Major Permit to Alter
Executive Summary
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Category: Category IV (Contributory)
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Block/Lot: 3704/021
Project Sponsor: Paul Tognotti, Michael Zucker & Associates
155 Montgomery Street, Suite 201
San Francisco, CA 94104
Staff Contact: Rebecca Salgado - 415-575-9101
Rebecca.Salgado@sfgov.org

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

972 MISSION STREET is located on the north side of Mission Street between 6th Street and Mint Street (Assessor’s Block 3704; Lot 021). The subject building is a contributor to the Mint-Mission Conservation District, locally designated under Article 11, Appendix K of the Planning Code.

The Classical Revival-style, five-story commercial loft building was built in 1925. It is clad with stucco with steel multilite windows and is topped by a flat roof.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project involves removing and replacing an existing elevator at the building with a larger, accessible elevator. The new elevator will have a rooftop penthouse over run that will be visible from a public right of way. The penthouse will be clad with cement plaster with a light, neutral finish and will be set back 53-8” from the front façade of the building. The new penthouse will be as tall as the remaining existing elevator penthouse, which rises 11’-5” above the rooftop parapet. Please see photographs and plans for details.

COMPLIANCE WITH PLANNING CODE

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

In order to proceed, a building permit from the Department of Building Inspection is required.
Applicable Preservation Standards.
The proposal overall is appropriate for and consistent with the purposes of Article 11, meets the standards of Article 1111.6 of the Planning Code, and complies with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, in that:

- the proposal respects the character-defining features of the subject building and conservation district;
- the integrity of distinctive stylistic features and examples of skilled craftsmanship that characterize the building shall be preserved; and,
- the proposed replacement of an existing elevator penthouse with a slightly larger elevator penthouse will not remove distinctive materials, nor irreversibly alter features that characterize the building;
- the distinctive features and finishes of the building will be retained and preserved by the proposal, as the existing flat roof is utilitarian in nature and does not possess any character-defining features that could be impacted by the proposed penthouse;
- the proposed penthouse will be only partially visible from the public right-of-way, and is set far back from the Mission Street façade;
- the penthouse will be clad in cement plaster painted in a neutral color, which will make it appear subordinate to the historic resource;
- the essential form and integrity of the building and its environment would not be impaired if the proposed penthouse were removed in the future.

The Department has determined that the proposed work will be in conformance with the requirements of Article 11 and the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. Proposed work will not damage or destroy distinguishing original qualities or character of the subject building. The Department finds that the historic character of the building will be retained and preserved and will not result in the removal of historic fabric.

PUBLIC/NEIGHBORHOOD INPUT
The Department has not received any public inquiries about the proposed project.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW STATUS
The Project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) as a Class 1 categorical exemption.

BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION
The Department recommends APPROVAL of the proposed project as it appears to meet the provisions of Article 11 of the Planning Code regarding Major Alteration to a Category IV (Contributory) Property and the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation.

ATTACHMENTS
Draft Motion – Major Permit to Alter
Exhibit A – Authorization Update, Severability, Changes and Modifications
Exhibit B – Plans and Context Photos
Exhibit C – Environmental Determination
Exhibit D – Maps and Aerial Views
ADOPTING FINDINGS FOR A PERMIT TO ALTER FOR MAJOR ALTERATIONS DETERMINED TO BE APPROPRIATE FOR AND CONSISTENT WITH THE PURPOSES OF ARTICLE 11 OF THE SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING CODE, AND TO MEET THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR’S STANDARDS FOR REHABILITATION, FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED ON LOT 021 IN ASSESSOR’S BLOCK 3704 IN A C-3-G DOWNTOWN- GENERAL ZONING DISTRICT AND A 160-F HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICT.

PREAMBLE

On October 16, 2019, Paul Tognotti of Michael Zucker & Associates (hereinafter “Project Sponsor”) filed Application No. 2019-019493PTA (hereinafter “Application”) with the San Francisco Planning Department (hereinafter “Department”) for a Permit to Alter for exterior alterations at a subject building located on Lot 021 in Assessor’s Block 3704, which is a Category IV (Contributory) building (hereinafter “Project Site”) and locally designated under Article 11, Appendix A of the Planning Code.

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

On February 5, 2020, the Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting on Permit to Alter Application No. 2019-019493PTA.
The Planning Department Commission Secretary is the custodian of records; the File for Record No. 2019-019493PTA 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 the Permit to Alter, as requested in Application No. 2019-019493PTA in conformance with the architectural plans dated October 16, 2019, and labeled Exhibit B based on the following findings:

FINDINGS

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

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

2. Project Description. The proposed project involves removing and replacing an existing elevator at the building with a larger, accessible elevator. The new elevator will have a rooftop penthouse overrun that will be visible from a public right of way. The penthouse will be clad with cement plaster with a light, neutral finish and will be set back 53'-8" from the front façade of the building. The new penthouse will be as tall as the remaining existing elevator penthouse, which rises 11'-5" above the rooftop parapet. Please see photographs and plans for details.

3. Property Description. 972 MISSION STREET is located on the north side of Mission Street between 6th Street and Mint Street (Assessor’s Block 3704; Lot 021). The subject building is a contributor to the Mint-Mission Conservation District, locally designated under Article 11, Appendix K of the Planning Code. The Classical Revival-style, five-story commercial loft building was built in 1925. It is clad with stucco with steel multilite windows and is topped by a flat roof.

4. Surrounding Properties and Neighborhood. The District is characterized by small- to mid-scale industrial, residential, and commercial buildings ranging in height from one to ten stories, with the predominate height between two and five stories. Most buildings in the District are constructed on through-lots with visible rear elevations. The District includes several warehouses and industrial lofts, three residential hotels with commercial ground floors, and a former bank. A four-story Edwardian-style commercial loft building is directly to the west of the subject building, while a two-story Art Deco-style commercial building is directly to the east of the subject building.

5. Public Outreach and Comments. At the date of publication, the Department has received no public correspondence in support or opposition to the project.

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.

Alteration: 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 compatible with the architectural character of the building and the district, and is consistent with Section 1111.6(c) of the Planning Code.

C. **Appendix K of Article 11: Mint-Mission Conservation District.** Section 7 of the Mint-Mission Conservation District includes specific standards and guidelines for the review of new construction and certain alterations. The Commission finds the proposed alterations to be compatible as follows:
a. Composition and Massing. The proposal is consistent with the Composition and Massing of this Conservation District. The new rooftop elevator penthouse, while visible from the street, is a slightly larger replacement of an existing visible elevator penthouse, and is set far back from the front façade. The new penthouse will match the height of the remaining existing elevator penthouse.

b. Scale. The proposal is consistent with the Scale of this Conservation District, as it will not change the overall height of the building.

c. Materials and Colors. The proposal is consistent with the Materials and Colors of this Conservation District. The new elevator penthouse will have cement plaster cladding to match the cladding of the building and the remaining elevator penthouse.

d. Detailing and Ornamentation. The proposal is consistent with the Detailing and Ornamentation of this Conservation District. No decorative elements of the building will be affected by the proposed work, and the new elevator penthouse will have simple detailing and cladding appropriate to its utilitarian nature.

D. 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 shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

Not Applicable.

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

The proposal is to replace an existing elevator penthouse with a slightly larger elevator penthouse on the roof of the property. This change will not remove distinctive materials, nor irreversibly alter features that characterize the building.

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

Not Applicable.
(4) **Standard 4:** Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

*Not Applicable.*

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

*The distinctive features and finishes of the building will be retained and preserved. The existing flat roof is utilitarian in nature and does not possess any character-defining features that could be impacted by the proposed elevator penthouse.*

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

*Not Applicable.*

(7) **Standard 7:** Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

*Not Applicable.*

(8) **Standard 8:** Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

*Not Applicable.*

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

*The existing flat roof does not possess any character-defining features; therefore, the proposed elevator penthouse will not destroy any distinctive architectural elements of the property. The elevator penthouse will be only partially visible from the public right-of-way, and is set far back from the Mission Street facade. The penthouse will be clad in cement plaster painted in a neutral color, which will make it appear subordinate to the historic resource.*
(10) **Standard 10:** New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

The essential form and integrity of the building and its environment would not be impaired if the proposed penthouse were removed in the future.

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 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 strengthen neighborhood character by respecting the character-defining features of the building in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards*

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

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

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

*The proposed project will not result in commuter traffic impeding MUNI transit service or overburdening the streets or neighborhood parking.*

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

*The proposed project will not have a direct impact on the displacement of industrial and service sectors.*

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

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

G) That landmark and historic buildings will be preserved:

*The proposed project is in conformance with Article 11 of the Planning Code and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards.*

H) Parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas will be protected from development:
The proposed project will not impact the access to sunlight or vistas for the parks and open space.

9. For these reasons, the proposal overall, appears to meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and the provisions of Article 11 of the Planning Code regarding Major Alterations to Category IV (Contributory) buildings.
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 a Permit to Alter for the property located at Lot 021 in Assessor’s Block 3704 for proposed work in conformance with the architectural submittal dated October 16, 2019, and labeled Exhibit B on file in the docket for Record No. 2019-019493PTA.

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 a period of three (3) years from the effective date of approval by the Historic Preservation Commission. The authorization and right vested by virtue of this action shall be deemed void and canceled if, within 3 years of the date of this Motion, a site permit or building permit for the Project has not been secured by Project Sponsor.

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

I hereby certify that the Historical Preservation Commission ADOPTED the foregoing Motion on February 5, 2020.

Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES:
NAYS:
ABSENT:
ADOPTED: February 5, 2020
EXHIBIT A

AUTHORIZATION UPDATE

This authorization is for a permit to alter to allow alterations located at 972 Mission Street (Block 3704, Lot 021) pursuant to Planning Code Section(s) 1111.6 and Appendix K to Article 11 of the Planning Code within the C-3-G DOWNTOWN- GENERAL District and a 160-F Height and Bulk District; in general conformance with plans, dated 10/16/2019, and stamped “EXHIBIT B” included in the docket for Record No. 2019-019493PTA reviewed and approved by the Historic Preservation Commission on 2/5/2020 under Motion No. XXXXXX. This authorization and the conditions contained herein run with the property and not with a particular Project Sponsor, business, or operator.

SEVERABILITY

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

CHANGES AND MODIFICATIONS

Changes to the approved plans may be approved administratively by the Zoning Administrator. Significant changes and modifications of conditions shall require Historic Preservation Commission approval of a new Major Permit to Alter. In instances when Planning Commission also reviews additional authorizations for the project, Planning Commission may make modifications to the Major Permit to Alter based on majority vote and not required to return to Historic Preservation Commission.
Exhibit B:
Plans and Context Photos
# Project Information

**ELEVATOR REPLACEMENT**

Apalpi & Rubino Building
973 Mission Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

**Sheet Number:** A5

**Issue Date:** Budget Set 03/01/19

**Permit:** 09/20/19

**Scale:** 3/32"=1'-0"

**Project Title/Address:**

**Sheet Title:**

**DRAWN BY:**

**PROJET NO.:**

**SCALE:**

**AS NOTED**

**IN THE DESCRIPTION**

**MATERIALS**

**NEW ELEVATOR MACHINE ROOM PENTHOUSE**

**SHOWN SHADED**

**NOTE:**

**NEW EXTERIOR WORK LIMITED TO ELEVATOR MACHINE ROOM PENTHOUSE**

**SHOWN SHADED**

**NEW ELEVATOR MACHINE ROOM PENTHOUSE NOT VISIBLE IN THIS VIEW CONCEALED BY EXISTING PENTHOUSE**

**MISSION STREET (SOUTH) ELEVATION**

**SCALE: 3/32"=1'-0"**

**JESSIE STREET (NORTH) ELEVATION**

**SCALE: 3/32"=1'-0"**

**WEST ELEVATION**

**SCALE: 3/32"=1'-0"**

**EAST ELEVATION**

**SCALE: 3/32"=1'-0"**
## CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination

### PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Address</th>
<th>Block/Lot(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>972 MISSION ST</td>
<td>3704021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Permit No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019-019493PRJ</td>
<td>201909252719</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Project description for Planning Department approval.

Major Permit to Alter request for replacement of existing elevator with a new larger wheelchair accessible elevator.

### STEP 1: EXEMPTION CLASS

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

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

**FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING USE ONLY**

- [ ] Class ___
### STEP 2: CEQA IMPACTS
**TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

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

**Comments and Planner Signature (optional):**
## STEP 3: PROPERTY STATUS - HISTORIC RESOURCE
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

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

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

## STEP 4: PROPOSED WORK CHECKLIST
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

Check all that apply to the project.

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

Note: Project Planner must check box below before proceeding.

- Project is not listed. GO TO STEP 5.
- Project does not conform to the scopes of work. GO TO STEP 5.
- Project involves four or more work descriptions. GO TO STEP 5.
- Project involves less than four work descriptions. GO TO STEP 6.

## STEP 5: CEQA IMPACTS - ADVANCED HISTORICAL REVIEW
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

Check all that apply to the project.

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

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

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

(Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator)

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

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

- Reclassify to Category C
  - (attach HRER or PTR)

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

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

Comments (optional):

Preservation Planner Signature:

---

**STEP 6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION**

**TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Approval Action: Planning Commission Hearing</th>
<th>Signature: Rebecca Salgado</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project.</td>
<td>01/08/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once signed or stamped and dated, this document constitutes a categorical exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code. In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, an appeal of an exemption determination can only be filed within 30 days of the project receiving the approval action. Please note that other approval actions may be required for the project. Please contact the assigned planner for these approvals.
**STEP 7: MODIFICATION OF A CEQA EXEMPT PROJECT**

**TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

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

### PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Address (If different than front page)</th>
<th>Block/Lot(s) (If different than front page)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>972 MISSION ST</td>
<td>3704/021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Previous Building Permit No.</th>
<th>New Building Permit No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019-019493PRJ</td>
<td>201909252719</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans Dated</th>
<th>Previous Approval Action</th>
<th>New Approval Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Modified Project Description:**

### DETERMINATION IF PROJECT CONSTITUTES SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

Compared to the approved project, would the modified project:

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

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

### DETERMINATION OF NO SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planner Name:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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