plan. Prior to issuance of a construction permit, the project sponsor shall submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan (Plan) to the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) for review and approval by an Environmental Planning Air Quality Specialist. The Plan shall detail project compliance with the following requirements:

1. All off-road equipment greater than 25 hp and operating for more than 20 total hours over the entire duration of construction activities shall meet the following requirements:

   a) Where access to alternative sources of power is available, portable diesel engines shall be prohibited.

   b) All off-road equipment shall have:

      i. Engines that meet or exceed either U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) or California Air Resources Board (ARB) Tier 2 off-road emission standards, and

      ii. Engines that are retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control

   Project sponsor/contractor shall submit a Construction Emissions Minimization Plan (Plan) for review and approval by an Environmental Planning Air Quality Specialist prior to issuance of a construction permit. The Plan shall detail project compliance with the following requirements:

   a) Engines that meet or exceed Tier 2 emission standards.

   b) Engines that are retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control.
## Adopted Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy (VDECS).²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Exceptions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Exceptions to A(1)(a) may be granted if the project sponsor has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the ERO that an alternative source of power is limited or infeasible at the project site and that the requirements of this exception provision apply. Under this circumstance, the sponsor shall submit documentation of compliance with A(1)(b) for on-site power generation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Exceptions to A(1)(b)(ii) may be granted if the project sponsor has submitted information providing evidence to the satisfaction of the ERO that a particular piece of off-road equipment with an ARB Level 3 VDECS is (1) technically not feasible, (2) would not produce desired emissions reductions due to expected operating modes, (3) installing the control device would create a safety hazard or impaired visibility for the operator, or (4) there is a compelling emergency need to use off-road equipment that are not retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 VDECS and the sponsor has submitted documentation to the ERO that the requirements of this exception provision apply. If granted an exception to A(1)(b)(ii), the project sponsor must comply with the requirements of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Equipment with engines meeting Tier 4 Interim or Tier 4 Final emission standards automatically meet this requirement, therefore a VDECS would not be required.
iii. If an exception is granted pursuant to A(1)(c)(ii), the project sponsor shall provide the next cleanest piece of off-road equipment as provided by the step down schedules in Table 4.8-13, Off-Road Equipment Compliance Step-Down Schedule.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.8-13</th>
<th>Off-Road Equipment Compliance Step-Down Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compliance Alternative</td>
<td>Engine Emission Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How to use the table: If the requirements of (A)(1)(b) cannot be met, then the project sponsor would need to meet Compliance Alternative 1. Should the project sponsor not be able to supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 1, then Compliance Alternative 2 would need to be met. Should the project sponsor not be able to supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 2, then Compliance Alternative 3 would need to be met.

* Alternative fuels are not a VDECS.

2. The project sponsor shall require the idling time for off-road and on-road equipment be limited to no more than two minutes, except as provided in exceptions to the applicable state regulations regarding idling for off-road and on-road equipment. Legible and visible signs shall be posted...
in multiple languages (English, Spanish, Chinese) in designated queuing areas and at the construction site to remind operators of the two minute idling limit.

3. The project sponsor shall require that construction operators properly maintain and tune equipment in accordance with manufacturer specifications.

4. The Plan shall include estimates of the construction timeline by phase with a description of each piece of off-road equipment required for every construction phase. Off-road equipment descriptions and information may include, but is not limited to: equipment type, equipment manufacturer, equipment identification number, engine model year, engine certification (Tier rating), horsepower, engine serial number, and expected fuel usage and hours of operation. For VDECS installed: technology type, serial number, make, model, manufacturer, ARB verification number level, and installation date and hour meter reading on installation date. For off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall indicate the type of alternative fuel being used.

5. The Plan shall be kept on-site and available for review by any persons requesting it and a legible sign shall be posted at the perimeter of the construction site indicating to the public the basic requirements of the Plan and a way to request a copy of the Plan. The project sponsor shall provide copies of Plan to members of the public as requested.

B. Reporting. Monthly reports shall be submitted to the ERO indicating the construction phase and off-road equipment information used during each phase including the information required in A(4). In addition, for off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall indicate the type of alternative fuel being used.
### Adopted Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3.3 – Maximum Daily Construction Activities. [Applies to growth in the 12 study areas and at the six project sites: Impacts AQ-3.3 and C-AQ-2] Construction activities shall be limited to the renovation (including architectural coating) of a maximum of 100,000 square feet of building space at a time.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Sponsor and contractor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4.1a – Best Available Control Technology for Diesel Generators. [Applies to growth in the 12 study areas: Impacts AQ-4.1 and AQ-4.3] All new (i.e., not replacement) diesel generators shall have engines that (1) meet Tier 4 Final or Tier 4 Interim emission standards, or (2) meet Tier 2 emission standards and are equipped with a California Air Resources Board (ARB) Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy (VDECS).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Sponsor and contractor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall include the actual amount of alternative fuel used.

Within six months of the completion of construction activities, the project sponsor shall submit to the ERO a final report summarizing construction activities. The final report shall indicate the start and end dates and duration of each construction phase. For each phase, the report shall include detailed information required in A(4). In addition, for off-road equipment using alternative fuels, reporting shall include the actual amount of alternative fuel used.

C. Certification Statement and On-Site Requirements. Prior to the commencement of construction activities, the project sponsor must certify (1) compliance with the Plan and (2) all applicable requirements of the Plan have been incorporated into contract specifications.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adopted Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Mitigation Schedule</th>
<th>Mitigation Action</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4.1b – Best Available Control Technology for Boilers.</strong> [Applies to growth in the 12 study areas: Impacts AQ-4.1 and AQ-4.3] All new (i.e., not replacement) boilers shall be natural gas operated. If infeasible, all boilers shall be equipped with Best Available Control Technologies, such as fuel gas filters, or baghouse or electrostatic precipitators. BACTs shall be approved by BAAQMD through the permitting process.</td>
<td>Project sponsor and contractor</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of permit for boiler from City agency</td>
<td>Submittal of plans detailing compliance and documentation of compliance with BAAQMD Regulation</td>
<td>Project sponsor and the ERO.</td>
<td>Considered complete approval of plans detailing compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4.1c – Air Filtration Measures within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone.</strong> [Applies to growth in the 12 study areas: Impacts AQ-4.1 and AQ-4.3] <strong>Air Filtration and Ventilation Requirements for Sensitive Land Uses.</strong> Prior to receipt of a building permit for a change of use to a sensitive land use, the project sponsor shall submit an enhanced ventilation plan for the proposed building(s). The enhanced ventilation plan shall be prepared and signed by, or under the supervision of, a licensed mechanical engineer or other individual authorized by the California Business And Professions Code Sections 6700-6799. The enhanced ventilation plan shall show that the building ventilation system will be capable of achieving protection from particulate matter (PM2.5) equivalent to that associated with a Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) 13 filtration, as defined by American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) standard 52.2. The enhanced ventilation plan shall explain in detail how the project will meet the MERV-13 performance standard identified in this measure.</td>
<td>Project sponsor and contractor</td>
<td>Prior to receipt of a building permit</td>
<td>Enhanced Ventilation Plan; Maintenance Plan; disclosure to buyers and renters</td>
<td>Project sponsor and the ERO.</td>
<td>Ongoing during operation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Adopted Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Mitigation Schedule</th>
<th>Mitigation Action</th>
<th>Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility</th>
<th>Monitoring Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>building includes an air filtration and ventilation system designed to remove 80 percent of outdoor particulate matter and shall inform occupants of the proper use of the installed air filtration system.</td>
<td>Project sponsor and contractor</td>
<td>Prior to building improvements</td>
<td>Ensure hazardous materials are properly disposed</td>
<td>Project sponsor; contractor; Department of Building Inspection (DBI)</td>
<td>Considered complete when equipment containing PCBs or DEHP or other hazardous materials are properly disposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

**Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2.1 – Testing and Removal of Hazardous Building Materials.** [Applies to growth in the 12 study areas and at PS-1, PS-2, PS-3, PS-4, and PS-6: Impacts HZ-2.1, HZ-2.2, HZ-2.3, and C-HZ-1] AAU shall ensure that for any existing building where tenant improvements are planned, the building is surveyed for hazardous building materials including PCB-containing electrical equipment, fluorescent light ballasts containing PCBs or DEHP, and fluorescent light tubes containing mercury vapors. The results of testing shall be provided to DBI. The materials not meeting regulatory standards shall be removed and properly disposed of prior to the start of tenant improvements for buildings in the study areas. Old light ballasts that are removed during renovation shall be evaluated for the presence of PCBs. In the case where the presence of PCBs in the light ballast cannot be verified, the light ballast shall be assumed to contain PCBs and handled and disposed of as such, according to applicable laws and regulations. Any other hazardous building materials identified either before or during demolition or renovation shall be abated according to federal, state, and local laws and regulations.
Constructed between 1910 and 1912, in advance of the 1914 opening of the Panama Canal, 58-60 Federal Street was commissioned by M.J. Hawley of the Rincon Warehouse Company for an estimated cost of $200,000. Designed by Perseo Righetti & August G. Headman, the building was "one of the largest and most costly warehouses in the city at the time of its construction.

The site was particularly promising, given its proximity to both the harbor and adjacent rail lines, an advantage that had become recognized within the last two weeks by capitalists, who bought two valuable holdings in the same warehouse districts. The building was originally occupied by Weston Basket and Barrel Company, which utilized the space for offices, storage, and manufacturing operations.

The cohesive, industrial character of the adjacent area reflects the development of warehouses over a 120-year period along the southern waterfront of San Francisco. The interdependence of architecture and history can be seen from a look at the evolution of warehouse forms along the southern waterfront. Unlike most other areas of the San Francisco waterfront, the South End district contains an extraordinary concentration of buildings from almost every period of San Francisco’s maritime history. Several street fronts...are characterized by solid walls of brick and reinforced concrete warehouses. With this harmony of scale and materials, the South End Historic District is clearly a visually recognizable place. The buildings of the South End District represent a rich and varied cross-section of the prominent local architects and builders of the period.

SOURCE: ESTM Case No. 2008.0586E - Appendix AR
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Remove existing bullet style security cameras and exterior sections of flex conduit.

Existing roll-up door on ground level at main facade to be legalized as is.

Existing metal roll-up door located on second level to be legalized as is. See sheet A1.0. Existing barrel conduit extended above electrical gutter.

Existing metal door.

West frontage/relocated purgatory permit No. 50363.

Existing street lamps proposed for legalization.

Install single small form factor panoramic dome camera. Extend one 3/4” up from the existing electrical gutter above the electrical gutter.

Existing metal door.

Existing ventilation grate to be legalized.

Existing roller door.

New steel windows with true divided lites to match historic fenestrations.

New steel frame doors.

New window. Restore to match original size & historic fenestration features.

Proposed identifying sign.

Proposed signage; see signage consultant drawings.

New indirectly illuminated AAU business wall sign painted on roll-up door; see signage consultant drawings.

Remove existing identifying sign.

Items noted below on sign.

All drawings and written material appearing herein constitute original and unpublished work of the Architect and may not be duplicated, used or disclosed without consent of Architect.
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**GENERAL NOTES**

1. LEGALIZE THE CONDITIONS PRESENTED IN THIS PLAN SET, UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.

2. PROPOSED WORK INVOLVING MODIFICATIONS TO THE EXISTING BUILDING, INCLUDING REMOVAL, REMODELING, AND INSTALLATION WILL BE PERFORMED IN A MANNER CONSISTENT WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO STANDARDS. THE BUILDING PERMITS FOR ALL SUCH WORK WILL BE REVIEWS AND APPROVED BY THE APPROPRIATE PLANNING OR INSPECTION OFFICIALS TO ENSURE SUCH CONSISTENCY, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, MATCHING THE Uranus TO MATCH ORIGINAL SIZE & HISTORIC FENESTRATIONS.

3. REMOVE ALL ABANDONED EQUIPMENT & ATTACHMENTS ON THE EXTERIOR.

4. SIGNAGE BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION NO. 2019086948 WILL BE WITHDRAWN.

5. ALL NEW PROPOSED SECURITY CAMERAS, LIGHTING, SIGNAGE, AND CONDUITS TO BE ROUTED INTERNALLY IN THE BUILDING. NO NEW CONDUIT TO BE EXPOSED FROM THE EXISTING EXTERIOR JUNCTION BOX.

6. TEF TO PROVIDE DETAILED DRAWINGS FOR FIXTURES, CONDUIT, AND INTERIOR WALLS & CEILINGS WITH CONSISTENCY, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, MATCHING THE NEW STEEL FRAME DOORS TO MATCH ORIGINAL SIZE & HISTORIC FENESTRATIONS. DIVIDED LITES TO MATCH NEW STEEL WINDOWS WITH TRUE DIVIDED LITES SYSTEM.

7. SECURITY CAMERA, LIGHT FIXTURES AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT PROPOSED WORK IN THESE PLANS IS NOT REQUIRED WORK PURSUANT TO THE APPROPRIATE PLANNING REQUIREMENT, BUT INSTEAD TO WORK AND MAY PURSUANT TO REPLACE EXISTING SECURITY CAMERAS, LIGHTING AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT CONSISTENT WITH THE APPROPRIATE PLANNING REQUIREMENTS.

**KEYNOTES**

- RESTORE ARCADE
- REMOVE EXISTING VENTS TO BE LEGALIZED
- EXISTING VENTS TO BE LEGALIZED
- INFILL PORTION OF WINDOW
- PATCH & REPAIR TO MATCH ADJACENT WALL

**EXISTING/PROPOSED EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS**

**SOUTHEAST ELEVATION - PROPERTY LINE (EXISTING/PROPOSED)**

- INSTALL SINGLE SMALL FORMFACTOR DOME CAMERA TO SIT ABOVE THE DOME CAMERA.
- INSTALL 3/4" CONDUIT ROUTED ABOVE THE ELECTRICAL GUTTER TO BE LEGALIZED AS IS.

**NORTHWEST ELEVATION - PROPERTY LINE (EXISTING/PROPOSED)**

- REMOVE EXISTING LIGHT FIXTURE TO INTERIOR.
- INFILL PORTION OF WINDOW
- PATCH & REPAIR TO MATCH ADJACENT WALL
- REPLACE DOOR TO MATCH DOOR
- WALL TO MATCH ADJACENT WALL
- REMOVE BOLT; PATCH & REPAIR TO MATCH ADJACENT WALL
- INSTALL SINGLE SMALL FORMFACTOR DOME CAMERA TO SIT ABOVE THE DOME CAMERA.
- INSTALL 3/4" CONDUIT ROUTED ABOVE THE ELECTRICAL GUTTER TO BE LEGALIZED AS IS.
REMOVE EXISTING BULLET STYLE SECURITY CAMERAS AND EXTERIOR SECTIONS OF FLEX CONDUIT
EXISTING ROLL-UP DOOR ON GROUND LEVEL AT MAIN FACADE TO BE LEGALIZED AS IS
EXISTING METAL ROLL-UP DOOR LOCATED ON SECOND LEVEL TO BE LEGALIZED AS IS, SEE SHEET A4.1. ROLL-UP DOOR DOES NOT HAVE BARREL ON EXTERIOR
EXISTING VENTILATION GRATE TO BE LEGALIZED
EXISTING RAILING ON ROOF LINE INSTALL SMALL FORMFACTOR DOME CAMERA. LOWER THE CAMERA TO SIT ABOVE THE EXISTING ELECTRICAL GUTTER.
INSTALL 3/4" CONDUIT ROUTED ABOVE THE ELECTRICAL GUTTER
EXISTING METAL DOOR WEST FRONTAGE RELOCATED PURSUANT PERMIT NO. 8600336
EXISTING STREET LAMPS PROPOSED FOR LEGALIZATION
INSTALL SINGLE SMALL FORM FACTOR PANORAMIC DOME CAMERA, EXTEND ONE 3/4" UP FROM THE EXISTING EXTERIOR JUNCTION BOX
REPLACE DOOR TO MATCH DOOR ABOVE
EXISTING ROLL-UP DOOR RELOCATE EXISTING DRAIN PIPE TO INTERIOR
REMOVE EXISTING LIGHT FIXTURE
REMOVE EXISTING GLASS DOOR SYSTEM
NEW STEEL WINDOWS WITH TRUE DIVIDED LITES TO MATCH HISTORIC FENESTRATIONS
NEW STEEL FRAME DOORS WITH TRUE DIVIDED LITES TO MATCH HISTORIC FENESTRATIONS
NEW WINDOW, RESTORE TO MATCH ORIGINAL SIZE & HISTORIC FENESTRATION FEATURES
PROPOSED IDENTIFYING SIGN ON EXISTING GLAZED TRANSOM ABOVE ENTRANCE; SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS
PROPOSED INDIRECTLY ILLUMINATED AAU BUSINESS WALL SIGN PAINTED ON ROLL-UP DOOR; SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS
REMOVE EXISTING IDENTIFYING SIGN
ITEMS NOTED BELOW ON 9/25/19 SITE WALK:
*SEE PHOTOS ON SHT A4.1 AREA OF EXISTING WINDOW OPENING EXPANSION (SHOWN HATCHED)
EXISTING WINDOW OPENING TO BE LEGALIZED
EXISTING FIRE STAND PIPE
EXISTING VENT PIPE
REMOVE PVC PIPES
REMOVE JULIET BALCONY
REMOVE EXISTING WINDOW
REMOVE SPOOL, PATCH & REPAIR WALL TO MATCH ADJACENT WALL ABOVE
REPLACE DOOR TO MATCH DOOR ABOVE
EXISTING ROLL-UP DOOR
RELOCATE EXISTING DRAIN PIPE TO INTERIOR
REMOVE EXISTING LIGHT FIXTURE
REMOVE EXISTING GLASS DOOR SYSTEM
NEW STEEL WINDOWS WITH TRUE DIVIDED LITES TO MATCH HISTORIC FENESTRATIONS
NEW STEEL FRAME DOORS WITH TRUE DIVIDED LITES TO MATCH HISTORIC FENESTRATIONS
NEW WINDOW, RESTORE TO MATCH ORIGINAL SIZE & HISTORIC FENESTRATION FEATURES
A) Revised placement and size of alert wall sign
B) Removed painted logo on roll up door on Southwest Elevation

Painted Logo on Roll Up Door

Scale: 1" = 1' - 0"

Indirect LED Lighting Bar Above Painted Door

Customer Approval

Signature

MUSE/TPP

Date: 9/20/19

Rev. P C

Address:

3647 FEDERAL STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94134

All Signs to be Tri, 35, Compliant

Sheet No.

GG 2.0
Vinyl Window Graphics - Applied To Transom Window above Doors

Scale: 3"=1'-0"

- Red
- White Opaque Vinyl

Match Poppy Red 3630-143
CODE NOTES
REFERENCE: SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION REVIEW

A - FLOOR AREAS

**GROSS FLOOR AREA (NO CHANGE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>Existing (SF)</th>
<th>Proposed (SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BASEMENT</td>
<td>10,446</td>
<td>10,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 1</td>
<td>9,632</td>
<td>9,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 2</td>
<td>6,076</td>
<td>6,076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OCCUPIED FLOOR AREA (NO CHANGE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>Existing (SF)</th>
<th>Proposed (SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BASEMENT</td>
<td>10,446</td>
<td>10,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 1</td>
<td>9,632</td>
<td>9,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 2</td>
<td>6,076</td>
<td>6,076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GROSS FLOOR AREA (CHANGE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>New Assembly (SF)</th>
<th>Proposed (SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BASEMENT</td>
<td>10,446</td>
<td>10,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 1</td>
<td>9,632</td>
<td>9,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 2</td>
<td>6,076</td>
<td>6,076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OCCUPIED FLOOR AREA (CHANGE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>New Assembly (SF)</th>
<th>Proposed (SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BASEMENT</td>
<td>10,446</td>
<td>10,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 1</td>
<td>9,632</td>
<td>9,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 2</td>
<td>6,076</td>
<td>6,076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FLOOR AREA RATIO (PER SECTION 212-2; TABLE 212-2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BASEMENT</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 1</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 2</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MAXIMAL ALLOWED GROSS SF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>Existing (SF)</th>
<th>Proposed (SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BASEMENT</td>
<td>10,446</td>
<td>10,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 1</td>
<td>9,632</td>
<td>9,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 2</td>
<td>6,076</td>
<td>6,076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OCCUPIED SF TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>Existing (SF)</th>
<th>Proposed (SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BASEMENT</td>
<td>10,446</td>
<td>10,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 1</td>
<td>9,632</td>
<td>9,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 2</td>
<td>6,076</td>
<td>6,076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GROSS SF TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>Existing (SF)</th>
<th>Proposed (SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BASEMENT</td>
<td>10,446</td>
<td>10,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 1</td>
<td>9,632</td>
<td>9,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 2</td>
<td>6,076</td>
<td>6,076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROPERTY INFORMATION**

**ADDRESS**

491 Post Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

**DEVELOPER**

Mason - Sutter

**TEFarch.com**

T 415.391.7918  F 415.391.7309

**PROJECT NUMBER**

C12405

**PRINT DATE**

10/11/2019 11:44:24 PM

**COVER SHEET**
Not To Scale

491 Post Street was constructed between 1913 and 1915 as the home of the First Congregational Church of San Francisco. This building replaced the group's earlier Gothic Revival-style church constructed on the site in 1870 and destroyed in the 1906 earthquake and fire. The First Congregational Church owned and occupied the building from the 1910s for nearly 90 years, until 2001, when the building was sold to the Academy of Art University (AAU) for the purpose of a new campus expansion. The magnificent home gradually became a burden...Church members decided to put the building up for sale and hunt for a more appropriate place. 'It's a wrenching sort of thing and yet we're much too small to stay here,' said Ed Steiner, 82, who joined the congregation in 1950.

The building was purchased by AAU in 2001.
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EXISTING DOUBLE DOORS ALLOWING BASEMENT LEVEL ACCESS FROM POST. PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION DETAILS PROVIDED ON SHEET A4.1.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL FIXTURE MONUMENT +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS AAU BUSINESS SIGN AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL FIXTURE MONUMENT +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL FIXTURE MONUMENT +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL FIXTURE MONUMENT +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS AAU BUSINESS SIGN AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL FIXTURE MONUMENT +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN +/- 2’X4’ VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING’S HISTORY AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.
EXISTING DOUBLE DOORS ALLOWING BASEMENT LEVEL ACCESS FROM POST, PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMATION. DETAILS PROVIDED ON SHEET A4.1.

EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN +/- 2'X4' VIF (WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT) PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION AS AAU BUSINESS SIGN AND ADD INDIRECT ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS FOR LEGITIMIZATION.
GENERAL NOTES

1. LEGALIZE THE CONDITIONS PRESENTED IN THIS PLAN SET UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.

2. PROPOSED WORK INVOLVING MODIFICATIONS TO THE EXTERIOR OF THE BUILDING INVOLVES REMOVAL, DEMOLITION, AND INSTALLATION WORK PERFORMANCE IN A MANNER CONSISTENT WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT STAFF TO DESIRE. THE BUILDING PERMITS FOR ALL SUCH WORK WILL BE REVISED AND APPROVED BY THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF TO DESIRE. NOTED SCALES MUST BE ADJUSTED. THIS LINE SHOULD BE EQUAL TO ONE INCH.

3. ALL NEW PROPOSED SECURITY CAMERAS, LIGHTING, SIGNAGE TO HAVE ALL ASSOCIATED CONDUITS TO BE ROUTED INTERNALLY IN THE BUILDING. ALL NEW CONDUIT TO BE ROUTED INTERNALLY TO POWER SOURCES WITHIN THE BUILDING. ALL FIXTURES FOR EACH BUILDING TO BE EXPLICITLY SPECIFIED AND SHOWN IN PLAN VIEW, (2) ELEVATION VIEWS AND A SECTION/DETAIL DRAWING WITH SHOWING WHERE, HOW AND WITH WHAT METHOD THESE ARE ATTACHED TO THE STRUCTURE. NEW LIGHTING ON PROPOSED ELEVATION VIEWS AND A SECTIONS/DETAIL DRAWING WITH EACH PROPERTY’S DESIGNED SHEET A4.1.

4. TEF TO PROVIDE DETAIL DRAWINGS FOR FIXTURES, CONDUIT, AND INTERNAL POWER SOURCES. SHOWING WHERE, HOW AND WITH WHAT METHOD THESE ARE ATTACHED TO THE STRUCTURE. NEW LIGHTING ON PROPOSED ELEVATION VIEWS AND A SECTIONS/DETAIL DRAWING WITH EACH PROPERTY’S DESIGNED SHEET A4.1.

5. SECURITY CAMERA INSTALLATION AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT INSTALLATION WORK IN THESE PLANS IS NOT REQUIRED WORK PURSUANT TO THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT. TEF IS PROPOSED TO REPLACE EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA INSTALLATION AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT SUBJECT TO REMOVAL REQUIREMENTS.

KEYNOTES

1. EXISTING-EXHIBIT 1 MEDIUM SIGN PERMITTED BY PERMIT NO. 200801112355 AND 2011027798.

2. EXISTING DOUBLE DOORS ALLOWING ENSUREMENT LEVEL ACCESS FROM POST. PROPOSED FOR LEGALIZATION DETAILS PROVIDED ON SHEET A4.1.

3. DEMO UNILS CONDUIT PATHWAY – REMOVE BACKBOX

4. SKATEBOARD DETERRENTS ON POST STREET STAIRS DETAIL ON SHEET A4.1.

5. NEW LIGHT MOUNTED IN SAME LOCATION REMOVED EXISTING JUNCTION BOX.

6. PAINT CAMERA HOUSING TO MATCH BUILDING COLOR

7. EXISTING LIGHTING ABOVE THE STATUE AT THE POST STREET ENTRANCE TO BE REMOVED, SEE RECOLEIGHTING ON PROPOSED ELEVATION

8. EXISTING CHURCH WALL FIXTURE SIGN = 2' X 4' WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT. WILL BE REMOVED ASedral AS AAU BUSINESS SIGN AND ADD INDOOR ILLUMINATION. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.

9. INSTALL CONDUIT ADAPTER TO FEED DIRECTLY INTO CAMERA

10. NOT USED

11. KEY CARD ACCESS WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE DOOR ON THE NORTHWESTEREN ENTRANCE BICYCLE ACCESS.

12. EXISTING CHURCH WALL SIGN = 2' X 4' WHICH AAU UNDERSTANDS WERE INSTALLED BY CHURCH WITHOUT PERMIT. PROPOSED FOR LEGALIZATION. AS INTERPRETIVE PANEL ON THE BUILDING. INCLUDE HOW CONDUIT WILL BE ATTACHED TO THE STRUCTURE.

13. SECURITY CAMERA INSTALLATION AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT INSTALLATION WORK IN THESE PLANS IS NOT REQUIRED WORK PURSUANT TO THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT. TEF IS PROPOSED TO REPLACE EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA INSTALLATION AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT SUBJECT TO REMOVAL REQUIREMENTS.

LEGEND

SECURITY CAMERA

PROPOSED SIGNAGE; SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS
If this drawing is not 24” x 36”, then the drawing has been revised from its original size. Noted scales must be adjusted. This line should be equal to one inch.

All drawings and written material appearing herein constitute original and unpublished work of the Architect and may not be duplicated, used or disclosed without consent of Architect.

---

**EXISTING DOORS & SKATE BOARD STOPS**

1. **EXTERIOR DOOR AT POST STREET 1**
2. **EXTERIOR DOOR AT POST STREET 2**
3. **EXTERIOR DOOR AT POST STREET 3**
4. **EXTERIOR DOOR AT POST STREET 4**
5. **SKATE BOARD DETERRENT CUTSHEET**
6. **SKATE BOARD DETERRENCE**
7. **EXTERIOR DOOR - FIRE RATING LABEL**
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EXISTING DOUBLE DOORS ALLOWING BASEMENT LEVEL ACCESS FROM POST, PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION, DETAILS PROVIDED ON SHEET A4.1.
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Additional Indirect lighting to existing signs

Scale: 1-1/2" = 1’ - 0”
APPENDIX E

GROSS SF TOTAL 90,681
LEVEL 4 9,666
LEVEL 3 9,648
LEVEL 2 18,301
LEVEL 1 18,522

CLASS II - N/A 4
CLASS I - N/A 0

OCCUPIED SF TOTAL 68,807
LEVEL 4 7,308
LEVEL 3 7,321
LEVEL 2 11,312
MEZZANINE 4,513

ALTERATIONS TO EXTERIOR) SEE SHEETS A3.2 AND A3.3 FOR REMOVAL REQUIREMENTS.

WORK MAY PURSUE TO REPLACE EXISTING SECURITY
PERSUIT TO THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT, BUT INSTEAD IS PROPOSED WORK IN THESE DRAWINGS IS NOT REQUIRED WORK

INSTITUTION USE AT 601-625 POLK. NO CHANGE OF USE

APPLICABLE CODES

ALL WORK SHALL COMPLY WITH THE APPLICABLE CODES, AMENDMENTS, RULES, REGULATIONS, ORDINANCES, LAWS, DECREES, APPROVALS, ET AL. THAT ARE REQUIRED BY PUBLIC AUTHORIZED, NOT HAVING BECOME EFFECTIVE IN THE EVENT OF CONFLICT, THE MOST AMENDMENTS, RULES, REGULATIONS, ORDINANCES, LAWS, DECREES, APPROVALS, ET AL. THAT ARE REQUIRED BY PUBLIC AUTHORIZED, BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO THE FOLLOWING (OR OTHERWISE NOTED):

2016 SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE
2016 CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE
2016 CALIFORNIA MECANICAL CODE
2016 CALIFORNIA ELECTRICAL CODE
2016 CALIFORNIA EXISTING BUILDING CODE
2016 CALIFORNIA FIRE CODE

THE NATIONAL FIRE CODES: STANDARD AND THE FIRE PROTECTION HANDBOOK OF THE NFPA

PROPOSED: INSTRUCTIONAL, POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

HISTORIC EVALUATION

NO HISTORIC RESOURCE STATUS

NO CHANGE OF USE REQUIRED

PROPERTY INFORMATION

ADDRESS: 601-625 POLK STREET (SAN FRANCISCO BLVD)

NO. OF STORES: 0 (NO CHANGE)

DEPARTMENT: NO. 4

SPECIAL USE: WITHIN 1/4 MILE OF THE FRINGE FINANCIAL DISTRICT BLU PLOT PLAN

GROSS: NO CHANGE OF USE REQUIRED

PROJECT SCOPE

Pursuant to Case Number 2018.0586.3, the project proposes to use the Post-Secondary Educational Institution Use At 601-625 POLK. NO CHANGE OF USE PROPOSED.

The project proposes to abate and close Planning Department Complaint No. 1956, (ALTERATIONS TO EXTENSIONS SEE SHEETS A3.2 AND A3.3 FOR REFERENCES; HISTORIC PRESERVATION)

NEW PROPOSED SIGNAGE

SECURITY CAMERA, LIGHTING AND ASSOCIATED CONDO

PROPOSED WORK IN THE DRAWINGS IS NOT REQUIRED WORK.

THIS DRAWING SHOWS THE EXISTING SECURITY CAMERAS, LIGHTING AND ASSOCIATED CONDO SUBJECT TO REMOVAL REQUIREMENTS.
SITE HISTORY

625 Polk is a German Renaissance designed by Frederick Meyer and completed in 1912. Originally named California Hall and owned by the California Hall Association, this building was built as a social hall for one of San Francisco's principle ethnic communities.

625 Polk is a finely detailed example of a rarely seen architectural style in San Francisco, and is one of a limited number of structures associated with the city's German community. The building was constructed from funds raised by German societies and served as a social center for the community.

The cornerstone was laid in March of 1912 by John Hermann, founder of Hermann Safe Company. The hall opened in December of 1912 in an elaborate celebration with a message of personal best wishes from Kaiser Wilhelm II in recognition of the construction of Heidelberg Castle in Germany.

SOURCE: San Francisco Planning Commission Resolution No.9985
If this drawing is not 24" x 36", then the drawing has been revised from its original size. Noted scales must be adjusted. This line should be equal to one inch.

All drawings and written material appearing herein constitute original and unpublished work of the Architect and may not be duplicated, used or disclosed without consent of Architect.
If this drawing is not 24" x 36", then the drawing has been revised from its original size. Noted scales must be adjusted. This line should be equal to one inch.

All drawings and written material appearing herein constitute original and unpublished work of the Architect and may not be duplicated, used or disclosed without consent of Architect.

EXISTING FLOOR PLANS - LEVEL 4

1 LEVEL 4 - EXISTING

LEGEND
- OCCUPIED FLOOR AREA
- OCCUPIED FLOOR AREA IN ACTIVE USE ZONE
- GROSS FLOOR AREA
- PROPERTY LINE

ROOM TAG
- NAME
- ROOM NUMBER
- RESTROOM

1/8" = 1'-0" 1/8" = 1'-0"
LEVEL 5 - EXISTING

LEGEND

- OCCUPIED FLOOR AREA
- OCCUPIED FLOOR AREA IN ACTIVE USE ZONE
- PROPERTY LINE
- GROSS FLOOR AREA

ROOM TAG

Name  ROOM NUMBER

+  NO.  DATE  DESCRIPTION

EXISTING FLOOR PLANS - LEVEL 5
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001-025 POLK

San Francisco, CA 94102

HISTORICAL EXTERIOR ELEVATION IMAGES

601-625 POLK

San Francisco, CA 94102

SOURCE: SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY

EAST ELEVATION - (1954)
All drawings and written material appearing herein constitute original and unpublished work of the Architect and may not be duplicated, used or disclosed without consent of Architect.

1. LEGALIZE THE CONDITIONS PRESENTED IN THIS PLAN SET, UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
2. PROPOSED WORK INVOLVING MODIFICATIONS TO THE EXTERIOR OF THE BUILDING, INCLUDING REMOVAL, DEMOLITION, AND ALTERATION, WILL BE PERFORMED IN A MANNER CONSISTENT WITH THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION STANDARDS. THE BUILDING'S EXISTING EXTERIOR WILL BE RESTORED. SUCH WORK WILL BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY PLANNING AND BUILDING OFFICIALS. EXISTING BUILDING ENVELOPE MATERIALS WILL NOT BE REPLACED. SFI'S MAY BE USED.
3. EXTERIOR LIGHTING BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION No. 201212075767 TO BE WITHDRAWN. NO NEW CONDUIT TO BE ROUTED AND NO NEW SECURITY CAMERAS, LIGHTING, SIGNAGE, TO BE EXPOSED.
4. REMOVE ALL ABANDONED, GARBAGE, TRASH, AND ATTACHMENTS ON THE EXTERIOR;
5. SECURITY CAMERAS SHALL BE THE MOST MINIMALLY VISIBLE FIXTURE FEASIBLE WITH REMOVAL OF ALL CONDUIT ON PRIMARY FACADE.
6. LIGHTING SHOULD BE MINIMIZED TO THE GREATEST EXTENT POSSIBLE AND ALL CONDUIT ROUTED INTERNALLY OR CONSISTENCY, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO APPROPRIATE ATTACHMENT AND PATCHING.
7. ALL NEW PROPOSED SECURITY CAMERAS, LIGHTING, SIGNAGE, TO HAVE AN ASSOCIATED CONDUIT INSTALLATION ATTACHED TO THE PRIMARY FACADE.
8. PROPOSED NON-ILLUMINATED WALL SIGN, SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.
9. SECURITY CAMERAS AND ASSOCIATED CONDUITS PROPOSED IN THESE PLANS ARE ATTACHED TO THE EXISTING BUILDING COLOR; VERIFY CONSISTENT WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S Standards.
10. STANDARDS. SEE PHOTOS 4-11.

A3.2

INSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE SET

AAU

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

601-625 POLK

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

79 NEW MONTGOMERY STREET

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109

1420 SUTTER STREET

T 415.391.7918 F 415.391.7309

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109

INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE CENTER

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94122

INSTITUTIONAL HEARING CENTER

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109
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GENERAL NOTES

1. LEGALIZE THE CONDITIONS PRESENTED IN THIS PLAN Set, UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.

2. PROPOSED WORK INvolving MODIFICATIONS TO THE EXTERIOR STRUCTURE, LIGHTING, SECURITY, CAMERA, and CONDUIT REPAIR, DEMOLITION, AND INSTALLATION WILL BE PERFORMED IN A MANNER CONSISTENT WITH THE STANDARDS OF THE ARCHITECT’S STANDARDS. THE BUILDING PERMITS FOR ALL SUCH WORK WILL BE REVISED AND APPROPRIATE PLUMBING, LIGHTING, AND AIR CONDITIONING SYSTEMS SHALL BE DESIGNED AND EXECUTED IN SUCH CONSISTENCY, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO APPROPRIATE PLANS FOR METHOD OF REMOVAL, ATTACHMENT AND PATCHING.

3. EXTERIOR LIGHTING BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION IS A DRAFT TO BE WITHDRAWN.

4. REMOVE ALL ABANDONED EQUIPMENT AND ATTACHMENTS FROM THE EXTERIOR.

5. SECURITY CAMERAS SHALL BE THE MOST MINIMALLY VISIBLE FIXTURE FEASIBLE WITH REMOVAL OF ALL CONDUIT ON PRIMARY FACADE.

6. LIGHTING SHOULD BE LIMITED TO THE GREATEST EXTENT POSSIBLE TO EXISTING LIGHT FIXTURES. IF PROPOSED CONDUIT ROUTED INTERNALLY OR CONSTRUCTURAL MASONRY FEATURES, IF POSSIBLE. ANY PROPOSED MAIN OR DETAIL ATTACHMENT DETAILS THAT DEMONSTRATE THAT LIGHTS ARE ATTACHED VIA MORTAR JOINTS AND NOT SECURED DIRECTLY INTO THE MASONRY BACK.

7. ALL NEW PROPOSED SECURITY CAMERAS, LIGHTING, SIGNAGE, TO HAVE BEEN ASSOCIATED CORRECTLY TO THE EXISTING BUILDING. NEW CONDUIT TO BE EXPOSED.

8. TEF TO PROVIDE DETAILS DRAWINGS FOR FIXTURES, CONDUIT, AND INTERNAL POWER SOURCES. SKETCHING WORKS, HOW AND WHERE THESE FIXTURES ARE ATTACHED TO THE EXISTING structure THAT CONDUIT WILL BE ROUTED INTERNALLY TO A POWER SOURCE WITHIN THE BUILDING. EACH BUILDING TO BE EXPLICITLY SPECIFIED AND BROKEN DOWN PLANS VIEW, ELEVATION VIEWS AND SECTIONS, DETAIL DRAWING WITH DIMENSIONS THAT WILL BE ROUTED THROUGH PLUMBING, AIR, AND UTILITY REQUIREMENTS.

9. SECURITY CAMERA, LIGHTING, AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT PROPOSED WORK IN THESE PLANS IS NOT REQUIRED WORK PURSUANT TO THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT, BUT PERMITTED TO FULFILL THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT. PROPOSED WORK MAY BE APPROVED BY THE DEPARTMENT STAFF PRIOR TO APPROVAL/INSTALLATION.

10. UTILIZE THE EXISTING BUILDING PENETRATION.

11. ROUTE CABLE THROUGH EXISTING CONDUIT.

12. PROPOSED WORK INVOLVING EXISTING CONDUIT.

13. PROPOSED CAMERA LOCATION AT EDGE OF COLUMN.

14. EXISTING EXTERIOR LIGHTS AND ASSOCIATED FIXTURES TO BE REPLACED.

15. PROPOSED NEW LIGHT FIXTURES, SEE LIGHTING SHEETS.

16. STEEL FOLDING SECURITY GATES PROPOSED FOR LEGALIZATION OF LIGHTING SHEETS.

17. Proposed non-illuminated Race Seal. See Signage Consultant Drawings.

18. REPROPOSED SECURITY CAMERAS, LIGHTING, SIGNAGE TO HAVE BEEN ASSOCIATED CORRECTLY TO THE EXISTING BUILDING. NEW CONDUIT TO BE EXPOSED.

19. SECURITY CAMERA, LIGHTING, AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT PROPOSED WORK IN THESE PLANS IS NOT REQUIRED WORK PURSUANT TO THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT, BUT PERMITTED TO FULFILL THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT. PROPOSED WORK MAY BE APPROVED BY THE DEPARTMENT STAFF PRIOR TO APPROVAL/INSTALLATION.

20. LEGALIZE, MODIFY ATTACHMENTS TO ALIGN AT MORTAR JOINTS.

LEGEND

- SECURITY CAMERA
- PROPOSED SIGNAGE SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS

MASTER SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ELEVATIONS & EXISTING/PROPOSED EXTERIOR LIGHTING & SIGNAGE

A3.3

AAU INSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE SET

601-625 POLK
San Francisco, CA 94105

79 New Montgomery Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

1420 Sutter Street
San Francisco, CA 94108

DISTRICT STANDARDS

- PLAN
- ELEVATIONS
- PROPOSED ELEVATIONS
- ELEVATION DETAILS
- DRAWINGS FOR FIXTURES, CONDUIT, AND INTERNAL POWER SOURCES
- SKETCHING WORKS, HOW AND WHERE THESE FIXTURES ARE ATTACHED TO THE EXISTING structure THAT CONDUIT WILL BE ROUTED INTERNALLY TO A POWER SOURCE WITHIN THE BUILDING. EACH BUILDING TO BE EXPLICITLY SPECIFIED AND BROKEN DOWN PLANS VIEW, ELEVATION VIEWS AND SECTIONS, DETAIL DRAWING WITH DIMENSIONS THAT WILL BE ROUTED THROUGH PLUMBING, AIR, AND UTILITY REQUIREMENTS.

- SECURITY CAMERA, LIGHTING, AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT PROPOSED WORK IN THESE PLANS IS NOT REQUIRED WORK PURSUANT TO THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT, BUT PERMITTED TO FULFILL THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT. PROPOSED WORK MAY BE APPROVED BY THE DEPARTMENT STAFF PRIOR TO APPROVAL/INSTALLATION.

- LEGALIZE, MODIFY ATTACHMENTS TO ALIGN AT MORTAR JOINTS.

- EXISTING FIXTURE: RELAMP WITH NEW LED Retrofit Lamp

- EXISTING HISTORIC FIXTURES

- REMOVE EXISTING BULLET STYLE SECURITY CAMERA AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT. REMOVE EXISTING CAMERA BOX AND FROSTING GLASS ON JUNCTION BOX

- INSTALL SMALL FORM FACTOR DOME CAMERA, INSTALL THE CABLE WITHIN THE CAMERA HOUSING, CAMERA HOUSING FITS INTO EXISTING HOUSING, CAMERA HOUSING BEING SECURED EXISTING HARDWARE. INSTALL SMALL FORM FACTOR DOME CAMERA, INSTALL THE CABLE WITHIN THE CAMERA HOUSING, CAMERA HOUSING FITS INTO EXISTING HOUSING, CAMERA HOUSING BEING SECURED EXISTING HARDWARE.

- INSTALL SMALL FORM FACTOR DOME CAMERA, INSTALL THE CABLE WITHIN THE CAMERA HOUSING, CAMERA HOUSING FITS INTO EXISTING HOUSING, CAMERA HOUSING BEING SECURED EXISTING HARDWARE.

- EXISTING SYSTEMS ARE FUNCTIONAL TYPE TO BUILDING DEPARTMENT STAFF PRIOR TO APPROVAL/INSTALLATION.

- UTILIZE THE EXISTING BUILDING PENETRATION.

- ROUTE CABLE THROUGH EXISTING CONDUIT.

- PROPOSED WORK INVOLVING EXISTING CONDUIT.

- PROPOSED WORK INVOLVING EXISTING CONDUIT.

- TEF TO PROVIDE DETAILS DRAWINGS FOR FIXTURES, CONDUIT, AND INTERNAL POWER SOURCES. SKETCHING WORKS, HOW AND WHERE THESE FIXTURES ARE ATTACHED TO THE EXISTING structure THAT CONDUIT WILL BE ROUTED INTERNALLY TO A POWER SOURCE WITHIN THE BUILDING. EACH BUILDING TO BE EXPLICITLY SPECIFIED AND BROKEN DOWN PLANS VIEW, ELEVATION VIEWS AND SECTIONS, DETAIL DRAWING WITH DIMENSIONS THAT WILL BE ROUTED THROUGH PLUMBING, AIR, AND UTILITY REQUIREMENTS.

- SECURITY CAMERA, LIGHTING, AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT PROPOSED WORK IN THESE PLANS IS NOT REQUIRED WORK PURSUANT TO THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT, BUT PERMITTED TO FULFILL THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT. PROPOSED WORK MAY BE APPROVED BY THE DEPARTMENT STAFF PRIOR TO APPROVAL/INSTALLATION.

- LEGALIZE, MODIFY ATTACHMENTS TO ALIGN AT MORTAR JOINTS.
1. Gate attachments shall be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's standards.

If this drawing is not 24" x 36", then the drawing has been revised from its original size. Noted scales must be adjusted. This line should be equal to one inch.

All drawings and written material appearing herein constitute original and unpublished work of the Architect and may not be duplicated, used or disclosed without consent of Architect.
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**AAU INSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE SET**
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**EXTERIOR ELEVATION DETAIL IMAGES**

---

A4.1
1. Gate attachments shall be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's standards.

2. Remove existing bullet-style security cameras and associated conduits; remove existing camera backbox or junction box.

3. Install small-form-factor dome camera; install the cable within the camera housing; paint the camera body to match exterior building color; verify existing systems are functional; type to be reviewed by Planning Department staff prior to approval/installation.

4. Route cable through existing conduit.

5. Route cable from inside of building.

6. Proposed camera location at edge of column.

7. Existing exterior lights and associated conduits to be removed.

8. Proposed new light fixtures, see lighting cut sheets.

9. Steel folding security gates proposed for legalization; subject to fire and building code review; see photos 4-11 on sheet A3.1 and Attachment Details on A4.1 (materials to be provided to Planning under separate cover).

10. Proposed non-illuminated wall sign; see signage consultant drawings.

11. Conduit concealed within groove; connects to J-box within groove.

12. Retrofit historic light fixtures with LED lamps.

13. Proposed indirectly illuminated blade sign; see signage consultant drawings.

14. Existing conditions not noted on 9/25/19 site walk; see photos on sheet A4.2.

15. Existing penetrations shall be appropriately repaired in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior’s standards; see photos provided on A4.2.

16. Existing sign proposed for legalization; modify attachments to align at mortar joints.
EXISTING HISTORIC FIXTURES

REMOVE EXISTING BULLET STYLE SECURITY CAMERAS AND ASSOCIATED CONDUITS; REMOVE EXISTING CAMERA BACKBOX OR JUNCTION BOX

INSTALL SMALL FORM FACTOR DOME CAMERA, INSTALL THE CABLE WITHIN THE CAMERA HOUSING, PAINT THE CAMERA BODY TO MATCH EXTERIOR BUILDING COLOR; VERIFY EXISTING SYSTEMS ARE FUNCTIONAL, TYPE TO BE REVIEWED BY PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF PRIOR TO APPROVAL/INSTALLATION

EXISTING EXTERIOR LIGHTS AND ASSOCIATED CONDUITS TO BE REMOVED

PROPOSED NON-ILLUMINATED WALL SIGN; SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS

EXISTING PENETRATIONS SHALL BE APPROPRIATELY REPAIRED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S STANDARDS. SEE PHOTOS PROVIDED ON A4.2

EXISTING SIGN PROPOSED FOR LEGALIZATION. MODIFY ATTACHMENTS TO ALIGN AT MORTAR JOINTS

EXISTING EXTERIOR LIGHTS AND ASSOCIATED CONDUITS TO BE REMOVED

PROPOSED INDIRECTLY ILLUMINATED SLICE SIGN, SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS

EXTERIOR ELEVATION IMAGES

EAST ELEVATION - POLK STREET

SOUTH ELEVATION - TURK STREET

SOUTHEAST CORNER - POLK STREET & TURK STREET
Aluminum Wall Sign w/ Vinyl Graphics
QTY 2

Scale: 3” = 1’ - 0”

NOTE:
No Higher than (2) Horizontal Bands
(Survey Required)

Cut vinyl graphics on painted sign panel
1-1/2” alum. sq. tube frame
w/ 1/2” alum. sign face
painted black

Note: Bolt into Grout Lines Only
In summary, AAU's proposal would provide 24 Class I spaces at 2211 Van Ness (as per the requirements of the Code for 2151, 2109 and 2209 Van Ness) with 2151 Van Ness granting the Roman Catholic Welfare Organization of San Francisco a perpetual easement dating to October 2005, which grants the organization the right to use the parking spaces during non-school hours and only grants AAU a non-exclusive right to use the spaces during non-school periods. AAU understands that the surface parking area is in a legal non-conforming zone.

**BICYCLE PARKING SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPERTY INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address: 2151 VAN NESS AVENUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip Code: 94105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block of Street: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height Limit: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Secondary Educational Institution Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGEND: INSTITUTIONAL, RELIGIOUS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPLICABLE CODES**

- ALL WORK SHALL CONFORM WITH THE APPLICABLE CODES, STANDARDS, RULES, REGULATIONS, ORDINANCES, LAWS, LAWS, ORDINANCES, ETC., THAT ARE REQUIRED BY PUBLIC SAFETY. FURTHER, ALL WORK SHALL CONFORM TO THE CURRICULUM APPLICABLE EDICTIONS OR PUBLICATIONS OF THE FOLLOWING (OR OTHERWISE NOTED):
  - 2016 CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE
  - PART 2 - 2016 CALIFORNIA MECHANICAL CODE
  - PART 3 - 2016 CALIFORNIA ELECTRICAL CODE
  - PART 9 - 2016 CALIFORNIA FIRE CODE
  - THE NATIONAL FIRE CODES STANDARD AND THE FIRE PREVENTION CODE

**PROJECT SCOPE**

Pursuant to case number 1251, the project proposes to change the use of 2151 Van Ness Avenue from a religious institution (vacant for 13 years prior to AAU acquiring the property in 2005) to a post-secondary educational institution.

**APPENDIX**

- Administrative Certification of Appropriateness and Historic Preservation Commission Review

**REFERENCES**

- SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING CODE AS EXISTING ON JANUARY 1, 2019.

**CODE NOTES**

- ESTM CONDITIONS

**ESTM CONDITIONS**

- Recommended Condition of Approval

**SITE PLAN NAME**

- 2151 Sutter Street

**SITE PLAN DRAWS**

- A0.S1 SITE PLAN AERIAL IMAGE AND SITE HISTORY
- A0.S2 SITE PLAN DRAWINGS
- A0.S3 STREETSCAPE DRAWINGS
- A0.T3a ACCESSIBILITY DIAGRAMS (1 of 3)
- A0.T3c ACCESSIBILITY DIAGRAMS (3 of 3)
- A1.0 EXISTING FLOOR PLAN - BASEMENT
- A1.1 EXISTING FLOOR PLAN - LEVEL 1
- A2.0 PROPOSED FLOOR PLAN - BASEMENT
- A3.0 HISTORIC EXTERIOR ELEVATION IMAGES
- A3.1 EXTERIOR ELEVATION IMAGES
- A3.3 EXISTING/PROPOSED EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS
- A4.1 EXTERIOR ELEVATION DETAIL IMAGES
- G 3.0 SIGNAGE DETAILS

**PROPERTY INFORMATION**

- Address: 2151 VAN NESS AVENUE
- Zip Code: 94105
- Block of Street: 3
- Height Limit: 4
- Post-Secondary Educational Institution Use

**LEGAL**

- INSTITUTIONAL, RELIGIOUS

**PROPOSED INSTITUTIONAL**

- POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

**HISTORIC EVALUATION**

- HISTORIC RESOURCE STATUS
  - A- Historic Resource

- NATIONAL REGISTRED HISTORIC DISTRICTS
  - None

- CALIFORNIA REGISTRED DISTRICT
  - None

- HISTORIC RESOURCE EVALUATION
  - None

- ARTICLE 16 DESIGNATED HISTORIC DISTRICT LANGAMARKS
  - None

- ARTICLE 11 PRESERVATION DESIGNATION
  - None

- MILLS ACT
  - None

- LEGACY BUSINESS REGISTRY
  - None

**VICINITY MAP**

- N.T.S.

**COVER SHEET**

- A0.0
The Romanesque-Richardsonian church at 2151 Van Ness Avenue was constructed by the San Francisco Roman Catholic Archdiocese for the parish of St. Brigid. The parish was founded in 1862 with the construction of the current church building beginning in 1896. The church was originally designed by the architectural firm of Shea and Shea. The architectural firm of Shea and Shea was comprised of brothers Frank T. Shea (1859-1929) and William D. Shea (1866-1931), who completed a number of works for the San Francisco Archdiocese. Notable projects include 1822 Eddy Street, San Francisco (Holy Cross Catholic Church and Parish Hall, 1899), 221 Valley Street, San Francisco (St. Paul’s, 1900-1902), 745 Waverly Street, Palo Alto (St. Thomas Aquinas Church, 1901) and 19 St. Mary’s Avenue, San Francisco (Church of St. John the Evangelist, 1902).

Work on the building was phased with the basement and foundation being constructed between 1896 and 1897, and the north and south sides of the interior constructed between 1902 and 1904. In 1930, Henry A. Minton was commissioned to design the Romanesque Revival Facade, as well as complete interior alterations to accommodate additional seating. A native of Boston, Minton (1914-1974) worked as an artist and after the 1906 earthquake, Minton worked at and eventually took over the Los Angeles branch of the Chas. E. Dines Cigar Company. Minton stuck out on his own, working primarily for the Bank of Italy (now Bank of America) and the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of San Francisco. Alterations that occurred after Minton included the replacement of stained glass windows in the 1940s and the construction of the upper story and roof of the corner tower in 1965.

Citing declining attendance and the need to seismically upgrade the building, the Archdiocese closed the parish in 1994. The building sat vacant for 11 years prior to AAU’s occupancy in 2005.
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AAU INSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE SET

A3.0

HISTORIC EXTERIOR ELEVATION IMAGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: ESTM Case No. 2008.0586E - Appendix AAK

1 NORTHEAST ELEVATION (1906)
2 NORTHEAST ELEVATION (1910)
3 NORTHEAST ELEVATION (2006)
PROPOSED NON-ILLUMINATED AAU FREESTANDING SIGN ATTACHED TO FENCE; SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS
EXISTING METAL FENCE CHANGED EXISTING WALL SIGN TO AAU SIGN AND INDIRECTLY ILLUMINATE INSIDE AT TOP OF CABINET; SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS; SEE PHOTO ON SHT A4.1 FOR EXISTING CONDITION

ITEMS BELOW NOTED ON 9/25/19 SITE WALK:
*SEE PHOTOS ON SHT A4.1 EXISTING SIGN ON FENCE TO BE REMOVED.

If this drawing is not 24" × 36", then the drawing has been revised from its original size. Noted scales must be adjusted. This line should be equal to one inch.

All drawings and written material appearing herein constitute original and unpublished work of the Architect and may not be duplicated, used or disclosed without consent of Architect.

1420 Sutter Street
San Francisco, CA  94109
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AAU INSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE SET

A3.1

EXTERIOR ELEVATION IMAGES
1. LEGALIZE THE CONDITIONS PRESENTED IN THIS PLAN SET UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED

2. PROPOSED WORK INVOLVING MODIFICATIONS TO THE EXTERIOR OF THE BUILDING, INCLUDING REPAIR, DEMOLITION, AND INSTALLATION SHALL BE PERFORMED IN A MANNER CONSISTENT WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S STANDARDS. THE BUILDING PERMITS FOR ALL SUCH WORK WILL BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF TO ENSURE SUCH CONSISTENCY, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO APPROPRIATE PLANS FOR METHOD OF REMOVAL, ATTACHMENT AND PATCHING.

3. REPAIR/PATCH AND REFINISH THE EXTERIOR WALL TO MATCH EXISTING MATERIALS AND APPEARANCE AS REQUIRED


5. ALL NEW PROPOSED SECURITY CAMERAS, LIGHTING, AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT PROPOSED WORK IN THESE PLANS IS NOT REQUIRED WORK PURSUANT TO THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT, BUT INSTEAD IS WORK AAU MAY PURSUE TO REPLACE EXISTING SECURITY CAMERAS, LIGHTING AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT SUBJECT TO REMOVEAL REQUIREMENTS.
1. LEGALIZE THE CONDITIONS PRESENTED IN THIS PLAN SET UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
2. PROPOSED WORK INVOLVING MODIFICATIONS TO THE EXTERIOR OF THE BUILDING, INCLUDING REPAIR, DEMOLITION, AND INSTALLATION SHALL BE PERFORMED IN A MANNER CONSISTENT WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S STANDARDS. THE BUILDING PERMITS FOR ALL SUCH WORK WILL BE REQUIRED AND APPROVED BY PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF TO ENSURE SUCH CONSISTENCY, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO APPROPRIATE PLANS FOR METHOD OF REMOVAL, ATTACHMENT AND PATCHING.
3. REPAIR/REFRESH AND REFURBISH THE EXTERIOR WALL TO MATCH EXISTING MATERIALS AND APPEARANCE AS REQUIRED.
5. ALL NEW PROPOSED SECURITY CAMERAS, LIGHTING, AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT WILL BE ROUTED INTERNALLY IN THE BUILDING. NO NEW CONDUIT TO BE EXPOSED
6. TEF TO PROVIDE DETAIL DRAWINGS FOR FIXTURES, CONDUIT, AND INTERNAL POWER SOURCES, SHOWING WHERE, HOW AND WITH WHAT METHOD THESE ARE ATTACHED TO THE STRUCTURE AND HOW CONDUIT WILL BE ROUTED INTERNALLY TO A POWER SOURCE. WHERE AppROPRIATE, PLAN ELEVATIONS AND A SECTIONAL/DETAIL DRAWING WITH EACH PROPERTY’S DBI PACKAGES THAT WILL BE ROUTED THROUGH PLANNING AND CAN BE REVIEWED AT THAT TIME.
7. SECURITY CAMERA, LIGHTING AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT PROPOSED WORK IN THESE PLANS IS NOT REQUIRED WORK PURSUANT TO THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT, BUT INSTEAD IS WORK AAU MAY PURSUE TO REPLACE EXISTING SECURITY CAMERAS, LIGHTING AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT SUBJECT TO REMOVAL REQUIREMENTS.

EXISTING/PROPOSED EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS

LEGEND

PROPOSED SIGNAGE; SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS
EXISTING METAL FENCE
EXISTING SIGN ON FENCE TO BE REMOVED
PROPOSED NON-ILLUMINATED AAU FREESTANDING SIGN ATTACHED TO FENCE; SEE EXISTING METAL FENCE
EXISTING SIGN ON FENCE TO BE REMOVED
PROPOSED WORK INVOLVING MODIFICATIONS TO THE EXTERIOR OF THE BUILDING, INCLUDING REPAIR, DEMOLITION, AND INSTALLATION SHALL BE PERFORMED IN A MANNER CONSISTENT WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S STANDARDS. THE BUILDING PERMITS FOR ALL SUCH WORK WILL BE REQUIRED AND APPROVED BY PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF TO ENSURE SUCH CONSISTENCY, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO APPROPRIATE PLANS FOR METHOD OF REMOVAL, ATTACHMENT AND PATCHING.
REPAIR/REFRESH AND REFURBISH THE EXTERIOR WALL TO MATCH EXISTING MATERIALS AND APPEARANCE AS REQUIRED.
ALL NEW PROPOSED SECURITY CAMERAS, LIGHTING, AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT WILL BE ROUTED INTERNALLY IN THE BUILDING. NO NEW CONDUIT TO BE EXPOSED
TEF TO PROVIDE DETAIL DRAWINGS FOR FIXTURES, CONDUIT, AND INTERNAL POWER SOURCES, SHOWING WHERE, HOW AND WITH WHAT METHOD THESE ARE ATTACHED TO THE STRUCTURE AND HOW CONDUIT WILL BE ROUTED INTERNALLY TO A POWER SOURCE. WHERE AppROPRIATE, PLAN ELEVATIONS AND A SECTIONAL/DETAIL DRAWING WITH EACH PROPERTY’S DBI PACKAGES THAT WILL BE ROUTED THROUGH PLANNING AND CAN BE REVIEWED AT THAT TIME.
SECURITY CAMERA, LIGHTING AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT PROPOSED WORK IN THESE PLANS IS NOT REQUIRED WORK PURSUANT TO THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT, BUT INSTEAD IS WORK AAU MAY PURSUE TO REPLACE EXISTING SECURITY CAMERAS, LIGHTING AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT SUBJECT TO REMOVAL REQUIREMENTS.

EXISTING/PROPOSED EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS
1. LEGALIZE THE CONDITIONS PRESENTED IN THIS PLAN SET UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED

2. PROPOSED WORK INVOLVING MODIFICATIONS TO THE EXTERIOR OF THE BUILDING, INCLUDING REPAIR, DEMOLITION, AND INSTALLATION SHALL BE PERFORMED IN A MANNER CONSISTENT WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE EXTERIOR STANDARDS. THE EXISTING MATERIALS AND APPEARANCE OF THE EXTERIOR WALLS SHALL BE MAINTAINED AND REFINISHED AS REQUIRED TO MAINTAIN CONSISTENCY, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO APPROPRIATE PLANS FOR METHOD OF REMOVAL, ATTACHMENT AND PATCHING.

3. REPAIR AND REFRESH THE EXTERIOR WALL TO MATCH EXISTING MATERIALS AND APPEARANCE AS REQUIRED


5. ALL NEW PROPOSED SECURITY CAMERAS, LIGHTING, SIGNAGE, TO HAVE ALL ASSOCIATED CONDUITS TO BE ROUTED INTERNALLY IN THE BUILDING, NO CONDUITS TO BE EXPOSED.

6. TEF TO PROVIDE DETAIL DRAWINGS FOR FIXTURES, CONDUIT, AND INTERNAL POWER SOURCES, SHOWING WHERE, HOW AND WITH WHAT METHOD THESE ARE ATTACHED TO THE STRUCTURE AND HOW CONDUIT WILL BE ROUTED INTERNALLY TO A POWER SOURCE. ALL FIXTURES MUST BE ELECTRICAL GRADE. 1. 1/8" = 1'-0".

7. SECURITY CAMERA, LIGHTING AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT PROPOSED WORK IN THESE PLANS IS NOT REQUIRED WORK PURSUANT TO THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT BUT INSTEAD IS WORK AAU MAY PURSUE TO REPLACE EXISTING SECURITY CAMERAS, LIGHTING AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT SUBJECT TO REMOVAL REQUIREMENTS.

GENERAL NOTES

ADJACENT BUILDING

SOUTH ELEVATION - PROPERTY LINE

EXISTING/PROPOSED
PROPOSED NON-ILLUMINATED AAU FREESTANDING SIGN ATTACHED TO FENCE; SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS

EXISTING METAL FENCE

CHANGE EXISTING WALL SIGN TO AAU SIGN AND INDIRECTLY ILLUMINATE INSIDE AT TOP OF CABINET; SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS; SEE PHOTO ON SHT A4.1 FOR EXISTING CONDITION

ITEMS BELOW NOTED ON 9/25/19 SITE WALK:

EXISTING SIGN ON FENCE TO BE REMOVED.

If this drawing is not 24" x 36", then the drawing has been revised from its original size. Noted scales must be adjusted. This line should be equal to one inch.
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A4.1

EXTERIOR ELEVATION DETAIL IMAGES

No. Date Description

1 IMAGE

2 IMAGE

3 IMAGE

4 IMAGE

5 IMAGE
Proposed New Signage

A. Bartizal
G. Graves

2151 VAN NESS AVE
SAN FRANCISCO

GG 2.0

 Proposed New Signage

S/F Int. Illuminated (Face Replacement)

Replace Face of Existing S/F Internally Illuminated Sign. Use AAU Colors as Req.

White Acrylic Face w:
- 1st Surface Black Bkgd
- 3M Poppy Red Logo & White Copy.
NORTH ELEVATION - BROADWAY

2" Alum. Sq. Tube Frame w/.125" Alum. Face w/ Vinyl Graphics

S/F Non - Illuminated Panel w/ Vinyl Graphics 24 sq ft
Scale: 3/4"=1'-0"

2" L angle stringer Thru-Bolt Sign to L stringer
Among the new building announcements made this week the most interesting is that of a Class A structure at the northeast corner of Mission and New Montgomery streets...The site of the new building was...Mrs. Oelrichs. The building is intended to be eventually the first two stories and basement of a big office structure of eight stories...The plans have been so laid out that in the event of a purchaser acquiring either one of the three buildings he could add six stories and be independent of the other buildings.

While the architectural lead for the 1920 expansion of the property is Mel Schwartz, it appears that the plans and design had already been determined in Schnaittacher's 1913 plans. The 1920 addition brought three more stories, bringing the building to its current five-story massing (rather than the original planned eight stories).

Ownership and tenancy in the building appears to have changed hands on several occasions through the years. Owners/tenants included Associated Oil Company, which occupied the building as early as the 1920s through the mid-1950s, Allied Oil Company, which occupied at least a portion of the property from an early 1960s through the late 1980s. As of 1968, Pacific Telephone and Telegraph occupied office space as a tenant...
Street: New Montgomery Street

- Bike Rack, Typ.
- 11'-0" CLR.
- New Montgomery Street
- 7'9" NEWMONTGOMERY
- MATCHLINE 1
- MATCHLINE 2
- MATCHLINE 3
- 6'-0" RIGHT OF WAY CLR.
- 6'-0" RIGHT OF WAY CLR.
- 6'-0" RIGHT OF WAY CLR.
- 6'-0" RIGHT OF WAY CLR.
- ASSUMED
- ASSUMED
- ASSUMED
- ASSUMED
- ⅊
- ASSUMED
- ASSUMED
- ASSUMED
- ASSUMED
- ASSUMED
- ⅊
- MANHOLE

**BIKE PARKING COUNT**

Class II

- Existing:
  - (10) Bike Parking Spaces
- Proposed:
  - (16) Bike Parking Spaces
- Total: 26

**NOTES:**

1. Bike Racks in Passenger Loading Zone are accepted on a case-by-case basis.
2. Assumed Property Line at Face of Building.

**GENERAL NOTES**

- (E) = Existing
- (N) = New, Proposed
- CLR = Clearance
- TYP = Typical
- ⅊ = Property Line
LEVEL 3 - EXISTING

LEGEND

- INSTITUTIONAL OCCUPIED FLOOR AREA
- INSTITUTIONAL OCCUPIED FLOOR AREA IN ACTIVE USE ZONE
- GROSS FLOOR AREA
- PROPERTY LINE
- EXISTING PARTITION TO REMAIN
- EXISTING PARTITION TO BE REMOVED
- PROPOSED PARTITION

ROOM TAG

ROOM NAME

GROSS FLOOR AREA

EXISTING FLOOR PLANS - LEVEL 3

A1.4
1/8" = 1'-0" 1/8" = 1'-0"

LEVEL 5 - EXISTING

EXISTING FLOOR PLANS - LEVEL 5

LEGEND

A1.6
If this drawing is not 24" x 36", then the drawing has been revised from its original size. Noted scales must be adjusted. This line should be equal to one inch.
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**SOURCE:** ESTM Case No. 2008.0586E - Appendix HR
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**HISTORIC EXTERIOR ELEVATION IMAGES**

3 SOUTH EAST ELEVATION (1913)

SOURCE: ESTM Case No. 2008.0586E - Appendix HR

2 SOUTH EAST ELEVATION (1977)

SOURCE: ESTM Case No. 2008.0586E - Appendix HR

1 SOUTH EAST ELEVATION (2007)

SOURCE: ESTM Case No. 2008.0586E - Appendix HR

---

**79 NEW MONTGOMERY**

San Francisco, CA 94105

---

**A3.0**
ES-27, HR-1 PROJECTING SIGNAGE LEGALLY PERMITTED BY PERMIT NOS [9305460, 9305461, 9305463, 200106282578, 200106282581, 200108166236, 20100119488]

EXISTING CONDUITS FOR THE EXISTING SIGNS TO BE CONCEALED BEHIND EXISTING FEATURES OR INTERNALLY ROUTED IF POSSIBLE.

EXISTING BULLET-STYLE SECURITY CAMERAS AND ASSOCIATED CONDUITS TO BE REMOVED; SALVAGE CAMERAS 

EXISTING AWNINGS WITH UNDERMOUNT LINEAR LIGHT FIXTURES PENDING REVIEW WITH PLANNING DEPARTMENT HISTORIC PRESERVATION STAFF, PERMITS AUTHORIZING AWNINGS ARE EXPIRED. AWNINGS PROPOSED FOR LEGITIMIZATION; CONDUITS ASSOCIATED WITH LIGHTING TO BE INTERNALLY ROUTED.

EXISTING METAL SIGNAGE BOXES DEDICATED TO GALLERY SPACE, TYP. OF (3) TO REMAIN INFILLED WINDOWS, TYP. OF (2) ON JESSIE ST. ELEVATION.

EXISTING TINTED FILM AT SOME OF THE EXTERIOR WINDOWS ON 3RD & 4TH LEVELS OF NEW MONTGOMERY ST. ELEVATION.

EXISTING WINDOW SIGNS DECALS AND FILM ON GLAZING AT ALCOVE. SEE PHOTOS ON SHEET A4.1

ITEMS BELOW NOTED DURING 9/25/19 SITE WALK:

- EXISTING METAL SIGNAGE BOXES DEDICATED TO GALLERY SPACE, TYP. OF (3) TO REMAIN
- INFILLED WINDOWS, TYP. OF (2) ON JESSIE ST. ELEVATION
- EXISTING TINTED FILM AT SOME OF THE EXTERIOR WINDOWS ON 3RD & 4TH LEVELS OF NEW MONTGOMERY ST. ELEVATION
GENERAL NOTES

1. LEGALIZE THE CONDITIONS PREVAILING THIS PLAN SET, UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.

2. PROPOSED WORK INVOLVING MODIFICATIONS TO THE EXISTING BUILDING, INCLUDING REPAIR, REMOVAL, AND INSTALLATION SHALL BE PERFORMED IN A MANNER CONSISTENT WITH THE SEC. 145.1 STANDARDS. THE BUILDING REMAINS FOR ALL SUCH WORK WILL BE CONDITIONAL AND APPROVED BY PLANNING DEPARTMENT. REPLACEMENT OF SUCH CONSISTENCY, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO EXISTING SECURITY CAMERAS AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT, SUBJECT TO REMOVAL REQUIREMENTS.

3. REMOVE ALL ABANDONED SECURITY CAMERAS AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT.

4. ALL NEW PROPOSED SECURITY CAMERAS, LIGHTING, SIGNAGE, TO HAVE ALL ASSOCIATED CONDUIT TO BE ROUTED INTERNALLY IN THE BUILDING. NO NEW CONDUIT TO BE EXPOSED.

5. TYP. TO PROVIDE DETAIL DRAWINGS FOR EXTERIOR DETAILS, CONDUIT, AND INTERNAL POWER SOURCES. SHOWING HOW AND WITH WHAT METHOD THESE ARE ATTACHED TO THE BUILDING, OR CONNECTED TO THE CONDUIT, AS INDICATED. ALL EXISTING SECURITY CAMERAS WILL BE ROUTED INTERNALLY TO A POWER SOURCE WITHIN THE BUILDING. ALL FIXTURES FOR SUCH BUILDING TO BE EXISTING SECURITY CAMERAS UNIT TO BE INSTALL. 3/32” = 1’-0” 3/32” = 1’-0”

6. SECURITY CAMERA, LIGHTING AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT, PROPOSED TO BE INSTALL IN THESE PLANS IS NOT REQUIRED WORK PURSUANT TO THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT, BUT INSTEAD IS WORK AAU MAY PURSUE TO REPLACE EXISTING SECURITY CAMERAS, LIGHTING AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT. SUBJECT TO REMOVAL REQUIREMENTS.

LEGEND

SECURITY CAMERA

KEYNOTES

1. ES-27, HR-1 PROJECTING SIGNAGE LEGALLY PERMITTED BY PERMIT NO: [3133060, 3133061, 3132460]

2. EXTERIOR CONDUITS FOR THE EXISTING BUILDING TO BE ADEQUATELY EXPOSED AND INTERNAL TO THE BUILDING. THROUGH THE GALLERY

3. REMOVAL SALVAGE CAMERA EQUIPMENT FOR REINSTALL IN ANY FUTURE BUILDING

4. PROPOSED SINGLE SMALL FORM FACTORS SECURITY CAMERA, ROUTE THROUGH EXISTING BUILDING PENETRATION

5. TYP. TO PROVIDE DETAIL DRAWINGS FOR FIXTURES, CONDUIT, AND INTERNAL POWER SOURCES, SHOWING WHERE, HOW AND WITH WHAT METHOD THESE ARE ATTACHED TO THE BUILDING, OR CONNECTED TO THE CONDUIT, AS CRITICAL FOR ALL PROPERTIES. ALL EXISTING SECURITY CAMERAS ENTRANCE TO BE INTERNALLY ROUTED THROUGH PLANNING AND CAN BE REVISED AT THAT TIME.

6. SECURITY CAMERA, LIGHTING AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT, PROPOSED TO BE INSTALL IN THESE PLANS IS NOT REQUIRED WORK PURSUANT TO THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT, BUT INSTEAD IS WORK AAU MAY PURSUE TO REPLACE EXISTING SECURITY CAMERAS, LIGHTING AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT. SUBJECT TO REMOVAL REQUIREMENTS.

7. EXISTING SECURITY CamERAS, LIGHTING AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT, PROPOSED TO BE INSTALL IN THESE PLANS IS NOT REQUIRED WORK PURSUANT TO THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT, BUT INSTEAD IS WORK AAU MAY PURSUE TO REPLACE EXISTING SECURITY CAMERAS, LIGHTING AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT. SUBJECT TO REMOVAL REQUIREMENTS.

8. REMOVE EXISTING AAU PAINTED COPY ON AWNING, TYP.

9. EXISTING/PROPOSED EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS

10. INFILLED WINDOWS, TYP. OF AAU ON JESSIE ST. ELEVATION

11. EXISTING WINDOW SIGNAGE BOXES LOCATED TO GALLERY SPACE TYP. OF (2) TO REMOVE

12. EXISTING METAL SIGNAGE BOXES DEDICATED TO GALLERY SPACE TYP. OF (2) TO REMOVE

13. EXISTING TINTED FILM AT SOME OF THE EXTERIOR WINDOWS ON 3RD & 4TH LEVELS OF NEW MONTGOMERY ST. ELEVATION

14. EXISTING A1A PANELS TO REMAIN, CONSIDER ASSOCIATED EXPOSED CONDUITS

15. REMOVED WINDOW SIGNAGE BOXES AND PLANS [SHAVING AT SOUTH, MONTGOMERY] BBP PHOTO ON SHEET AA-7

16. EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TYP. OF (2) TO REMOVE

17. SECURITY CAMERA TYP. TO REMAIN CONSIDER ASSOCIATED EXPOSED CONDUITS
1. LEGALIZE THE CONDITIONS PRESENTED IN THIS PLAN SET, UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED:

- LEGALLY PERMITTED BY PERMIT NOS [9305460, 9305461, 9305463, 200106282578, 200106282581, 200108166236, 20100119488] PRESENTED IN THIS PLAN SET, UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED

2. PROPOSED WORK INVOLVING MODIFICATIONS TO THE EXTERIOR OF THE BUILDING, INCLUDING REPAIR, DEMOLITION, REPAIR OR REMOVAL OF EXISTING UNAUTHORIZED CONSTRUCTION AS PERMITS ISSUED TO A MUNICIPAL OFFICIAL CONSENTING TO THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR’S STANDARDS. THE BUILDING SOLDER PANEL (B7) IS NOT TO BE REVERSED AND APPROVED BY PLANNING, DEPARTMENT STAFF TO ENSURE SUCH CONSPICUITY, INCLUDING APPROPRIATE PLANS FOR METHOD OF REMOVAL, ATTACHMENT, AND PATCHING.

3. REMOVE ALL ABANDONED EQUIPMENT & ATTACHMENTS ON THE EXTERIOR AND CAN BE REVIEWED AT THAT TIME.

4. ALL NEW PROPOSED SECURITY CAMERAS, LIGHTING, SYSTEMS, TO HAVE ALL ASSOCIATED CONDUITS TO BE ROUTED INTERNALLY IN THE BUILDING.

5. TEF TO PROVIDE DETAIL DRAWINGS FOR FIXTURES, CONDUIT, INTERNAL POWER SOURCES, SHOWING WHERE, HOW AND WITH WHAT METHOD TO A BUILDING. ALL CONDUITS EXISTING/PROPOSED WILL BE ROUTED EXTERNALLY STRUCTURE AND HOUS CONDUIT WILL BE ROUTED INTERNALLY TO A BUILDING. ALL EXISTING/PROPOSED CONDUITS WILL BE SPECIFY AND SHOWN IN PLAN VIEW. (2) SHEET DRAWING WITH EACH EXISTING/PROPOSED CONDUIT AS IN THE DRAWING.

6. SECURITY CAMERA, LIGHTING, AND ASSOCIATED CONDUITS AND FIXTURES WHICH ARE NOT LISTED IN APPROPRIATE PLANS IS NOT REQUIRED WORK.

7. EXISTING AWNINGS WITH INVALIDATING LINEAR LIGHT FIXTURES

8. PROVIDE SECURITY CAMERA, LIGHTING, AND ASSOCIATED CONDUITS AND FIXTURES WHICH ARE NOT LISTED IN APPROPRIATE PLANS IS NOT REQUIRED WORK.

9. EXISTING METAL SIGNAGE BOXES DEDICATED TO GALLERY SPACE, TYP. OF (3) TO REMAIN

10. INFILLED WINDOWS, TYP. OF (10) ON JESSIE ST. ELEVATION

11. EXISTING THICK LEG OF THE EXTERIOR WINDOWS ON PRESERVE A FRAME OF ASH MONTGOMERY ST. ELEVATION
1. Legalize the conditions presented in this plan set, unless otherwise noted.

2. Proposed work involving modifications to the exterior, including repair, demotion and installation shall be performed in a manner consistent with the existing architecture and materials of the building. The building permits for all such work will be reviewed and approved by planning, historical preservation, and fire officials to ensure such consistency, including but not limited to appropriate plans for method of removal, attachment, and patching.

3. Remove all abandoned equipment & attachments on the exterior windows along all frontages to be brought into compliance with transparency requirements.

4. All new proposed security hardware, lighting, signage, to have all associated conduit to be isolated internally in the building, no new conduit to be installed.

5. TEF to provide detail drawings for fixtures, conduit, and historical preservation staff, permits.

6. Security camera, lighting and associated conduit proposed work in these plans is not required work pursuant to the approved permits but instead is work that may pursue to replace existing devices and associated conduit subject to removal requirements.

7. Existing metal signage boxes dedicated to gallery space, type (3) to remain.

8. Infilled windows, type (2), on Jessie St. elevation.


10. Windows along all frontages to be brought into compliance with existing awnings and associated conduit to be isolated through planning.

11. Existing window signage decals and film on glazing at alcones. See photos on sheet A1 for removal scope.

12. Secondary entrance door installed.

13. Proposal under the awning; no exposed conduit. Feed the camera from inside the building, through the soffit.


15. Existing light fixtures to remain, logical associated exposed conduits.

16. Security camera, lighting and associated conduit, legal permits,

17. All conduits routed internally to a power source within the building. All fixtures for each building to be explicitly specified and shown in plan view, elevation views and a section/detail drawing with each property's DBI packages that will be routed through planning.

18. Windows associated with lighting to be internally routed.

19. Existing AUI painted copy on entrance.

20. Existing light fixtures to remain, logical associated exposed conduits.

21. Existing awnings with panaromic security camera inserted, happy.

22. Pursuant to review with planning department, historical preservation, and associated conduit to be isolated through planning.

23. Existing signs to be relocated, window signage decals and film on glazing at alcones. See photos on sheet A1 for removal scope.

24. Existing metal signage boxes dedicated to gallery space, type (3) to remain.

25. Infilled windows, type (2), on Jessie St. elevation.

26. Existing tinted film at some of the exterior windows on 3rd & 4th levels of new Montgomery St. elevation.

27. Poster frame for exhibit.

28. Rolling door (which the estm notes was replaced in 2011) provided to planning department historic preservation staff, permits.

29. Existing metal signage boxes dedicated to gallery space, type (3) to remain.

30. Infilled windows, type (2), on Jessie St. elevation.

31. Existing tinted film at some of the exterior windows on 3rd & 4th levels of new Montgomery St. elevation.

32. Poster frame for exhibit.
If this drawing is not 24" x 36", then the drawing has been revised from its original size. Noted scales must be adjusted. This line should be equal to one inch.
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REMOVE WINDOW DECALS

REMOVE WINDOW DECALS AND FILM ON GLAZING
KEYNOTES

1. ES-27. H-3.1. PROJECTING SIGNAGE LEGALLY PERMITTED TO BE CONCEALED BY)/(EXISTING FEATURES OR INTERIALLY Routed, IF POSSIBLE
2. EXISTING BULLET-STYLE SECURITY CAMERAS AND ASSOCIATED CONDUITS TO BE REMOVED, SALVAGE CAMERA EQUIPMENT FOR REINSTALL
3. REINSTALL SALVAGED CAMERA UNITS AND EXISTING COXES TO BE REMOVED, ROUTE CABLE THROUGH EXISTING BUILDING, THROUGH THE STORY INTERIALLY Routed
4. PROPOSED SINGLE SMALL FORM FACTOR DOME CAMERA; ROUTE CABLE THROUGH EXISTING BUILDING PENETRATION
5. WINDOWS ALONG ALL EXISTING AWNINGS TO BE BROUGHT INTO COMPLIANCE WITH TRANSPARENCY REQUIREMENTS OF SEC. 145.1. SEE LEVEL 1 FLOOR PLAN FOR REMOVAL SCOPE
6. EXISTING METAL SIGNAGE BOXES DEDICATED TO GALLERY SPACE, TYP. OF (3) TO REMAIN
7. INFILLED WINDOWS, TYP. OF (2) ON JESSIE ST. ELEVATION
8. EXISTING TINTED FILM AT SOME OF THE EXTERIOR WINDOWS ON 3RD & 4TH LEVELS OF NEW MONTGOMERY ST. ELEVATION

ITEMS NOTED DURING 9/25/19 SITE WALK

EXISTING METAL SIGNAGE BOXES DEDICATED TO GALLERY SPACE, TYP. OF (3) TO REMAIN

EXISTING TINTED FILM AT SOME OF THE EXTERIOR WINDOWS ON 3RD & 4TH LEVELS OF NEW MONTGOMERY ST. ELEVATION

EXISTING WINDOW STORAGE DECKS AND FOAM ON GLAZING AT 6TH FLOOR; SEE PHOTOS ON SHEET A2.1

EXISTING LIGHT FIXTURES TO REMAIN; CONCEAL EXPOSED CONDUITS

EXISTING BULLET-STYLE SECURITY CAMERAS AND ASSOCIATED CONDUITS TO BE REMOVED, SALVAGE CAMERA EQUIPMENT FOR REINSTALL

REINSTALL SALVAGED CAMERA UNITS AND EXISTING COXES TO BE REMOVED, ROUTE CABLE THROUGH EXISTING BUILDING, THROUGH THE STORY INTERIALLY Routed
Designed by architect Kenneth MacDonald, Jr., 170-180 New Montgomery Street was constructed in 1920 to serve as the San Francisco Furniture Exchange. The building was constructed for an estimated cost of $700,000 and commissioned by the Sharon Estate and Henry J. Moore, head of the city's Furniture Exchange. Upon its construction, the building was heralded in the San Francisco Chronicle as offering “a practical solution of what has been one of the city’s greatest commercial problems”—namely, that previously ‘foreign buyers landing at any Pacific Coast port and representatives of United States manufacturers and United States representatives of the Furniture Exchange’ made a long trip East to inspect furniture stocks. Once completed, space in the building was quickly filled with practically all the large manufacturers of furniture in the United States represented in the Furniture Exchange.

By the late 1960s, for at least twenty years, the building served as one of several locations in San Francisco for the offices of Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Company/Pacific Bell.
**GENERAL NOTES**

ABBR.ATIONS

(E) = EXISTING

(N) = NEW, PROPOSED

CLR. = CLEARANCE

TYP. = TYPICAL

⅊ = PROPERTY LINE

**BIKE PARKING COUNT**

CLASS II

EXISTING:

(E) BIKE PARKING SPACES

PROPOSED:

(N) BIKE PARKING SPACES

TOTAL: 16

**NOTES:**

1) BIKE RACKS IN PASSENGER LOADING ZONE ARE ACCEPTED ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS

2) ASSUMED PROPERTY LINE AT FACE OF BUILDING

**ABBREVIATIONS**

(E) = EXISTING

(N) = NEW, PROPOSED

CLR. = CLEARANCE

TYP. = TYPICAL

⅊ = PROPERTY LINE

**STREETScape DRAWINGS**
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1 BASEMENT - EXISTING

EXISTING FLOOR PLANS - BASEMENT
If this drawing is not 24" x 36", then the drawing has been revised from its original size. Noted scales must be adjusted. This line should be equal to one inch.

All drawings and written material appearing herein constitute original and unpublished work of the Architect and may not be duplicated, used or disclosed without consent of Architect.

1420 Sutter Street
San Francisco, CA  94109
T 415.391.7918  F 415.391.7309

Project Number  Scale:  Issue Date

Phase 

Print Date:

TEFarch.com

As indicated 10/12/2019 12:14:52 AM

AAU

INSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE SET

10/2019
A1.9

EXISTING FLOOR PLANS - LEVEL 8

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

EXISTING FLOOR PLANS - LEVEL 8

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

EXISTING FLOOR PLANS - LEVEL 8

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING

LEVEL 8 - EXISTING
The image contains a floor plan of a basement level labeled as "Proposed." The plan includes various rooms and areas such as a closet, freight elevator, baking room, and storage areas. The diagram is in black and white and includes various symbols and annotations to indicate different sections and areas of the basement.

Key features on the plan include:
- Storage areas
- Freight elevator
- A closet
- A baking room
- Various rooms labeled with room tags
- Areas marked as occupied floor area
- A main sump pump
- A machine room
- An elevator

The plan also includes a legend at the bottom with symbols for different types of areas and spaces, such as occupied floor area and gross floor area.

The text on the plan indicates "A2.1 PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS - BASEMENT."
Level 4 - Proposed

Legend:
- Occupied Floor Area
- Occupied Floor Area In Active Use Zone
- Gross Floor Area
- Property Line
- Room Number
- Room Name

#2 Stairs

Freight Elev.

Loading Area

[Diagram of floor plan with labels and symbols]
OCCUPIED FLOOR AREA
ROOM TAG
NAME
ROOM NUMBER
GROSS FLOOR AREA
PROPERTY LINE
OCCUPIED FLOOR AREA IN ACTIVE USE ZONE

667
STORAGE
FREIGHT ELEV.
LOADING AREA
STAIRS #2
DN
UP
STAIRS #1
LOBBY
ELEVATOR
ROOM
TEL. TERM.
RR
RR
JAN.
ELEV.
#2
ELEV.
#3
#4
ELEV.
ELEV.
#1
ELECT.

1420 Sutter Street
San Francisco, CA  94109
T 415.391.7918  F 415.391.7309
TEFarch.com

70 New Montgomery Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

As indicated
10/12/2019 12:15:19 AM

LEGEND
1/8" = 1'-0" 1/8" = 1'-0"

LEVEL 6 - PROPOSED

PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS - LEVEL 6
GENERAL NOTES
1. LEGALIZED THE CONDITIONS PREVIOUSLY FOUND AT THE SITE, UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
2. PROPOSED WORK INVOLVING MODIFICATIONS TO THE EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM, INCLUDING SIZING, EXHAUST, AND INSTALLATION SHALL BE PERFORMED BY A MAINTENANCE TECHNICIAN CONSISTENT WITH THE EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM STANDARDS. THE BUILDING HALLWAYS FOR ALL SUCH WORK WILL BE RESTORED AND RETURNED TO THEIR PREVIOUS STATE. CONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS ARE SUCH CONSISTENCY INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO SAFETY, ACCESSIBILITY, AND APPROPRIATE METHOD OF REMOVAL, ATTACHMENT, AND MOUNTING.
3. SIGNAGE BUILDING FORMAT AND LOCATION(S) OF EXISTING AND ADDITIONAL SIGNS TO BE WITHDRAWN.
4. ALL NEW PROPOSED SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEMS, INCLUDING MISCELLANEOUS CONDUITS TO BE ROUTED INTERNALLY IN THE BUILDING. SUCH CONDUITS WILL BE BURIED IN CONCRETE FLOOR SLAB OR WALL AS CONSTRUCTED.
5. IPTV TO PROVIDE DETAIL CONDUIT ROUTING FOR EXTERNAL POWER SOURCES, SHOWN WHERE WORK AND WITH WHAT METHOD. THESE ARE ATTACHED TO THE EXISTING CONDUIT SYSTEM AND SHOWN IN PLAN VIEW. ELECTRICAL VIEWS AND DETAIL DRAWING WITH EACH PROPERTY IS REQUIRED TO BE ROUTED THROUGH PLANNING AND CAN BE REVIEWED AT THAT TIME.
6. SECURITY CAMERA SITES INCLUDING EXISTING AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT PROPOSED WORK SUBJECT TO ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATE WORK PURSUANT TO THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT BUT NOT LIMITED TO SECURITY CAMERA SITES INCLUDING EXISTING AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT SUBJECT TO ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATE WORK.

KEYNOTES CONT.
1. PROPOSED ITEMS LISTED IN TABLES TO MATCH EXISTING.
2. E250, HR1 SIGNAGE LEGALLY REQUIRED TO MATCH EXISTING.
4. STORERGUARD CAMERA OVER EDGE OF ROOF OF NEW MONTGOMERY STREET AND HOWARD STREET TO BE REPAIRED AND REPAIRED DEPARTMENT STAFF TO ENSURE APPROPRIATE PLANS FOR APPROVED BY PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF TO ENSURE CONFORMITY, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO SAFETY, ACCESSIBILITY, AND APPROPRIATE METHOD OF REMOVAL, ATTACHMENT, AND MOUNTING.

MASTER SCHEDULE

KEYNOTES
1. USE IMPACT MATERIAL TO MATCH EXISTING.
2. REMOVABLE GLAZING PANELS TO MATCH EXISTING.
3. LINEAR LIGHT FIXTURE
4. SPOT LIGHT FIXTURE
5. DOWN LIGHT FIXTURE
6. WALL SCONCE DOWN LIGHT FIXTURE
7. RECESS LIGHT FIXTURE
8. PROPOSED TO BE LEGALIZED AS - EXISTING/NEW-
9. MONTGOMERY STREET LEVELS, TYP OF (10)
10. EXISTING WALL SIGN "PARK" TO BE REMOVED.
11. PARTIAL REPLACEMENT OF PARTIAL REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING SCONCE DECORATIVE GLASS GLASS PANELS TO MATCH EXISTING.
12. METAL/CONCAST PANELS TO MATCH EXISTING.
13. ALUMINUM FRAMED WINDOWS AT THE UPPER LEVELS PAINTED TO MATCH EXISTING.
14. ABOVE GROUND LEVELS, SET TO MATCH EXISTING.
15. PUBLIC FURNITURE, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO CONCRETE INSERTS, WALL AND COLUMN METAL BANDS, CONCRETE RAILING, CURB, PROJECTING ADJACENT TO MOUNTED SIGN, TO MATCH EXISTING.
16. PAINT TO MATCH EXTERIOR BLDG. COLOR
17. METAL BANDS AFFIXED TO EXTERIOR BLDG.
18. ALUMINUM FRAMED ENTRANCE TO MATCH EXISTING.
19. METAL BANDS AFFIXED TO EXTERIOR BLDG.
20. ALUMINUM FRAMED ENTRANCE TO MATCH EXISTING.

AAU INSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE SET

EXISTING/PROPOSED EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS

A3.3
Alleyways offer unique opportunities for human-scale changes more achievable than on major streets or corridors. Yerba Buena has a distinct history of transit and pedestrian use, and debates on improving the area have been ongoing for decades. In some respects, the project results could create memorable places that are safer, more inviting and ecologically sustainable. Alleyways could add public art, greening and pedestrian-focused ideas. More specifically, an alley’s use may fluctuate between pedestrian and vehicle access during different times of the day with features to signal the priority for pedestrian activity. Examples include wider sidewalks, bulb-outs, special paving, different methods for social gathering. The project is expected to be completed in 2019.
**Keynotes**

1. **Propped Tinted Glazing Panels to Match Existing**
2. **Metal Duct Vent**
3. **Railing at Roof Level**
4. **Recessed Light Fixtures at Alcove Soffits**
5. **Light Fixture**
6. **Light Benches Attached to Fixed Floor at Alcove**
7. **Window with Broken Glazing to be Repaired**
8. **Minor Protrusions (Including Light Attachments) Concentrated at Howard Street 3rd and 4th Levels in the Marked Stucco Area to be Removed**
9. **Bicycle Rack**
10. **Public Light Fixture and Associated Conduits Affixed to Concrete Column**
11. **Existing Fire Alarm Bell to be Repaired**

**Propped Tinted Glazing Panels to Match Existing**

- Metal Duct Vent
- Railing at Roof Level
- Recessed Light Fixtures at Alcove Soffits
- Light Fixture
- Light Benches Attached to Fixed Floor at Alcove
- Window with Broken Glazing to be Repaired
- Minor Protrusions (Including Light Attachments) Concentrated at Howard Street 3rd and 4th Levels in the Marked Stucco Area to be Removed
- Bicycle Rack
- Public Light Fixture and Associated Conduits Affixed to Concrete Column
- Existing Fire Alarm Bell to be Repaired

**Propped Tinted Glazing Panels to Match Existing**

- Metal Duct Vent
- Railing at Roof Level
- Recessed Light Fixtures at Alcove Soffits
- Light Fixture
- Light Benches Attached to Fixed Floor at Alcove
- Window with Broken Glazing to be Repaired
- Minor Protrusions (Including Light Attachments) Concentrated at Howard Street 3rd and 4th Levels in the Marked Stucco Area to be Removed
- Bicycle Rack
- Public Light Fixture and Associated Conduits Affixed to Concrete Column
- Existing Fire Alarm Bell to be Repaired

**Exterior Elevations Details Images**

- **A4.1**

**Phase:**

- **Issue Date:** 10/12/2019
- **Compliance:** 10/11/2019
- **Project Number:** 21823.06
- **Scale:** 1/8" = 1'-0"
ESMT CONDITIONS (CONT.)

CODE NOTES (CONT.)

C. STUDENT HOUSING CHARACTERIZATION

Exposure Planning Map reflects the updated exposure results from the noise reduction and mitigation planning. The map shows the areas impacted by noise reduction and mitigation efforts. The map is color-coded to indicate the extent of noise reduction and mitigation efforts. The map is updated annually to reflect the latest noise reduction and mitigation efforts.

FLOOR AREAS

I. RESIDENTIAL USES

- Residential
- Student Housing
- Classroom

Project Information

- San Francisco Planning Code Sections 155.1 - 155.4
- Other relevant codes and regulations

VOCABULARY

- Student Housing
- Academic and Residential用途
- Institutional and Community用途

APPLICABLE CODES

- California Building Code
- California Fire Code
- California Electro-technical Code
- California Mechanical Code

SCOPE OF WORK

- Any student housing development
- Any academic or residential development

NEW SIGNAGE PROPOSED

- Safety and Security
- Energy Efficiency
- Building Materials

COVER SHEET

- Project Name
- Address
- Contact Information

A0.0
All drawings and written material appearing herein constitute original and unpublished work of the Architect and may not be duplicated, used or disclosed without consent of Architect.
620 Sutter Street was constructed in 1918 for an estimated cost of $230,000. The seven-story brick building, designed by architect Lewis P. Hobart (1873-1954), was built for an estimated cost of $230,000. A native of St. Louis, Missouri, Hobart received his degree in architecture from the University of California. After practicing in New York for two years, he moved to California in 1906. He designed in San Francisco until his death, designing a number of notable buildings in the city, including St. Ignatius Church (1912), the Academy of Sciences (1915-1921), and the Union Square Macy’s Department Store (1918).

In his design for the new YWCA building, the San Francisco Chronicle detailed Hobart’s approach:

"Everything possible has been done by the architect, Lewis P. Hobart to make this building homelike in every respect on the theory that a structure of its kind should be in character of a large complex home rather than as a type of hotel. The design is worked out in the general interior arrangement, which separates the living from the public part of the building.

The main entrance vestibule will open into a large living-room, which will have, among other interesting features, a great open fireplace… In the rear will be an auditorium with seating capacity of 500 persons, also a gymnasium and swimming pool, the latter decorated in warm Pompeian wall colors.

Across the entire front of the second story will be a cafeteria to be open to the public at all times… Executive offices, classes and club and rest rooms will be arranged on the third floor. The next three floors will be devoted exclusively to hotel rooms for members having permanent residence in the building, and for visiting members. Separate living-rooms, serving and tea rooms will be in this section.

On the seventh floor will be the library, supper and board rooms, all convertible into large room for parties or theatrical parties.

The YWCA would occupy the building for the following 70 years, during which time it would continue to be a center of social and cultural activities. In the late 1970s, the building was sold to William Ferndon who converted the building for use as a hotel. Ownership subsequently transferred to Union Square Hotels in 2000 before the property was eventually purchased by AAU in 2005 (building permits)."
Level 5 - EXISTING

ROOM COUNT

500 2
501 2
502 2
503 2
504 2
505 2
506 1
507 2
508 2
509 2

TOTAL BED COUNTS 19

LEVEL 6 - EXISTING

ROOM COUNT

600 1
601 2
602 2
603 2
604 2
605 2
606 1
607 2
608 2
609 2

TOTAL BED COUNTS 18

LEGEND

BED COUNT

ESTM ES 20, HR 1 EASTERN AWNING TO BE REMOVED.

ESTM ES 20, HR 1 CENTRAL AWNING TO REMAIN LEGALLY PERMITTED PER PERMIT Nos. 94 FRP 972594.

REMOVE EXISTING BULLET-STYLE CAMERA AND PATHWAYS.

INSTALL SMALL FORMFACTOR DOME CAMERA WITH CUSTOM CORNER MOUNT IN THE CORNER OF THE AWNING ROUTE THE CABLE BACK THROUGH THE ENTRYWAY INTO THE BUILDING. PAINT CAMERA BODY TO MATCH EXTERIOR AWNING COLOR.

EXISTING SMALL FORMFACTOR DOME CAMERA TO REMAIN, SEE A4.2.

INSTALL SMALL FORMFACTOR DOME CAMERA WITH INTERNALLY ROUTED CONDUIT.

LIGHT FIXTURES AT BELTCOURSE SHALL BE REMOVED.

PROPOSED LIGHT FIXTURE, ATTACH AT MORTAR JOINTS.

36" DW EXISTING AAU AWNING SIGNAGE.

58" x 21" EXISTING AAU AWNING SIGNAGE.

RESTORE EXISTING "YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION" ENGRAVING.

VENTILATION SYSTEMS TO BE LEGALIZED AS IS.

ITEMS BELOW NOTED DURING 9/25/19 SITE WALK.

*SEE PHOTOS ON SHEET A4.1, A4.2.

EXISTING LIGHT FIXTURES AT (3) ALCOVES DO NOT MATCH. AAU TO PROVIDE CONSISTENT LIGHT FIXTURES.

REMOVE EXISTING LIGHT FIXTURES BEYOND PROPOSED RECESSED LIGHT FIXTURE IN SOFFIT.

FACADE MATERIALS DAMAGE IDENTIFIED AT THE ENTRY AREA, SEE SHEET A4.2.

© Copyright 2018. All Rights Reserved. TEF Design, Inc.

1420 Sutter Street
San Francisco, CA 94109
T 415.391.7918  F 415.391.7309

TEFdesign.com
1. Legalize the conditions presented in this Plan Set, unless otherwise noted.

2. Proposed work involving modifications to the exterior of the building, including repairs, demolition, and installation of work, is performed in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The building permits for all such work will be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department staff.

3. Perforations to and damage areas in the masonry of the ornamental door surrounds shall be patched, repaired, and restored to match existing appearance (color, texture, detailing).

4. Repairs, patching, and refinishing the exterior wall to match existing materials and appearance as required.

5. The business sign is proposed at a residential property with student housing use characteristic under the definition of student housing. The Academy of Art respectfully submits that the Section 602 definition of "business sign" covers the Academy of Art's activity which is conducted on the premises upon which the business sign is located.

6. TEF to provide detail drawings for fixtures, conduit, and internal power sources, showing where, how, and why these fixtures and conduits are attached to the structure and how conduit will be routed to a power source within the building. Each property will be explicitly specified and shown in plan to ensure compliance.

7. Security camera, lighting, and associated conduit proposed work in these plans is not required work pursuant to the Development Agreement, but instead is work that may be pursued to replace existing security cameras, lighting, and associated conduit subject to removal requirements.

GENERAL NOTES

No. Date Description

1/8" = 1'-0" 1/8" = 1'-0"
1. Legalize the conditions presented in this plan set, unless otherwise noted.

2. Proposed work involving modifications to the exterior of the building, including repair, demolition, and installation shall be performed in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's standards. The building repair, demolition, and installation will be reviewed and approved by Planning Department staff to ensure these changes are consistent but not limited to appropriate plans for method of removal, attachment, and patching.

3. Perforations to and damaged areas in the masonry of the ornamental door surrounds shall be patched, repaired, and restored to match existing appearance (color, texture, detailing).

4. Repair, patch, and refinish the exterior wall to match existing materials and appearance as required.

5. The business sign is proposed at a residential property with student housing use characteristics under the Section 102 definition of student housing. The Academy of Art respectfully submits that the Section 602 definition of "business sign" covers the Academy of Art's intent for the sign. The Academy of Art's intent is to conduct an operation and control by a post-secondary educational institution (i.e., a business) upon the premises upon which the business sign is located.

6. TEF to provide detailing drawings for fixtures, conduit, and internal power sources. Showings, where applicable, are to be labeled. Each building to be explicitly specified and shown in plan view. (2) Elevation views and a sectional detail drawing with TEF to provide details that will be routed through planning and can be reviewed at that time.

7. Security camera, lighting, and associated conduit proposed work in P-B-E plans is not subject to removal per the Development Agreement. However, work may be pursued to replace existing security cameras, lighting, and associated conduit subject to removal requirements.

See Sht. A3.3 for keynotes.
1. LEGALIZE THE CONDITIONS PRESENTED IN THIS PLAN SET, UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.

2. PROPOSED WORK INVOLVING MODIFICATIONS TO THE EXTERIOR OF THE BUILDING, INCLUDING REPAIR, DEMOLITION, AND INSTALLATION OF FIXTURES, CONDUIT, AND INTERNAL POWER SOURCES, WILL BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF TO ENSURE SUCH CONSISTENCY, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, APPROPRIATE PLANS FOR METHOD OF REMOVAL, ATTACHMENT, AND PATCHING.

3. PERFORATIONS TO AND DAMAGED AREAS IN THE MASONRY OF THE ORNAMENTAL DOOR SURROUNDS SHALL BE PATCHED, REPAIRED AND RESTORED TO MATCH EXISTING APPEARANCE (COLOR, TEXTURE, DETAILING).

4. SECURE PATCH AND REFRESH THE EXTERIOR WALLS TO MATCH EXISTING MATERIALS AND APPEARANCE AS REQUIRED.


6. TEF TO PROVIDE DETAIL DRAWINGS FOR FIXTURES, CONDUIT, AND INTERNAL POWER SOURCES, SHOWING WHERE, HOW AND WITH WHAT METHOD THESE ARE ATTACHED TO THE STRUCTURE. ALL FIXTURES FOR EACH BUILDING TO BE EXPLICITLY SPECIFIED AND SHOWN IN PLAN VIEW, (2) ELEVATION VIEWS AND A SECTION/DETAIL DRAWING WITH EACH PROPERTY'S DBI PACKAGES THAT WILL BE ROUTED THROUGH PLANNING AND CAN BE REVIEWED AT THAT TIME.

7. SECURITY CAMERA, LIGHTING AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT. PROPOSED WORK IS NOT REQUIRED WORK PURSUANT TO THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT, BUT INSTEAD IS WORK THAT MAY PURLIANCE TO REPLACE EXISTING SECURITY CAMERAS, LIGHTING AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT SUBJECT TO REMOVAL REQUIREMENTS.

KEYNOTES

SEE SHEET A3.3 FOR KEYNOTES
ESTM ES-20, HR-1 EASTERN AWNING TO BE REMOVED.

- REMOVE EXISTING BULLET-STYLE CAMERA AND PATHWAYS.
- INSTALL SMALL DOME CAMERA WITH CUSTOM CORNED MOUNT IN THE CORNER OF THE AWNING. ROUTE THE CABLE BACK THROUGH THE EXISTING SMALL FORMFACTOR DOME CAMERA BODY TO MATCH EXTERIOR AWNING COLOR.
- EXISTING SMALL FORMFACTOR DOME CAMERA TO REMAIN, SEE SHT. 3/A3.2.
- INSTALL SMALL DOME CAMERA WITH INTERNALLY ROUTED CONDUIT.
- LIGHT FIXTURES AT BELTCOURSE SHALL BE REMOVED.
- REMOVE EXISTING LIGHT FIXTURES BEYOND PROPOSED RECESSED LIGHT FIXTURE IN SOFFIT.
- RESTORE EXISTING "YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION" ENGRAVING.
- VENTILATION SYSTEMS TO BE LEGALIZED AS-15.

ITEMS BELOW NOTED DURING SITE WALK:
- EXISTING LIGHT FIXTURES AT (3) ALCOVES DO NOT MATCH. AAU TO PROVIDE CONSISTENT LIGHT FIXTURES.
- FACADE MATERIALS DAMAGE IDENTIFIED AT THE ENTRY AREA, SEE SHT. A4.2.

EXISTING LIGHT FIXTURES AT (3) ALLOWED TO NOT MATCH AAU TO PROVIDE CONSISTENT LIGHT FIXTURES.

ITEMS BELOW NOTED DURING SITE WALK:
- EXISTING LIGHT FIXTURES AT (3) ALCOVES DO NOT MATCH. AAU TO PROVIDE CONSISTENT LIGHT FIXTURES.
- FACADE MATERIALS DAMAGE IDENTIFIED AT THE ENTRY AREA, SEE SHT. A4.2.

EXISTING LIGHT FIXTURES AT (3) ALLOWED TO NOT MATCH AAU TO PROVIDE CONSISTENT LIGHT FIXTURES.

ITEMS BELOW NOTED DURING SITE WALK:
- EXISTING LIGHT FIXTURES AT (3) ALCOVES DO NOT MATCH. AAU TO PROVIDE CONSISTENT LIGHT FIXTURES.
- FACADE MATERIALS DAMAGE IDENTIFIED AT THE ENTRY AREA, SEE SHT. A4.2.

EXISTING LIGHT FIXTURES AT (3) ALLOWED TO NOT MATCH AAU TO PROVIDE CONSISTENT LIGHT FIXTURES.

ITEMS BELOW NOTED DURING SITE WALK:
- EXISTING LIGHT FIXTURES AT (3) ALCOVES DO NOT MATCH. AAU TO PROVIDE CONSISTENT LIGHT FIXTURES.
- FACADE MATERIALS DAMAGE IDENTIFIED AT THE ENTRY AREA, SEE SHT. A4.2.

EXISTING LIGHT FIXTURES AT (3) ALLOWED TO NOT MATCH AAU TO PROVIDE CONSISTENT LIGHT FIXTURES.

ITEMS BELOW NOTED DURING SITE WALK:
- EXISTING LIGHT FIXTURES AT (3) ALCOVES DO NOT MATCH. AAU TO PROVIDE CONSISTENT LIGHT FIXTURES.
- FACADE MATERIALS DAMAGE IDENTIFIED AT THE ENTRY AREA, SEE SHT. A4.2.

EXISTING LIGHT FIXTURES AT (3) ALLOWED TO NOT MATCH AAU TO PROVIDE CONSISTENT LIGHT FIXTURES.
**FLORAL AREAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Required Conditions of Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CODE NOTES**

**REFERENCE: SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING CODE AS EXISTING ON JANUARY 1, 2019.**

**EXTERIOR VIEW**

**SHEET INDEX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sheet</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1.2</td>
<td>EXISTING FLOOR PLANS - LEVELS 2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1.3</td>
<td>EXISTING FLOOR PLANS - LEVEL 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1</td>
<td>PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS - BASEMENT &amp; LEVELS 2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.2</td>
<td>PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS - LEVEL 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3.1</td>
<td>EXTERIOR ELEVATION IMAGES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4.1</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING DESIGN SUMMARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4.2</td>
<td>GENERAL NOTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4.3</td>
<td>CONTRACT DOCUMENT ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5.1</td>
<td>SF DBI ISSUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5.2</td>
<td>SF PLC ISSUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6.1</td>
<td>HISTORIC PRESERVATION HISTORY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROPERTY INFORMATION**

- **ADDRESS:** 79 New Montgomery Street
- **SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109**
- **T 415.391.7918  F 415.391.7309**
- **TEFarch.com**

**APPLICABLE CODES**

- **ALL WORK SHALL COMPLY WITH THE APPLICABLE CODES, AMENDMENTS, RULES, REGULATIONS, ORDINANCES, LAWS, ORDERS, APPLICABLE TO THAT ARE REQUIRED BY PUBLIC OFFICIALS TO INSPECT AND ADVISE THE PROJECT**
- **HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION REQUIREMENTS INCLUDE, BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO THE CURRENT APPLICABLE SIGNATURES OR PUBLICATIONS OF THE FOLLOWING (OR OTHERWISE NOTED):**
  - 2016 SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE
  - PART 1: 2016 CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE
  - PART 2: 2016 CALIFORNIA MECHANICAL CODE
  - PART 3: 2016 CALIFORNIA ELECTRICAL CODE
  - PART 4: 2016 CALIFORNIA PLUMBING CODE
  - 2016 CALIFORNIA SAFETY REVISIONS
  - 2016 CALIFORNIA FIRE CODE

**PROJECT SCOPE**

Pursuant to Case Number 2016-054, the Project is Proposed to change the use of the Building from Historic of Use, SUTTER not currently entitled for post-secondary educational use to post-secondary educational use. The following rules apply to the Project:

1. The building is proposed to be used as a post-secondary education facility with the following conditions:
   - All structural, electrical, mechanical, and HVAC systems shall be in good working order.
   - All plumbing and HVAC systems shall be in compliance with the California Plumbing Code.
   - All electrical systems shall be in compliance with the California Electrical Code.
   - All mechanical systems shall be in compliance with the California Mechanical Code.

2. The building shall be equipped with a fire suppression system.

3. The building shall comply with all applicable state and local codes, including but not limited to the California Building Code, the California Fire Code, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the California Public Resources Code.

4. The building shall be accessible to people with disabilities, including wheelchair accessibility.

5. The building shall be equipped with emergency lighting and sprinkler systems.

6. The building shall be equipped with security cameras and other security systems.

7. The building shall be equipped with a security plan.

**TABLE 210.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTIONAL: POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAXIMUM ALLOWED GROSS SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLOOR AREA RATIO (PER SECTION 210.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G FAR X LOT AREA = 6.0 X 6,662 SF = 39,972 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FLOOR AREA REVIEW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Existing (SF)</th>
<th>Proposed (SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 4</td>
<td>5,052</td>
<td>5,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 3</td>
<td>5,052</td>
<td>5,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASEMENT</td>
<td>4,642</td>
<td>4,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROSS SF TOTAL</td>
<td>24,917</td>
<td>24,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 2</td>
<td>4,357</td>
<td>4,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCUPIED SF TOTAL</td>
<td>20,564</td>
<td>20,564</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 1921, Meyers commissioned the firm to design 625-629 Sutter. When it was completed in 1925, four years later, the San Francisco Chronicle reported that: "the building, which is the workmanship of Samuel Lightner Hyman and Abraham Appleton, architects, is a new departure in store buildings, representing a rich, old Spanish structure appealing to the aesthetic rather than the commercial taste."

Ownership of the building changed on numerous occasions in subsequent decades, with various improvements undertaken by each occupant. Building permits indicate that, as of 1929, the building was owned by F.M. Gilberd, who in April of that year added a one-story addition to the rear in 1929. By October of that year, D.R. Eisenbach was listed as the owner; ten years later, in 1939, it was owned by S. Weisser. During the 1940s, the American Red Cross and the U.S. Army occupied the building.

The building was owned by Herbert W. and Barbara F. Richards by April of 1946 before it transferred again to new owners Walter & Rose in October of that year. In 1959, U.P. Channon took ownership of the building, and in 1968, AAU took ownership of the building. Since that time, it has completed a number of alterations, most notably to the storefronts on the main (north) elevation.
If this drawing is not 24" x 36", then the drawing has been revised from its original size. Noted scales must be adjusted. This line should be equal to one inch.

All drawings and written material appearing herein constitute original and unpublished work of the Architect and may not be duplicated, used or disclosed without consent of Architect.

1420 Sutter Street
San Francisco, CA 94109
T 415.391.7918  F 415.391.7309

1/8" = 1'-0"
PER DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT, GALLERY SPACE IS A RETAIL USE ACCESSORY TO AAU POST-SECONDARY EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONAL USE HOWEVER, SPACE TO BE OPEN TO THE PUBLIC AT LEAST 40 HOURS PER WEEK, 10 MONTHS OUT OF EACH YEAR, PROVIDED THAT AAU MAY AT A LATER DATE SEEK DISCRETIONARY APPROVALS TO CONVERT SPACE TO A USE NOT MEETING ABOVE DESCRIBED PUBLIC ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS.

EXCEPTION REQUESTED FOR THE STUDIO WALLS BEING IN 25 FT ZONE.
If this drawing is not 24" x 36", then the drawing has been revised from its original size. Noted scales must be adjusted. This line should be equal to one inch.

All drawings and written material appearing herein constitute original and unpublished work of the Architect and may not be duplicated, used or disclosed without consent of Architect.
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79 New Montgomery Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

1/8" = 1'-0"

INSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE SET

SOURCE: ESTM Case No. 2008.0586E - Appendix HR
SOURCE: ESTM Case No. 2008.0586E - Appendix HR
SOURCE: ESTM Case No. 2008.0586E - Appendix HR

NORTH ELEVATION (1964)
NORTH ELEVATION (1976)
NORTH ELEVATION (UNKNOWN DATE)

SOURCE: ESTM Case No. 2008.0586E - Appendix HR
SOURCE: ESTM Case No. 2008.0586E - Appendix HR
SOURCE: ESTM Case No. 2008.0586E - Appendix HR

HISTORICAL EXTERIOR ELEVATION IMAGES

SOURCE: ESTM Case N0. 2008.0586E - Appendix HR
SOURCE: ESTM Case N0. 2008.0586E - Appendix HR
SOURCE: ESTM Case N0. 2008.0586E - Appendix HR

SOURCE: ESTM Case N0. 2008.0586E - Appendix HR
SOURCE: ESTM Case N0. 2008.0586E - Appendix HR
SOURCE: ESTM Case N0. 2008.0586E - Appendix HR
1. ESTM ES 20. HR-1 SIGNAGE DETAIN EXISTING PROJECTING SIGN.
2. ESTM ES 20. HR-2 AWNINGS TO BE REMOVED USING GENTLEST MEANS POSSIBLE.
3. RESTORE TRANSOM AND LEAVE ORIGINAL MUNTIN DETAIL. GLAZING TO BE TRANSPARENT.
4. ESTM ES 20. HR-4 NON-EXISTING WINDOW CONDITION TO BE REMOVED IN GENTLEST MEANS POSSIBLE.
5. STOREFRONTS TO ALLOW FOR TRANSPARENCY INTO THE BUILDING. OBSTRUCTIONS TO BE REMOVED.
6. LOCATION OF STOREFRONT AND TRANSOM WINDOWS REMOVED AND/OR FILLED WITH PLYWOOD PANELS.
7. WINDOWS TO BE RESTORED. REPAIR AND REFINISH SURFACE AND MATERIALS TO MATCH EXISTING.
8. INSTALL NEW WOOD CASEMENT WINDOW WITH SASH AND MUNTINS TO MATCH ORIGINAL HISTORIC PROFILES SUBJECT TO SCHEDULE OF PERFORMANCE.
9. EXISTING TRACK FLOOD LIGHTS.
10. REMOVE EXISTING TRACK FLOOD LIGHTS AND ASSOCIATED CONDUITS.
11. EXISTING LINEAR LIGHT FIXTURES AND ASSOCIATED CONDUITS TO BE REMOVED.
12. Transom Glazing Covered with Wood Panels.
13. BROKEN WINDOW GLAZING TO BE REPLACED.
14. EXISTING LIGHT FIXTURES AND ASSOCIATED CONDUITS TO BE REMOVED.
15. PROPOSED NON-ILLUMINATED AAU BUSINESS WINDOW SIGN. SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWING.
16. EXISTING IDENTIFYING SIGN. AAU 15" X 18" PLAQUE.
17. TRANSOM GLAZING COVERED WITH WOOD PANELS.
1. LEGALIZE THE CONDITIONS FOR EXISTING SECURITY CAMERAS. SECURITY CAMERAS MUST BE COMPATIBLE WITH THE GREATEST EXTENT POSSIBLE AND ALL MOUNTING MOUNTED INTERNALLY OR CONCEALED BEHIND EXISTING FEATURES. INSTALLATIONS SHOULD CONFORM TO THE CURRENT NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE. NEW OR RETAINED LIGHTING FIXTURES MUST BE SPECIFIED AND MATCHING DETAILS THAT DEMONSTRATE THAT LIGHTS ARE ATTACHED VIA MORTAR JOINTS AND NOT DRILLED DIRECTLY INTO MASONRY/MIX.
2. PROPOSED LIGHTING SHOULD BE LIMITED TO THE GREATEST EXTENT POSSIBLE AND ALL LIGHTING MOUNTED INTERNALLY OR CONCEALED BEHIND EXISTING FEATURES & INSTALLATIONS SHOWN. NEW OR RETAINED LIGHTING FIXTURES ATTACHMENT DETAILS THAT DEMONSTRATE THAT LIGHTS ARE ATTACHED VIA MORTAR JOINTS AND NOT DRILLED DIRECTLY INTO MASONRY/MIX.
3. REMOVER/REPLACE EXISTING LIGHTING TO MATCH EXISTING MATERIALS AND APPEARANCE AS REQUIRED.
4. REPLACEMENT AND REFRESH THE EXTERIOR WALL TO MATCH EXISTING MATERIALS AND APPEARANCE AS REQUIRED.
5. PROPOSED WORK/REPAIR MODIFICATIONS TO EXTERIOR WALL TO MATCH EXISTING MATERIALS AND APPEARANCE AS REQUIRED.
6. PROPOSED WORK/REPAIR MODIFICATIONS TO EXTERIOR WALL TO MATCH EXISTING MATERIALS AND APPEARANCE AS REQUIRED.
7. ALL NEW PROPOSED SECURITY CAMERA LIGHTING, SIGNAGE, TO MATCH ALL ASSOCIATED MASONRY/BRICK, AND INTERNAL CONDUITS TO BE ROUTED INTERNALLY IN THE BUILDING. NO NEW CONDUIT TO BE REMOVED.
8. SECURITY CAMERA LIGHTING AND ASSOCIATED CONDUITS TO BE REPLACED.
9. SECURITY CAMERA LIGHTING AND ASSOCIATED CONDUITS TO BE INTERNAL CONDUIT SUBJECT TO REMOVAL REQUIREMENTS.
ADJACENT PROPERTY SHOWN DASHED

1. **EXISTING/PROPOSED EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS**

   - SOUTH ELEVATION - PROPERTY LINE
   - WEST ELEVATION - PROPERTY LINE
   - EAST ELEVATION - PROPERTY LINE

**GENERAL NOTES**

SEE SHEET A3.2 FOR GENERAL NOTES

**KEYNOTES**

1. **EXISTING/PROPOSED**

   - SOUTH ELEVATION - PROPERTY LINE

   - WEST ELEVATION - PROPERTY LINE

   - EAST ELEVATION - PROPERTY LINE

   - ADJACENT PROPERTY SHOWN DASHED

   - SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"
REPAIR AND REFINISH MATERIALS TO MATCH EXISTING. INSTALL NEW WOOD CASEMENT WINDOW WITH SASH AND MUNTINS TO MATCH ORIGINAL HISTORIC PROFILES.

PARTIAL ENLARGED NORTH ELEVATION (EXISTING)

PARTIAL ENLARGED NORTH ELEVATION (PROPOSED)

GENERAL NOTES

SEE SHEET A3.2 FOR GENERAL NOTES

KEYNOTES

SEE SHEET A3.2 FOR KEYNOTES

WINDOW SCOPE

SEE SHEET A3.2 FOR WINDOW SCOPE

1/4" = 1'-0"
1. ESTM ES-22, HR-1 SIGNAGE RETAIN EXISTING PROJECTING SIGN
2. ESTM ES-22, HR-2 AWNINGS TO BE REMOVED USING GENTLEST MEANS POSSIBLE
3. RESTORE TRANSOMS AND LEAVE ORIGINAL MUNTIN DETAIL; GLAZING TO BE TRANSPARENT
4. ESTM ES-22, HR-4 NON-ORIGINAL WINDOW CONDITION TO BE REMOVED IN GENTLEST MEANS POSSIBLE
5. STOREFRONTS TO ALLOW FOR TRANSPARENCY INTO THE BUILDING; OBSTRUCTIONS TO BE REMOVED.
6. LOCATION OF STOREFRONT AND TRANSOM WINDOWS REMOVED AND/OR IN-FILLED WITH PLYWOOD PANELS; WINDOWS TO BE RESTORED.
7. REPAIR AND REFINISH SURFACE AND MATERIALS TO MATCH EXISTING
8. INSTALL NEW WOOD CASEMENT WINDOW WITH SASH AND MUNTINS TO MATCH ORIGINAL HISTORIC PROFILES SUBJECT TO SCHEDULE OF PERFORMANCE
9. EXISTING TRACK FLOOD LIGHTS REMOVE EXISTING TRACK FLOOD LIGHTS AND ASSOCIATED CONDUITS
10. DECORATIVE PEDESTRIAN LEVEL LIGHT FIXTURE
11. RECESSED LIGHT FIXTURE IN SOFFIT
12. EXISTING REAR METAL STAIRS PARTICIPATE IN HISTORIC RAILING
13. PROPOSED NON-ILLUMINATED AAU BUSINESS WINDOW SIGN SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS
14. ITEMS NOTED ON 9/25/19 SITE WALK: SEE IMAGES ON SHEET A4.2
15. EXISTING IDENTIFYING SIGN: AAU 15" x 18" PLAQUE
16. TRANSOM GLAZING COVERED WITH WOOD PANELS
17. BROKEN WINDOW GLAZING TO BE REPLACED
18. EXISTING LINEAR LIGHT FIXTURES AND ASSOCIATED CONDUITS TO BE REMOVED.
INSTALL NEW 2nd Surface Vinyl Graphics

THIS DRAWING IS ONLY SHOWING SIGNAGE LOGOS ON GLAZING. SEE ARCHITECTURAL ELEVATION FOR ALL OTHER SCOPE.

2nd Surface Vinyl Window Signs (OPTION B) QTY 2

Scale: 1-1/2" = 1' - 0"

SURVEY REQUIRED NOT FOR PRODUCTION
655 Sutter was completed in 1913 and would have numerous owners and tenants over the following decades. As of 1946, the property was owned by Dr. Francis B. Quinn. By 1955, Quinn had converted the apartment building into an office building, primarily oriented towards medical offices. Quinn renovated the entrance and lobby in 1961. Subsequent owners include Anthony Martinis and Sutter Medical, and various financial institutions. A number of tenants occupied spaces within the building, including the American Institute of Wine and Food, Paralegal Training and Resource Center, and an unknown bar that altered the eastern ground-level storefront in 1986. Since AAU took ownership of the building in 1999, AAU changed the use of the property from office to residential and completed multiple alterations including installation of a box sign and new lighting and materials along the eastern ground-level storefront.
CAFE & RESTAURANT (URBAN KNIGHTS ART CAFE) IS PRIMARILY USED AND INTENDED FOR AAU STUDENTS (RESTAURANT USE ACCESSORY TO POST-SECONDARY EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION); HOWEVER, CURRENTLY THE CAFE IS OPEN AND AVAILABLE TO INTERESTED MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC. PER DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT, STOREFRONT IS A RETAIL USE ACCESSORY TO AAU POST-SECONDARY INSTITUTIONAL USE; HOWEVER, STOREFRONT TO BE OPEN TO THE PUBLIC AT AT LEAST 40 HOURS PER WEEK, 10 MONTHS OUT OF EACH YEAR, PROVIDED THAT AAU MAY AT A LATER DATE SEEK DISCRETIONARY APPROVALS TO CONVERT SPACE TO A USE NOT MEETING ABOVE DESCRIBED PUBLIC ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS.
Cafe & Restaurant (Urban Knight Art Cafe) is primarily used and intended for AAU students (restaurant use accessory to post-secondary educational institution); however, currently, the space is open and available to interested members of the public.

For development agreement, storefront is a retail use accessory to the post-secondary institutional use. However, storefront to be open to the public at least 40 hours per week, 10 months out of each year, provided that AAU may, at a later date, seek discretionary approval to convert space to a use not meeting above described public accessibility standards.

If this drawing is not 24" x 36", then the drawing has been revised from its original size. Noted scales must be adjusted. This line should be equal to one inch.
Level 6 - Proposed

- **Bedrooms:**
  - Bedroom 603: 4
  - Bedroom 604: 2
  - Bedroom 605: 3
  - Bedroom 606: 4
  - Bedroom 606A: 1
  - Bedroom 607: 1
  - Bedroom 610: 2
  - Bedroom 610A: 4
  - Bedroom 610B: 4

- **Total Bed Counts:** 25

**Legend:**
- **Proposed Floor Plans - Level 6**
- **Bedroom**
- **Common Room**
- **Kitchen**
- **Computer Room**
- **Refrigerator Room**
- **(E) Fire Escape**
- **Group Housing RM (52)**
- **Group Housing RM (53)**
- **Group Housing RM (54)**
- **(E) Fire Escape**

**Scale:** 1/8" = 1'-0"
If this drawing is not 24" x 36", then the drawing has been revised from its original size. Noted scales must be adjusted. This line should be equal to one inch.
The facade, storefront, window sashes, and surrounds should be painted in lighter hues to be compatible with the district’s color palette in accordance with Article 11.

Security cameras and existing flex conduit pathways to be removed.

Goose neck light fixtures to be removed.

Remove existing signage.

Remove existing linear light fixtures.

Relocate security camera to directly above conduit penetration hose through the building.

New lamp at existing recessed fixtures in alcove above.

New lamp at existing recessed alcove.

Proposed non-illuminated AAU business projecting sign; “ACADEMY OF ART UNIVERSITY STUDENT STORE.” See signage consultant drawings.

Proposed non-illuminated AAU business projecting sign; “ACADEMY OF ART UNIVERSITY ART CAFE.” See signage consultant drawings.

Items noted on 9/25/19 site walk:

The facade, storefront, window sashes, and surrounds at street level should be painted in lighter hues to be compatible with the district’s color palette in accordance with Article 11.

Remove existing signage.

Remove existing linear light fixtures.

Relocate security camera to directly above conduit penetration hose through the building.

New lamp at existing recessed fixtures in alcove above.

New lamp at existing recessed alcove.

Proposed non-illuminated AAU business projecting sign; “ACADEMY OF ART UNIVERSITY STUDENT STORE.” See signage consultant drawings.

Proposed non-illuminated AAU business projecting sign; “ACADEMY OF ART UNIVERSITY ART CAFE.” See signage consultant drawings.

Items noted on 9/25/19 site walk:

The facade, storefront, window sashes, and surrounds at street level should be painted in lighter hues to be compatible with the district’s color palette in accordance with Article 11.

Remove existing signage.

Remove existing linear light fixtures.

Relocate security camera to directly above conduit penetration hose through the building.

New lamp at existing recessed fixtures in alcove above.

New lamp at existing recessed alcove.

Proposed non-illuminated AAU business projecting sign; “ACADEMY OF ART UNIVERSITY STUDENT STORE.” See signage consultant drawings.

Proposed non-illuminated AAU business projecting sign; “ACADEMY OF ART UNIVERSITY ART CAFE.” See signage consultant drawings.

Items noted on 9/25/19 site walk:

The facade, storefront, window sashes, and surrounds at street level should be painted in lighter hues to be compatible with the district’s color palette in accordance with Article 11.

Remove existing signage.

Remove existing linear light fixtures.

Relocate security camera to directly above conduit penetration hose through the building.

New lamp at existing recessed fixtures in alcove above.

New lamp at existing recessed alcove.

Proposed non-illuminated AAU business projecting sign; “ACADEMY OF ART UNIVERSITY STUDENT STORE.” See signage consultant drawings.

Proposed non-illuminated AAU business projecting sign; “ACADEMY OF ART UNIVERSITY ART CAFE.” See signage consultant drawings.

Items noted on 9/25/19 site walk:

The facade, storefront, window sashes, and surrounds at street level should be painted in lighter hues to be compatible with the district’s color palette in accordance with Article 11.
1. LEGALIZE THE CONDITIONS PREVAILING IN THIS PLAN SET, UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.

2. PROPOSED WORK INVOLVING MODIFICATIONS TO THE EXISTING BUILDING, INCLUDING REPAIR, DEMOLITION, AND INSTALLATION SHALL BE CONSISTENT WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE CITY'S STANDARDS. THE BUILDING CONFORMS TO ALL SUCH WORK. WORK NOT APPROVED BY PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF TO TRIM EXISTING BLDG MOLDING.

3. SEPARATE AND REFRESH THE EXISTING WALL TO MATCH EXISTING MATERIALS AND APPEARANCE AS REQUIRED.

4. THE BUSINESS SIGN IS PROPOSED AT A RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY. WITH STUDENT HOUSING USE CHARACTERISTIC TO THE AREA, THIS SIGN IS PROPOSED AT A RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY. THE SIGNAGE SHALL BE COURTESY OF HOURS UNDER THE CARE AND CONTROL OF THE OWNER OF THE PROPERTY.

5. ALTERATIONS TO THE STOREFRONT ARE NOT PERMITTED.

6. ALL NEW SECURITY CAMERA CONSIDERED TO BE INTERIOR WITHOUT EXPOSED CONDUIT.

7. ALL NEW LIGHTING CONSIDERED TO BE INTERIOR WITHOUT EXPOSED CONDUIT.

8. SEE STORAGE DETAIL FOR INTERIOR CONSIDERATION OF MATERIALS, CONSIDERED TO BE INTERIOR WITHOUT EXPOSED CONDUIT.

9. SECURITY CAMERA, LIGHTING, AND ASSOCIATED CONSIDERED TO BE INTERIOR WITHOUT EXPOSED CONDUIT. WORK TO BE COMPLETED TO REQUISITE SAFETY AND SECURITY REQUIREMENTS.

10. SECURITY CAMERAS AND AUXILIARY FIXTURES TO BE PROVIDED.

11. SECURITY CAMERAS TO BE AUTHORIZED BY THE SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.

12. SECURITY CAMERAS TO BE AUTHORIZED BY THE SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.

13. SECURITY CAMERAS TO BE AUTHORIZED BY THE SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.

14. SECURITY CAMERAS TO BE AUTHORIZED BY THE SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.

15. SECURITY CAMERAS TO BE AUTHORIZED BY THE SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.
1. LEGALIZE THE CONDITIONS PRESENTED IN THIS PLAN SET UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED
2. PROPOSED WORK INVOLVING MODIFICATIONS TO THE EXTERIOR OF THE BUILDING, INCLUDING REPAIR, DEMOLITION, REPLACEMENT, OR INSTALLATION, SHALL BE PERFORMED IN A MANNER CONSISTENT WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S STANDARDS. THE BUILDING PERMITS FOR ALL SUCH WORK WILL BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF TO ENSURE SUCH CONSISTENCY, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, APPROPRIATE PLANS FOR METHOD OF REMOVAL, ATTACHMENT AND PATCHING.

3. REPAIR/PATCH AND REFINISH THE EXTERIOR WALL TO MATCH EXISTING MATERIALS AND APPEARANCE AS REQUIRED.

4. THE BUSINESS SIGN IS PROPOSED AT A RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY WITH STUDENT HOUSING USE CHARACTERISTIC UNDER THE RATIONALE THAT THE SECTION 102 DEFINITION OF STUDENT HOUSING CONTEMPLATES "OPERATION AND CONTROL" BY A POST-SECONDARY EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION (I.E. A BUSINESS). AAU RESPECTFULLY SUBMITS THAT THE SECTION 602 DEFINITION OF "BUSINESS SIGN" COVERS AAU'S "ACTIVITY WHICH IS...CONDUCTED ON THE PREMISES UPON WHICH [THE BUSINESS] SIGN IS LOCATED."

5. ALTEPRATIONS TO THE STOREFRONT MADE WITHOUT PERMIT, INCLUDING ADDITION OF BLACK TILING, A BENCH, AND MODIFIED STOREFRONT DESIGN, TO BE LEGALIZED AS IS.

6. ALL NEW SECURITY CAMERA CONDUIT TO BE INTERNALLY ROUTED. NO EXTERIOR EXPOSED CONDUIT.

7. ALL NEW LIGHTING CONDUIT TO BE INTERNALLY ROUTED UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.

8. TEF TO PROVIDE DETAIL DRAWINGS FOR EXTERIORS, CONDUIT, AND INTERNAL POWER SOURCES, SHOWING WHERE, HOW AND WITH WHAT METHOD THESE ARE ATTACHED TO THE STRUCTURE AND HOW CONDUIT WILL BE ROUTED INTERNALLY TO A POWER SOURCE位於 THE BUILDING AND EACH PROPERTY'S DBI PACKAGES THAT WILL BE ROUTED THROUGH PLANNING AND CAN BE REVIEWED AT THAT TIME.

9. SECURITY CAMERA, LIGHTING AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT PROPOSED IN THESE PLANS IS NOT REQUIRED WORK PURSUANT TO THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT, BUT IS UNDER CONSIDERATION TO REPLACE EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA, LIGHTING AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT SUPPLIES IDENTIFIED.

GENERAL NOTES:

WEST ELEVATION - PROPERTY LINE (EXISTING/PROPOSED)

SOUTH ELEVATION - PROPERTY LINE (EXISTING/PROPOSED)

EAST ELEVATION - PROPERTY LINE (EXISTING/PROPOSED)

ACCEPTANCE 10/11/19 11:03:32 PM

AAU
RESIDENTIAL COMPLIANCE SET

1420 Sutter Street
San Francisco, CA  94109

T 415.391.7918  F 415.391.7309

A3.3
If this drawing is not 24" x 36", then the drawing has been revised from its original size. Noted scales must be adjusted. This line should be equal to one inch.

All drawings and written material appearing herein constitute original and unpublished work of the Architect and may not be duplicated, used or disclosed without consent of Architect.

---

**KEYNOTES**

1. ESTIM ES 21, HR 1 SIGNAGE TO REMAIN, PROVIDE INTERNALLY ROUTED CONDUIT.
2. ESTIM ES 21, HR 2 THE FACADE, STOREFRONT, WINDOW SASHES, AND SURFACES SHOULD BE PAINTED IN LIGHTER HUES TO BE COMPATIBLE WITH THE DISTRICTS COLOR PALETTE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 11.
3. SECURITY CAMERAS AND EXISTING FIXTURES PATHWAYS TO REMOVED.
4. GOOSENECK LIGHT FIXTURES TO BE REMOVED.
5. REMOVE EXISTING SIGNAGE.
6. REMOVE EXISTING LINEAR LIGHT FIXTURES.
7. RELOCATE SECURITY CAMERA TO DIRECTLY ABOVE CONDUIT PENETRATION FROM THROUGH THE BUILDING.
8. NEW LAMPS AT EXISTING RECESSED FIXTURES IN ALCOVE ABOVE.
9. NEW LAMP AT EXISTING RECESSED FIXTURES.
10. PROPOSED NON-ILLUMINATED AAU BUSINESS PROJECTING SIGN: "ACADEMY OF ART UNIVERSITY" "ART CAFE" SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS.
11. ITEMS NOTED ON 9/25/19 SITE WALK.
12. THE FACADE, STOREFRONT, WINDOW SASHES, AND SURFACES AT STREET LEVEL SHOULD BE PAINTED IN LIGHTER HUES TO BE COMPATIBLE WITH THE DISTRICTS COLOR PALETTE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 11.
Lag bolts and shields for mounting to wall surface

SURVEY REQUIRED

8/14/19
A. Bartizal
N. Ford

655 SUTTER STREET
SAN FRANCISCO

Scale: 3 = 1' - 0"

D/F Non-Illuminated Aluminum Blade Sign w/Vinyl Cut Graphics

Aluminum Cabinet - Painted Black
1st Surface Vinyl Graphic
All Exterior Indirect Lighting w/ LED Modules

GG 2.0

2300 Ross Lane, Suite 180
Concord, CA 94520
925.771.4000
CA License #345363

Project ID

Date: 8/14/19
Sales: A. Bartizal
Designer: N. Ford

Rev. #: 2
Date: 9/24/19

Revision Notes:
A) Revised blade sign dims. and lighting
B) Revised wall sign lighting
C) Added wall sign above entrance
D) Added wall sign above retail entrance
E) Revised dimensions of sign B

Type of Lighting:

All Exterior Indirect Lighting with LED Modules

Address
655 SUTTER STREET
SAN FRANCISCO

Customer Approval

Signature

MUSEUM

NOT FOR PRODUCTION
D/F Externally Illuminated Aluminum Blade Sign w/Vinyl Cut Graphics

Scale: 1-1/2” = 1’ - 0”

Aluminum Cabinet - Painted Black
1st Surface Vinyl Graphic
3M 3630-143 Poppy Red Logo/Vinyl
All Exterior Indirect Lighting w/ LED Modules

Electrical to Sign by Others

GG 4.0
**EXPOSURE**

- No Change

**REAR YARD**

- No Change

**OPEN SPACE**

- No Change

**ACTIVITY USE**

- No Change

---

**CODE NOTES**

**RESOURCES:** SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING CODE NO. 102 (2016-01-01)

**APPLICABLE CODES**

ALL WORK SHALL COMPLY WITH THE APPLICABLE CODES, REGULATIONS, SEC. 316, DOCUMENTS (THEREOF), ORDINANCES (THEREOF), STANDARDS, ORDERS, APPROVALS, ETC. THAT ARE REQUIRED BY PUBLIC AUTHORITIES. IN THE EVENT OF CONFLICT, THE MOST STRINGENT REQUIREMENTS INCLUDE, BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO, THE CURRRENT APPLICABLE EDICTIONS OR PUBLICATIONS OF THE FOLLOWING (IN COUNTERWISE ORDER):

- San Francisco Building Code
- San Francisco Municipal Code
- San Francisco Administrative Code
- San Francisco Fire Code
- San Francisco Zoning Code
- San Francisco Planning Code
- National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Code Collection
- American National Standards Institute (ANSI) Standards
- American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) Standards
- National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Code Collection
- American National Standards Institute (ANSI) Standards
- American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) Standards
- San Francisco Building Code
- San Francisco Municipal Code
- San Francisco Administrative Code
- San Francisco Fire Code
- San Francisco Zoning Code
- San Francisco Planning Code
- National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Code Collection
- American National Standards Institute (ANSI) Standards
- American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) Standards
- San Francisco Building Code
- San Francisco Municipal Code
- San Francisco Administrative Code
- San Francisco Fire Code
- San Francisco Zoning Code
- San Francisco Planning Code
- National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Code Collection
- American National Standards Institute (ANSI) Standards
- American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) Standards

**APPENDIX E**

- No Change

**APPENDIX H**

- No Change

**APPENDIX J**

- No Change

**APPENDIX L**

- No Change

---

**GROSS FLOOR AREA (NO CHANGE)**

- Level 6: 2,806
- Level 5: 2,821
- Total: 5,627

**OCCUPIED FLOOR AREA (NO CHANGE)**

- Level 6: 2,398
- Level 5: 2,521
- Total: 4,919

**NOTES**

1. All proposed bed counts subject to review by Fire and Building Site Survey.

2. Proposed bed count subject to review by Fire and Building Department.

3. The exact number of beds in any unit may be adjusted to respond to student housing demand, provided the unit does not exceed code mandated occupancy limits.

4. One Bedroom/Unit occupied by non-student AAU residents may remain in their current Bedrooms/Units until voluntarily vacating.

5. Legal Dwelling Unit use on ground floor.

6. Remodel work on level 5, 6, and 7.

---

**SCOPE OF WORK**

Pursuant to Case Number 2018-6998, the Project proposes to locate on the Ground Floor of the Building, the Academy of Art University (AAU) for residential uses, based on Jun 2017. Pursuant to San Francisco Planning Code Section 124(b), the Project proposes to retain 898 SF of retail occupied area on the first level of the building. The project also proposes to retain 5,686 SF of existing occupied floor area on the first level of the building. Planning Code exceptions requested as part of the project are noted on the following pages.

---

**PROPERTY INFORMATION**

- Address: 680 Sutter Street
- Building: Lower Nob Hill Apartment Hotel
- Use: Residential, with student housing use
- Legal Description: As shown on Graphic Sheet 10.4

---

**COVER SHEET**

- Sheet: A0.0
- Project: Academy of Art University
- Project Number: 1C2405
- Issue Date: 10/2019
- Scale: 1/100
- Sheet 1 of 10

---

**VICTIM MAP**

- Elevation
- Address
- Street
- District
- County
- City
- State
- Zip Code

---

**PLAN SHEET**

- Title: Floor Plan - Basement, Levels 1-7
- Scale: 1/100
- Sheet 1 of 1
In 1918, Conrad Alfred Meussdoffer constructed 680 Sutter Street for I. Goodfriend. Although little information was available on I. Goodfriend, it is presumed to be Isidor Goodfriend, the president and manager of the Goodfriend Hotel, located on 245 Powell Street.

A San Francisco native, Meussdoffer began his architectural firm of C. A. Meussdoffer in 1913. Meussdoffer designed a number of single family residences in San Francisco, including 1000 Sutter Street (1917) and 660 Sutter Street (1918).

Meussdoffer’s firm partnered with Victor de Prosse in 1895 before opening his own firm two years later in 1897. Early in his career, Meussdoffer designed a number of single family residences in San Francisco, including 1000 Sutter Street (1917) and 660 Sutter Street (1918). His firm designed several multifamily residences, including 680 Sutter Street (1918), 2145 Francisco Street (1917), and 3101 Jackson Street (1922), among others.

After 680 Sutter was completed in 1918, the building changed ownership on numerous occasions. Goodfriend owned the building through 1924, at which time it transferred to Ralph McLeran. By 1934, the building had changed hands to T. Fahrenkrog, who transferred ownership the same year to the Panama Realty Company. Between 1935 and 1962, available building permits show several names listed under the owners/leasees, including Hale Bros. Realty Company (1935), M. Rabonovitch (1948), Richard King (1960), and Don Faulkner and Associates (1962).

By 1965, the building was owned by Roy Christie, who would retain the building until 1973. Christie is the last known owner prior to the AAU Acquisition of the building in 1982.
EXISTING FLOOR PLANS - BASEMENT, LEVELS 1 & 2

LEVEL 2 - EXISTING

ROOM NAME
ROOM NUMBER
ROOM TAG
BED TAG

LEV 2 - EXISTING

ROOM COUNT

201 2
203 2
204 1
210 2
211 1

TOTAL BED COUNTS 8

LEVEL 1 - EXISTING

ROOM NAME
ROOM NUMBER
ROOM TAG
BED TAG

LEV 1 - EXISTING

ROOM COUNT

104A 2
104B 1
106 2

TOTAL BED COUNTS 5

BASEMENT - EXISTING

ROOM NAME
ROOM NUMBER
ROOM TAG
BED TAG

BASEMENT - EXISTING

ROOM COUNT

AAU RESIDENTIAL COMPLIANCE SET

LEGEND

PROPERTY LINE
GROSS FLOOR AREA
RETAIL USE
PERMANENT RESIDENT
Level 1 - Proposed

Level 2 - Proposed

Level 2 Proposed

Level 1 - Proposed

Boiler Room

Game Room

Laundry

Light Court

Storage

Passenger Elevator

Elevator Room

Public Corridor

Office

Office

Bedroom

Bedroom

Bedroom

Bedroom

Bedroom

Bedroom

Living Room

Living Room

Living Room

Living Room

Bedroom

Bedroom

Bedroom

Bedroom

Bedroom

Bedroom

Garage

Level 2 Proposed

Level 1 Proposed
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A2.1

PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS - BASEMENT, LEVELS 1 & 2

LEGEND

PROPERTY LINE
GROSS FLOOR AREA
RETAIL USE
PERMANENT RESIDENT

ROOM TAG
ROOM NAME
ROOM NUMBER

Bed Tag
Existing Single Bed 1 occupant
Existing Bunk Bed 2 occupants
Proposed Single Bed 1 occupant
Proposed Bunk Bed 2 occupants

AAU RESIDENTIAL COMPLIANCE SET

600 SUTTER
San Francisco, CA 94102
LEVEL 3 - PROPOSED

302 4
305 2
307 2
309 2
310 4
311 2

TOTAL BED COUNTS 16

LEVEL 4 - PROPOSED

405 2
407 2
409 2
410 2
411 2
412 2
413 2

TOTAL BED COUNTS 14
Level 5 - PROPOSED
ROOM COUNT
505 2
506 2
507 3
509 2
510 2
511 2
512 1
TOTAL BED COUNTS 14

Level 6 - PROPOSED
ROOM COUNT
600A 2
602A 2
602B 2
604A 4
604B 2
606 2
608 2
TOTAL BED COUNTS 16

LEGEND
PROPERTY LINE
GROSS FLOOR AREA
RETAIL USE
PERMANENT RESIDENT
ROOM TAG
ROOM NAME
ROOM NUMBER
EXISTING SINGLE BED 1 OCCUPANT
EXISTING BUNK BED 2 OCCUPANTS
PROPOSED SINGLE BED 1 OCCUPANT
PROPOSED BUNK BED 2 OCCUPANTS
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HISTORICAL EXTERIOR ELEVATION IMAGES

SOURCE: ESTM Case No. 2008.0586E - Appendix HR

SOURCE: ESTM Case No. 2008.0586E - Appendix HR

SOURCE: ESTM Case No. 2008.0586E - Appendix HR

SOURCE: ESTM Case No. 2008.0586E - Appendix HR

4 SOUTH EAST CORNER (1919)

4 SOUTH ELEVATION (1919, ENTRANCE DETAIL)

2 SOUTH EAST CORNER (1978)

2 SOUTH EAST CORNER (1932)

Not To Scale

SOURCE: ESTM Case No. 2008.0586E - Appendix HR

SOURCE: ESTM Case No. 2008.0586E - Appendix HR
**South East Corner - Awning Detail**

- ESTM ES 19, HR 1: Awning brackets to be removed.
- ESTM ES 19, HR 2: Non-original vinyl, aluminum, and/or slider window to be removed.
- ESTM ES 19, HR 3: Fire escape legally permitted by permit no. 2962494, 9710146.

**South East Corner - Sutter Street (Existing/Proposed)**

- ORIGINAL ENTRANCE APPEARANCE TO BE RESTORED FOLLOWING REMOVAL OF THE AWNING MOUNTING HARDWARE, AND THE REPAIR AND PATCHING OF DAMAGE AREAS IN THE MASONRY OF THE ORNAMENTAL DOOR SURROUND TO BE RESTORED, RETAINED, AND RESTORED EXACTLY AS EXISTING IN APPEARANCE (COLOR, TEXTURE, DETAILING.)

**South East Corner - Awning Detail**

- PROPOSED NEW MULTI-LIGHT WOOD SASH WINDOWS TO BE INSTALLED TO MATCH HISTORIC FENESTRATION IN TERMS OF CONFIGURATION, FUNCTION, MUNTIN PATTERNS, PROFILE AND THICKNESS OF FRAMES (REF. A4.1 & A4.2);
- UNPERMITTED SLIDER WINDOW PANEL TO BE REMOVED
- PROPOSED OPERABLE WINDOW, NON-SLIDER CONSDITER WITH INTERIOR'S STANDARDS
- PROPOSED INDIRECTLY ILLUMINATED AAU BUSINESS WALL SIGN; SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS
- PROPOSED NON-ILLUMINATED PAINTED WALL SIGN, SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS
- EXISTING SIGN MOUNTING STRUCTURE TO BE REMOVED ENTIRELY

**South East Corner - Awning Detail**

- DECORATIVE WALL MOUNTED LIGHT FIXTURES TO REMAIN, ASSOCIATED EXPOSED CONDUITS TO BE REMOVED AND REPLACED BY INTERNALLY Routed CONDUITS (REF. A4.2)
- ITEMS NOTED ON 09/25/19 SITE WALK: SEE IMAGES ON SHEET A4.3
- PATCH & REPAIR EXISTING OPENING LOCATED BELOW WINDOW, TOP OF 10
- EXISTING METAL IDENTIFYING SIGN TO REMOVED

**South East Corner - Sutter Street (Existing/Proposed)**

- SOUTH ELEVATION - SUTTER STREET (EXISTING/PROPOSED)
GENERAL NOTES

1. LEGALIZE THE CONDITIONS PRESENTED IN THIS PLAN SET, UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.

2. PROPOSED WORK INVOLVING MODIFICATIONS TO THE EXISTING BUILDING INCLUDING REMOVAL, REPAIR, AND INSTALLATION SHALL BE PERFORMED IN A MANNER CONSISTENT WITH THE STANDARDS ISSUED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S OFFICE OF HERITAGE PRESERVATION. CONSTRUCTION PERMITS FOR ALL SUCH WORK WILL BE REQUIRED AND MUST BE ISSUED BY THE BUREAU OF BUILDINGSissant DEPARTMENT STAFF TO ENSURE SUCH CONSISTENCY, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS FOR APPEARANCE TO BE RESTORED; ORNAMENTAL DETAILING FOR MASONRY OF THE ORNAMENTAL DETAILS IN THE BUILDING, MULLIONS AND WINDOW OPENINGS, ORNAMENTAL DETAILING FOR MASONRY ORNAMENTAL DETAILS AND DECORATIVE BRICKWORK.

3. MITIGATION TO RESTORE/FACED THE EXISTING WALLS TO MATCH EXISTING MATERIALS AND APPEARANCE AS REQUIRED

4. THE BUSINESS SIGN IS PROPOSED AT A RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY WITH STUDENT HOUSING USE CHARACTERISTIC UNDER THE NATURE THAT THE STUDENT HOUSING CONSTITUTE SUBSTANTIAL DETERMINATION OF BUSINESS USE IDENTIFIED IN THE ZONING HISTORIC DISTRICT LAWS (REFER A.A. 4.1 AND 4.2)

5. TEF TO PROVIDE DETAIL DRAWINGS FOR EXTERIORS, CONDUIT, AND INTERNAL POWER SOURCES. INCLUDING WHERE AND HOW CONDUIT IS INSTALLED TO MATCH HISTORIC CONSISTENCY, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, MULLIONS AND WINDOW OPENINGS, ORNAMENTAL DETAILING FOR MASONRY ORNAMENTAL DETAILS AND DECORATIVE BRICKWORK.

6. SECURITY CAMERA CONSTRUCTION AND ASSOCIATED CONSULTANT WORK PURSUANT TO THE COMPETENCY AGREEMENT BUT INSTEAD IS WORK AND MAY PURSUANT TO THE COMPETENCY AGREEMENT REPAIR AND ASSOCIATED CONSULTANT SUBJECT TO REMOVAL REQUIREMENTS

KEYNOTES

1. EST ELEV-14. MR-1 AWNING AND BRACKETS TO BE REMOVED

2. EST ELEV-14. MR-1 NON-ORIGINAL VINYL ALUMINUM MEANDER WINDOW TO BE REMOVED

3. EST ELEV-14. MR-3 FIRE ESCAPE LEGALLY PERMITTED BY PERMIT NO. 5849, OCT 1978

4. ORIGINAL ENTRANCE RESTORED FOLLOWING REMOVAL OF THE ARCHED MOUNTING MUSCLE

5. EXISTING SIGN MOUNTING BRACKETS TO BE REMOVED (REFER A.A. 4.1 AND 4.2)

6. UNPERMITTED SLED WINDOW PANEL TO BE REMOVED

7. PROPOSED MULTILIGHT GLASS WINDOW TO BE INSTALLED TO MATCH HISTORIC CONSISTENCY IN TERMS OF WINDOW SIZE, MUNTIN PATTERN, PROFILE AND THICKNESS OF FRAMES

8. CONSTRUCTION TO BE PERFORMED IN A MANNER CONSISTENT WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S STANDARDS

9. PROPOSED INDIRECTLY ILLUMINATED BUSINESS SIGN TO BE CONSTRUCTED TO MATCH HISTORIC CONSISTENCY

10. PROPOSED NEW ALUMINUM POSTED WOOD FRAMES TO BE INSTALLED TO MATCH HISTORIC CONSISTENCY IN TERMS OF WINDOW SIZE, MUNTIN PATTERN, PROFILE AND THICKNESS OF FRAMES

LEGEND

- PROPOSED SIGNAGE: SEE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS

AAU RESIDENTIAL COMPLIANCE SET

EXISTING/PROPOSED EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS

A3.2
1. ESTM ES-16, HR-1 AWNING AND BRACKETS TO BE REMOVED
2. ESTM ES-16, HR-2 NON-ORIGINAL VINYL, ALUMINUM, ANCHOR SLIDER WINDOW TO BE REMOVED
3. ESTM ES-16, HR-3 FIRE ESCAPE LEGALLY PERMITTED BY PERMIT NO'S 95-1441, 97-1041.

ORIGINAL ENTRANCE APPEARANCE TO BE RESTORED; FOLLOWING REMOVAL OF THE AWNING MOUNTING HARDWARE, PERFORATIONS TO AND DAMAGED AREAS IN THE MASONRY OF THE ORNAMENTAL DOOR SURROUND TO BE SATOLED, REFURBED, AND PAINTED TO MATCH EXISTING IN APPEARANCE (COLOR, TEXTURE, DETAILING.)

PROPOSED NON-ILLUMINATED AAU BUSINESS WALL SIGN; SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS

EXISTING METAL IDENTIFYING SIGN TO REMAIN

DECORATIVE WALL MOUNTED LIGHT FIXTURES TO TOP OF, TO REMAIN, ASSOCIATED EXPOSED CONDUITS TO BE REMOVED AND REPLACED BY INTERNALLY ROUTED CONDUITS

ITEMS NOTED ON 9/25/19 SITE WALK: *SEE IMAGES ON SHT. A4.3

PATCH & REPAIR EXISTING OPENING LOCATED BELOW WINDOW, TYP OF 10

GENERAL NOTES SEE SHEET A3.2

EXISTING SIGN MOUNTING STRUCTURE TO BE REMOVED ENTIRELY

EXISTING METAL IDENTIFYING SIGN TO REMAIN

EXISTING METAL IDENTIFYING SIGN TO REMAIN

PROPOSED SIGNAGE; SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS

EXISTING SIGN MOUNTING STRUCTURE TO BE REMOVED ENTIRELY

EXISTING METAL IDENTIFYING SIGN TO REMAIN

PROPOSED NON-ILLUMINATED PAINTED WALL SIGN; SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS

PROPOSED INDIRECTLY ILLUMINATED AAU BUSINESS WALL SIGN; SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS

EXISTING METAL IDENTIFYING SIGN TO REMAIN

PROPOSED OPERABLE WINDOW, NON-SLIDER CONSISTENT WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S STANDARDS

PROPOSED INDIVIDUALLY ILLUMINATED AAU BUSINESS WALL SIGN; SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS

EXISTING METAL IDENTIFYING SIGN TO REMAIN

PROPOSED NEW MULTI-LIGHT WOOD SASH WINDOWS TO BE INSTALLED TO MATCH HISTORIC FENESTRATION IN TERMS OF CONFIGURATION, FUNCTION, MUNTIN PATTERNS, PROFILE AND THICKNESS OF FRAMES (REF. A4.1 & A4.2)

UNPERMITTED SLIDER WINDOW PANEL TO BE REMOVED

PROPOSED OPERABLE WINDOW, NON-SLIDER CONSISTENT WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S STANDARDS

EXISTING METAL IDENTIFYING SIGN TO REMAIN

PROPOSED OPERABLE WINDOW, NON-SLIDER CONSISTENT WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S STANDARDS

EXISTING METAL IDENTIFYING SIGN TO REMAIN

EXISTING METAL IDENTIFYING SIGN TO REMAIN

EXISTING METAL IDENTIFYING SIGN TO REMAIN
ADJACENT PROPERTY SHOWN DASHED

PROPOSED SIGNAGE; SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS

1. ESTM ES-19, HR-1 AWNING AND BRACKETS TO BE REMOVED
2. ESTM ES-19, HR-2 NON-ORIGINAL VINYL, ALUMINUM, AND/OR SLIDER WINDOW TO BE REMOVED
3. ESTM ES-19, HR-3 FIRE ESCAPE LEGALLY PERMITTED BY PERMIT NO. 95-29849, HR-741046

4. ORIGINAL ENTRANCE APPEARANCE TO BE RESTORED; FOLLOWING REMOVAL OF THE AWNING MOUNTING HARDWARE, PERFORATIONS TO AND DAMAGED AREAS IN THE MASONRY OF THE ORNAMENTAL DOOR SURROUNDS TO BE REPAIRED AND PATCHED TO MATCH EXISTING IN APPEARANCE (COLOR, TEXTURE, DETAILING)

5. PROPOSED NEW MULTI-LIGHT WOOD SASH WINDOWS TO BE INSTALLED TO MATCH HISTORIC FENESTRATION IN TERMS OF CONFIGURATION, FUNCTION, MUNTIN PATTERNS, PROFILE AND THICKNESS OF FRAMES (REF. A4.1 & A4.2)

6. UNPERMITTED SLIDER WINDOW PANEL TO BE REMOVED

7. PROPOSED OPERABLE WINDOW, NON-SLIDER CONSISTENT WITH SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S STANDARDS

8. PROPOSED INDIRECTLY ILLUMINATED AAU BUSINESS WALL SIGN (SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS)

9. PROPOSED NON-ILLUMINATED PAINTED WALL SIGN, SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS

10. EXISTING SIGN MOUNTING STRUCTURE TO BE REMOVED ENTIRELY

DETAILED VIEWS

EXISTING METAL IDENTIFYING SIGN TO REMAIN

GENERAL NOTES

ITEMS NOTED ON 9/25/19 SITE WALK:
*SEE IMAGES ON SHT. A4.3

PATCH & REPAIR EXISTING OPENING LOCATED BELOW WINDOW, TYP OF 10

EXISTING METAL IDENTIFYING SIGN TO REMAIN

GENERAL NOTES

GENERAL NOTES SEE SHEET A3.2

LEGEND

PROPOSED SIGNAGE; SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS

EXISTING/PROPOSED EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS
USING DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE, NEW MULTI-LIGHT WOOD SASH WINDOWS SHALL BE INSTALLED TO MATCH HISTORIC FENESTRATION IN TERMS OF CONFIGURATION, FUNCTION, MUNTIN PATTERNS, PROFILE, AND THICKNESS OF FRAMES.

NON-ORIGINAL VINYL AND ALUMINUM WINDOWS SHALL BE REMOVED USING THE LEAST INVASIVE MEANS POSSIBLE TO MINIMIZE DAMAGE TO SURROUNDING SURFACE AND MATERIALS.

EXISTING SIGN MOUNTING STRUCTURE TO BE REMOVED ENTIRELY.
NON-ORIGINAL VINYL AND ALUMINUM WINDOWS SHALL BE REMOVED USING THE LEAST INVASIVE MEANS POSSIBLE TO MINIMIZE DAMAGE TO SURROUNDING SURFACE AND MATERIALS.

USING DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE, NEW MULTILIGHT WOOD SASH WINDOWS SHALL BE INSTALLED TO MATCH HISTORIC FENESTRATION IN TERMS OF CONFIGURATION, FUNCTION, MUNTIN PATTERNS, PROFILE, AND THICKNESS OF FRAMES.

If this drawing is not 24" x 36", then the drawing has been revised from its original size. Noted scales must be adjusted.

All drawings and written material appearing herein constitute original and unpublished work of the Architect and may not be duplicated, used or disclosed without consent of Architect.
**KEYNOTES**

1. **ESTM ES-10, MR-1**
   - AWNING BRACKETS TO BE REMOVED

2. **ESTM ES-10, MR-2**
   - NON-ORIGINAL VINYL, ALUMINUM, AND/OR SLIDER WINDOW TO BE REMOVED

3. **ESTM ES-10, MR-3**
   - FIRE ESCAPE LEGALLY PERMITTED BY PERMIT NO.S 9622494, 9710146

4. **ORIGINAL ENTRANCE**
   - APPEARANCE TO BE RESTORED FOLLOWING REMOVAL OF THE AWNING MOUNTING HARDWARE

5. **ESTM ES-19**
   - MR-1
   - ORIGINAL VINYL, ALUMINUM, AND/OR SLIDER WINDOW TO BE REMOVED

6. **PROPOSED NEW MULTI-LIGHT WOOD FRAME WINDOWS TO BE INSTALLED TO MATCH HISTORIC FENESTRATION IN TERMS OF CONFIGURATION, FRAMING CONFIGURATION, MUNTIN PATTERNS, PROFILE AND THICKNESS OF FRAMES (REF. A4.1 & A4.2)

7. **EXISTING METAL IDENTIFYING SIGN TO REMAIN**

8. **EXISTING SIGN MOUNTING STRUCTURE TO BE REMOVED ENTIRELY**

9. **DECORATIVE WALL MOUNTED LIGHT FIXTURE OF 3, TO REMAIN ASSOCIATED EXPOSED CONDUITS TO BE REMOVED AND REPLACED BY INTERNALLY ROUTED CONDUITS**

**ITEMS NOTED ON 9/25/19 SITE WALK:**

- SEE IMAGES ON SHEET A4.3
- PATCH & REPAIR EXISTING OPENING LOCATED BELOW WINDOW, TYP OF 10
- EXISTING METAL IDENTIFYING SIGN TO REMAIN

---
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600 Sutter
San Francisco, CA 94102

**EXISTING SIGN MOUNTING STRUCTURE TO BE REMOVED ENTIRELY**

**PROPOSED INDIRECTLY ILLUMINATED AAU BUSINESS WALL SIGN; SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS**

**EXISTING METAL IDENTIFYING SIGN TO REMAIN**

**EXISTING SIGN MOUNTING STRUCTURE TO BE REMOVED ENTIRELY**

**EXISTING LIGHT FIXTURE OF 3, TO REMAIN ASSOCIATED EXPOSED CONDUITS TO BE REMOVED AND REPLACED BY INTERNALLY ROUTED CONDUITS**

**ITEMS NOTED ON 9/25/19 SITE WALK:**

- SEE IMAGES ON SHEET A4.3
- PATCH & REPAIR EXISTING OPENING LOCATED BELOW WINDOW, TYP OF 10
- EXISTING METAL IDENTIFYING SIGN TO REMAIN
D/F Externally Illuminated Wall Sign

Scale: 3" = 1' - 0"

Aluminum Cabinet - Painted Black
1st Surface Black Vinyl Bkgd. w/ Reversed Out Copy on White Lexan Face
& 3M 3630-143 Poppy Red Logo/Vinyl. All exterior Lighting w/ LED Modules
A painted wall sign is to be installed on the exterior of the Academy of Art University building. The sign will be painted directly onto the wall (no projection allowed) and will match the colors of 3M 3630-143 Poppy Red Logo/Vinyl. The proposed location is at the top of the second story window. The scale for the sign is 1" = 1' - 0". The dimensions of the sign are 43.17" x 6.29" x 6.29". The building address is 680 Sutter Street, San Francisco.
**BICYCLE PARKING SUMMARY**

**EXISTING SITES TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM**

**EXTENDED CONDITIONS**

**APPENDIX PROPOSAL: See Notes on Sheet A.3.2**

**CODE NOTES**

**EXISTING FLOOR AREA (NO CHANGE)**

**GROSS FLOOR AREA (NO CHANGE)**

**PROPOSED CAR SHARE SPACES**

**APPLICABLE CODES**

**PROJECT INFORMATION**

**PROJECT SCOPE**

**VICINITY MAP**

**COVER SHEET**
Following the remodel, the site plan—the aerial image—showed the building was designed and operated in collaboration with contractors Barrett & Hildebrand. As presented in Architect and Engineer, Roller is recognized as a master architect in San Francisco. Context Statement, Roller is recognized as a master architect in San Francisco. Architectural and Engineering modern make façade underwent a $150,000, Mid Century appearance and features of the building were replaced, and the building was renovated. By the work of the Architectural and Engineering firm of Albert F. Roller, in collaboration with contractors Barrett & Hildebrand. AAU institutional compliance set.

As presented in Architect and Engineer in November 1949, the Westinghouse Electric Corporation's new time-saving building at 410 Bush Street in San Francisco now provides a thoroughly modern, adeqately located, office environment for the sales and executive personnel. The new quarters affords ample space to meet current and immediate future office space requirements and is located in a long term lease location. Following the remodel, the building opened approximately, 11,000 square feet, the ideal location facing Bush Street.

By 1967, the property was owned and operated by Commercial Union Insurance Company. In the immediate postwar period, in 1946/1947, the St. George Garage was converted to office space by the Grant Company. At that time, all floors of the building, including the basement, were occupied by the Grant Company, continued operating as a garage. All floors of the building were replaced, and the property was sold to the AAU in late 1980.

According to building permits on file with the San Francisco Planning Department, 410 Bush Street was initially designed and built by C.B. Jordan in 1906. The early part of the 20th century appearance and features of the building were removed, and the building was renovated. By the work of the Architectural and Engineering firm of Albert F. Roller, in collaboration with contractors Barrett & Hildebrand.

In the immediate postwar period, in 1946/1947, the St. George Garage was converted to office space by the Grant Company. At that time, all floors of the building, including the basement, were occupied by the Grant Company, continued operating as a garage. All floors of the building were replaced, and the property was sold to the AAU in late 1980.

In the immediate postwar period, in 1946/1947, the St. George Garage was converted to office space by the Grant Company. At that time, all floors of the building, including the basement, were occupied by the Grant Company, continued operating as a garage. All floors of the building were replaced, and the property was sold to the AAU in late 1980.

The Westinghouse Electric Corporation's new time-saving building at 410 Bush Street in San Francisco now provides a thoroughly modern, adeqately located, office environment for the sales and executive personnel. The new quarters affords ample space to meet current and immediate future office space requirements and is located in a long term lease location. Following the remodel, the building opened approximately, 11,000 square feet, the ideal location facing Bush Street.

By 1967, the property was owned and operated by Commercial Union Insurance Company. In the immediate postwar period, in 1946/1947, the St. George Garage was converted to office space by the Grant Company. At that time, all floors of the building, including the basement, were occupied by the Grant Company, continued operating as a garage. All floors of the building were replaced, and the property was sold to the AAU in late 1980.
If this drawing is not 24" x 36", then the drawing has been revised from its original size. Noted scales must be adjusted. This line should be equal to one inch.
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ABBREVIATIONS
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CLR. = CLEARANCE

⅊ = PROPERTY LINE

BIKE PARKING COUNT

CLASS II
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(E) BIKE PARKING SPACES

PROPOSED:

(E) BIKE PARKING SPACES

TOTAL: 8

NOTES:

1) BIKE RACKS IN PASSENGER LOADING ZONE ARE ACCEPTED ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS

2) ASSUMED PROPERTY LINE AT FACE OF BUILDING
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BIKE PARKING COUNT

CLASS II

EXISTING:

(E) BIKE PARKING SPACES

PROPOSED:

(E) BIKE PARKING SPACES

TOTAL: 8

NOTES:

1) BIKE RACKS IN PASSENGER LOADING ZONE ARE ACCEPTED ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS

2) ASSUMED PROPERTY LINE AT FACE OF BUILDING

ABBREVIATIONS

(E) = EXISTING

(N) = NEW, PROPOSED

CLR. = CLEARANCE

⅊ = PROPERTY LINE

BIKE PARKING COUNT

CLASS II

EXISTING:

(E) BIKE PARKING SPACES

PROPOSED:

(E) BIKE PARKING SPACES

TOTAL: 8

NOTES:

1) BIKE RACKS IN PASSENGER LOADING ZONE ARE ACCEPTED ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS

2) ASSUMED PROPERTY LINE AT FACE OF BUILDING

ABBREVIATIONS

(E) = EXISTING

(N) = NEW, PROPOSED

CLR. = CLEARANCE

⅊ = PROPERTY LINE

BIKE PARKING COUNT

CLASS II

EXISTING:

(E) BIKE PARKING SPACES

PROPOSED:

(E) BIKE PARKING SPACES

TOTAL: 8

NOTES:

1) BIKE RACKS IN PASSENGER LOADING ZONE ARE ACCEPTED ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS

2) ASSUMED PROPERTY LINE AT FACE OF BUILDING

ABBREVIATIONS

(E) = EXISTING

(N) = NEW, PROPOSED

CLR. = CLEARANCE

⅊ = PROPERTY LINE

BIKE PARKING COUNT

CLASS II

EXISTING:

(E) BIKE PARKING SPACES

PROPOSED:

(E) BIKE PARKING SPACES

TOTAL: 8

NOTES:

1) BIKE RACKS IN PASSENGER LOADING ZONE ARE ACCEPTED ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS

2) ASSUMED PROPERTY LINE AT FACE OF BUILDING

ABBREVIATIONS

(E) = EXISTING

(N) = NEW, PROPOSED

CLR. = CLEARANCE

⅊ = PROPERTY LINE

BIKE PARKING COUNT

CLASS II

EXISTING:

(E) BIKE PARKING SPACES

PROPOSED:

(E) BIKE PARKING SPACES

TOTAL: 8

NOTES:

1) BIKE RACKS IN PASSENGER LOADING ZONE ARE ACCEPTED ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS

2) ASSUMED PROPERTY LINE AT FACE OF BUILDING
NOTE: NO BIKE PARKING PROPOSED ON ST. GEORGE ALLEY TO MAINTAIN 4'-0" RIGHT OF WAY.
EXISTING FLOOR PLANS - BASEMENT & LEVEL 1

LEGEND
- OCCUPIED FLOOR AREA
- OCCUPIED FLOOR AREA IN ACTIVE USE ZONE
- GROSS FLOOR AREA
- ROOM TAG
- ROOM NAME
- ROOM NUMBER
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AAU  INSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE SET

A3.0  HISTORICAL EXTERIOR ELEVATION IMAGES

SOUTH ELEVATION - (1949)
SOURCE:  ESTM Case No. 2008.0586E - Appendix HR

SOUTH ELEVATION - (1964)
SOURCE:  ESTM Case No. 2008.0586E - Appendix HR

SOUTH ELEVATION - (1978)
SOURCE:  ESTM Case No. 2008.0586E - Appendix HR

Image 1: SOUTH ELEVATION - (1949)
Image 2: SOUTH ELEVATION - (1964)
Image 3: SOUTH ELEVATION - (1978)
EXISTING FLOOD LIGHT Fixtures and Power Feed for All Light Fixtures along St. George Alley to be removed. Proposed flood light fixtures added, power feed for all light fixtures along St. George Alley to be provided from within the building. No exposed conduit.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA with minimal profile and concealed conduit.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA system at alley, typ., proposed to be retained.
EXISTING FLUSH LIGHT FIXTURES AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT ALONG ST. GEORGE ALLEY TO BE REMOVED.

PROPOSED FLUSH LIGHT FIXTURES ADDED, POWERED FOR ALL LIGHT FIXTURES ALONG ST. GEORGE ALLEY TO BE PROVIDED FROM WITHIN THE BUILDING; NO EXPOSED CONDUIT.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA WITH MINIMAL PROFILE AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.

EXISTING TILES TO BE REPAINTED IN A MEDIUM/DARK GREY (CHARCOAL) COLOR DISTINCT FROM EXISTING FACADE PAINT COLOR, TO REFLECT THE HISTORIC LOOK OF THE BUILDING.

EXISTING ALUMINUM WINDOWS REPLACED WITHOUT THE BENEFIT OF A PERMIT: AAU PROPOSES TO LEGALIZE; SEE PHOTOS ON A4.1.

POWER FEED FOR ALL LIGHT FIXTURES ALONG ST. GEORGE ALLEY TO BE PROVIDED FROM WITHIN THE BUILDING; NO EXTERIOR CONDUIT.

PAINT ALL PATHWAYS AND HOUSING TO MATCH THE EXTERIOR BUILDING COLOR.

REMOVE EXISTING_PAINTED SIGN.

ITEMS BELOW NOTED DURING 9/25/19 SITE WALK: *SEE IMAGES ON SHEET A4.1

- FIRE ALARM DEVICE
- WINDOW TRANSOM PANEL REPLACED BY VENT
- CHAIN LINK FENCE
- EXISTING BARED WIRE
- EXISTING FIRE ESCAPE BALCONIES
- EXISTING ACCORDIAN FIRE LADDER

PLANTER ENCLOSED AND SHEATHED IN BLACK TILE.

NEW WINDOWS REPLACE WITHOUT THE BENEFIT OF A PERMIT: AAU PROPOSES TO LEGALIZE; SEE PHOTOS ON A4.1.

POWER FEED FOR ALL LIGHT FIXTURES ALONG ST. GEORGE ALLEY TO BE PROVIDED FROM WITHIN THE BUILDING; NO EXTERIOR CONDUIT.

PAINT ALL PATHWAYS AND HOUSING TO MATCH THE EXTERIOR BUILDING COLOR.

REMOVE EXISTING_PAINTED SIGN.

ITEMS BELOW NOTED DURING 9/25/19 SITE WALK: *SEE IMAGES ON SHEET A4.1

- FIRE ALARM DEVICE
- WINDOW TRANSOM PANEL REPLACED BY VENT
- CHAIN LINK FENCE
- EXISTING BARED WIRE
- EXISTING FIRE ESCAPE BALCONIES
- EXISTING ACCORDIAN FIRE LADDER

EXISTING TILES TO BE REPAINTED IN A MEDIUM/DARK GREY (CHARCOAL) COLOR DISTINCT FROM EXISTING FACADE PAINT COLOR, TO REFLECT THE HISTORIC LOOK OF THE BUILDING.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA WITH MINIMAL PROFILE AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.

EXISTING TILES TO BE REPAINTED IN A MEDIUM/DARK GREY (CHARCOAL) COLOR DISTINCT FROM EXISTING FACADE PAINT COLOR, TO REFLECT THE HISTORIC LOOK OF THE BUILDING.

EXISTING ALUMINUM WINDOWS REPLACED WITHOUT THE BENEFIT OF A PERMIT: AAU PROPOSES TO LEGALIZE; SEE PHOTOS ON A4.1.

POWER FEED FOR ALL LIGHT FIXTURES ALONG ST. GEORGE ALLEY TO BE PROVIDED FROM WITHIN THE BUILDING; NO EXTERIOR CONDUIT.

PAINT ALL PATHWAYS AND HOUSING TO MATCH THE EXTERIOR BUILDING COLOR.

REMOVE EXISTING_PAINTED SIGN.

ITEMS BELOW NOTED DURING 9/25/19 SITE WALK: *SEE IMAGES ON SHEET A4.1

- FIRE ALARM DEVICE
- WINDOW TRANSOM PANEL REPLACED BY VENT
- CHAIN LINK FENCE
- EXISTING BARED WIRE
- EXISTING FIRE ESCAPE BALCONIES
- EXISTING ACCORDIAN FIRE LADDER

EXISTING TILES TO BE REPAINTED IN A MEDIUM/DARK GREY (CHARCOAL) COLOR DISTINCT FROM EXISTING FACADE PAINT COLOR, TO REFLECT THE HISTORIC LOOK OF THE BUILDING.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA WITH MINIMAL PROFILE AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.

EXISTING TILES TO BE REPAINTED IN A MEDIUM/DARK GREY (CHARCOAL) COLOR DISTINCT FROM EXISTING FACADE PAINT COLOR, TO REFLECT THE HISTORIC LOOK OF THE BUILDING.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA WITH MINIMAL PROFILE AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.

EXISTING TILES TO BE REPAINTED IN A MEDIUM/DARK GREY (CHARCOAL) COLOR DISTINCT FROM EXISTING FACADE PAINT COLOR, TO REFLECT THE HISTORIC LOOK OF THE BUILDING.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA WITH MINIMAL PROFILE AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.

EXISTING TILES TO BE REPAINTED IN A MEDIUM/DARK GREY (CHARCOAL) COLOR DISTINCT FROM EXISTING FACADE PAINT COLOR, TO REFLECT THE HISTORIC LOOK OF THE BUILDING.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA WITH MINIMAL PROFILE AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.

EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
1. Legalize the conditions presented in this plan set, unless otherwise noted.

2. Proposed work involving modifications to the exterior of the building, including repair, removal, demolition, and installation shall be performed in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s standards. The building forms for all such work will be reviewed and approved by Planning Department staff to ensure consistency, including but not limited to appropriate plans for method of removal, attachment, and patching.

3. Withdraw building permit application No. 201008098351.

4. All new proposed security cameras, lighting, signage, conduits to have all associated conduits to be routed internally in the building, no new conduit to be exposed.

5. Test to provide detail drawings for fixtures, conduit, and internal power sources. Show how conduit will be routed internally to a power source within the building. All existing conduit in existing buildings to be explicitly noted and shown in plan. Provide a schedule and a sectional drawing with a cross-section viewed internally. Packages that will be routed through plumbing and electrical may be reviewed at that time.

6. Security camera, lighting, and associated conduit proposed work pursuant to the Development Agreement. The proposed work is not required work pursuant to the Development Agreement. Mobile teachers work anywhere and do not require security cameras, lighting, and associated conduit subject to physical requirements.

Keynotes
See sheet A3.2 for keynotes.

Master Schedule
See sheet A3.2 for master schedule.

Legend
SECURITY CAMERA

EXISTING/PROPOSED EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS

A3.3
1. LEGALIZE THE CONDITIONS PRESENTED IN THIS PLAN SET, UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.

2. PROPOSED WORK INVOLVING MODIFICATIONS TO A BUILDING, INCLUDING REPAIR, DEMOLITION, AND INSTALLATION OF COMMISSIONED ART, SHALL BE PERFORMED IN A MANNER CONSISTENT WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S STANDARDS. THE BUILDING PERMITS FOR ALL SUCH WORK WILL BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF TO ENSURE SUCH CONSISTENCY, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO APPROPRIATE PLANS FOR METHOD OF REMOVAL, ATTACHMENT, AND PATCHING.

3. WITHDRAW BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION NO. 201008098351.

4. ALL NEW PROPOSED SECURITY CAMERAS, LIGHTING, SIGNAGE, TO HAVE ALL ASSOCIATED CONDUITS TO BE ROUTED INTERNALLY IN THE BUILDING. NO NEW CONDUIT TO BE EXPOSED.

5. TEF TO PROVIDE DETAIL DRAWINGS FOR FIXTURES, CONDUIT, AND INTERNAL POWER SOURCES WHERE, HOW AND WITH WHAT METHOD THEY ARE ATTACHED TO THE STRUCTURE AND HOW CONDUIT WILL BE ROUTED. NO EXTERIOR CONDUIT TO BE EXPOSED. ALL EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.

6. SECURITY CAMERA, LIGHTING AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT PROPOSED IN THESE PLANS IS NOT REQUIRED WORK PURSUANT TO THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT, BUT INSTEAD IS WORK AAU MAY PURSUE TO REPLACE EXISTING SECURITY CAMERAS, LIGHTING AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT AS PER THE REQUIREMENTS.
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A4.1

EXISTING WINDOW IMAGES

1. FOR MORE INFORMATION, REFER TO ELEVATIONS ON A3.3

2. EXISTING ALUMINUM WINDOWS REPLACED BY AAU: AAU PROPOSES TO LEGALIZE
EXISTING FLOOD LIGHT FIXTURES AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT ALONG ALLEY TO BE REMOVED.
PROPOSED FLOOD LIGHT FIXTURES ADDED, POWER FEED FOR ALL LIGHT FIXTURES ALONG ST. GEORGE ALLEY TO BE PROVIDED FROM WITHIN THE BUILDING; NO EXPOSED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA WITH MINIMAL PROFILE AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING FLOOD LIGHT FIXTURES TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
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EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA TO BE REPLACED WITH MODERN MODELS AND CONCEALED CONDUIT.
EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM AT ALLEY, TYP., PROPOSED TO BE RETAINED.
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A0.12 EXISTING/ PROPOSED EXTERIOR ELEVATION DETAILS ● ● ●
A0.13 EXISTING/ PROPOSED SITE PLANS ● ● ●
A0.14 EXISTING/ PROPOSED SITE MAPS ● ● ●
A0.15 EXISTING/ PROPOSED SITE SECTIONAL IMAGES ● ● ●
A0.16 CONTROLS AND REGULATIONS ● ● ●
A0.17 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.18 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.19 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.20 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.21 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.22 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.23 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.24 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.25 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.26 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.27 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.28 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.29 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.30 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.31 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.32 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.33 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.34 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.35 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.36 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.37 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.38 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.39 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.40 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.41 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.42 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.43 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.44 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.45 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.46 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.47 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.48 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.49 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.50 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.51 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.52 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.53 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.54 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.55 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.56 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.57 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.58 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.59 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.60 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.61 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.62 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.63 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.64 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.65 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.66 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.67 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.68 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.69 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.70 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.71 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.72 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.73 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.74 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.75 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.76 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.77 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.78 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.79 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.80 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.81 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.82 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.83 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.84 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.85 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.86 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.87 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.88 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.89 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.90 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.91 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.92 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.93 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.94 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.95 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.96 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.97 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.98 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A0.99 SURVEY INFORMATION ● ● ●
A1.0 PLOT MAP ● ● ●
A1.1 EXISTING FLOOR PLANS - BASEMENT & LEVEL 1 ● ● ●
A1.2 EXISTING FLOOR PLANS - LEVELS 2 & 3 ● ● ●
A1.3 EXISTING FLOOR PLANS - LEVELS 4 & 5 ● ● ●
A1.4 PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS - BASEMENT & LEVEL 1 ● ● ●
A1.5 PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS - LEVELS 2 & 3 ● ● ●
A1.6 PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS - LEVELS 4 & 5 ● ● ●
A2.1 PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS - BASEMENT & LEVEL 1 ● ● ●
A2.2 PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS - LEVELS 2 & 3 ● ● ●
A2.3 PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS - LEVELS 4 & 5 ● ● ●
A3.1 EXISTING/ PROPOSED EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS ● ● ●
A3.2 EXISTING/ PROPOSED EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS ● ● ●
A3.3 EXISTING/ PROPOSED EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS ● ● ●
A3.4 EXISTING/ PROPOSED EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS ● ● ●
A4.1 BUILDING MATERIALS ● ● ●
A4.2 EXTERIOR ELEVATION DETAIL IMAGES ● ● ●
A4.3 BUILDING MATERIALS DAMAGE ● ● ●
A4.4 BUILDING MATERIALS DETAIL IMAGES ● ● ●
Construction of 540 Powell Street commenced with a groundbreaking ceremony in November 1908. The San Francisco Lodge, No. 3, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks commissioned the building after its members raised $150,000 for the construction through the sale of stock. The Spanish Renaissance/Mission Revival-style building was designed by well-regarded and prolific San Francisco architect Alexander Aimwell Cantin. The San Francisco Chronicle, in an article published October 2, 1908, heralded the amenities and details of the new Elks building:

The basement will be laid out as a pleasant and social room, with heavy timbered beams, and high wainscoting. The demands of the social side of the lodge, which are exorbitant, will be met on the first floor, which is to be luxuriously furnished and arranged as a lounging room with models and cozy corners, a large dining room, billiard rooms, library, writing rooms, telephone, and hat rooms and offices. The second floor will be exclusively devoted to living rooms with baths, as will be the front part of the top floor. In the rear, where the needs of the social side will be fully satisfied, a room of twelve feet and the walls and ceiling will be decorated and lined by a red moquette. The building's overall design is a blend of the Classic and the Gothic style of the building itself, which will be used exclusively by the lodge as a club and for fraternal purposes and also for numerous social functions.

By 1927, 540 Powell Street had been purchased by the University of California, which used the property as an extension space. A major remodel of the building took place in 1927, consisting of nearly $50,000 of work carried out by architect W.P. Stephenson; these alterations appear to have included the construction of classrooms. According to available building permits, the building's decorative, overhanging cornice line, which appears in historic photographs, was removed by the University of California in 1943. By circa 1970, San Francisco State College began occupying the building. Prior to the AAU's 1977 acquisition of the property, a portion of the building was occupied by the Erotic Art Museum.
ANSON PLACE (AT P O W E L L  S T R E E T)

NOTE: NO BIKE PARKING PROPOSED ON ANSON PLACE TO MAINTAIN 4'-0" RIGHT OF WAY.

ANSON PLACE (AT D E A D  E N D)

NOTE: NO BIKE PARKING PROPOSED ON ANSON PLACE TO MAINTAIN 4'-0" RIGHT OF WAY.

BIKE PARKING COUNT

CLASS II
EXISTING:
(N) BIKE PARKING SPACES
PROPOSED:
(E) BIKE PARKING SPACES
TOTAL:

NEW MONTGOMERY STREET
San Francisco, CA  94105

74 New Montgomery Street
San Francisco, CA  94108

540 Powell
San Francisco, CA 94108

NOTE:
1) ASSUMED PROPERTY LINE AT FACE OF BUILDING

2) IN-GROUND UTILITY

3) BIKE RACK, CLASS II

4) PARKING SIGN
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AAU INSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE SET

Creo
466 Geary Street, Suite 300
San Francisco, CA 94102
www.creolandarch.com
1415.688.2506

If this drawing is not 24" x 36", then the drawing has been revised from its original size. Noted scales must be adjusted. This line should be equal to one inch.

All drawings and written material appearing herein constitute original and unpublished work of the Architect and may not be duplicated, used or disclosed without consent of Architect.
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San Francisco, CA 94108
EXISTING FLOOR PLANS - LEVELS 2 & 3

LEVEL 2 - EXISTING

LEVEL 3 - EXISTING

LEGEND

- OCCUPIED FLOOR AREA
- OCCUPIED FLOOR AREA IN ACTIVE USE ZONE
- GROSS FLOOR AREA

ROOM TAG

- ROOM NAME
- ROOM NUMBER

AAU
INSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE SET

540 POWELL, San Francisco, CA 94108

1/8" = 1'-0"
EXISTING FLOOR PLANS - LEVELS 4 & 5

LEVEL 4 - EXISTING

LEVEL 5 - EXISTING

LEGEND

- OCCUPIED FLOOR AREA
- OCCUPIED FLOOR AREA IN ACTIVE USE ZONE
- GROSS FLOOR AREA
- ROOM NAME
- ROOM NUMBER

ROOM TAG

Name

ROOM NAME

ROOM NUMBER

GROSS FLOOR AREA

OCCUPIED FLOOR AREA

OCCUPIED FLOOR AREA IN ACTIVE USE ZONE

1/8" = 1'-0"
LEVEL 4 - PROPOSED

LEVEL 5 - PROPOSED

LEGEND

1 LEVEL 4 - PROPOSED

1 LEVEL 5 - PROPOSED

3 FIRE ESCAPE

STAIRS

PROP ROOM

CLOSET

STORAGE

OPEN TO BELOW

1/8" = 1'-0"
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A3.0
HISTORICAL
EXTERIOR
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540 POWELL
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SOURCE:

ESTM Case No. 2008.0586E - Appendix HR

SOURCE:

ESTM Case No. 2008.0586E - Appendix HR

SOURCE:

ESTM Case No. 2008.0586E - Appendix HR

EARLY PHOTOGRAPH (NO DATE)

PHOTOGRAPH (1968)

PHOTOGRAPH (1978/79)
PROPOSED LOCATION:
REINSTALLATION OF EXISTING PROJECTION SIGN
EXISTING PROJECTION SIGN TO REMAIN
PROPOSED LOCATION FOR REINSTALLATION OF EXISTING PROJECTION SIGN
EXISTING PLAQUE SIGN TO REMAIN
REMOVING EXISTING AWNINGS; RESTORE TRANSOMS AND LEAVE ORIGINAL MUNTIN DETAIL. GLAZING TO BE TRANSPARENT
REMOVE EXISTING BULLET-STYLE CAMERA, DEMO EXISTING PATHWAY AND ANY UNUSED PATHWAYS
INSTALL SMALL FORM FACTOR DOME CAMERA; PAINT CAMERA BODY AND ASSOCIATED PATHWAYS TO MATCH BUILDING EXTERIOR
ROUTE CABLE BEHIND CAMERA TO THE BUILDING INTERIOR
ROUTE CONDUIT THROUGH THE PANEL ABOVE THE EXIT DOOR
INSTALL A CONDUIT ADAPTER TO ROUTE THE CABLE DIRECTLY INTO THE CAMERA HOUSING; ROUTE CABLE THROUGH EXISTING BUILDING PENETRATION
REMOVE THE EXISTING CAMERA BACKBOX AND CAMERA
PARAPET LEGALLY PERMITTED BY PERMIT NO. 8104080; ANY FUTURE RESTORATION OF THE EXISTING PARAPET WILL REQUIRE REMOVAL OF THE EXISTING SUPPORT STRUCTURE AND REPLACEMENT WITH A MORE SENSITIVE STABILIZATION THAT MEETS CURRENT PRESERVATION AND BUILDING SAFETY REQUIREMENTS. THE EXISTING BRACE IS APPROXIMATELY 37 YEARS OLD.
WINDOW TO BE REMOVED AND REPLACED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SCHEDULE OF PERFORMANCE
PROPOSED NEW WOOD WINDOWS SHALL BE INSTALLED TO MATCH HISTORIC FENESTRATION IN TERMS OF CONFIGURATION, FUNCTION, MUNTIN PATTERNS, PROFILE AND THICKNESS OF FRAMES. SIMILARLY, THE ALTERED ORIGINAL WINDOW ON THE FACADE SHALL BE REPLACED, AND ITS ORIGINAL CHARACTER/APPEARANCE RESTORED; SEE SHT. A4.1
ENTRY MARQUEE METAL/GLASS LID DAMAGE TO BE REPAIRED (REQUIRES TO BE SAFELY SECURED TEMPORARILY)
EXISTING VENT AT WINDOW TRANSOM
EXTERIOR WINDOW MATERIALS DAMAGE IDENTIFIED AT THE ENTRY AREA, SEE SHT. A4.2, A4.3
ITEMS BELOW NOTED DURING 9/25/19 SITE WALK
*SEE PHOTOS ON SHT. A4.2
REFERENCES TO SCHEDULE OF PERFORMANCE
EXHIBIT B INSPECTION REPORT-
1/8" inch scale equals 1 foot
Drawing completed by DOUGLAS G TOM,
Certified Architect 10/20/21

Date Scale
No. Date Description

TEFarch.com
79 New Montgomery Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

1/8" = 1'-0"
GENERAL NOTES

- PROPOSED LOCATION FOR REINSTALLATION OF EXISTING FIXTURE
- EXISTING PLAQUE SIGN TO REMAIN
- REMOVAL OF SUPPORT PILLARS WITHOUT BENEFIT OF PERMIT
- INSTALL SMALL FORM-FACTOR DOME CAMERAS AND ASSOCIATED PATHWAYS TO MATCH BUILDING EXTerior
- ROUTE CABLE DIRECTLY INTO THE Camera HOUSING
- INSTALL A CONDUIT ADAPTER TO ROUTE THE CABLE DIRECTLY INTO THE CONDUIT

KEYNOTES

- ESTM ES-25, HR-1; SALVAGE AND RELOCATE (S) PROJECTING SIGN
- ESTM ES-25, HR-3; LEGALLY PERMITTED BY PERMIT NO. 8104080; ANY FUTURE RESTORATION OF THE EXISTING PARAPET WILL REQUIRE REMOVAL OF THE EXISTING SUPPORT STRUCTURE AND REPLACEMENT WITH A MORE SENSITIVE STABILIZATION THAT MEETS BUILDING SAFETY REQUIREMENTS.

FACADE MATERIALS DAMAGE TO BE REPAIRED, SEE SHT. A4.2
EXISTING VENT AT WINDOW TO BE REPAIRED, SEE SHT. A4.2
EXISTING FIXTURE, RELAMP WITH NEW LED RETROFIT LAMP
EXISTING FIXTURE RECESSED IN SOFFIT

PROPOSED SIGNAGE, SEE SIGNAGE CONSULTANT DRAWINGS

ITEMS BELOW NOTED DURING INSPECTION
- SIZE PHOTOS ON SHT. A4.2
- FACADE MATERIALS DAMAGE IDENTIFIED AT THE ENTRY AREA
- ENTRY MARQUEE METAL/GLASS LG DAMAGE TO BE REPAIRED, PROPOSED TO BE LEGALIZED AS IS
- EXISTING VENT AT WINDOW TRANSFORMED TO EXISTING FLOOD LIGHT FIXTURE
- EXISTING FLOOD LIGHT FIXTURE RECESSED IN SOFFIT

WEST ELEVATION - POWELL STREET (EXISTING)
AND PATCHING

KEYNOTES

*NOT ALL FIXTURES LISTED BELOW ARE USED AT EACH PROPERTY'S PROPOSAL

1. LEGALIZE THE CONDITIONS PRESENTED IN THIS PLAN SET, UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED

ESTM ES - 25, HR

- 1

PAINT TO MATCH EXTERIOR BLDG. COLOR

PRESENTED IN THIS PLAN SET, UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED

PAINT TO MATCH EXTERIOR BLDG. COLOR

2. PROPOSED WORK INVOLVING MODIFICATIONS TO THE EXTERIOR OF THE BUILDING INCLUDING THE INSTALLATION OF SECURITY CAMERAS AND LIGHTING

3. ALL NEW PROPOSED SECURITY CAMERA INSTALLATION SHALL BE PERFORMED IN A MANNER CONSISTENT WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE INTERIOR'S HISTORIC PRESERVATION AND CURRENT PRESERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT. THE PROPOSED SECURITY CAMERAS SHALL BE SECURED, TODO TO MATCH BUILDING EXTERIOR AS REQUIRED

4. THE EXISITING BRACE IS NOW APPROXIMATELY 37 YEARS OLD. THE ALTERED ORIGINAL WINDOW SHOULD BE REPLACED AND ITS ORIGINAL CHARACTER / APPEARANCE RESTORED, SEE SHT. A4.1

5. MONUMENTAL DETAIL. GLAZING

RESTORATION OF THE EXISTING SUPPORT STRUCTURE AND REPLACEMENT CONDUITS TO BE ROUTED INTERNALLY TO A POWER SOURCE, WITH A MORE SENSITIVE STABILIZATION THAT MEETS CURRENT PRESERVATION AND BUILDING SAFETY REQUIREMENTS

6. THE EXISTING VENT AT WINDOW TRANSOM TO BE REPAIRED (REQUIRES TO BE SAFELY FILLED IN WINDOWS, TYP. OF 2

7. WINDOW TO BE REPAIRED AND REPLACED TO MEET PERFORMANCE

8. PROPOSED WORK INVOLVING MODIFICATIONS TO THE EXTERIOR OF THE BUILDING INCLUDING THE INSTALLATION OF SECURITY CAMERAS AND LIGHTING

9. THE EXISTING BRACE IS NOW APPROXIMATELY 37 YEARS OLD. THE ALTERED ORIGINAL WINDOW SHOULD BE REPLACED AND ITS ORIGINAL CHARACTER / APPEARANCE RESTORED, SEE SHT. A4.1

EXISTING/PROPOSED EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS

A3.4
NEW WOOD WINDOWS SHALL BE INSTALLED TO MATCH HISTORIC FENESTRATION IN TERMS OF CONFIGURATION, FUNCTION, MUNTIN PATTERN, PROFILE AND THICKNESS OF FRAME. NON-ORIGINAL VINYL WINDOWS OR THE FACADE SHALL BE REPLACED AND TO ORIGINAL CHARACTER / APPEARANCE RESTORED.

NON-ORIGINAL VINYL WINDOWS SHALL BE REMOVED IN THE LEAST INVASIVE MANNER POSSIBLE, TO AVOID DAMAGING ADJACENT HISTORIC FABRIC, SURFACES, OR MATERIALS. USING DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE OR EXTANT ORIGINAL WINDOWS.

PHOTOS - EXISTING UPPER LEVEL WINDOWS

PARTIAL ENLARGED WEST ELEVATION (EXISTING)

1/2" = 1'-0" 1/2" = 1'-0"      [Ref: 1/A4.1] PHOTOS OF EXISTING UPPER LEVEL WINDOWS

PARTIAL ENLARGED WEST ELEVATION (PROPOSED)

540 POWELL
San Francisco, CA 94108

GENERAL NOTES

1. LEGALIZE THE CONDITIONS PRESENTED IN THIS PLAN SET, UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.

2. PROPOSED WORK INVOLVING MODIFICATIONS TO THE EXISTING BUILDING, INCLUDING REPAIR, DEMOLITION, AND INSTALLATION SHALL BE PERFORMED IN A MANNER CONSISTENT WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S STANDARDS. THE BUILDING PERMITS FOR ALL SUCH WORK WILL BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF TO ENSURE SUCH CONSISTENCY, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO APPROPRIATE PLANS FOR METHOD OF REMOVAL, ATTACHMENT, AND PATCHING.

3. REPAIR/PATCH AND REFINISH THE EXISTING ENTRANCE TO MATCH EXISTING MATERIALS AND APPEARANCE AS REQUIRED.

4. ALL NEW PROPOSED SECURITY CAMERAS, LIGHTING, TO HAVE ALL ASSOCIATED CONDUITS TO BE ROUTED INTERNALLY IN THE BUILDING, NO NEW CONDUIT TO BE EXPOSED.

5. TEF TO PROVIDE DETAIL DRAWINGS FOR FIXTURES, CONDUIT, AND INTERNAL ROUTING WHERE, HOW AND WITH WHAT MATERIAL THESE ARE ATTACHED TO THE STRUCTURE, HOW CONDUIT WILL BE ROUTED INTERNALLY TO A POWER SOURCE WITHIN THE BUILDING, ALL FIXTURES FOR EACH PROPERTY TO BE EXPLICITLY SPECIFIED AND SHOWN IN PLAN VIEW, ELEVATION (WITH EXTERIOR CONDUIT), AND A DETAIL DETAIL DRAWING WITH EACH PROPERTY'S DBI PACKAGES THAT WILL BE ROUTED THROUGH PLANNING AND CAN BE REVIEWED AT THAT TIME.

6. SECURITY CAMERA, LIGHTING AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT PROPOSED WORK IN THESE PLANS IS NOT REQUIRED WORK PURSUANT TO THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT, BUT INSTEAD IS WORK AAU MAY PURSUE TO REPLACE EXISTING SECURITY CAMERA, LIGHTING AND ASSOCIATED CONDUIT SUBJECT TO MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS.
1. Proposed location for reinstallation of existing projecting sign
2. Existing plaque sign to remain
3. Remove existing awnings; restore transoms and leave original muntin detail, glazing to be transparent
4. Remove the existing bullet-style camera, demo existing pathway and any unused pathways
5. Install a small form factor dome camera; paint camera body and associated pathways to match building exterior
6. Route cable behind camera to the building interior
7. Route conduit through the panel above the exit door
8. Install a conduit adapter to route the cable directly into the camera housing; route cable through existing building penetration
9. Remove the existing camera backbox and camera
10. Remove existing flood light fixture
11. New light fixture recessed in soffit
12. New light fixture in accordance with Schedule of Performance
13. Proposed new wood windows shall be installed to match historic fenestration in terms of configuration, function, muntin patterns, grille and thickness of frames. Similarly, the altered original window on the facade shall be replaced and its original character/appearance restored
14. Proposed new window to be removed and replaced in accordance with Schedule of Performance
15. Facade materials damage to be repaired
16. Entry marquee metal/glass lid damage to be repaired
17. Existing vent at window transom
18. Existing floodlight fixture
19. Items below noted during 9/25/19 site walk
20. New interior light, AK.2
21. Entry marquee metal glass lid
22. Facade materials damage
23. Existing vent at window transom
24. Existing floodlight fixture
25. Metal security bars added to first STORY WINDOWS ALONG THE EAST ELEVATION WITHOUT BENEFIT OF PERMIT TO BE LEGALIZED AS IS
26. Windows replaced to second & third Story along the East elevation without benefit of permit to be legalized as is
27. Items below noted during 9/25/19 site walk
28. New interior light, AK.2
29. Facade materials damage
30. Entry marquee metal glass lid damage to be repaired
31. Existing vent at window transom
32. Existing floodlight fixture
If this drawing is not 24" x 36", then the drawing has been revised from its original size. All scales must be adjusted. This line should be equal to one inch.

All drawings and written material appearing herein constitute original and unpublished work of the Architect and may not be duplicated, used or disclosed without consent of Architect.
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11 EXAMPLE OF MATERIAL DAMAGE
10 EXAMPLE OF MATERIAL DAMAGE
9 EXAMPLE OF MATERIAL DAMAGE
8 EXAMPLE OF MATERIAL DAMAGE
7 EXAMPLE OF MATERIAL DAMAGE
6 EXAMPLE OF MATERIAL DAMAGE
5 EXAMPLE OF MATERIAL DAMAGE
4 EXAMPLE OF MATERIAL DAMAGE
3 EXAMPLE OF MATERIAL DAMAGE
2 EXAMPLE OF MATERIAL DAMAGE
1 EXAMPLE OF MATERIAL DAMAGE
Relocate Existing D/F Internally Illuminated Blade Sign

Mounting hardware pending survey

Existing Sign Location

Re-locate Existing AAU Blade sign

Remove Awnings
Remove Existing Awnings

Existing Sign Location

Proposed New Sign Location

Existing Plaques

WEST ELEVATION - POWELL STREET
(EXISTING - OPTION B)

1/8" = 1'-0"
Exhibit E

Maps and Context Photos

*This is an approximation of the district boundaries and location of the subject properties for context. More accurate locations can be found on the individual building’s parcel maps.

Master Certificate of Appropriateness Hearing
Case Number 2019-012970COA/PCA/DVA
(4) Article 10 Properties
Academy of Art University
58-60 Federal Street

Parcel Map

Sanborn Map*

Aerial Photo

Site Photo – Front Facade

Site Photo – Rear Facade

GRAPHIC KEY:

Subject Property

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

Master Certificate of Appropriateness Hearing
Case Number 2019-012970COA/PCA/DVA
(4) Article 10 Properties
Academy of Art University
491 Post Street

Parcel Map

Sanborn Map*

Site Photo – Side Façade (West)

Site Photo – Front Facade

Aerial Photo

GRAPHIC KEY:

Subject Property

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

Master Certificate of Appropriateness Hearing
Case Number 2019-012970COA/PCA/DVA
(4) Article 10 Properties
Academy of Art University
625 Polk Street

Parcel Map

Sanborn Map*

Aerial Photo

Site Photo – View 1

Site Photo – Rear Facade

GRAPHIC KEY:

Subject Property

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

Master Certificate of Appropriateness Hearing
Case Number 2019-012970COA/PCA/DVA
(4) Article 10 Properties
Academy of Art University
2151 Van Ness Avenue

Parcel Map

Sanborn Map*

Aerial Photo

Site Photo – View 1

Site Photo – Rear Facade

GRAPHIC KEY:

Subject Property

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

Master Certificate of Appropriateness Hearing
Case Number 2019-012970COA/PCA/DVA
(4) Article 10 Properties
Academy of Art University
Exhibit E
Maps and Context Photos

Project Sites Map*

- 620 Sutter Street
- 625-629 Sutter Street
- 655 Sutter Street
- 680-688 Sutter Street
- 410 Bush Street
- 540 Powell Street

*This is an approximation of the district boundaries and location of the subject properties for context. More accurate locations can be found on the individual building’s parcel maps.

Master Permit to Alter Hearing
Case Number 2019-012970PTA/PCA/DVA
(8) Article 11 Conservation District Properties
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Article 11 Conservation District Map*
New Montgomery-Mission-Second Street

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

*The New Montgomery-Mission-Second Street Conservation District map has not been updated in the Planning Code since 2012 and this map may not accurately reflect existing conditions.
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Article 11 Conservation District Map*

Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter Street

*The Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter Conservation District map has not been updated in the Planning Code since 1985 and this map may not accurately reflect existing conditions.
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 *The Sanborn Maps in San Francisco have not been updated since 1998, and this map may not accurately reflect existing conditions.
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*The Sanborn Maps in San Francisco have not been updated since 1998, and this map may not accurately reflect existing conditions.
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*The Sanborn Maps in San Francisco have not been updated since 1998, and this map may not accurately reflect existing conditions.
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*The Sanborn Maps in San Francisco have not been updated since 1998, and this map may not accurately reflect existing conditions.
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655 Sutter Street
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*The Sanborn Maps in San Francisco have not been updated since 1998, and this map may not accurately reflect existing conditions.
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680-688 Sutter Street
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*The Sanborn Maps in San Francisco have not been updated since 1998, and this map may not accurately reflect existing conditions.
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*The Sanborn Maps in San Francisco have not been updated since 1998, and this map may not accurately reflect existing conditions.
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*The Sanborn Maps in San Francisco have not been updated since 1998, and this map may not accurately reflect existing conditions.
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