San Francisco
Historic Preservation
Commission

Meeting Minutes

Commission Chambers – Room 400
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

Wednesday, October 7, 2009
11:30 A.M.

Regular Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Wolfram, Buckley, Martinez Matsuda, Damkroger, Hasz, Chase

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT CHASE AT 11:40 A.M.

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Tina Tam – Preservation Coordinator, Tara Sullivan, Aaron Starr, Tim Frye, Angela Threadgill, Shelley Caltagirone and Linda Avery – Commission Secretary
A. **TRAINING**

1. **Planning CEQA Workshop / Training**

   **Tara Sullivan** – Department Staff
   - Overview of CEQA and how the Department focuses in Categorical Exemption for historic resources.

   **SPEAKERS:**
   - Nancy Shanahan – Telegraph Hill Dwellers, re: categorical exemption (Cat Ex) process.
   - Aaron Goodman – from District 7, re: (Cat Ex) issues of notification.
   - Peter Warfield – Library Users Association, re: CEQA training.

**12:30 P.M.**

Commission Secretary made the following announcements before starting the meeting.
- Public records are available to the public at all HPC hearings and at the Planning Department everyday.
- Full packets of material for the hearings are available at the hearing for the public. They can definitely see it but they need to return the materials for my files after the hearing is over.

B. **PUBLIC COMMENT – 15 Minutes**

**SPEAKERS:**
- Robert A. Byrum – Resident representing the neighbors, re: Preserve historic house at 2750 Vallejo.
- Bradley Wiedmaier – Concerned Historian, re: 2750 Vallejo preservation.
- Aaron Goodman – Resident of District 7, re: Public broadcasting of HPC meetings and HPC meeting minutes.
- Peter Warfield – Library Users Association, re: Agenda packets, commissioner’s attendance, public broadcast of hearings, and draft minutes.
- Peggy Coster – Use of historic designation and video recording of hearings.

C. **MATTERS OF THE COMMISSION**

2. Consideration of Adoption of Draft Minutes:

   - Draft minutes of Special Hearing of April 8, 2009
   - Draft minutes of Regular Hearing of August 19, 2009
   - Draft minutes of Regular Hearing of September 16, 2009

   **SPEAKER:** Peter Warfield – Library Users Association
   **Motion:** April 8, 2009 minutes - Approved
   August 19, 2009 minutes – Approved as corrected by Commissioner Martinez, changing Delores to Dolores
September 16, 2009 minutes – Continued to 10/21/09 to address commissioner’s concerns

AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase

Commissioner Martinez:
How is materials given to the Commission at the hearing handled in terms of making them available to the public?

Commission Secretary Avery:
As I do with the Planning Commission, I either stamp or write on the documents that they are received at this hearing. We take them back to the office. Staff, Ms. Margaret Yuen who is assigned to work with me will make a copy. The original will go to the staff planner for their file, and I retain a copy for my public correspondence file.

Commissioner Martinez:
So, whatever is handed out to the Commission during the hearing will be made available to the public.

Commission Secretary Avery:
Yes.

Commissioner Damkroger:
I ask that staff could come back with the report on 2750 Vallejo and I also ask to put packet materials on-line.

Commission Secretary Avery:
The Department is trying to make that happen. Our Department is under the Department of Technology and Information Systems (DTIS) which is the department that handles our website. For instance, the Board of Supervisors (BOS) is not under DTIS. They can link their case documents to their calendar. We are not able to do that, but our Department is working to establish its own software so that we can link our case reports to the calendar. If I can, I’d also like to respond to the whole thing about putting this Commission hearing on television – we would like to do that too. Unfortunately, when this Commission was established, there was no money put aside for it. We are hoping that next year we can find money to make that happen. I can’t promise that.

Deputy City Attorney Marlena Byrne:
I think there are some kinds of concerns from the public that this is being videoed and the video is not being made available to members of the public. That actually is incorrect. These hearings are not being videoed. This is just an internal live feed to these cameras directly. There is no video recording being made of this; there are only audio tape recordings which are, if requested, made for a fee and made available for the public.

Commissioner Buckley:
To what extent is the process for public information the same or different from the Planning Commission and for this Commission? Is the agenda available?

Commission Secretary Avery:
There is no difference. The agendas are posted electronically on the website where anybody can access. Hard copies are at our Department at the 4th floor reception, at the Planning Information Counter next door at 1660 Mission on the first floor and at the Library. It is posted here in City Hall and also the entire agenda is read into a recorder for anyone who wants to call up and listen to the entire agenda. The HPC process is absolutely identical to the Planning Commission.
D. CONSIDERATION OF ITEM PROPOSED FOR CONTINUANCE

   431 Jackson Street - Assessor’s Block 0196; Lots 027. Between Sansome Street and
   Hotaling Place, the subject property is a contributing structure to City Landmark #13, the
   Jackson Square Historic District. It is located within a C-2 (Community Business)
   District with a 65-A Height and Bulk limit. The proposal is a request for a Certificate of
   Appropriateness to remove the existing projecting sign and armature and install a new
   armature and tenant signage.

   Recommendation: Approval.
   (Proposed for Continuance Until Determined)

SPEAKERS:  None

ACTION:  Continue to October 21, 2009

AYES:  Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase

E. PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS WHERE THE PUBLIC HEARING HAS BEEN CLOSED

There was new information for this category that pertained to Item 4, 1833 Page Street. Public
hearing was held for this item.

NOTE: Because new information was made available for item 4, this category was omitted

F. CONSIDERATION OF FINDINGS AND FINAL ACTION – PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

4. 2009.0852L (S. Caltagirone: 415/558-6625)
   1833 PAGE STREET, Park Branch Library, south side of Page Street between Shrader
   and Cole Streets, on Assessor’s Block 1229, Lot 031 – The subject property is a
   Classical Revival-style branch library building designed by the McDougall Brothers and
   constructed circa 1909. Before the Commission is consideration to approve,
   disapprove, or approve with modifications initiation of landmark designation as a
   San Francisco Landmark under Article 10 of the Planning Code. The property is
   zoned P (Public) and is in a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

   Preliminary Recommendation:  Disapprove Initiation of Landmark Designation.
   (Continued from the September 16, 2009 hearing)

   NOTE:  On September 16, 2009, following public testimony, the public hearing was
   closed and the Commission entered into deliberation. The Commission continued this
   item to October 7, 2009, to allow the Project Sponsor a chance to see if the
   recommendations of their consultant are cost effective and whether or not the cost to
   use a different material for a door than what is currently proposed, as recommended by
   Commissioner Martinez is within their ability to do. The vote was (+5 -0) with
   commissioners Buckley and Wolfram absent

SPEAKERS:  Elisa Skaggs – Page and Turnbull, Jill Bourne – Deputy City Librarian,
   Mark Shotts – Lead Architect, Peter Warfield – Library Users
   Association, Howard Wong, Bradley Wiedmaier - Historian

ACTION:  Disapproved initiation of designation; required that staff calendar a
   status report in six months; and another initiation for landmark
   designation in 13 months.

AYES:  Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase

NO:  Buckley

RESOLUTION:  637
G. REGULAR CALENDAR

5. 2008.0968L  
THE APPLETON & WOLFARD LIBRARIES – Parkside Branch Library, 1200 Taraval Street: Assessor’s Block 2351, Lot 001; Marina Branch Library, 1890 Chestnut Street: Assessor’s Block 0469, Lot 001; Merced Branch Library, 155 Winston Drive: Assessor’s Block 7236, Lot 001; Ortega Branch Library, 3223 Ortega Street: Assessor’s Block 2094, Lot 005; North Beach Branch Library, 2000 Mason Street: Assessor’s Block 0074, Lot 001; Eureka Valley Branch Library, 3555 16th Street: Assessor’s Block 3564, Lot 095; Western Addition Branch Library, 1550 Scott Street: Assessor’s Block 0703, Lot 002; Excelsior Branch Library, 4400 Mission Street: Assessor’s Block 6797, Lot 046.

The subject buildings are eight postwar branch libraries designed by the firm Appleton & Wolfard and constructed from 1951-1966. Before the Commission is consideration to approve, disapprove, or approve with modifications the initiation of landmark designation as a San Francisco Landmark under Article 10 of the Planning Code. The properties are zoned P (Public) and/or Open Space (OS).

Preliminary Recommendation: Approve Initiation of Landmark Designation with Modifications for some Branch Libraries and Disapproval for others. Staff will identify each at the hearing.

(Continued from the September 16, 2009 hearing)

SPEAKERS - Project Sponsors and affiliates:  
Jill Bourne – Deputy City Librarian, Paul DeFratus – Bureau of Architecture, Marcia Maytum – Ledding, Maytum & Stacey Architect, John Paul Scott – Deputy Director for Mayor’s Office on Disability, Karen Mauney-Brodek – Planner from Recreation and Park

SPEAKERS against Initiation of Landmark Designation:  
Peggy Coster - Library user, Karin Payson – Interior Designer, Marcia Schneider – S.F. Public Library, Tan Chow – China Town Community Development Center, Tricia Defries – North Beach Resident, Elizabeth Beaus – Friends of Joe DeMaggio, Anita Walker – Telegraph Hill Cooperative Nursery School, Bob Planthold, Lizzy Hirsch – North Beach Resident, Julie Christensen, Pat Tura, Lee Goodin – North Beach Resident, Alison Wetherall, Mindy Linetzky – Branch Library Improvement Program, Rene Bihan – North Beach Resident & Landscape Architect, Marc Bruno – North Beach Resident, Paul Scott – former President of Telegraph Hill Dwellers, Anne Wintroub – Friends of the Libraries

SPEAKERS in favor of Initiation of Landmark Designation:  
ACTION: Initiated designation of landmarking or a district nomination for Marina, Eureka Valley, North Beach (the building itself and not the lot), Western Addition and the Excelsior Branch Libraries; strike out “ranch style” in No. 5a; strike out Nos. 7 and 8; change landmark designation to landmark designation and/or multiple property listing designation; calendar Parkside and Merced Branch Libraries for a status report in two months

AYES: Buckley, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger
NAYES: Hasz and Chase

RESOLUTION: 638

6. 2009.0846U (A. Threadgill: 415/558-6602)
1050 Battery Street, southeast corner of Union and Battery Streets, in Assessor's Block 0111, Lot 003. Request for Review and Comment on the nomination of the Armour & Co. Building to the National Register of Historic Places. The subject property is located within a C-2 (Community Business) Zoning District, 65-X Height and Bulk District, and the Northeastern Waterfront Historic District.

Preliminary Recommendation: Send comments of support to the State Historic Preservation Officer

SPEAKER: None
ACTION: Recommended forwarding the nomination of the building to the National Register of Historic Places
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Chase
ABSENT: Damkroger

7. 2009.0848U (A. Threadgill: 415/558-6602)
1 Lombard Street, southwest corner of Battery and Lombard Streets, in Assessor's Block 0081, Lot 001. Request for Review and Comment on the nomination of the Merchants Ice & Cold Storage Building to the National Register of Historic Places. The subject property is located within a C-2 (Community Business) Zoning District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

Preliminary Recommendation: Send comments of support to the State Historic Preservation Officer

SPEAKER: None
ACTION: Recommended forwarding the nomination of the building to the National Register of Historic Places
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Chase
ABSENT: Damkroger

8. 2009.0849U (A. Threadgill: 415/558-6602)
450 Sutter Street, north side, between of Stockton and Powell Streets, in Assessor's Block 0285, Lot 006. Request for Review and Comment on the nomination of the Medical Arts Building to the National Register of Historic Places. The subject property is located within a C-3-R (Downtown Retail) Zoning District, 80-130-F Height and Bulk District, and the Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter Conservation District.

Preliminary Recommendation: Send comments of support to the State Historic Preservation Officer

SPEAKER: None
ACTION: Recommended forwarding the nomination of the building to the National Register of Historic Places with an amendment to change the text description in Section 8, on page 12 to reflect that there is no need to compare this building to other works and to say it's far superior.

AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Chase

ABSENT: Damkroger

557 Ashbury Street, northwest corner of Haight and Ashbury Streets, in Assessor's Block 1231, Lot 009. Request for Review and Comment on the nomination of the Doolan Building to the National Register of Historic Places. The subject property is located within a Haight Street Neighborhood Commercial District, 40-X Height and Bulk District, and the Haight Street Alcohol Restricted Use District. Preliminary Recommendation: Send comments of support to the State Historic Preservation Officer

SPEAKER: Norman Larson – Owner of the Doolan Building supports the nomination

ACTION: Recommended forwarding the nomination of the building to the National Register of Historic Places

AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Chase

ABSENT: Damkroger

H. STAFF REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

10. (T. Tam: 415/558-6325)
Landmark Designation Work Program – Review properties for status and possible funding sources
(Continued from the September 16, 2009 hearing)

Item was not heard and was continued to the next hearing on October 21, 2009.

I. PRESIDENT’S REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

None

J. PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS: None

Adjournment: 5:10 p.m.

The minutes were proposed for adoption at the Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission on Wednesday, November 4, 2009.

ACTION: Approved

AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram, Damkroger

ABSENT: Chase and Matsuda
San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission

Meeting Minutes

Commission Chambers – Room 400
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

Wednesday, October 21, 2009
12:30 P.M.

Regular Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Damkroger, Hasz, Martinez, and Wolfram
COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Chase, Buckley, and Matsuda

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY VICE PRESIDENT DAMKROGER AT 12:34 P.M.

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Tina Tam – Preservation Coordinator, Pilar LaValley, Matt Weintraub, Tim Frye, Mary Brown, and Linda Avery – Commission Secretary
Time: 12:30 P.M.

A. PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS:
Aaron Goodman – District 7 Resident, Re: Symposium at UC Berkeley on Landscape Design; Minutes
Peter Warfield – Library Users Association, Re: Golden Gate Valley Branch Library; Minutes; Preservation Architect for Park Branch renovation
William Hough – Representing Philip and Zella Burton Center for Human Rights, Re: Proposal to nominate SF Civic Center National Historic Site as a UNESCO World Heritage Site
Zach Stewart – Re: Thanking Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) for serving
Pat Buschavich – Re: Facade ordinance
Bradley Wiedmaier – District 6 Resident, Re: Golden Gate Valley Branch Library; Historic report on Park Branch on naming issues; Minutes

B. STAFF REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. (T. Tam: 415/558-6325)

Landmark Designation Work Program
(Continued from September 16 and October 7, 2009 hearings)

Preservation Coordinator Tina Tam:
This is an informational presentation about the historic resource surveys currently in progress. Later this afternoon, we'll going over the details of these projects and we'll bring these findings to you for adoption. Included in the survey program are four survey areas in the Eastern Neighborhood plan area, South of Market (SOM), Show Place Square, Mission North and Mission South. These survey activities have been on going for quite some time and based upon the current progress, we can bring the survey findings to you sometime early next year. While we wait unit that happens, we have the Eastern Neighborhood interim review procedures. These procedures were adopted some time last fall. They are set up so that they act as some sort of precautionary measures to secure against the loss of historical resources and to provide an extra layer of scrutiny in the period between when the Eastern Neighborhood was adopted and when the survey will be completed and adopted by the HPC. Today’s calendar, you have two items on the Consent Calendar for your review and comment, and one item on informational presentation for your review. In the interim procedure, there are two levels of review. There are two types in your packet today. The first type, are projects that require California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review for properties constructed before 1963 that involves demolition or major alteration. Those projects get forwarded to you for review. We will provide you with a memo outlining why it’s in your packet, a copy of the environment evaluation application, and information that is part of the project. The second type, are new construction within the plan area that is 55 feet or taller, or, 10 feet taller that the adjacent building that were built before 1963. Those projects get forwarded to you for review and comments. They are part of the regular scheduled hearing in whatever comment you'll make to us, we forward it to the project sponsor and the Planning Director. Today’s calendar we have two items – 141-147 Albion Street and 411-415 Valencia Street. Both are for demolition and new construction. Should you want to pull those items off from the Consent
Calendar, we have planner staff prepared to make their presentation to receive your comments.

2750 Vallejo Street is a 3-story single family building constructed in 1905. The Planning Department began its review on the property three years ago on March 3, 2006, when they proposed a project to demolish the existing building to construct a new single family in its place. At that time in 2006, the Planning Department issued an Historical Resource Evaluation Response (HRER) stating that the subject building was a potential contributory building in the identified historic district. Therefore, demolition of the building would cause an adverse impact to the environment. In 2007 and 2008, the project came back revised to retain the existing building and to construct a horizontal addition at the side and at the rear of the building instead. A new permit was filed and the old permit was cancelled. In response to this revised project, on July 2, 2008, the Planning Department issued another HRER, finding the proposed project would not be a significant impact to the identified historic district, or to the subject property. On May 6, 2009, the Department issued a Categorical Exemption (Cat Ex) for the project. A digressional review (DR) was filed for the permit, a DR hearing before the Planning Commission was heard on July 16, 2009. At the hearing, the Zoning Administrator considered a front set back variance for the project. Based upon the DR action, the Planning Commission did not take DR and approved the project as proposed. The variance decision for the front set back was taken under advisement. Based on the notes that I have, there were three points that the DR requestor brought up at the DR hearing. The first one, the DR requestor believed that the building qualified as an individual building eligible for the California Register. The Planning Department disagreed. We believed that the building is a contributory building to historic district, but did not merit and qualify under criteria 3. Another point that the DR requester raised was the Planning Department assessment of the facade’s historic integrity. The requestor believed that the building retained a high level of historic integrity. We have evidence based upon investigation of both archival records and a preservation consultant’s report that demonstrated that the building’s foundation and facade were different from what originally constructed on the property. The third dealt with some of the minor texture and massing of the building facade. It was the bay window which since has been eliminated. After the DR hearing, the building permit was approved and it’s currently under review by the Department of Building Inspection. That’s the status of this project.

The Landmark Designation Work Program – I had reported back to you in September on the genesis and original of the Landmark Designation report, the buildings that were designated through the program, the challenges we faced, some ideas about the Department’s budget, and staff time devoted to this program. Since the conception of this program, the Department has allocated approximately 0.5 FTE, which is around $50,000 for this program. That typically allowed the Department to work on one or sometimes two designations per year. Depending upon the complexity of a particular landmark – the size, review procedures, write up of the project – sometimes a designation can take up to two or three years to process. For example, the James Lick Bath Building at 6165, 10th Street, City Landmark No. 246, took three years; the Music Concourse at Golden Gate Park, City Landmark No. 249 – the Department had a completed designation report from a preservation consultant, it still took seven hearings of the Landmark Preservation Advisory Board and a number of rewrites by planning staff. That designation resulted in taking up the budget for designation work programmed for the entire year. As much as we support
having a work program on designation, it is difficult to have it with the reduction in staff, (two major rounds of lay-offs, and an increased workload). Unfortunately, we are not able to keep the Landmark Program in this current fiscal year’s budget. Elaine Forbes, our Chief of Finance in the Department, presented that information to you in February of this year. Now with the initiation of the five Appleton & Wolfard Libraries from this Commission, I have asked Elaine and the Planning Director, John Rahaim, to come to the November 18 meeting to talk straightly about budgets and numbers. Hopefully we will get some more information then. With no other known designation work program, you non-the-less asked a status report of the program from last year. We had ten buildings or sites in the program: 1) The Van Ness Avenue Light Standards – 260 or so that run the entire length of US 101 – at 10% completion; 2) The Tellan Flat at 2870 Washington Street – at 10%; 3) Mona Cafe/Club at 440 Broadway – at 10%; 4) Sunshine School at 2728-2762 Bryant Street – at 40%; 5) Park Merced – at the time it was placed on the work program, we did not have a designation report and a DPR form, we just had newspaper clippings. However, we have a draft resource evaluation from a consultant at this point. It includes an analysis of the building as an eligible historic district – at 10%; 6) 49 Mile Scenic Drive – at 10%; 7) Mission National Bank at 3868 16th Street – it is a building that’s part of the Mission North Survey; we have more information – at 25%; 8) Muni Transit Shelters at multiple locations – at 25%; 9) Del Monte Canning at Montgomery – at 25%; 10) Mother’s Building in San Francisco Zoo – at 25%. Those are the 10 buildings/sites on last year’s Historic Landmark Designation Program; our gage of how much we have done and how much more we need to do.

Vice President Damkroger:
When Planning Staff come on the 18th, they will be able to in addition to talk to us about the budget, talk to us about the prospect for the initiation of our library designation.

Preservation Coordinator Tina Tam:
Yes, I have asked them to provide all their input as to how that could be accomplished, either this fiscal year, or, the next fiscal year. (I do want to clarify something I said to you at the last HPC hearing. I mis-spoke when I said that once initiation from HPC happens, the Planning Department staff has a 90-day turn around time to come back to you with some information, a designation report, for you to consider in making your decision of whether to approve, disapprove, or approve with modifications. That is not true. The only initiation for the 90 days is triggered is when the Board of Supervisors makes that initiation. There is no time limit on the planning staff for when that has to come back to the HPC, once HPC initiates.

Commissioner Martinez:
There’s a building on Sutter Street that Johannan was working on that had been connected to a synagogue. It might have been from the year before. It’s a classical building.

Preservation Coordinator Tina Tam:
I don’t see it on last year’s work program. It might have been the previous year’s work program. I can look it up.

Commissioner Martinez:
It seems to me that work was done on it. Also, on the Transit Shelters, there was a draft report for the whole group written by a graduate student. Did you take that into account?

Preservation Coordinator Tina Tam:
I do have a draft DPR, but I’m not sure which shelters. There are five identified. That has still put us in the 25% according to planning staff.

**Commissioner Martinez:**
When you come to the Fund Committee, you should be prepared to describe what this is all about. You should talk about these also. The Fund Committee may want to pursue some of these, either hiring separate consultants, or, funding you guys to do it if you don’t have staff time. There may be some of these that the Committee might want to pursue and finish.

**Preservation Coordinator Tina Tam:**
It’s my understanding that the Department is going to pursue funding sources for this program, but we can certainly consider your suggestion.

**Commissioner Martinez:**
I think you should, even if only 10%, this is already a considerable investment in time. The longer we wait, the harder it is. As staff changes, the harder it is to go back to finish because no one remembers what was done. Now at least, you have people who still remember what’s going on here. I think some of these things the committee might be interested in pursuing. I think these should be presented to the Fund Committee one way or another.

**SPEAKERS:**

**C. MATTERS OF THE COMMISSION**

**Commission Secretary Avery:**
Commissioners, there were lots of comments about minutes today. I think this is a good time for us, for you especially, to indicate to me how you want to go forward with minutes. I believe the Chair is going to make a statement. I have had conversation with our Deputy City Attorney, Ms. Tam of Planning, and with President Chase on the minutes. I can actually tie part of this back to the budget, and what has been allocated to HPC is zero dollars. The minutes from my understanding is going from what happened in the past from the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board. We have tried to continue with that pattern. It seems that the Landmarks Board wanted more comments in their minutes from their Commissioners than the Planning Commission, for instance. Planning Commission minutes do not include comments from their Commissioners at all, except under Commission Matters. Their comments are captured there. For comments from the public, Mr. Warfield is correct, the Sunshine Ordinance does require summary of comments from the public. I can honestly say that in addition to being tardy now, your minutes would be extremely tardy. There is no way I can meet the deadline because we don’t have staff. We have a temporary staff person assigned to me to help with all the logistics of putting together a hearing and doing your minutes. We just don’t have the money to hire another person who can be dedicated to these functions. I also have taken on another commission without additional modifying my other responsibilities. This is costing the Department nothing because I just took it on. I can’t, honestly, give you everything that you had in the past as the Landmarks Board, that the public wants, or that the Sunshine Ordinance even requires without adequate staff. Until there is a balance here, somehow or another, I will always be deficient [to some degree] with what everyone wants.
Vice President Damkroger:
We’ll have the adoption of minutes first and then we’ll have discussion about the format of the minutes.

2 Consideration of Adoption:
   a. Draft Minutes of Regular Hearing of September 2, 2009
   b. Draft Minutes of Regular Hearing of September 16, 2009

SPEAKERS:
Peter Warfield – Library Users Association, Re: summary of public comments in minutes, Joan Wood – Friends of Appleton and Wolfard, Re: Video tape of the meeting would include public comments.

ACTION: Approved September 2, 2009 minutes, and approved as amended September 16, 2009 minutes - on page 2, correct mews from muse; real dirt at grade; the way it is in the plans; and on page 4 - Venetian palazzo

AYES: Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram, Damkroger

Vice President Damkroger:
I like to ask the City Attorney if you see any difficulty or any problem with us discussing format of the minutes at this point

Deputy City Attorney Byrne:
No, I think it is well within the purview of the Matters of the Commission to discuss the format of its minutes and provide feedback to the Commission Secretary on how they would like to see minutes in the future.

Vice President Damkroger:
There has been some discussion about condensing the minutes. I’ll give you my personal experience with having been on the staff and also on the commission side and the public side. It can be very helpful to have lengthy minutes. It’s also enormously time consuming on the staff’s part. There tends to be a fair amount of discussion around specifically what someone said and some changing of that discussion when in fact they may have said what was there, but they just want to change it now. What is most critical on each agenda item is who the speaker were, how they are identified, what the final resolution is, or the action is, and how it was worded and who voted in what way. The proposal is to summarize our minutes in that way so that we have the core and the most important information. And if someone wants more details they can go to the tape which is one of the functions of the tape. With regard to Architectural Review Committee (ARC), I would suggest we do what we did when I was the Historical Preservation Officer for San Jose – because those comments are critical for action on the part of the applicant - the Chair would summarize some of the key points at the end of each item in order to give direction to the applicant – and those could go into the minutes for referral. But, aside from that, there would not be a great amount of discussion included in the minutes. I’ll leave you with those thoughts.

Commissioner Wolfram:
Is the audio tape available to the public?

Commission Secretary Avery:
The audio tape is the official record for Commission meetings and they are always available to the public

Commissioner Wolfram:
What about the compliance with summarizing public comments. Sounds like we are required....

Commission Secretary Avery:
The Sunshine Ordinance does require a summary of public comments and in the past I have
actually been able to do that because I had the staff that I needed and we were able to go through it. Basically what we do now is identify the speakers, their affiliation(s) with whichever organization, and whether they are for or against the item that’s on the calendar. We don’t actually have summaries. For instance, we had California Pacific Medical Center (CPMC) at last Thursday’s Planning Commission hearing. We had 140 speakers. We are not able to go through and include a summary of all the comment for those speakers. But we can say this person is in favor of whichever site as part of the IMP process for that project. But we are not going through and just summarizing everything that’s being said. I honestly say that my preference would be to not to do it. But I would always want to do what the law requires. But I need to have staff to do that. I have two commissions to run. I can’t do that any longer unless I can get full-time staff to do this. I can honestly say you probably won’t get that.

**Vice President Damkroger:**
I would add that the current proposal which would be to include the speakers information, the action, or the resolution, and the vote would be more in line with the Planning Commission, and probably be more consistent with the way Planning Commission keeps minutes as well.

**Commissioner Wolfram:**
I was wondering if we can say something like 20 people spoke in favor of this and 10 against - something to summarize it. At least we would be trying to acknowledge what they are saying. People not reading the minutes would have no idea what the flavor or the tenor is. And I would agree with Vice President Damkroger in trying to condense the comments, especially the ARC - maybe just having a summary at the end that these are the directions and approach and concept - not necessarily listing every single comment, but just trying to get a summary at the end. Often there is so much back and forth and the commissioner said one thing but then they think about it and they have a different point of view....doesn’t need to all be there.

**Commission Secretary Avery:**
I agree.

**Commissioner Martinez:**
Is the Director aware that we are out of compliance?

**Commission Secretary Avery:**
He is aware of the amount that I can produce. Yes, he knows that we are not meeting the time line and I’m not sure he is aware of the summary issues.

**Commissioner Martinez:**
That is important. He is the one responsible.

**Commission Secretary Avery:**
Commissioners, I would suggest that there’s not much we can do in this current fiscal year. The budget has been set and was done so before you were formed.

**Commissioner Martinez:**
There’s not much you can do, but there are things that John can do. He needs to know from us that this is an issue. We are out of compliance. I don’t think it is up to us necessarily to come up with a solution or to figure out an easier way of doing it.

**Deputy City Attorney Byrne:**
I would recommend the Commission provide feedback right now to Ms. Avery on format of the minutes and continue to work with Department staff on specific issues related to the Sunshine Ordinance.

**Commissioner Martinez:**
I think we need to comply with the ordinance. We need to do it in a substantive way, not a symbolic way. Are the tapes digital? I’d like you to look into the possibility of doing digital recordings and posting it on-line.
Commission Secretary Avery:
I'll look into that.

Vice President Damkroger:
Why don't we try for the next meeting the format that we've discussed here and we'll have the Planning Director at our November 18th meeting. We'll be talking about the budget, and that would be an opportunity to talk about this. Hopefully we'll have an example prior to that meeting.

Commission Secretary Avery:
At the next meeting, I will let you know what I find out about the digital recording.

SPEAKERS:
Peter Warfield – Library Users Association, Re: Minutes in relation to Sunshine Ordinance and maximum disclosure
Unidentified Speaker – Re: Funding the video taping of HPC hearings

3. President’s Report and Announcements
None

4. Commission Comments/Questions

Vice President Damkroger:
I want to make a suggestion that staff reports we received not include the appendixes that are part of the ordinance. I feel because we have those in the binder already, the great binder that was done for the new preservation commission, I don’t think they need to be included. That is one way to save paper and time.

Commissioner Martinez:
When are we going to schedule the discussion about California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in response to the questions from Mr. Wolfram and Mr. Buckley about the discrepancy between following the Secretary of Interior Standards and Findings, and whether or not the project affects the historic resource. The topic needs to be calendared.
The Golden Gate Branch Library was reviewed by the Landmarks Board and did have comments about it. It would be nice to have an informational presentation about what they did with our comments.

D. CONSENT CALENDAR

Note: All items (5 through 10) were removed from the Consent Calendar and considered at this hearing. Items 5-7, 9 & 10 were removed from the Consent Calendar by Commissioner Martinez and item 8 was removed from the Consent Calendar by Vice President Damkroger. It should also be noted that a member of the public indicated an interest in removing item 10 from the Consent Calendar.

Note: Prior to the staff presentation for item 5, Commission Secretary Avery suggested that the Commission should capture their actions in a motion or in a resolution, as follows:

Commission Secretary Avery:
Before we get to Public Comment, this is a perfect example I believe of how this Commission is proceeding as you did as the Landmark Advisory Board. Your comments, your direction to staff should be captured in a motion. You should
have a document that actually shows the public what this Commission wants to have happen, but that is not going to happen. Going forward, items like this (item 5), your action should be captured in a motion or resolution document that the public has easy access to as opposed to making comments in a somewhat notation, advisory format. I guess they could be captured in your notes because they wouldn’t be captured in your minutes.

**Vice President Damkroger:**
My expectation was we would make a motion which include Alan’s comments.....This is also a comment, not a C of A.

**Commission Secretary Avery:**
I agree, but still even this should be captured in a document and I’d like you to have that. You don’t have anything before you. You don’t have a draft motion or a draft resolution.

**Vice President Damkroger:**
I see what you mean. Typically a staff report would have a draft motion and you would have carried that in the minutes and maybe added to or subtract from it in a discussion. I see your point.

**Commissioner Martinez:**
Ms. Tam, I am confused about what we can do or what we can’t do on the calendar. On the calendar it says “concur with the Department....”, how can we concur without making a motion.

**Preservation Coordinator Tam:**
You can agree with our recommendation and make that part of your comment to Planning Director.

**Commissioner Martinez:**
Isn’t that a motion?

**Preservation Coordinator Tam:**
It’s your comment. That’s how I see it looking at the interim permit procedure. The comments to the Director who can either accept them, or, not necessarily reject them, but take them into advisement when we are processing the permits.

**Commissioner Martinez:**
I’d like to make a motion. The City Attorney can figure out whether or not we ought to or not – cause I don’t see any other way of moving with this.

**Commissioner Hasz:**
I am in agreement with Commissioner Martinez. Have we just become an Advisory Board again? We aren’t actually a Commission if we are only commenting and passing on to someone else to decide. I would prefer to make a motion.

End of discussion.

5. 2008.0726E (P. LaValley: 415/575-9084) 141-147 Albion Street, east side between 16th and 17th Streets, in Assessor's Block 3568, Lot 068. **Presented for review pursuant to the Eastern Neighborhoods Interim Permit Review Procedures for Historic Resources.** The proposed project is to demolish an existing, one-story, storage building, and construct a 4-story residential building. The subject property is located within the RTO-Mission (Residential Transit Oriented - Mission) District with a 45-X Height and Bulk limit. The Department is processing an Environmental Evaluation application and Historic Resource Evaluation Report for the project.
Recommendation: Concur with the Department's preliminary determination regarding identification of historical resources and/or the potential for historical resource impacts, and allow the Department to proceed with reviewing and/or processing the project's application(s).

SPEAKERS: Owen Canelly – Project Architect
ACTION: Passed a motion to concur with the Department’s determination with an addendum that the fact that this new building on the same lot does not damage the historic integrity of this historic building and that it remain a historic resource.
AYES: Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram, Damkroger
ABSENT: Buckley, Matsuda, Chase

MOTION NO. 0027

6. 2008.0180EV (P. LaValley: 415/575-9084)
411-415 Valencia Street, east side between 15th and 16th Streets, in Assessor's Block 3554, Lot 027. Presented for review pursuant to the Eastern Neighborhoods Interim Permit Review Procedures for Historic Resources. The proposed project is to demolish an existing, one-story, auto repair building and construct a six-story residential building with ground floor retail and parking. The subject property is located within the Valencia Street Neighborhood Commercial Transit (Valencia NCT) District with a 55-X Height and Bulk limit. The Department is processing a Community Plan Exemption and Variance application for the project. Recommendation: Concur with the Department's preliminary determination regarding identification of historical resources and/or the potential for historical resource impacts, and allow the Department to proceed with reviewing and/or processing the project's application(s).

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Following the public hearing, the item was continued indefinitely. Commissioners requested that the Planning Department bring back more information that includes elevations of the two buildings together, historic resource and its significant character defining features, and material samples.
AYES: Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram, Damkroger
ABSENT: Buckley, Matsuda, Chase

431 Jackson Street - Assessor’s Block 0196; Lots 027. Between Sansome Street and Hotaling Place, the subject property is City Landmark #13, the Hotaling Annex-East Building and is a contributing structure to the Jackson Square Historic District. It is located within a C-2 (Community Business) District with a 65-A Height and Bulk limit. The proposal is a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove the existing projecting sign and armature and install a new armature and tenant signage.
Recommendation: Approval with Conditions
(Continued from October 7, 2009 hearing)

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Approved with conditions as modified that the new sign, with the size and design shown, be mounted in the frieze above the store front at least one foot away from the bracket.
AYES: Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram, Damkroger  
ABSENT: Buckley, Matsuda, Chase  
MOTION NO. 0028

584-590 Pacific Avenue Assessor’s Block 0163; Lots 011. Between Kearny Street and Montgomery Streets, the subject property is a contributing structure to the Jackson Square Historic District. It is located within a C-2 (Community Business) District with a 65-A Height and Bulk limit. The proposal is a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove the existing non-historic storefronts and install a new storefront system; and to construct a vertical addition.  
Recommendation: Approval with Conditions.

SPEAKERS: Alex Teriam – Project Architect  
ACTION: Approved with condition as drafted by Planning Staff  
AYES: Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram, Damkroger  
ABSENT: Buckley, Matsuda, Chase  
MOTION NO. 0029

1182 Market Street - City Landmark #94, The Orpheum Theater Building, historically known as the Pantages Theater, Assessor’s Block 0351; Lots 022. Located at the intersection of Market and Grove Streets. The subject property is also a contributing structure to the Civic Center Historic District and is a Category I building under Article 11 of the Planning Code. It is located within a C-3-G (Downtown General) District with an 80-X Height and Bulk limit. The proposal is a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a new hollow metal core door on the exterior of the building.  
Recommendation: Approval with Conditions

SPEAKERS: Pat Buscovich – Project Sponsor  
ACTION: Approval with conditions as drafted and modified by Department staff regarding the hardware  
AYES: Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram, Damkroger  
ABSENT: Buckley, Matsuda, Chase  
MOTION NO. 0030

51-99 Grove Street – The Bill Graham Civic Auditorium, historically known as the Exposition Auditorium, Assessor’s Block 0812; Lots 001. Bound by Hayes, Grove, Larkin, and Polk Streets. The subject building is a contributing structure to the Civic Center Historic District. It is located within a P (Public) District with an 80-X Height and Bulk limit. The proposal is a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove the existing light box sign on the Hayes Street elevation and to install a sign indicating the theater name and an LED marquee to promote theater events.  
Recommendation: Approval with Conditions

SPEAKERS: Michael Levine – Re: Name of Civic Auditorium, Gregg Perloff – Project Sponsor  
ACTION: Following public testimony and commissioner’s deliberation the item was continue to November 18, 2009 to allow absent commissioners the opportunity to participate. Commissioner Hasz requested
additional information on the history (including the original name) of the building. The public hearing remains open.

AYES: Hasz, Wolfram, Damkroger
NAYES: Martinez
ABSENT: Buckley, Matsuda, Chase
NOTE: For votes on strictly procedural matters (such as a continuance), all that is required is a majority vote of those present.

E. REGULAR CALENDAR

11. Historic Resource Surveys In Process (citywide). Informational Presentation by Department Staff regarding historic resource surveys that are currently in process and anticipated to be completed in 2009 or 2010. Includes descriptions of individual survey projects, anticipated findings, schedules for completion, and discussion of steps required to finalize survey projects. In-process surveys include Department projects as well as community-sponsored projects for which Department staff provides review and recommendation.

Preliminary Recommendation: Informational only

SPEAKERS: Aaron Goodman requested that Historic Surveys be open to more historic survey consultants

ACTION: Information only – no action was taken

12. 2009.0963U West Slope of Russian Hill Historical Context Statement. The area under study consists of the block bounded by Greenwich, Lombard, Larkin and Polk Streets, plus four lots at the northwest corner of Lombard and Larkin Streets. Consideration to adopt, modify, or disapprove the West Slope of Russian Hill Historical Context Statement.

Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt the West Slope of Russian Hill Historical Context Statement.

SPEAKERS: Catherine Patrin – Architectural Historian, Re: Role of the Northeast San Francisco Conservancy; Joe Butler – Director of Northeast SF Conservancy, Re: Urged adoption which would aid fundraising

ACTION: Approved as corrected page 6, paragraph 3, “area burned” should read “area did not burn”; and page 18, paragraph 4, “Greenwich and Larkin” should be Greenwich and Lombard.

AYES: Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram, Damkroger
ABSENT: Buckley, Matsuda, Chase

MOTION NO. 0031

Adjournment: 5:02 p.m.

The minutes were proposed for adoption at the Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission on Wednesday, November 4, 2009.

ACTION: Approved
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram, Damkroger,
ABSENT: Chase and Matsuda
SAN FRANCISCO
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes

Hearing Room 400
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Wednesday, November 4, 2009
11:30 A.M.

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Alan Martinez, Andrew Wolfram, Karl Hasz

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY ALAN MARTINEZ, CHAIR, AT 11:05 A.M.

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Tina Tam – Preservation Coordinator, Pilar LaValley, Tim Frye, and Linda Avery – Commission Secretary

(11:30 a.m. – 12:15 p.m.)

1. 2009.0081ACE. (T. Frye: 415/575-6822)
950 Mason Street, the Fairmont Hotel, bounded by California, Mason, Powell and Sacramento Streets. Assessor’s Block 0244, Lot 001 - Request for Review and Comment before the Architectural Review Committee regarding the removal of the existing adjacent podium and tower structure and the construction of a new podium and tower. The project is currently undergoing environmental review per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by the Department (Case No. 2009.0081E) and will require a Certificate of Appropriateness (C of A) for final Historic Preservation Commission approval. The Fairmont Hotel is San Francisco Landmark No. 185. The site is zoned RM-4 (Residential, Mixed) District within the Nob Hill Special Use District and is in a 200-E, 300-E, and 320-E Height and Bulk District.
PRESENTERS: Elisa Skaggs, Page & Turnbull – Project Team; Miles Berger, Architect – Project Team

SPEAKERS: Alice Carey – Representing Neighbors for Historic Nob Hill and SOS
Tonga – she expressed concern that the presentation was focused on California and Mason without addressing Powell and Sacramento; would like to see a project that is compatible with the historic district (this neighborhood); listed a number of resources in the neighborhood including the Tonga Room in the hotel and the terraces by Lawrence Halprin that are also in the hotel
Keith Whitening – Representing a number of people for Historic Nob Hill and residents in his building at 850 Powell Street – concerned that the sponsors have not shown views of the “ugly” side of the tower which needs to have appropriate loading docks; expressed concerns about traffic; the project needs a more friendly approach for the proposed residents; and the proposed glass is not compatible with the neighborhood
Bradley Wiedmaier – Architectural Historian – he expressed concern about the Tonga Room and the great pavilion room that sits at the corner over California and Powell with a magnificent lighting fixture that Mario Giadano designed (will the fixture be re-used?); expressed that there many wonderful things about this design, but unfortunate that the eastern front of the building gets less play with the low-rise structure.

ACTION: None – Review and Comment only

ARC COMMENTS: Commissioner Wolfram:
- Would like to see a series of analysis diagrams that analyze the composition of the historic Fairmont and do the same sort of analysis and comparison with the new addition to prove in what way this addition is compatible with the historic Fairmont. That would look at the composition of the building; the base; the middle; the top; the composition of the façade; the punched windows; the repetition of the windows; how much of the repetition is kind of the same window type repeated; the scale of the massing of the façade elements – how long they are; their proportions; the scale of the roof elements; and some analysis of the materials
- There has been no speaking to what makes this compatible
- In looking at the view up Powell Street at the existing tower, that tower has a clear base, middle, top; it has a repetition of windows that are very regular; it has a real simplicity and clarity to it.
- I look at the new design and I don’t understand it at all. It is just a whole bunch of forms that are pushed together. There is no expression of the top of the building; there’s no real repetition of windows; there’s a lot of different windows; different balconies; different door cut outs; the building has pop out in every direction; and I would argue that the original tower for all its flaws is perhaps more compatible than this new proposal
- I’m not saying this needs to look like a historic building, but it needs to have some relationship in terms of the repetition of the elements; in terms of the solids and voids
- In order for this to be compatible it should look like it really belongs in this location adjacent to the Fairmont and not like it could be a tower anywhere in the South of Market or...
anywhere. Right now it looks like it could be anywhere in any part of the city. It doesn’t really speak to me as being in this extremely important location.

**Commissioner Hasz:**
- Where the trellis is, I would prefer to have less differentiation in all the elements and maybe a little more consistency which would go to exactly what is already in the neighborhood.
- Something a little more consistent on the number of openings, etc, but also on changing the materials. The trellises are just adding on another thing that is confusing.
- Even the trees down below – above the lower historic setback area – to me it adds an element that simply doesn’t go in the neighborhood. I don’t see trees on all sorts of pavilions throughout that neighborhood.
- The new addition could be a lot more simple on the upper section so that is more uniform and more in going with the rhythm of other towers in the area.
- I enjoy the setback now. I enjoy the lower historic section and how you bookend to that. It makes sense to me.
- I appreciate the project more than what is sitting there right now.
- I think more historic context, and as Andrew was saying, more explanation and maybe a little bit of re-design would help out a lot

**Commissioner Martinez:**
- I want to make it clear that I didn’t feel that any setback was appropriate because I don’t think that any volume greater than what’s there now is conceivably appropriate. I will never vote for a CofA for anything that’s a bigger volume than what’s there now.
- Really I feel that any appropriate project would have to be of considerably less mass than what is there now.
- The critical views of the Fairmont on the east side are, to me, between Powell and Mason. And it’s sort of telling to me that you cropped the photos so that you couldn’t see that.
- To say that the view is only slightly impacted is to me mind boggling. That seems to me a complete mis-representation of what is there. I’ve been there. You can see most of the east façade from California Street walking along the south sidewalk. To say that this is going to be a minimal impact to that experience of this building is simply not true.
- That being said, I don’t disagree with anything that Andrew has said, but to me, playing with a setback of 20 feet or 40 feet is beside the point. The podium should be lower. The tower if built at all – I would have to be persuaded that the tower is even desirable for it to be rebuilt.
- When you look at what the state of this building was at the end of World War II, there had been an addition on the back. In the ‘60s you could make an argument that a parking garage and a new tower were necessary for the operations of the hotel. We are not talking about adding hotel rooms in this current project. This will be all privately owned condo units. The hotel is actually going to get smaller. So I don’t
see how any of this is necessary for the operation of the hotel as a hotel. The entire rationale for building something like this as a support to the hotel is just not there. So if we look at what the hotel needs – new conference rooms; a bigger parking garage – well possibly, but I think you have to look at, as one member of the public said, I think you have to start from scratch and look at what is compatible with this building in terms of form and massing as if only the original structure was there.

- This to me seems like a completely wrong headed approach.
- As far as the details go about the work being done on the existing hotel, I am fine with that.
- The more I look at the canopy at the back, the more I think that the only canopy I would feel comfortable with would be a traditional cloth canopy as opposed to a modern glass permanent one.
- The seismic joints; the linkages; all these seem to be sensitively done
- But to me we need to look at the larger issue, which to me is whether or not a project of this size could conceivably be compatible with this landmark.

Commissioner Wolfram:
- Looking at the view from the corner of Powell and California, about the setback above the historic wall, it isn’t so much to me the setback – the setback seems reasonable, it’s the top two stories of that piece that seem like they shouldn’t be there. I think if you had the same setback but didn’t have those top two stories of townhouses – that to me would be much better. I think it is really the massing of those top two stories seems like its too much massing in that location relative to its proximity. It is the closest piece to the historic building.
- The other thing about that view that is telling to me is that it looks like there are four additions proposed. The composition looks like four separate buildings – the tower that has sort a lump on the south side of it; the podium; the atrium entrance; and then those townhouse pieces. It just seems like there is so much going on
- In the existing building there is just this very straight forward, symmetrical solid volume that in footprint is probably as large as the footprint of the new additions and yet it’s just a single building.
- I think simplifying further would be helpful; and coming back with those analysis diagrams and maybe I could be persuaded that some of the things you have done with the horizontal fenestration do relate with the horizontal rustication of the building. I just would need to see those in more detail.
- What is the status of the Tonga Room relative to the historic resource study of this building?

Tim Frye of Department Staff:
The Department has identified the Tonga Room as a historic resource and we are currently drafting our Historic Resource Evaluation Response to be included in the Draft EIR as part of the project.
Commissioner Martinez:
- I agree with your analysis Andrew in terms of the aesthetics of it. This project has made me appreciate what is there from a modernist point of view – the parts are very clear; they express their function; very straight forward whereas this current proposal lacks any clear order.
- But that being said, I like Andrew's idea about having a compatibility analysis and also to have more studies done to show more clearly what is really happening with the massing and what this project is doing with the eastern side of the building.

Commissioner Wolfram:
- I picture those analysis documents and they could be like hand-drawn 3-D diagrams. They don’t need to be photo realistic simulations. They really just need to kind of speak to the architectural elements – massing; fenestration; proportions of the elevations – they can be hand-drawn diagrams that help us understand the concepts behind the project and look at its compatibility and analyzing the existing structure.
- I think the south side is two stories too tall. If you took that off I think I would be okay.

Commissioner Martinez
- I think it is four stories too tall

Commissioner Hasz
- I think that is a use idea. I’m not too against it

Commissioner Wolfram
- I think if those trellises were gone, it would help. They make it look taller and bigger than it is.

Commissioner Martinez:
- To wrap up – I think we agree on some things and disagree on others.

Commission Secretary Avery:
- Mr. Chair, I think as we continue to try to fine tune our minutes what I will do is include these last set of comments for your review and you can let us know how we have erred and correct us.

(12:15 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.)

2. 2008.1398A (P. LaValley: 415/575-9084)

150 Otis Street, - the Juvenile Court and Detention Center, west side between McCoppin Street and Duboce Avenue, in Assessor’s Block 3513, Lot 007. Request for Review and Comment before the Architectural Review Committee regarding the adaptive use and rehabilitation of the existing building for low-income housing. The project is currently undergoing environmental review per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by the Department (Case No. 2008.1398E) and will require a Certificate of Appropriateness (CofA) for final Historic Preservation Commission approval. The former Juvenile Court and Detention Home, designed by architect Louis Christian Mullgardt and constructed in 1916, is Landmark #248. The site is zoned P (Public) District and is in an 85-X Height and Bulk District.

PRESENTERS: Kim Piechota, Chinatown Community Development Center – Project Manager for Project Sponsor; Jim Fagler and Kate
Rochelle, Gelfand Partners, Architects – Project Team; Chris Meyer, Carey & Co – Project Consultants; Joan McNamara – Mayor’s Office of Housing

SPEAKERS: Bradley Wiedmaier – Architectural Historian – Wants to know what is happening with the bronze lanterns on either side of the door; expressed that it might be more appropriate to keep the recessed main entry rather than have it right on the street reflecting the light; and expressed concerns about the façade.

ACTION: None – Review and Comment only

ARC COMMENTS: Commissioner Wolfram:

- I’m really thrilled to see this project. It is a fantastic use for this building. I congratulate you all for what you’ve done to date
- I would be very curious to see the comments from SHIPO. I’m very curious to see their perspective on the windows because I think that is the most challenging on this.
- Starting at the entrance, I think that the solution that you’ve done is reasonable. I think it is a fairly compatible solution of lowering that piece. I am a little concerned about the logistics about those floor heights and whether once you get sprinklers and other things in that piece that bridges over, whether there really is enough height because 7 feet at the entrance lobby when you are coming in to a building is kind of mean, so anything you can do that – I think you just might have to do some more analysis there.
- I’d be curious to see more drawings of the front door because it is going to be visible.
- You might also consider whether that front piece – whether glass is the appropriate security. Maybe there is a discrete metal grill instead or metal door or grate or something. I’m not convinced that glass is the right solution so maybe there is some alternatives you can look at
- I don’t have any problem with lowering this. It was done at the Conservatory of Music quite successfully – this same accessibility condition
- I think the elevator tower seemed fine. The new design is quite compatible and appropriate.
- I think my biggest concerns are the windows. They are two fold; both the ventilator and the lights.
- I guess I would prefer if there was more of the character of the divided lights that was more similar to the historic views both in the base of the building and above
- I’m curious to see - maybe if we saw some perspective or something - what those ventilators would look like.
- One approach would be to do this where it would look like a New York historic apartment building and everybody would have window air conditioners and it like after-the-fact treatment. It’s like a quasi temporary solution.
- That could be one approach – the window design is designed and it is adjusted for this infill units.
- I’m very sympathetic to trying to get natural ventilation instead of mechanical ventilation. I understand the issues about the cost and you would lose space with ducting and it would start affecting the room plans, but it is a pretty big design feature.
• If we could look at ways to get more of the [divided] lights in, I would prefer that.

**Commissioner Hasz:**
• On the ventilators, in looking at this on the depth in the setback on the windows, I actually think it might just go away if you put them on the bottom. We probably would never see them. However on the third floor we definitely will especially if they are protruding. I would ask there if we could potentially do the hydraulic system just for that floor so we don’t have look at the mechanics. Do a different solution just for one floor. I don’t think it will throw your budget that crazy. Everything else I think could fly.
• The entrance – I have a different opinion. I agree with lowering it. I’d just take all remnants of stairs out. I think it would look clean and majestic. I think the columns would be accented very nicely.
• For the use this is going to be, out of respect, I do not want a side entrance for the men and women that have served. They should come through the front door. I believe in taking the stairs out.
• Thank you Mr. Wiedmaier in pointing out the light fixtures. Definitely we need to keep those around

**Commissioner Martinez:**
• I’m ok with the entrance.
• I do think it is a little awkward to have the remnants of the steps on the outside. I think they can be paired back on the outside, but I’d still like to see the shadow of them so that you know it was there. But it does feel a little awkward to have these lumps of stairs.
• I’m fine with the elevators at the back.
• I did agree with Planning about the vegetation at the top, about it being too much and the flair out being too much. With this sort of thing I think the simpler and straight forward the better.
• I agree with the concern that the clay roof tile be salvaged and replaced whenever possible.
• I agree with staff’s recommendation to have a gate instead of a door to address shadow concerns.
• I would like to see a little bit more background on the vents to see if we can around that. I like Karl’s idea about maybe getting around the protrusions. When they are not protruding they are not so bad.
• I share staff’s desire to have the divided lights but I do understand about the cost. When this comes back to the full commission, to be persuaded I would need to see the cost involved; that this is a hardship; that the project can’t bare these divided lights, then I’ll live with it. Our preference is to restore it to what it was as much as possible. Another possibility might be just the divided lights at the lower south façade, especially that upper lantern.

**Commissioner Hasz:**
• I enjoy the glass in front and find it more inviting than putting a gate. I think it would be lighter, brighter. And pay more attention to the height. People would really see it and open it up.
• I do think there is a possibility of bringing a secondary door further up closer more in historic fashion than where it is now.
• Anyway, I’m fine with the glass door and I would actually prefer it.
• For the use this is going to be, out of respect, I do not want a side entrance for the men and women that have served. They should come through the front door. I believe in taking the stairs out.

Commissioner Wolfram:
• I just want to add that I agree with Commissioner Hasz’ comments about the stairs. I don’t actually like the remnants so much. I think I’d prefer to see a clean new design there. It’s a new alteration and I think having these little pieces left over isn’t satisfactory

Adjournment: 1:16 p.m.

The minutes was proposed for adoption at the Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission on Wednesday, December 16, 2009.
ACTION: Approved
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Buckley, Damkroger, Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram
COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Chase and Matsuda

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY VICE PRESIDENT DAMKROGER AT 1:33 P.M.

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Tina Tam – Preservation Coordinator, Michael Smith, Angela Threadgill, S. Caltagirone, Tim Frye, Tara Sullivan, and Linda Avery – Commission Secretary

A. PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS: Bradley Wiedmaier – Re: Urged the HPC to take a position on 2750 Vallejo Street

B. STAFF REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. CLG Annual Report

(T. Tam: 415/558-6325)

Preservation Coordinator Tina Tam:
The Planning Department is in the process of preparing the San Francisco Certified Local Government (CLG) 2009 Annual Report. The report covers the period from October 1, 2008 to September 30, 2009. Since the recording period covers the last three months in 2008, it will highlight the change over from the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board
(LPAD) to the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC). This report goes over the Department’s participation and commitment to make sure we maintain a highly qualified Historic Preservation Commission, professional staff and administrative support services. The CLG has a requirement for you, as well as the Planning staff, to provide me or Margaret Yuen a copy of your latest resume. For those of you who have done so, thank you very much. Another aspect of the report will cover the high level of dedication and creativity on the part of the Planning Department to ensure we continue to implement a very ambitious preservation program despite the fact we have very limited financial resources and funding. As I have mentioned at the last hearing, the Planning Director, John Rahaim, and the Chief Finance Officer, Elaine Forbes are coming to the November 18 hearing to talk specifically about the Department’s Work Program and our budget. We’ll be able to see how much we can accomplish in the area of preservation with very little resources. Some of the responsibilities of the San Francisco Planning Department as a CLG include conducting historic resource surveys, preparing context statements, landmark designations and historic district designations, processing Mills Act tax reduction applications, facilitating the review and comments of National Register nominations, conducting design and environmental review and the review of Section 106 projects. The report we produce will demonstrate that we have accomplished all of this. Another important aspect of the report that I think you’ll find of interest is that we will be including in this report the attendance records of commissioners at HPC hearings, the minutes from these hearings, as well as a list of training sessions and conferences attended by commissioners and Planning Department staff. As a CLG requirement, all commissioners and staff are required to attend at least one approved training session or program per year. For those who have attended training this current fiscal or calendar year, please provide the information to me. And for those of you that haven’t please contact me off-line and I will go over what is required and what is approved training. I have given your names and e-mail addresses to the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) and you are all part of the California CLG listserv. You should be getting emails and announcements of upcoming events, training session and conferences. The annual report is due by the end of the year, December 31st. I plan to provide you a copy of the report once we complete it.

Status of the Market and Octavia survey integration project – you have heard this at least two times in the months of August and September. The project was heard before the Planning Commission (PC) on October 22, 2009. The PC did pass the resolution to move this forward. They incorporated all of your comments into their resolution. I’m going to read this verbatim so I don’t miss anything, “The Planning Commission approved a resolution to modify and add language to address design principles about blank walls, make amendments to Policy 3.2.10 per HPC suggestions by changing mid-block non contributory sites to 50/55 feet instead of 60/65 feet; reduce height from 80/85 feet to 50/55 feet and 60/65 feet on parcels at the corner of Market and Church per HPC suggestions.” They also added three additional parcels to this motion and those are parcels are near or at the corners of Landers and 14th Street. The resolution was passed by a vote of 7 to 0.
Commissioner Damkroger:
It might also be worth noting in the CLG Annual Report the training that Tara has done for this commission, or can that be included?

Preservation Coordinator Tina Tam:
I would have to double check with OHP. This training has to be an approved CLG training program. I don’t want to discredit Ms. Sullivan.

Commissioner Damkroger:
You could also mention to them this is in-house training that may not count as a CLG requirement.

C. MATTERS OF THE COMMISSION

2. Consideration of Adoption:
   a. Draft minutes of Regular Hearing of October 7, 2009
   b. Draft minutes of Regular Hearing of October 21, 2009

SPEAKERS: None

MOTION: Adopted the minutes for October 7, 2009 with corrections made to Item 5, page 4 – from “SPEAKERS in favor of a New North Beach Branch Library and/or against Initiation of Landmark Designation” to “SPEAKERS against Initiation of Landmark Designation”; for October 21, 2009 Item 4, page 7 – from “......that staff reports included the appendixes” to “.....that staff reports we receive NOT include the appendixes”

AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram, Damkroger
ABSENT: Chase and Matsuda

3. President’s Report and Announcements
   None

4. Commission Comments/Questions

Commissioner Wolfram:
I would like to suggest a few things to calendar for future hearings. The first would be a report, maybe from staff. I am very concerned about Articles 10 and 11 just not going anywhere and if I was a project sponsor I think I would be very confused about what’s in conflict with Proposition J and what Articles 10 and 11 say, what I’m supposed to be following. If there are things that we as a commission could do to try to move that along … It’s just sitting at the Board of Supervisors (BOS). I’m just concerned that there is no action. I suggest we calendar that.

Maybe this will be at the last hearing in December that we calendar a discussion, a year end wrap up of what this commission has accomplished this year; what has taken place; and goals for next year.

The final thing would be to have the City Attorney Office do a presentation on ethics for us and whether the Commission wants to adopt specific codes of ethic that governs this Commission that are beyond the ethics code for the City in general; whether there are specific things that we as a Commission would like to adopt.

Commission Secretary Linda Avery:
On the last point, the City Attorney Office in conjunction with the Ethic Commission does an annual training for all commissions and department
heads. We also have the SIAs – Statement of Incompatible Activities now. It’s also a document that is administered by the Ethics Commission. We can arrange to have someone from there come and speak to you about that document in particular. I would suggest that the other meeting we would have someone from the City Attorney Office in conjunction with the Ethic Commission speak to you about both of those. We’ll try to arrange that before the end of the year.

Commissioner Wolfram:
I am suggesting that we consider whether we want to have additional things or not, e.g., there’s nothing that says that commissioners can’t meet with project sponsors now, but we might adopt our own ethic codes that says we don’t meet with project sponsors.

Commission Secretary Linda Avery:
When you do that, you wouldn’t change any of the ethic codes that exist, but you could change your Rules and Regulation to incorporate that ethic code change [for how you conduct business]. That takes a public hearing and a 10-day notice before the hearing.

Commissioner Buckley
I agree with Commissioner Wolfram on calendaring Articles 10 and 11 and on the ethic code. I haven’t seen notices on California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) issues for a while. I wonder if there has been anything.

Preservation Coordinator Tina Tam:
I’ll double check your mailing address with the list that Major Environmental Analysis (MEA) has with their circulation of materials to see if it is current and up-to-date.

Commissioner Martinez:
I want to remind you we did talk about hearing issues of CEQA in general based on what Tara presented during her half-hour education training.
We talked about something to honor the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board (LPAB) members who did not become part of this Commission. They did not get an acknowledgement. I’d like to do that before the year ends.

Commissioner Damkroger:
For the reminder, I didn’t forget, I am just waiting for the President to come back.

D. CONSENT CALENDAR

5. 2009.0876A (M. Smith: 415/558-6322)
200 Fair Oaks Street - southwest corner at 23rd Street, in Assessor’s Block 3648; Lot 050, the subject property is City Landmark #192, the Oakley Residence & Flats. Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace a garage entrance at the side of the building with two windows, and replace windows and construct a minor addition at the rear of the building. The property is located within a RH-3 (Residential, House, Three-Family) District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District. Recommendation: Approval

ACTION: Approved
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram, Damkroger
ABSENT: Chase and Matsuda
MOTION NO. 0032
6. 2008.1404A  
10 United Nations Plaza, northeast corner of Market Street and United Nations Plaza, in Assessor’s Block 0351, Lot 050. Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install business signage (dba The Art Institute of California - San Francisco). The property is non-contributory to the Civic Center Historic District. It is within the C-3-G (Downtown Commercial, General) Zoning District, in an 80-X Height and Bulk District, and is also within the Civic Center Special Sign District and the Market Street Special Sign District.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approval

ACTION: Approved
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram, Damkroger
ABSENT: Chase, Matsuda
MOTION NO. 0033

7. 2009.0824A  
2 Cottage Row, east side between Bush and Sutter Streets. Assessor’s Block 0677, Lot 041. Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish and re-construct two decks located at the first and second floor levels of the subject building in the rear yard. The property is a contributor to the Bush Street-Cottage Row Historic District. It is zoned RM-1 (Residential, Mixed, Low Density) District and is in a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approval

ACTION: Approved
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram, Damkroger
ABSENT: Chase and Matsuda
MOTION NO. 0034

E. REGULAR CALENDAR

8. 2009.0948A  
760 Market Street, The "Phelan Building," corner of O'Farrell and Market Streets, in Assessor’s Block 0328, Lot 001. Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install business signage (dba Walgreens). The property is Landmark No. 156 and is rated as Category I (Significant) within the Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter Conservation District. It is within the C-3-R (Downtown Retail) Zoning District, in an 80-130-F Height and Bulk District, and is also within the Market Street Special Sign District.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approval with Conditions

SPEAKERS: Steve Peterson – Project Sponsor

ACTION: Continuance to December 2, 2009. Public hearing will remain open. Staff will check the record to see what LPAB did on the sign program and the project sponsor is to explore other options for the signage.

AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram, Damkroger
ABSENT: Chase and Matsuda

9. 2009.0037H  
403-405 Taylor Street Assessor’s Block 0317; Lots 003. is located at the southwest corner of Taylor and O'Farrell Streets. Historically known as the Hotel
Californian, the subject property is a Category I Building within the Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter Conservation District and is individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places. It is located within a C-3-G (Downtown General) District with an 80-130-F Height and Bulk limit. The proposal is a request for a Permit to Alter for window replacement; pressed metal ornament replacement; brick replacement; and painting the exterior of the building.

Recommendation: Approval with conditions.

SPEAKER(S): None
ACTION: Without hearing, continuance to November 18, 2009
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram, Damkroger
ABSENT: Chase and Matsuda

10. (T. Sullivan: 415/558-6257)
An informational presentation on the Mills Act program and contracts.

The presentation described what the Mills Act Program is, how the Department has been using it and how the Department is planning to revamp the Program.

SPEAKER(S): Matt Thomas – Assessor’s Office; Joan Wood – North Beach resident wants to know if Supervisor Alioto-Pier’s ordinance is going to simplify or complicate the Mills Act program
ACTION: None - Informational only - no action is required

Amendments to Chapter 71 of the Administrative Code (Mills Act Contracts) [Board File No. 09-1137]. Ordinance introduced by Supervisor Alioto-Pier amending Chapter 71 of the Administrative Code regarding historical property contract procedures (Mills Act) to reflect amendments made to the San Francisco Charter to create the Historic Preservation Commission, establish certain time lines for review of applications for historical property contracts, require Budget Analyst review of applications for historical property contracts, and making other clarifying amendments; and making findings, including environmental findings.

Recommendation: Approval with modifications.

SPEAKER(S): Bill Barnes – Supervisor Alioto-Pier’s Office
ACTION: Approved with staff modifications and a further modification to delete all General Plan Compliance language (Section 7)
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram, Damkroger
ABSENT: Chase and Matsuda

Adjournment: 3:31 P.M.

The minutes was proposed for adoption at the Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission on Wednesday, November 18, 2009

ACTION: Approved
AYES: Buckley, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase
ABSENT: Hasz
SAN FRANCISCO
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes

Hearing Room 400
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Wednesday, November 18, 2009
12:30 P.M.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Buckley, Damkroger, Martinez, Wolfram, Matsuda, Chase
COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Hasz

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY VICE PRESIDENT DAMKROGER AT 12:38 P.M.

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Tina Tam – Preservation Coordinator, Planning Director – John Rahaim, Chief Finance Officer – Elaine Forbes, Neighborhood Planning Chief – Kelley Amdur, Tim Frye, Tara Sullivan, and Linda Avery – Commission Secretary

A. PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS: Michael Levine, re: Was a public hearing held for retaining the two balconies at the Mutual Bank Building at 710 Market St?; Dan Weaver, re: Landmarking for historic street lights at Market Street, Golden Triangle, and Van Ness Avenue; Gee Gee Platt, re: Belli Art Building, Van Ness Light Standards, Muni substation at Turk and Fillmore – a City landmark; Bradley Weidmaier, re: Urged the Commission to review and make a statement for 2750 Vallejo Street; Alex Beuk – SF Architectural Heritage, re: Training and workshops by Heritage for Mills Act when amendments are adopted by the Board of Supervisors; Peter Warfield – Library Users Association, re: asked the Commission to agendize in the future Page and Turnbull’s report on Park Branch Library, Library and Planning Department’s non-attendance of meetings of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force.
B. STAFF REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Department Work Program and Budget (J. Rahaim: 415/558-6411)

Planning Director John Rahaim:

Article 10 and 11 – The Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions responded to the proposed legislation with modifications and those modifications were transmitted to the Board of Supervisors (BOS). We have not heard back. The BOS is likely to produce a new version of the legislation but we have not heard the specifics.

The HPC is the Planning Department’s second commission. On the discussion about minutes and how they are constructed and done: We try to comply with the law and make sure we have the right documentation. We are in the process of making sure the minutes essentially are the same way they are constructed for the Planning Commission. We are getting some additional technology to help tape them so the tapes are available.

Some have raised the issue of potentially televising the meeting. There is a fairly substantial cost to that. It was a six-figure number we estimated to televised your meeting. We can talk about putting that into the budget request for next year. We need to be aware that it cost $150,000 to do the Planning Commission every year. We need to have a discussion of how to do that, how best to make sure we document your meeting so that the public can be aware of what happens here.

Our new Annual Report – The first one we've done in almost a decade. The report is Charter mandated for all boards and commissions. Our Department is unique in that we staff two full blown commissions. The document describes the Department. It’s a good tool to document not only what we’ve done in the last year but an overall view of the Department. Everyone realizes that the web page has a lot of information; sometimes we find it useful to have a piece of paper in our hands to describe what we do and how we do it to the public, to visitors, to whomever. I’m pleased we have been able to issue this report this year. I want to thank the staff that are involved – AnMarie Rogers, intern – Jasal Galvin, Gary Chen, Alicia John-Baptiste, David Alumbaugh, Bill Wycko, all who collectively put this together.

For whatever reason, last year when the charter amendment came forward we were looking at the impacts. We did not budget additional funds to staff HPC. I can’t tell you specifically the reason for that. The primary thought was that since we had already been staffing the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board (LPAB), the demand would not be that much greater. In retrospect, I think that was probably a mistake. Whether additional funds are forthcoming given the budget year is a big question. It's important to think about what additional funding demand we will have to support your work. What we have tried to do to get you up and going is to make sure that we at least match the funding levels that we have for the Planning Commission in terms of staff. And we are pretty much there. You may recall Linda’s role. Linda spent about half of her time prior to the existence of the HPC as an operations manager for this Department. She oversaw the clerical staff and all the administrative function of the Department. In her new role she’s no longer doing that work and instead is acting as your secretary. We think we are at the point where we are about equal in terms of staffing two commissions. The questions come, what additional resources does this Commission and the Planning Commission need to do the kind of work that we really want to
do and how best to make the request in the budget cycle.

**Chief Finance Officer Elaine Forbes:** [She went over the “FY2009/2010 Work Program and Budget Update” through a PowerPoint presentation. The following pertains particularly to the HPC]:

The Preservation Program was impacted by the HPC being formed and Articles 10 and 11. There continues to be quite a strong demand for preservation staff at the Public Information Counter and on applications. The result is we needed to discontinue the preservation work related to landmarks and historic districts so we could make staff available for the preservation related applications. This is part of how we dealt with balancing the FTE we have left and matching it to the work. One note is that 8.47 FTE is on the Preservation Program. The total preservation effort is actually 11 FTE if we count the preservation technician specialist that is related to the general applications that were in Item 1 of our Neighborhood Planning work program. To get into the nuts and bolts of our funding this year, the total preservation budget is about $1.7 million dollars. You’ll see 9.9% is coming from our general fund. It's importantly in that the 9.9% we have about $150,000 for subsidies of applications we don't charge for cost. I am pointing out this number because I am going to talk about this. We have our Historic Preservation Fund Committee (HPFC) grant awards, State grants and our application fees. You can see the application fee is about 70% of our total funding for preservation. This is quite a shift from our prior year where the general fund picked up a larger proportion of this work. I understood from the Director and also from Kelly Amdur and Tina Tam that this group has had an interest in us funding landmark designations that you initiate. You can see from the numbers we just presented we didn’t assume that in the budget. But there is some room because that subsidy we have for private preservation applications, because our volume is down, we could assume that subsidy for this Commission this year. For next year, we would need to put a budget request together. It’s quite small; it would be about $44,500 and that’s 30% of our general fund subsidies for our private applications. It’s 250 hours of staff time, it’s about 0.16 FTE. It doesn’t include the time already spent on the library designations. I’ve put in here what’s required and Tina could provide better information. Designations would include research, designation, designation report, case report, presenting before you, the Land Use Committee and the full Board. I understand from Tina it is a large effort. It takes quite a few staff hours. Looking forward to next year, the budget process is one where we have a long and arduous priority setting process. It will begin with us coming to you and to the Planning Commission to ask what your priorities and funding requests are - it maybe to televise or maybe a certain number of hours for landmark designations, etc. We will work with our commissions, look at our resources, the Mayor’s budget instruction and your request and come up with our balanced budget which we present to the Mayor’s office in mid February. At that point the Mayor’s office would come back to us, there may need to be more cuts, we may need to find more sources, etc, until we get to the BOS in June. The BOS would do their priority setting and eventually by the end of June we will come out with our own final budget numbers which we then allocate through our work program and through the division of our departments. That is the process. We will be back to you in January to get your requests and talk about our financial picture.
Commissioner Damkroger:
Under the subsidies, I noticed the Mills Act is there. Having overseen the Mills Act Program, I think what we have in San Francisco, the fee is very high. It would cost far more than the program that I had run to process individual applications. Is that actually a subsidy for Mills Act?

Chief Financial Officer Elaine Forbes:
It is. How the fee schedule is set is based on a couple of early Mills Act applications from 2005-2006. The fee is $17,000 for commercial and $8,000 for residential. At the time, our early applications were costing $1,700. We decided to subsidize the residential applications of the Mills Act. Over time, as we have more experience with them, the hour effort would go down. We recalibrate our fee every two years based on what it is actually costing - because it is a new program and there's a lot of city attorney’s hours, assessor’s hours, Planning Department staff. There actually is a subsidy at this point for the residential applications.

Commissioner Wolfram:
Has the Department been exploring the opportunity to involve college students' course work for the designation work? Whether they could partner with a college or a university program to have Planning Department staff supervise the course work of the designation reports?

Director Rahaim:
It's a good idea. That's the first I've ever heard of it. We can certainly have a discussion. It still requires supervisory time....

Commissioner Wolfram:
It would require a different type of time. It would more of a supervisory thing, but research would be done for the course work and students would be on a schedule. The benefit of having students doing it as opposed to a non-profit is the schedule might be better maintained.

Director Rahaim:
It's a good thing worth exploring

Commissioner Martinez:
Actually my question is in terms of this whole question about whether or not this Commission costs more that the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board (LPAB). To me, we have to go back a couple of years to where the LPAB was actually functioning. I don't think it was funded for the last year of the LPAB. If we are talking about reviving some version of the LPAB program in terms of a dollar amount, we need to go back three years.

Director Rahaim:
In terms of the actual LPAB initiating designations - is that what you are talking about?

Commissioner Martinez:
The LPAB had a program of starting a landmark designation for ten sites every year and we went through public process where the public came to talk about what was in front of them to initiate designation. It kind of floundered the last couple of years. Things were taking too long as the budget for it dwindled. But historically, quite a few things had been landmarked. These were basically individual buildings. I think we have ten partial or incomplete designations left over from the LPAB. I think we have to go back two or three years to see what the budget for that program was for the LPAB.

Director Rahaim:
I think as Elaine has said, we did have enough FTE allocated that we actually decided, because of the budget crunch, to remove and shift to other
resources. I am perfectly happy to have a discussion with the Commission about what your priorities are in terms of budget requests. That would be a healthy discussion to have. If we had a budget from previous years that was set and discussed for landmarks, we should look at that.

**Commissioner Martinez:**
Because you never know what designations might turn up that need to get done in the middle of the year that no one could have anticipated in the work program, etc. The other question I have is about the subsidies from public applications. I didn’t understand that whole....

**Director Rahaim:**
Elaine can explain that better. The applications that come through are primarily from the BOS and Mayor’s Office. They don’t have a project sponsor in the typical sense, and therefore nobody we can charge a fee to. This is fairly common. There are a number of things from elected officials that come through our office that we subsidize application costs.

**Commissioner Martinez:**
There was some talk about transferring. You had an allocation that could be transferred?

**Chief Financial Officer Elaine Forbes:**
There are two items and the first one that Director Rahaim was talking about is work that is generated that we can’t charge to the BOS etc. The second item would be the subsidies that we are not charging full cost. We are talking about the Mills Act. It seems we are charging full cost. We are not charging for the residential. We don’t charge full cost for landmark designations. An individual comes in with a landmark application and we don’t charge full cost for C of As that are at the lowest constructing value. Our fee schedule says cost would be 80% higher and we say, for pricing reasons, we are going to subsidize that application to encourage it being...and that’s where I was saying we don’t have as many applications this year because we have a down turn, so your applications could essentially be subsidized and that’s where I came up with a number we could conceivably allocate this left over.

**Commissioner Martinez:**
My other question is about landmark designation for the Library. Shouldn’t the Library pay for that?

**Chief Financial Officer Elaine Forbes:**
We called the Library about paying for it. Because their bond has already been allocated, it isn’t that easy just to put in a new application fee. They felt it was our designation and that we should bare the cost.

**Commissioner Buckley:**
Regardless there is a CEQA issue that has to be dealt with

**Chief Financial Officer Elaine Forbes:**
They pay those fees. They pay the associated fees with the CEQA determination. It was the initiation.
Commissioner Buckley:
This may be a question for the preservation planner. CEQA identifies the historic resource and someone who owns the resource wants to change it. The cost in evaluating that, whether it becomes a landmark or not, should be borne by the entity that is making the proposal.

Director Rahaim:
The CEQA process is entirely different from the initiation process in local landmarking. CEQA is all covered through the environmental fees, but whether something is proposed for designation, that process is completely a separate process that requires its own staff effort that is essentially separate from CEQA the process.

Commissioner Buckley:
But the process in determining whether it should be a landmark or not is part of the proposal. If I, as a private developer, come in and I have a historical building and the department is trying to figure out what the ultimate disposition of that building should be - that’s part of the process. It is not necessarily a CEQA process but it is a legally designated process whether it’s a landmark building or not.

Director Rahaim:
Right, but that is completely separate from CEQA. CEQA does have its own fee structure. The environmental review process has a whole fee structure associated with..... that’s paid for. Whether something that’s initiated as a landmark, it’s capped under those fee.

Commissioner Buckley:
Why can’t it be covered by those fees? We need to figure out whether it’s a landmark or not. They are proposing a change to it and we have to make that decision.

Planning Staff Tim Frye:
We are making a similar determination of whether the building is landmark worthy or not. Per Article 10, it’s based on the information required by this body that makes it a different format and process than a CEQA determination that requires the additional work.

Commissioner Buckley:
It doesn’t really matter because there’s a cost to it and the Planning Department has to pay that cost somehow.

Planning Staff Tim Frye:
It comes down to how much information the HPC needs to make that determination of whether they want to move forward with the landmark designation. We do have a consultant that we require the applicant to hire to evaluate the building and we either concur or evaluate that evaluation. After that there is a case report, a motion and several other types of documents that are required, and that’s the portion that is costing that additional fee that we are not sure how to allocate - if HPC is completely content with a CEQA determination and our analysis of an EIR to move forward and carry that through the designation process - that’s a call by the city attorney, the preservation coordinator and the director. It is just a matter of format and process, and what the Land Use Committee wants, what the BOS wants to see in all of their different processes. Those documents are related

Commissioner Damkroger:
The second question I had was the issue of the excess in the general fund for landmark designations. There are approximately 250 hours of staff time in excess. It doesn’t include the time spent on the Library initiation, so you need
to deduct that amount from it. Maybe it would be worth knowing what that final sum is for staff involvement and determining how much we could get with this Library initiation in order to know we have enough left there to do a sufficient job.

**Preservation Coordinator Tina Tam:**
To answer Commission Buckley’s question about what is produced for the initiation or the definition for landmarking – we actually need a designation report, a DPR form that’s required for you to go ahead and make your recommendation to the BOS. The CEQA process in which the Library is pursuing has its own consultants do their historic resource evaluation. These are two separate documents. I understand some of the information can overlap and can be shared, but they are two separate documents that have to move forward respectively for what they are trying to do. To respond to Commissioner Damkroger’s question about the 250 hours, how much can we do with that – that’s approximately six weeks of staff hours? Based upon my experience working on designations, that’s not a lot of time. That could perhaps be time for staff to review designation reports proposed by the consultants, review and provide our comments and edits to them, prepare our case report for you to consider for your decision-making process. It would also cover time to go ahead to bring forward the report and the case recommendation to the Land Use Committee and the BOS. I don’t see how that time, 250 hours, can be used to do the research or the preparation of the report itself. We are more than happy to collaborate with somebody, either on the Commission or in the preservation community or someone who would be willing to volunteer hours to help produce the report. The 250 hours would not be enough to do one designation let alone the 7 libraries you initiated two months ago.

**Commissioner Martinez:**
My last question is about televising. Would the cost be different if you didn’t do it live? What about doing audio and a VHS file and put it on the web?

**Commission Secretary Linda Avery:**
We are doing a digital recording and when the device is purchased for us, I can upload it the next day. The cost is a couple of thousands for the equipment.

**Commissioner Martinez:**
We have two plan areas - the Eastern Neighborhood and Market Octavia. They are obliged to bring the historic district nomination for the result of those plans to this Commission. We are talking maybe ten historic districts altogether, at least. Right now there is a pending request for the Historic Fund Committee to pay for those designations. That’s a big expense.

**Director Rahaim:**
The Eastern Neighborhood and Market Octavia surveys are being completed. The question is at what point and to what extent the Department would bring those initiations forward to you, or do we simply identify those places where the surveys have found them eligible?

**Commissioner Martinez:**
The Market Octavia area plan is mandated to be brought forward. I expect the Fund Committee would agree to pay for those. The Fund Committee has a limited amount of money. There are things we need to do – the 10 incomplete sites left from the LPAB program, the Van Ness light Standards, the Sunshine School, the Appleton-Wolfard Libraries, and some others like Park Merced. What is the cost to do all the things that we ought to be doing if the Fund committee wasn’t paying for it? There was some community
participants wanting to move these things forward. We need to see the big overview so we can then see how much we still feel needs to be done that we can do. We don’t have a full picture of all the things this Commission ought to be doing just to be doing as the LPAB was doing.

**Director Rahaim:**
This was exactly what Elaine suggested, that we come up with a laundry list of everything and then talk about setting priorities.

**Commissioner Chase:**
It is important to recognize that the public who stands before us and speaks to issues want some kind of resolution. When the Commission, like the Library, feels that it is an important issue and initiates landmarking, there are expectations that it’s going to be done. The question of not having enough money to do that is a disconnect between process and the ability to perform. It places the Commission in a difficult position knowing that and trying to communicate that to the public that yes, that may be your wish but we may never see that report within the lifetime of the project or lifetime of the members of this Commission if not recognized within the budgeting process.

**Commissioner Buckley:**
I understand the difference between CEQA and this process. If CEQA identifies something we don’t have the funds to follow up on, we just designate it because we think it’s one, or do we put it off forever, or does the project sponsor get to do whatever they want with it? I appreciate the Department showing us what the numbers are and we need to go through a priority process to figure out what we can or cannot do. It seems like we have a ton of things that we enumerate that are expected and are part of what the voters put this body together for. We have a lot of thinking to do about that.

The other item/question I have is we seem to be on TV right now. We are on closed circuit and we can’t get a copy of that?

**Commission Secretary Linda Avery:**
This is exactly what it is. It don’t believe we can, but I will try. I know there are cameras. The cameras equipment is a live feed into this room. It seems to me that we should be able to get a tape [VHS] recording.

**Commission Buckle:**
It’s better than nothing. We have all expressed our concern that we have to be as visible a process as possible. When people want to come back to see what happened, to play the old style tape, whatever it is, we should find a way.

**Commission Secretary Linda Avery:**
We definitely have the audio tapes. As soon as we get the equipment for digital recording, we’ll have it available on-line. Whether or not I can get VHS tapes based on these cameras, I’ll find out.

**Commissioner Martinez:**
Was the Library response about not paying for the nomination for Park Branch Library or for all the Appleton-Wolfard Libraries?

**Director Rahaim:**
I think it is for all of them.

**Commissioner Martinez:**
Aren’t they paying for the designation for the Carnegie Libraries, or is the Department paying for all of them?

**Preservation Coordinator Tina Tam:**
The context statement for the Carnegie Libraries was produced by Tim Kelly who was the president of the LPAB. He brought forth a lot of the background
information in the report. We basically responded, provided comments, and forwarded to you, the Planning Commission and the BOS.

**Commissioner Wolfram:**

About Article 10 and 11 – you said the BOS is doing something. It seems critical that the Department obviously be really involved in that. Do you think there’s something we as a Commission can do to be proactive about that?

**Director Rahaim:**

My expectation is that there might be a new version introduced by the BOS, but I haven’t seen that yet. We obviously would have to respond. Supervisor Daly was the primary sponsor of that legislation. Although I haven’t contacted his office, that might be helpful.

**Chief Financial Officer Elaine Forbes:**

If I could just reiterate the proposal to develop your budget request going into next fiscal year - Tina Tam and I will write down many of the things you, the Commission, brought today - size them, cost them out, etc, and come back to you in January to show you your wish list amounts and to show you the Department’s overall financial picture and how to prioritize among that wish list. We may well put in a new general fund request as a result and see how it goes through the Mayor’s process. I also wanted to say, just like you are experiencing the down turn from a couple of year ago, all aspects of our Department have unfunded wish-lists across the Department. We really needed to strip down where we have revenue sources. It is a very difficult time in terms of what we are able to accomplish. I didn’t want you to feel like you are alone, or being given the short end of the stick. It really goes throughout our work program. If that makes sense, we will come back to you in January with your wish list and priority setting.

**Commissioner Chase:**

In terms of what you’ll come back to us with, I am very interested to understand and it will be very enlightening to the public to understand the kind of man-hours to get from a request for designation through the process. You have talked about 250 man-hours – that might somehow be construed as how we create a designation and the process. I think we need to know more specifically where that time is attributed. I don’t know. We, the commissioners nor the public understand the internal process of these applications. I think it would be a value not only in determining cost but also looking at how it affects the overall picture of what we need to do. A designation a year, reflecting on Commissioner Martinez’ comments about the old LPAB, there was a lot of volunteer time associated with that processes. But if they are doing 10 a year, you know, we are not going to be able to do that. We need to know where the money comes from and those kinds of figures for us to be able to compare that.

**Commissioner Martinez:**

The process would be good. All these historic nominations, really from my point of view, are precipitated by the area plans. They are really one of the final outcomes of area plans. The BOS and their budget consideration has to understand it’s part of the result of the planning process that they funded and initiated. Our Commission, we should really remember that we could actually have some say in what happens with this budget we are advocating for at the BOS. We should think about taking some responsibility and advocating for what we think we ought to be doing before the BOS and help the Department in getting as much of the funding as we can for the things we care about. It is our responsibility to educate the BOS about why these things are happening.
and why it is necessary.

Commissioner Buckley:
I would add it’s not just us. We should talk to the whole constituency of people in historic preservation in San Francisco and solicit their input into what our priority should be.

SPEAKERS:
Dan Weaver – Resident of Balboa Park Plan Area, Re: There are no rules set up to deal with landmarking concerns for this plan area, in particular the Pentecost Church.
Gee Gee Platt, Re: 1) The HPC should have its own work program and funding for it; 2) There should be staff allocation to HPC; 3) Get designations done and not count on the Historic Preservation Fund Committee; 4) distinguish CEQA and designation levels of research; 5) Articles 10 and 11 should come in time; 6) Televised recording are in the City Hall Building Management Office; 7) the Department not to subsidize Mills Act residential applications; 8) Staff to designate time to do a landmark designation.
Howard Wong – Friends of Appleton-Wolfard Library, Re: DEIR connection between mitigation measures and funding of landmark designation report.
Peter Warfield – Library Users Association, Re: 1) HPC should require minimum sunshine requirements for minutes to be the top of the list for this Commission and the Planning Department; 2) Agendize the HPC work program; 3) Clarify the cost of landmark designations.

Commissioner Chase closed public comments and said the following:
It’s very helpful for the Commission and I, I can’t speak for the Department. They will take what’s been said seriously in providing us with information that we can help partner to develop a budget or work program for the Commission.
I did have a request from the Deputy City Attorney to speak to on an item under Staff Report and Announcements.

Deputy City Attorney Andrea Ruiz-Esquide:
From the last meeting there was discussion whether general sign consistency findings and section 101 findings were necessary in one of the draft motions. You decided that it wasn’t and we agreed, because it was an amendment to the Administrative Code. It was an administrative act ordinance that you were discussing. I just want to let you know at this hearing you will be considering two other draft motions for the remaining item and these draft motions will have General Plan consistency findings as well as section 101.1 findings. We have determined that these are required because these are final decisions that you are taking on these items for C of A. From now on you’ll be seeing these findings in the draft motions.

C. REGULAR CALENDAR

2. 2009.0966A (T. Frye 415/575-6822)
51-99 GROVE STREET - The Bill Graham Civic Auditorium, historically known as the Exposition Auditorium, Assessor’s Block 0812; Lots 001. Bound by Hayes, Grove, Larkin, and Polk Streets. The subject building is a contributing structure to the Civic Center Historic District. It is located within a P (Public) District with an 80-X Height and Bulk limit. The proposal is a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove the existing light box sign on the Hayes Street

Meeting Minutes
elevation and to install a sign indicating the theater name and an LED marquee
to promote theater events.
Recommendation: Approval with Conditions
(Continued from the Regular meeting of October 21, 2009)

SPEAKERS: Milo Hanke – San Francisco Beautiful, re: Concerned about the
signage and that it would not disrupt the character of the Civic
Center; also concerned about the sale of naming rights for a civic
asset. Michael Levin, re: Opposed new sign as proposed. Gee
Gee Platt, re: Encouraged commissioners to look at last election
ballot book which covered signage and Proposition E, and
information that goes along with the City Historic District
Designation and National Historic Landmark Designation.

ACTION: Continued to December 16, 2009.
AYES: Buckley, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase
ABSENT: Hasz

PRESENTERS: Jeremy Paul – for Serano Hotel and CREA, Jessica
Wallace – Waterproofing Consultant/Architect; Patrick Bouscovich
– Structural Engineer, Brad Blemker – Restoration Contractor,
Ron Wurgley – Project Manager, Michael Calhoun – Chief
Engineer at the Serano Hotel

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Approved with amendment to condition 1 that all windows above
4th floor be replaced with Marvin metal clad wood window; paint
analysis for both facade and transom be conducted of historical
coloring of the building and be subjected to review and approval
by preservation staff; transom details be revised to match the
historic.

AYES: Buckley, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase
ABSENT: Hasz

MOTION NO: 0035

4 2009.0947A  (T. Frye: 415/575-6822)
850 Montgomery Street - (Assessor’s Block 0175; Lots 033) Between Pacific
Avenue and Jackson Streets. The subject property was constructed in 1970 and
is a non-contributing structure to the Jackson Square Historic District. It is
located within a C-2 (Community Business) District with a 65-A Height and Bulk
limit. The proposal is a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install
new storefront and entry systems at the courtyard level and on the courtyard side on each of the suspended walkways.

*Recommendation: Approval with Conditions*

**PRESENTER:** Carl Shaoliam – Project Architect/ Agent  
**SPEAKERS:** None  
**ACTION:** Approved Option C as sketched by Commissioner Chase for use with acoustical panels, or, alternatively, Option A with at least one more vertical mullion if it is all glazed, and with all other conditions and recommendations by staff.  
**AYES:** Buckley, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase  
**ABSENT:** Hasz  
**MOTION NO:** 0036

**D. MATTERS OF THE COMMISSION**

5. **Consideration of Adoption:**  
   - Draft minutes of Regular Hearing of November 4, 2009  

**SPEAKERS:** None  
**ACTION:** Adopted meeting minutes of November 4, 2009 Regular Meeting as corrected by Commission Damkroger  
**AYES:** Buckley, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase  
**ABSENT:** Hasz

6. **President’s Report and Announcements**

**Commission Chase:**  
Regarding the Sunshine Ordinance issues that have come up, since we are a new commission, I would urge you to be clear about your comments and direction. Clear in terms of making motions, clear about who you are requesting information from – project sponsor, staff, or the public. In terms of our motions, they are certainly being scrutinized for us to be as clear as possible and reflect changes in the recommendations for the draft motion in front of us. It will greatly help the staff. I want to thank Ms. Avery-Herbert for taking the heat on this. Just to publicly state: I don’t think that what’s been [given] to us is particularly fair, but be that as it may, we have to deal with issues in the public form.

7. **Commission Comments/Questions**

**Commission Secretary Avery:**  
I have a couple of items before taking up the three items under the Commission’s Comments/Questions category. I think you are aware of the training you need to take before the end of the year. I want to remind you that if you have not done them, you should do so. The City and County of San Francisco ID you received a while back has your 5-digit access number on the back of the card. This number should be used to access the online training. Second, when you know you are going to be absent, please send me an email in advance so that if we come across to a quorum problem, I’ll be able to let the President know as early as possible.
a. Discussion of resolutions for LPAB members
   
   **Note:** Tina is to circulate two resolution samples for recognition of services rendered by former Landmark Preservation Advisory Board members: Bob Cherny, Lily Chan, Johana Street, Bridget Maley, Jean-Paul Samah, and Ina Dearman. Resolutions could be presented to former members at the hearing or at the holiday party.

b. Discussion of HPC Year-end wrap up and achievements
   
   **Note:** Commissioner Wolfram suggested a press release to coincide with the CLG Annual Report on HPC accomplishments this year -- what the goals are, and what the mission is in fulfilling Proposition J. Deputy City Attorney Andrea Ruiz-Esquide suggested that instead of a press release, maybe a year-end summary with bullet points that highlights achievements and distribute it to the Mayor’s office and to the BOS. Preservation Coordinator Tina Tam stated that the CLG Annual Report will be completed by the end of this year and would be available beginning next year.

c. Discussion of year-end holidays and schedules
   
   **Note:** i) Commissioner Karl Hasz had offered to coordinate a dinner or year-end holiday event but was absent this hearing. The Commission agreed the year-end dinner would be set for December 16 and would need a 15-day notice. The location still has to be determined. ii) The Commission decided to meet on the first Wednesday in January of next year (January 6, 2010). President Chase announced that he could not attend this meeting.

Other matters brought up by the Commission at the hearing

d. Commissioner Wolfram got a note from the Disability Commission expressing concern.

   **Commissioner Chase:**
   I had a HPC calendar meeting with Tina, Linda, and John. John indicated that he would contact Susan Miser (Disability Commission). He specifically wants to know if the information the Disability Commission seeks is required to come from staff or whether one or two HPC commissioners can go to the meeting.

   **Commissioner Buckley:**
   If there’s a concern I don’t know what that concern is. We are concerned with accessibility issues, especially in the Architectural Review Committee. If there’s a particular concern, we need to be made aware of it and be able to respond to it.

   **Commissioner Chase:**
   I don’t know what the concerns are either.

   **Commissioner Martinez:**
   It could be the........

   **Commissioner Buckley:**
   There was an online article. The person who wrote it did a lot of good work involving accessibility issues, but this article is very inappropriate. I don’t want to just be saying we are responding to some concern and don’t know what the concern is.

   **Commissioner Damkroger:**
   In the past we had a joint meeting with the Disability Commission and the LPAD about accessibility at City Hall. That may be an option.
e. Memorandum labeled privileged and confidential from City Attorney Byrne

Commissioner Martinez:
We were handed this memorandum. Can we get a discussion of this on the next calendar? It says that it can only be distributed to the public with a vote. But how do we vote if it’s not on the calendar?

Commissioner Buckley:
Then it wouldn’t be confidential. Maybe we do a closed session?

Commissioner Secretary Avery:
You have the ability to do a closed session only if the matter for discussion is a pending litigation, or a contractual issue, or a personnel issue. For this memo, I would suggest that either I or Tina speak with the City Attorney about their intent for giving you this memo and if this is something we can calendar for a public hearing as opposed to a close session.

Preservation Coordinator Tam:
I have spoken with Marlena about this extensively and I spoke with Andrea earlier today before the hearing about this memo. I didn’t realize she was going to circulate this today. I recommend that you contact Marlena directly yourself to get your take on why she is doing this and in this fashion.

Commissioner Chase:
I think Tina and Linda need to have a conversation with them about how, when and in what form when it comes to a public hearing. We can’t have a joint conversation around this item until it is not privileged information. If we play the rules of Sunshine Ordinance, we just need to make sure we do that appropriately and in a public form.

Commissioner Damkroger:
I am interested in what everyone’s reaction is and questions are. I would like to know what the conversation is with the attorneys.

Commissioner Secretary Avery:
To the extent that each of you follows the suggestion of Tina, that you each call the City Attorney, I would caution you against calling or following up with an email to everyone. Your conversation with the City Attorney would be your conversation with the City Attorney. And until or unless we have a public hearing, sharing your views on the conversation is inappropriate.

f. Calendaring a discussion on ethics

Commissioner Wolfram:
I suggest adopting some kind of an ethics code for this commission. Specifically, whether we can have some language regarding meeting with project sponsors. I talked to Marlena already and she said we could amend the rules and regulations we already have.

Commissioner Secretary Avery:
That’s true. When I first came to the commission and went to training, that was one of the first things I learned. I will note that I have informed the Planning Commission that if they are going to meet with any one party, they should make themselves available to parties on both sides of an issue. And if they do that, they must announce publicly that they have met with those parties. They do this all the time. I agree you should amend your rules and regulations to reflect what you as a body want. We can put that before you at any point you want to do so. It is truly your
collective call.

Commissioner Chase:
I asked earlier on about the issues of amending other aspects of those regulations. I would ask everybody to look at that and begin to think about it so we can talk about this collectively about how we can amend those rules. We probably will not touch all of them, but if issues come to mind about our operating procedures, like what we just talked about, then we may want to address those issues comprehensively at a hearing and consider amendment(s).

Commissioner Secretary Avery:
I will put a hard copy in your packet for the next hearing. It won’t be on the calendar, but will be in you packet. This is for you to review. When you do amend your rules, that amendment needs to be noticed 10 days in advance of the hearing. I need you to look at those rules and decide where you want to amend. Let me know so we can calendar it and I can put out a notice to the public what you are considering amending.

Commissioner Chase:
Speaking about disclosure, there might be a need to simply have within the framework of our agenda “Announcements and Disclosures” before we hear these items.

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Discussions only – no actions

Adjournment: 4:06 p.m.

The minutes was proposed for adoption at the Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission on Wednesday, December 16, 2009.
ACTION: Approved
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase
Commission Secretary Linda Avery: Announced that we have received the digital recorder and will be testing it today. We hope to have it operational at our next hearing on December 16 with public access on December 17. We will keep you posted.

A. PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS:
Anthony Poplawski – President, Secretary, & Treasurer of the Marin Fireman Union Headquarters, re: Opposed listing their building as a landmark under Article 10.
Peter Warfield – Library Users Association (LUA), re: Announced Sunshine Ordinance Task Force took up minutes of the April 8 and August 19 hearing based on complaint filed by the LUA.
Bradley Wiedmaier – District 6 Resident, re: Asked for HPC collective support for 2750 Vallejo Street at the Board of Supervisors (BOS) hearing.
B. STAFF REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Preservation Coordinator Tina Tam:
Two samples of resolutions for recognition of services of Landmarks Board members were sent to the Commission.

Chief Finance Officer Elaine Forbes will return in January to listen to HPC priorities and wish list for your Work Program and Budget for the next fiscal year, which begins in 7/1/10.

The cost estimates, based on a 10 year study (since 1999), the average staff time to process landmark designations from initiation to adoption at the BOS for a simple, basic, small scale property with support from owners and community support was 40 – 60 hours, roughly $3,000 of staff time. For historic districts with multiple properties like the Music Concourse and Dogpatch, the average cost was roughly 300 hours, roughly $31,000. An individual landmark as the Metro Theater at 2055 Union Street, staff time was 125 hours, roughly $11,000. It is not a large or complicated building, but it took multiple hearings at the Landmark Preservation Advisory Board (LPAB), the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC), the Planning Commission (PC), Land Use Committee, and the BOS.

The $44,000 Elaine Forbes mentioned in her presentation at the last hearing did not take into consideration time already spent on discussion of initiation for Appleton and Wolfard Libraries or other requests the HPC asked of staff. Based on staff efforts already spent, what’s left is roughly $30,000 for the HPC between now and 6/30/10.

1. Training/Information Presentation – Landmark Tree Program (Hui: 415/355-3731)

Urban Forest Coordinator for the Department of Environment by May Ling Hui:
Ms. Hui gave a powerpoint presentation on the Landmark Tree Program.
Commission Wolfram asked what is the process to nominate a tree. The HPC could discuss whether they think a tree is worthy or not; assemble a nomination packet; maybe adopt a resolution, send a picture of the tree; and send all that information to her.

Commission Matsuda asked what would be a cultural tree. A historic tree is having importance to people who used to live here. A cultural tree has importance to people who are living here now. The official City tree across from McLaren Lodge is the City’s annual Christmas tree. That is an example of a tree with current cultural significance.

C. MATTERS OF THE COMMISSION

2. Consideration of Adoption:
   • Draft minutes of Architectural Review Committee meeting of November 4, 2009

   ACTION: Item continued to December 16, 2009 for corrections and summary of comments from the public
   AYES: Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram, Matsuda, Chase
   ABSENT: Buckley and Damkroger

3. President’s Report and Announcements
   None
Commission Comments/Questions

Commissioner Martinez suggested to agendize for consideration a letter of support regarding the CEQA Categorical Exemption (Cat. Ex) appeal for 2750 Vallejo Street at the BOS hearing on 12/15/09. Preservation Coordinator Tina Tam will provide a copy of material prepared for the BOS hearing to the HPC Commissioners for review at the next HPC hearing.

NOTE: Holiday party set for the evening of December 16, following the hearing. The location is still to be determined.

D. CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS PROPOSED FOR CONTINUANCE

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

5. 2009.0948A (A. Threadgill: 415/558-6602)

760 Market Street, The "Phelan Building," corner of O'Farrell and Market Streets, in Assessor’s Block 0328, Lot 001. Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install business signage (dba Walgreens). The property is Landmark No. 156 and is rated as Category I (Significant) within the Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter Conservation District. It is within the C-3-R (Downtown Retail) Zoning District, in an 80-130-F Height and Bulk District, and is also within the Market Street Special Sign District.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approval with Conditions

(Proposed for Continuance to December 16, 2009)

ACTION: Continued to December 16, 2009
AYES: Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram, Matsuda, Chase
ABSENT: Buckley and Damkroger
SPEAKERS: None

E. CONSENT CALENDAR


819 Grove Street - (Assessor’s Block 0804; Lots 023) south side between Fillmore Street and Webster Street. The subject property is a contributing structure to the Alamo Square Historic District. It is located within a RH-3 (Residential, House, Three-Family) Zoning District and 50-X Height and Bulk District. The proposal is a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a rear horizontal addition.

Recommendation: Approval

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Approved as recommended.
AYES: Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram, Matsuda, Chase
ABSENT: Buckley and Damkroger
MOTION NO: 0038
F.  REGULAR CALENDAR

7.  2007.0519E (B. Bollinger: 415/575-9024)
1645 Pacific Avenue Project, - Review and Comments on the Draft Environment Impact Report on the proposed project would demolish the existing two-story, 27,275 sq.ft. commercial building (1645 Pacific Ave), retain the front façade of the adjacent building (1661 Pacific Ave.) and construct a new six-story, 65-foot-tall residential and retail building located on a block bounded by Pacific and Van Ness Avenues and Jackson and Polk Streets (Assessor’s Block 0595, Lot 013). The existing 1661 Pacific Ave. building is a contributor to the Van Ness Auto Row District. Preliminary Recommendation: The Historic Preservation Commission will discuss the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) to frame their written comments on the adequacy of the DEIR, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Commission Martinez: Commented that 3 stories instead or 4 on top of 1661 would be part of the mitigation.
Commission Wolfram: Commented that the historic resource report could be more thorough. There was very little visual documentation to back up some statements that were made in the report. Some interpretation could be made in the lobby of the building that talks about the Riding Academy and its history.
Commissioner Matsuda: Commented on the consideration of another preservation alternative. In addition there should be at least an interpretive sign or documentation included in this new project.
Commissioner Hasz: Maybe there could be more than one preservation alternative.
Commissioner Chase: Commented that the project sponsor should/could make a gesture through mitigation measures to interpret that period of evolution of these buildings. The Page and Turnbull memorandum should be part of this documentation reviewed by the public.

SPEAKERS:
James Joannides – Resident at Polk and Washington Neighborhood - expressed concern about the scale of the project and the cultural resources along this part of the automobile repair row.
Dawn Trenneert – Middle Polk Neighborhood Association – expressed the need to preserve the historic nature and highlights of the area as new projects come into the Auto Row Historic District.

ACTION: None - Action is not required on this item

Adjournment:  1:43 P.M.

The minutes was proposed for adoption at the Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission on Wednesday, December 16, 2009.
ACTION: Approved
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase
SAN FRANCISCO
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes

Hearing Room 400
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Wednesday, December 16, 2009
12:30 P.M.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chase, Matsuda, Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram,
Damkroger and Buckley

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT CHASE AT 12:40 P.M.

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Tina Tam – Preservation Coordinator, A. Threadgill, T. Frye, T. Johnston, J. Navarrete, P. LaValley, S. Caltagirone, J. Battis, Linda Avery – Commission Secretary

A. PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS:
Katherine Howard – Friends of the Music Concourse, re: Requested agendizing a discussion on the applicability of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the hotdog stands' location and appearance at the Music Concourse.
Chris Duderstadt – re: Concession stands at the Music Concourse and the need to preserve the character of this important historical landmark.
Bradley Wiedmaier – Architectural Historian, re: Asked would 2750 Vallejo Street still be on the agenda as an information item; shared with the HPC two simple elemental buildings - the Monterey Pavilion built 1894 and the Mary Bradford House at Union Street – which had been left out of architectural history books.

Note: Commissioner Damkroger requested the Chair to agendize the Music Concourse hotdog stands. Commissioner Chase agreed and set the date for 1/20/10 after discussing the timing of it with Preservation Coordinator Tam.
B. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. 2009.0961A (A. Threadgill: 415/558-6602)
   620 Jones Street, the "Gaylord Hotel," east side between Geary and Post Streets, in Assessor's Block 0305, Lot 036. Request for Certificate of Appropriateness to construct an accessible ramp on the front facade; install a new metal gate on the side facade; re-grade existing walkway; replace aluminum windows with new doors; and replace trellis. The property is Landmark No. 159. It is within an RC-4 (Residential-Commercial, High Density) Zoning District, in an 80-130-T Height and Bulk District, and is also within the North of Market Residential Special Use District, Subarea 1.
   Preliminary Recommendation: Approval
   SPEAKERS: None
   ACTION: Approved
   AYES: Buckley, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase
   RECUSED: Hasz
   MOTION NO: M0038

C. CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS PROPOSED FOR CONTINUANCE

2. 2009.0966A (T. Frye 415/575-6822)
   51-99 Grove Street - The Bill Graham Civic Auditorium, historically known as the Exposition Auditorium, Assessor's Block 0812; Lots 001. Bound by Hayes, Grove, Larkin, and Polk Streets. The subject building is a contributing structure to the Civic Center Historic District. It is located within a P (Public) District with an 80-X Height and Bulk limit. The proposal is a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove the existing light box sign on the Hayes Street elevation and to install a sign indicating the theater name and an LED marquee to promote theater events.
   Recommendation: Approval with Conditions
   (Proposed continuance to January 20, 2010)
   SPEAKERS: None
   ACTION: Continued to January 20, 2010
   AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase

D. REGULAR CALENDAR

   Crystal Springs San Andreas Transmission Upgrade Project – Commission Review and Comment on Draft Environmental Impact Report. The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) is proposing the Crystal Springs San Andreas Transmission Upgrade Project. The project seeks to improve seismic and delivery reliability of the CS/SA Transmission System, and to meet the anticipated requirements of the California Division of Dam Safety (DSOD) for dam facilities in an emergency drawdown scenario. The Project would be located on City and County of San Francisco (CCSF)–owned lands in unincorporated portions of San Mateo County near the Town of Hillsborough and the cities of San Bruno, Burlingame, San Mateo, and Millbrae. The total proposed project area (including all construction, staging, and access areas) covers approximately 135 acres and is composed of five distinct project components that are oriented
southeast to northwest, running approximately 7.6 miles across the Peninsula Watershed. The primary components of the proposed project would include:

- Seismic and functional upgrades to the Upper Crystal Springs Dam Culverts, including seismic strengthening of the Lower Culvert, which crosses the San Andreas Fault rupture zone, and providing isolation capabilities to both culverts.
- Seismic improvements to the Crystal Springs Outlet Structures 1 and 2, including removal of the seismically vulnerable aboveground portions of their towers, and construction of a small onshore control shed for remote valve operation.
- Major seismic upgrade of the Crystal Springs Pump Station (CS Pump Station), including construction of a new, seismically strengthened Pump Station, and replacement of all related facilities, pipelines, and pipeline connections. The upgrade would also include increasing the pump station booster capability to 120 million gallons per day to meet delivery reliability goals, and construction of a new dissipation structure for releases into San Mateo Creek to meet anticipated DSOD requirements.
- Seismic upgrades to the existing CS/SA Pipeline that conveys water from CS Pump Station to San Andreas Reservoir (approximately 4.7 miles), including replacement of two segments of the pipeline, general pipeline improvements, and new access roads to ensure access to the pipeline for emergency and maintenance repairs.
- Seismic upgrade to the San Andreas Outlet Structures 2 and 3, including improvements at both the outlet towers and tunnel portals located at the Harry Tracey Water Treatment Plant.

This public hearing is intended to assist the Historic Preservation Commission in its preparation of written comments on the Draft EIR. Comments made by members of the public at this hearing will not be considered comments on the Draft EIR and may not be responded to in the Final EIR. The Planning Commission will hold a public hearing to receive comments from the public on the Draft EIR on December 10, 2009. Written comments will be accepted at the Planning Department’s offices until the close of business on Monday, December 21, 2009.

Preliminary Recommendation: The Commission may direct staff to prepare written comments of the Commission

PRESENTERS: Todso Magudas – Project Manager of the San Andreas Transmission System Upgrade Project; Madelyn Bolan – Architectural Historian from ICF Jones and Stokes; Tim Yates – Historian from Jones and Stokes

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: No action was required for this Item. Staff was directed to draft and prepare written comments of the Commission to the Environmental Review Officer.

4. 2007.0946E (J. Navarrete: 415/575-9040) Candlestick Point - Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Plan (Project) Draft Environmental Impact Report - The Project site is located on approximately 702 acres in the southeastern portion of San Francisco and includes both Candlestick Point and HPS Phase II. Commission Review and Comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report. The Project proposed includes a mixed-use community with a wide range of residential, retail, office, research and
development, civic and community uses, and parks and recreational open space. A major component would be a new stadium for the San Francisco 49ers National Football League team. Additionally, new transportation and utility infrastructure would serve the Project including a bridge across Yosemite Slough. The Project proposes development of 10,500 residential units; 885,000 gross square feet (gsf) of retail; 150,000 gsf of office; 2.5 million gsf of Research & Development uses; a 220-room, 150,000-gsf hotel; 255,000 gsf of artist studio space and arts center; 100,000 gsf of community services; approximately 240 acres of new parks, sports fields, and waterfront recreation areas, as well as approximately 97 acres of new and improved State parkland; a 69,000-seat 49ers stadium; and a 10,000-seat performance arena. In addition, a 300-slip marina would be provided. Shoreline improvements would also be implemented to stabilize the shoreline. The Project would include structured and on-street parking and various infrastructure improvements to support the development.

NOTE: The Draft Environmental Impact Report was published on November 12, 2009. The project may result in the destruction or degradation of historical resources. The Draft EIR identifies this as a significant and unavoidable environmental effect of the proposed project, and identifies mitigation measures to lessen this effect, though not to a level of insignificance.

This public hearing is intended to assist the Historic Preservation Commission in its preparation of written comments on the Draft EIR. Comments made by members of the public at this hearing will not be considered comments on the Draft EIR and may not be responded to in the Final EIR. The Redevelopment Agency Commission and the Planning Commission will hold a public hearing to receive comments on the Draft EIR on December 15 and December 17, 2009, respectively. Written comments on the Draft EIR will be accepted at the Planning Department until 5:00 p.m. on Monday, December 28, 2009.

Preliminary Recommendation: The Commission may direct staff to draft written comments of the Commission.

PRESENTERS: Tiffany Bohee – Mayor’s Office of Economic and Workforce Development: Provided a brief background and overview of the project; Michael Rise – PBS&J Project Director for the Draft EIR, Ruth Todd – Page and Turnbull, Sheila McElroy – CIRCA Historic Properties Development; Mary Smitheran Sheldon – CD Richard Ellis

SPEAKERS:
Bradley Wiedmaier – Architectural Historian – The proposed bridge over the slough is an awkward place to be. Placing the bridge at an angle to the street on the east would preserve the historic shoreline and avoid shoreline obstruction.

ACTION: No action was required for this Item. Staff was directed to prepare some bullet points of the Commission’s comments for tomorrow’s DEIR public hearing at the Planning Commission (12/17/09). Staff also was to draft and prepare more detailed written comments of the Commission to the Environmental Review Officer.

This item was continued to January 6, 2010

AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase
Items 5 and 6 were heard concurrently.

5. 2009.0476U (P. LaValley: 415/575-9084)
178 Townsend Street - northeast corner of Townsend Street and Clarence Place, in Assessor’s Block 3788, Lot 012. **Request for Review and Consideration** of a Draft Resolution recommending approval of a Mills Act historical property contract for 166-178 Townsend Street, which is a contributing resource to the South End Historic District designated pursuant to Article 10 of the Planning Code. The Mills Act authorizes local governments to enter into contracts with owners of private historical property who, through the historical property contract, assure the rehabilitation, restoration, preservation and maintenance of a qualified historical property. In return, the property owner enjoys a reduction in property taxes for a given period. The subject property is within a SLI (Service/Light Industrial) District and a 65-X Height and Bulk District. **Preliminary Recommendation:** Approval of Resolution Recommending Approval of the Mills Act Contract

**SPEAKERS:** None
**ACTION:** Approved the Mills Act contract.
**AYES:** Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Damkroger, Chase
**NAYES:** Wolfram
**RESOLUTION:** R640

6. 2009.0476F (P. LaValley: 415/575-9084)
178 Townsend Street - northeast corner of Townsend Street and Clarence Place, in Assessor’s Block 3788, Lot 012. **Request for Review and Comment** on the documentation and draft Memorandum of Agreement prepared by United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for Section 106 review of the proposed adaptive-reuse of the existing building and construction of a vertical addition to provide up to 94 dwelling units, ground floor retail and daycare space, and up to 45 off-street parking spaces. Consistent with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, HUD has requested comments on the effects the proposed undertaking could have upon historic properties. The subject property is a contributing resource to the South End Historic District and is within an SLI (Service, Light Industrial) District with a 65-X Height and Bulk limit. **Preliminary Recommendation:** Direct staff to draft written comments of the Commission.

**SPEAKERS:** None
**ACTION:** Approved. Staff is requested to keep project sponsor’s language on process as it stands. In this singular case, the size of the project is mitigated by good design; care has been taken; and good design should be encourage.
**AYES:** Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Damkroger, Chase
**NAYES:** Wolfram

7. 2009.0948A (A. Threadgill: 415/558-6602)
760 Market Street, The "Phelan Building," corner of O’Farrell and Market Streets, in Assessor’s Block 0328, Lot 001. **Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness** to install business signage (dba Walgreens). The property is Landmark No. 156 and is rated as Category I (Significant) within the Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter Conservation District. It is within the C-3-R (Downtown
Retail) Zoning District, in an 80-130-F Height and Bulk District, and is also within the Market Street Special Sign District.  

Preliminary Recommendation: Approval with Conditions  
(Continued from the November 4, 2009 hearing.)

PRESENTERS: Peter McEarney – Martin Building Company  
SPEAKERS: None  
ACTION: Approved as recommended by staff  
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase  
NAYES: Martinez  
MOTION: M0039

8. 2006.0747A (S. Caltagirone: 415/558-6625)  
890 Grove Street - northeast corner of Grove and Fillmore Streets. Assessor's Block 0797, Lot 019. Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a vertical addition at the roof of the existing two-story-over-basement building and to install a garage door opening at the basement level. The property is a contributing within the Alamo Square Historic District. It is zoned RH-3 (Residential, House, Three-Family) District and is in an 50-X Height and Bulk District.  

Preliminary Recommendation: Approval with Conditions  

PRESENTERS: Mark Topacher – Architect for the project.  
SPEAKERS: None  
ACTION: Approved with amendments to the finding that there is no substantial adverse impact to the district, the siding be flush siding, and the height reduced by six inches.  
AYES: Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase  
NAYES: Buckley and Hasz  
MOTION: M0040

D. STAFF REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Preservation Coordinator Tina Tam:  
Upcoming activities associated with the Market / Octavia (M/O) Plan Area has contributed to a delay in bringing this back to the HPC in February, 2010. The recommendations for nomination for potential districts and individual buildings in the M/O Plan Area are delayed because of recent activities, schedules, status of Mission Dolores neighborhood survey and M/O augmentation survey. Based upon the last HPC's M/O survey integration hearing, the Planning Department and Planning Commission were instructed to fold in both the Mission Dolores survey and the augmentation for recommendations to the HPC. The Mission Dolores survey is coming back to the HPC on February 17; the augmentation survey sometime in March; and the Planning Department’s recommendation in April.
E. MATTERS OF THE COMMISSION

9.  (S. Caltagirone/J. Battis: 415/558-6625)
   2750 Vallejo Street - Informational Presentation and Discussion regarding the appeal of a Categorical Exemption under the California Environmental Quality Act. This Categorical Exemption determination is currently under appeal to the Board of Supervisors and is scheduled for hearing before the Board of Supervisors on December 15, 2009. Should the hearing before the Board of Supervisors be continued, the Historic Preservation Commission may direct staff to draft a letter from the Commission to the Board of Supervisors regarding the appeal of the Categorical Exemption determination; if the appeal has been taken and a decision made by the Board, then this item will be for informational purposes only and no action will be taken by the Commission.

SPEAKERS:
Bradley Wiedmaier, Architectural Historian – There are inaccuracies in the Categorical Exemption (Cat Ex): the 1939 building permit was not incorporated in the report; the difference between the first two HRERs is not pointed out; and the third reason is in regard to the originality of the facade fenestration. He also referred to the San Borne maps and Water Department documents.
Tuia Catalana, Reuben and Junius, Representing the property owners – The owners have received support from neighbors, SF Heritage and SF Consortium. This building is a contributory historic resource to a potential district, not an existing district.
Joan Wood – The research that went into this project was inadequate and the Cat Ex was based on a different plan. The project needs further investigation.
Greg Malan, Property Owner – This property is not an architecturally significant home and it has been dramatically changed.
Jay Turnbull, Page and Turnbull – They need to release the site for continued alteration that requires only general compatibility with the district and the neighbor.

NOTE: Commissioner Damkroger disclosed that she had written to Supervisor Alioto Pier and met with the owner of the site.

ACTION: No action is required for this item.

10. Consideration of Adoption:
   a. Draft minutes of ARC Hearing of November 4, 2009
   b. Draft minutes of Regular Hearing of November 18, 2009
   c. Draft minutes of Regular Hearing of December 2, 2009

   ACTION: Adopted November 4, 2009 minutes as is, and adopted the draft minutes of November 18 and December 2 as they have been corrected: November 18, 2009 – front page, changed Belk to Bevk, page 4 – changed Buckley to Wolfram, and page 13 changed Wolfram to Buckley; December 2, 2009 – front page, changed Marin to Marine.

   AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase
11. The Historic Preservation Commission and Staff will be gathering at Absinthe Restaurant, located at 398 Hayes Street, immediately after the hearing on 12/16/09 for their Holiday Party.

**Noted from the Commission:** This is an informal meeting that is open to all members of the public without a requirement to pay for or buy a drink or refreshment. No business item is to be taken up at this gathering.

12. President’s Report and Announcements

- Commissioners Chase and Damkroger would attend, present and hear comments at the January 15, 2010 Mayor’s Office of Disability Hearing.

13. Commission Comments/Questions

**Commission Wolfram:**

- Would the disclosure category be at the beginning of the agenda? – **Commission Secretary Avery responded** that it is generally under Matters of the Commission which is usually at the beginning of the agenda. Due to the length and volume of this agenda, it was moved to the end. **Commissioner Chase commented** that in the future he would afford time for disclosure at the beginning of the meeting to accommodate any change in agenda format.

- Asked the status of the library designations – **Preservation Coordinator Tam responded** that Johanna Street was interested in preparing the background information, context statements and perhaps DPR forms. The Planning Department’s response to her submittal was not pending on any grant. It is anticipated that Ms. Street will bring her work to the Department soon and to the HPC in early 2010. The two months update for Merced and Parkside Branch Libraries will be in February 2010. There was no new information on the Park Branch Library initiation.

**Commissioner Martinez:**

- Commented the minutes were different and asked the status of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF) – **Commission Secretary Avery responded**, as directed by the Commission, the minutes now include a summary of public comments. For the SOFT: there was an official compliant filed and she went to the hearing on 12/10/09 during a recess of the Planning Commission’s hearing. At that time it appeared that the complaint was the only item on their calendar. Ms. Avery was able to respond to their questions before she had to go back to the Planning Commission hearing. The item was continued to 1/14/10 (which would also be a Planning Commission hearing date). Commission Secretary Avery will ask the Planning Commission to call a recess at 4:00 pm in order to participate in the SOTF hearing. She would bring the recently approved minutes to the hearing even though SOTF had not indicated they want to see them. Commission Secretary Avery did not receive the formal complaint that SOTF was obligated to send to the Department, and had not seen the SOTF preliminary decision that was issued.

**Commissioner Buckley:**

- Asked whether the HPC would be commenting on the North Beach Branch Library DEIR only. The other libraries were issued Cat Ex documents – **Preservation Coordinator Tam affirmed** that the other libraries were Cat Ex and that the HPC would have the opportunity to comment on the North Beach Branch Library DEIR when it is issued and published, probably in April 2010.
Commissioner Damkroger:
- She would like further discussions about CEQA. The more frequent use of Cat Ex in evaluating a project is a problematic approach when the historic evaluation report says that while it [a project] doesn’t entirely meet the standards, it doesn’t create a substantial adverse impact and/or material change to the resource.
- In situations when there is some disagreement about whether or not there are historic resources for a particular development proposal, the HPC ought to look at the historic resource evaluation report prior to certification. A case in point is the DEIR for 935-965 Market Street.

Commissioner Chase:
- We need to have appropriate information to assess the adequacy of the DEIR as it relates to historic resources.

Commissioner Martinez:
- HPC needs to develop guidelines about how properties are reviewed under CEQA.
- The gap between not entirely meeting the Secretary of Interior Standards and not creating a significant impact on historic resources has to be defined.
- The Planning Department and the HPC ought to work together because there is a lot of confusion and conflicts. This subject needs a full discussion at a hearing.

Commissioner Chase:
- HPC should have these discussions in a manner that is not rushed. We need to set aside time as a priority for the Commission to delve into the matter.
- I would like Planning Staff to present their rational for what they have done around the issues of evaluations using Cat Ex.
- Urged HPC to look at its Rules and Regulations seriously as to how they could create a construct for HPC to do business. The Planning Commission had changed and altered their rules to their particular needs. This Commission needs to do the same.

Commissioner Secretary Avery:
- Will provide commissioners with both the HPC and PC Rules and Regulations for this Commission to compare.

Adjournment: 4:43 P.M.

The minutes was proposed for adoption at the Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission on Wednesday, January 20, 2010.

ACTION: Approved
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, wolfram, Damkroger, Matsuda, Chase
SAN FRANCISCO HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes

Hearing Room 400
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Wednesday, January 6, 2010

12:30 P.M.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Buckley, Matsuda, Hasz, Martinez and Wolfram
COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Chase and Damkroger

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY ACTING CHAIR MARTINEZ AT 12:35 P.M.

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Tina Tam – Preservation Coordinator, Joy Navarrete, Brett Becker, Ben Fu, Don Lewis, Lisa Gibson, Pilar LaValley, Shelley Caltagirone, and Linda Avery – Commission Secretary

A. PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS:
Bradley Wiedmaier – Architectural Historian & District 6 resident, re: Requested HPC to write a letter supporting the appellant regarding 2750 Vallejo Street to the Board of Appeals.
Katherine Howard – re: Golden Gate Park soccer field improvement plan violates stated purpose of the western end of the Golden Gate Park as specified in the Golden Gate Park Master Plan.
B. STAFF REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Preservation Coordinator Tina Tam:
The Certified Local Government (CLG) Report is 75% complete and a copy of the report will be included in your packet material for the 1/20/10 hearing. After final approval from Planning Department management, a copy will be sent to the State Historic Preservation Office.

Music Concourse, Landmark No. 249 – after discussion with Zoning Administrator, Larry Badiner, it was determined that the proposed vending carts would be a 5-year long term lease. While they are not a permanent structure themselves, they do not constitute as temporary uses and would require a Certificate of Appropriateness. An informational presentation is scheduled on January 20 and a representative from Recreation and Park has been requested to come to the hearing to present details of the contract and the design of the vending carts.

HPC’s 2010-2011 Budget Discussion is scheduled on January 20. This is the opportunity for this Commission to voice your thoughts, goals and objectives in relation to the Planning Department’s work program.

C. MATTERS OF THE COMMISSION

1. President’s Report and Announcements - None

2. Commission Comments/Questions

Commissioner Buckley asked how best to prepare for the budget discussion and how to communicate ideas with each other. [In response: the commission should discuss all ideas, concerns and questions with staff and each other in the public arena, at the hearing.]

Commissioner Martinez asked if the budget item needed to be an action item to make HPC views known to the Planning Commission. - Preservation Coordinator Tam responded that the item on the calendar is to receive HPC comments. This does not have to be the only discussion. There could be a series of hearings and the HPC could request the Planning Department to come back. HPC will receive all memos from Planning Director Rahaim that have already been sent to the Planning Commission. HPC will be included in receive any further budget material. In addition to the FY 2010/2011 budget discussion scheduled before this commission on January 20, 2010, we hope to set up a joint hearing with Planning and HPC.

Commissioner Hasz asked if there is a document to inform applicants that they would be required to present their projects when/if their item is pulled off the Consent Calendar - Preservation Coordinator Tam and Commission Secretary Avery responded that the language in the Consent Calendar has a disclaimer that there is a chance that anyone could pull an item off the Consent Calendar and the applicant would need to present “at this or a future hearing”. Planning Department staff is also good about informing all parties involved in the case on either side that they need to be prepared to present.

Commission Martinez:
- Requested that 2750 Vallejo Street be agendized to discuss whether or not HPC should/would write a letter reflecting the opinions of the HPC to the Board of Appeals.
- Wanted to find out if the soccer field improvements near the Murphie Windmill are under HPC jurisdiction since the Windmill is a historic feature of Golden Gate Park.
D. REGULAR CALENDAR

   Candlestick Point - Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Plan (Project)
   Draft Environmental Impact Report - The Project site is located on approximately
   702 acres in the southeastern portion of San Francisco and includes both
   Candlestick Point and HPS Phase II. Commission Review and Comment on
   the Draft Environmental Impact Report. The Project proposed includes a
   mixed-use community with a wide range of residential, retail, office, research and
   development, civic and community uses, and parks and recreational open space.
   A major component would be a new stadium for the San Francisco 49ers
   National Football League team. Additionally, new transportation and utility
   infrastructure would serve the Project including a bridge across Yosemite Slough.
   The Project proposes development of 10,500 residential units; 885,000 gross
   square feet (gsf) of retail; 150,000 gsf of office; 2.5 million gsf of Research &
   Development uses; a 220-room, 150,000-gsf hotel; 255,000 gsf of artist studio
   space and arts center; 100,000 gsf of community services; approximately 240
   acres of new parks, sports fields, and waterfront recreation areas, as well as
   approximately 97 acres of new and improved State parkland; a 69,000-seat
   49ers stadium; and a 10,000-seat performance arena. In addition, a 300-slip
   marina would be provided. Shoreline improvements would also be implemented
   to stabilize the shoreline. The Project would include structured and on-street
   parking and various infrastructure improvements to support the development.
   NOTE: The Draft Environmental Impact Report was published on November 12,
   2009. The project may result in the destruction or degradation of historical
   resources. The Draft EIR identifies this as a significant and unavoidable
   environmental effect of the proposed project, and identifies mitigation measures
   to lessen this effect, though not to a level of insignificance.

   This public hearing is intended to assist the Historic Preservation Commission in
   its preparation of written comments on the Draft EIR. Comments made by
   members of the public at this hearing will not be considered comments on the
   Draft EIR and may not be responded to in the Final EIR. The Redevelopment
   Agency Commission and the Planning Commission held public hearings to
   receive comments on the Draft EIR on December 15 and December 17, 2009,
   respectively. Another Redevelopment Commission public hearing is scheduled
   for January 5, 2010. Written comments on the Draft EIR will be accepted at the
   Planning Department until 5:00 p.m. on Monday, January 12, 2010.
   Preliminary Recommendation: The Commission may direct staff to draft written
   comments of the Commission.
   (Continued from December 16, 2009 Hearing)

   SPEAKERS: None
   PRESENTERS: Tiffany Bohee – Mayor’s Office of Economic and Work Force
               Development, Teres Brecky – Lanar
   ACTION: Public hearing on the DEIR and no action is required for this
            item. Staff was directed to expand Commissioner Damkroger’s
            comment letter to include additional comments made at today’s
            hearing for submittal to the Environmental Review Officer.
   AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram, and Matsuda
   ABSENT: Chase and Damkroger
4. 2005.0963E  
Crystal Springs Pipeline No.2 Replacement Project Draft Environmental Impact Report – Commission Review and Comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report. The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) is proposing the Crystal Springs Pipeline No. 2 (CSPL2) Replacement Project. The Project proposes to upgrade and replace portions of the CSPL2, which extends (south to north) from the Crystal Springs Pump Station at the base of Lower Crystal Springs Dam in an unincorporated area of San Mateo County, through the Town of Hillsborough and the cities of San Mateo, Burlingame, Millbrae, San Bruno, South San Francisco, Brisbane, Daly City, and into the City and County of San Francisco, terminating at the University Mound Reservoir in southeastern San Francisco. The SFPUC has identified 19 sites along the 19-mile CSPL2 alignment where improvements are proposed to meet seismic reliability level-of-service goals. The improvements include pipeline rehabilitation and seismic retrofit activities at 15 sites and general improvements to protect the pipeline from corrosion and exposure at 4 sites. In addition to these improvements, the SFPUC proposes to install new cathodic protection equipment at 9 locations and insulated flange joints (referred to as electrical isolation) at 31 locations along the CSPL2 alignment to further protect the pipeline from corrosion.

This public hearing is intended to assist the Historic Preservation Commission in its preparation of written comments on the Draft EIR. Comments made by members of the public at this hearing will not be considered comments on the Draft EIR and may not be responded to in the Final EIR. The Planning Commission will hold a public hearing to receive comments on the Draft EIR on January 14, 2010. Written comments on the Draft EIR will be accepted at the Planning Department until 5:00 p.m. on Monday, January 25, 2010.

Preliminary Recommendation: The Commission may direct staff to draft written comments of the Commission.

SPEAKERS: None
PRESENTERS: Sheryl Davis – SF Public Utility Commission Environmental Project Manager; Brett Becker – Planning Department Staff; Brad Bruceter – Environmental Scientist Associates, Planning Department Cultural Resource Consultant on the DEIR

ACTION: Public hearing on the DEIR and no action is required for this item. Directed staff to study whether or not the trees along El Camino Real were a historic landscape and a cultural resource.

AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram, and Matsuda
ABSENT: Chase and Damkroger

5. 2009.0173E  
353 San Jose Avenue - located on the east side between 25th and 26th Streets, in Assessor’s Block 6531, Lot 022. Request for review pursuant to the Eastern Neighborhoods Interim Permit Review Procedures for Historic Resources. The proposed project is to demolish the existing building and construct a new four-unit, four-story, 40'-0" tall, residential building within RM-2 (Residential, Mixed, Moderate Density) District, in a 40-X Height and Bulk District, and within the Mission Area Plan. The Department is reviewing an Environmental Evaluation application and Historic Resource Evaluation Report for the project.

Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt Motion
SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Adopted staff recommendations and included a minor modification to reduce the setback on the 4th floor to 12'-4". Staff was instructed to continue working with the sponsor on front fence design.
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram, and Matsuda
ABSENT: Chase and Damkroger
MOTION #: M0041

1501 – 15th Street - southwest corner of South Van Ness Avenue and 15th Street, in Assessor’s Block 3553, Lot 054. Request for review pursuant to the Eastern Neighborhoods Interim Permit Review Procedures for Historic Resources. The proposed project is to demolish a parking lot (formerly a gas station), and construct a new 58’ tall, six-story, mixed-use building within the UMU (Urban Mixed Use) District, in a 58-X Height and Bulk District, and within the Mission Area Plan. The Department is reviewing an Environmental Evaluation application for the project. Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt Motion

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Adopted motion with comments by Commissioner Martinez that the project does not have an impact on the potential historic resources
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram, and Matsuda
ABSENT: Chase and Damkroger
MOTION #: M0042

7. 2009.0903A (P. LaValley: 415/575.9084)
4701 – 3rd Street (a.k.a 1601 Newcomb Avenue) - southwest corner of 3rd Street and Newcomb Avenue, in Assessor’s Block 5311, Lot 036. Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove existing front stair and construct new accessibility ramp and stair, add new ADA-accessible restrooms and interior wall, and provide seismic support for the existing interior balcony. The subject property, known as Bayview Opera House, is City Landmark #8. The property is within a P (Public) District with a 40-X Height and Bulk limit. Preliminary Recommendation: Approval with conditions

SPEAKERS: None
PRESENTER: Romell Taylor – Project Architect and Project Manager with the Department of Public Work’s Bureau of Architecture
ACTION: Approved project as proposed with the additions that staff is to review the turn back at the bottom two risers; the section of the secondary entrance; and the final working drawings.
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram, and Matsuda
ABSENT: Chase and Damkroger
MOTION #: M0043
8.  2009.1054A (S. Caltagirone: 415/558.6625)

1000 Great Highway, Golden Gate Park Music Concourse - between John F. Kennedy Drive, Hagiwara Tea Garden Drive, Martin Luther King Jr. Drive, and Music Concourse Drive. Assessor’s Block 1700, Lot 001. **Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness** to restore four fountains, to install new concrete block paving around the perimeter of the fountains; and to install a new drinking fountain. The Golden Gate Park Music Concourse is Landmark No. 249. It is zoned P (Public) District and is in an Open Space Height and Bulk District. Preliminary Recommendation: Approval

**PRESENTER:** Rick Thall – Recreation and Park

**SPEAKERS:** Bob Cherney – Former Landmark Board Member and Historian, re: Expressed his full support of the proposed project; Catherine Howard – Friends of Music Concourse, re: expressed her support of the renovation work and looks forward to its completion.

**ACTION:** Approved

**AYES:** Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram, and Matsuda

**ABSENT:** Chase and Damkroger

**MOTION #:** M0044

---

**Adjournment:** 3:22 P.M.

The minutes was proposed for adoption at the Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission on Wednesday, February 3, 2010

**ACTION:** Approved

**AYES:** Chase, Damkroger, Hasz, Martinez

**ABSENT:** Buckley, Wolfram, Matsuda
SAN FRANCISCO
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes

Hearing Room 400
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Wednesday, January 20, 2010
12:30 P.M.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Buckley, Matsuda, Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram, Chase, Damkroger

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT CHASE AT 12:37 P.M.

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Tina Tam – Preservation Coordinator, Elaine Forbes, Alicia John-Baptiste, Kelley Amdur, Tim Frye, Angela Threadgill, Michael Smith, Linda Avery – Commission Secretary

A. PUBLIC COMMENT

Recording started during Public Comment.
Katherine Howard – the lighting at Beach Chalet soccer field would be three times as much compared to South Sunset Playing Field and trees would be taken out at the Murphie Windmill and Mills Wright House locations where views from there would be impacted.
Bradley Wiedmaier – Architectural Historian, re: Requested HPC to support his campaign to make parcel file photos in the Recorder Assessor’s Office assessable to the public regardless of whether or not the parcel owner gave permission.
B. STAFF REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. HPC’s 2010-2011 Budget Discussion

Assistant Director Alicia John-Baptiste:

The Work Program presented today was not a balanced Work Program, meaning the Department anticipated fewer resources than allocated to the Work Program currently. It showed how the Department would allocate resources if it had the same level of resources going into the next fiscal year as it did this fiscal year. The Work Program is meant to provide information as a way for the Commission to become familiar with the Department’s services and the level of effort to allocate to those services, specifically around the Preservation Work Program. The Department is asking the HPC for feedback and guidance for services which HPC believed are priorities and the Department would use that as it makes its decisions and see how best to support the Commission going into the next fiscal year.

The HPC is aware that when this Commission was developed there was no funding source identified for the work that is needed in order to be effective for the Commission. The Department managed through that this fiscal year, but the Department is looking for more specific direction from the HPC for next fiscal year.

The Department will be presenting to this Commission and the Planning Commission next week, Thursday, January 28th, in a Joint Hearing a more detailed budget. It still won’t be balanced, and at that point, the Department will again ask HPC for direction in terms of choosing among the various balancing options that needs to be considered before going to the next fiscal year.

The trade-off decisions around how to allocate resources is assuming we have fewer resources next year than this year.

Some of the items affecting our work loads for next fiscal year:

- The Action Plan has thirty service items the Department has taken on to improve efficiency and effectiveness. It is intended to be a two year program from 2008 to 2010 and expires at the end of this fiscal year. Many of the key elements of the initiative have been implemented or will be implemented by this summer. The Department believes because of the efficiency put in place through the Action Plan, it can accommodate additional resources into the Neighborhood Planning Division.

- What the Department shows now in the Preservation Work Program is a shift to meet the needs of the Commission – increasing needs to application review and staffing the Planning Information Counter with preservation planners. The Department wants to have a discussion with the HPC about finding a funding source to meet the needs of the Commission.

- Eastern Neighborhood reviews - The Department has instituted a number of reforms in this area over the last couple of years, including the use of a consultant pool, community plan exemptions which is a more condensed environmental review process, and improved transportation functions. These efficiencies allowed the Department to shift staffs away from supporting private applications, especially with the reduction in environment review applications and applied toward supporting city projects, such as Fisherman’s Wharf, the Recreation and Open Space Element, the Preservation Element, and the Community Safety Element. These items have been in the Work Program for some time but the Department has not been able to adequately
resource them. Hopefully they can be done this fiscal year.

- The City Wide Program has completed a number of area plans over the last one and a half years – the Eastern Neighborhood, Market/Octavia, Balboa Park, etc, and with the completion of these area plans, the Department is able to move staff to some new projects, including sustainable city strategy. Also smaller projects that supports sustainable development such as the Central Subway Corridor, Candlestick Park, Transbay, and Parkmerced. With the adoption of these area plans, the Department is shifting focus in long range planning to plan implementation. A lot of effort was put into these community processes over the years around how development should occur and the Department now feels the responsibility to make sure these plans are implemented as had been directed by the community and the policy makers. The Department is hoping to give more attention to this in the next fiscal year.

- In the current fiscal year the Department was able to retain a number of staff positions through shifting its work to support public projects that received stimulus dollars on behalf of other city departments such as the Ports. In the next fiscal year much of the stimulus funding would expire. The whole group of staff supported through these revenues from other departments would be less available. The Department is working with those departments to try to think creatively to fill in those sources and to continue to work on these important public projects.

- Internal initiative - the Department is trying to resource for the next fiscal year to update its computer system and permit tracking system.

- We are trying to accommodate increasing demands to address requests for public records information.

The Department is proposing to add a grant writer position in next year’s budget to find ways to diversify revenue sources.

The Department is operating on the principle that we will make every effort to retain staff during this economic down-cycle. During this cycle it is an appropriate time to do long range planning and internal process improvements.

Chief Finance Officer Elaine Forbes: [She went over the “FY 2010-2011 – Financial Condition, Preliminary Balancing Options, and Work Program” using a PowerPoint presentation that she had used with the Planning Commission on December 17, 2009.]

Director of Neighborhood Planning Kelly Amdur: [She gave an overview of Neighborhood Planning Work Program contained in the PowerPoint “FY 2010-2011 – Financial Condition, Preliminary Balancing Options, and Work Program.” She also presented a broad picture of the proposed work program for the Neighborhood Planning division and gave details of the preservation work.]

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Informational presentation and discussion only – Although the Commission did not take any action, there was an expressed general consensus from commissioners that the Department should finish the survey work that has been started. The Commission expressed that finishing the historic districts that have been started has to be a priority, not starting new things. In relation to fees, it was expressed that projects under one million dollars are not happening and are being killed by the permit fees being asked for. The fees are killing the work/the
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economy in San Francisco. Smaller projects can’t afford it, they can’t borrow through development.

Preservation Coordinator Tam: Had a couple of items to report –

- Golden Gate Park Soccer Fields - In 2007 the Planning Department received a general plan referral for a proposal to renovate a total of six athletic play fields. At that time the Department made a determination that the project is consistent with the Planning Department policies and in balance with general conformity plan and issued a Categorical Exemption under Class I of California Environment Quality Act. Golden Gate Park play fields proposal calls for change from natural to synthetic turf, renovate existing bathroom facilities, upgrade ADA pavement, install new light standards, bleachers, benches, and included addition of one new soccer field to be located at the southern part of the existing four soccer fields. Recreation and Park representative Howard mentioned today that the soccer fields are located on the western part of Golden Gage Park near the Beach Chalet building which is designated as a local landmark. In the designating ordinance, the boundaries of the landmark site is limited to the footprint of the building itself. It has brought to our attention recently that we do need more information to evaluate the impact of potential historic and national resource concerns related to this project. We received from the Department of Recreation and Park a new environmental review application we had asked for. A new determination will be issued within the next month or so.

- Vending Cart at the Music Concourse – The Department of Recreation and Park requested to postpone the informational presentation to the HPC until it further defines their proposal.

Commission Secretary Avery:

- Commented on a complaint filed at the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOF) against the Department for deficiency in HPC minutes – On the January 14th I took samples of the last three months of HPC minutes to SOFT. One member of the SOFT was there and acknowledged there was no quorum but decided to move the hearing forward. Mr. Warfield from the Library Users Association was there as well as Mr. Bradley Wiedmaier to restate the complaint, express their concern and ultimately acknowledge that improvements were made to the minutes but felt it was not consistent as far as they were concerned. I stated that the Department was meeting the requirements of the Administrative Code and the Sunshine Ordinance. The disagreement around the complaint was the definition of summary of comments from the public. Another member of the SOFT came later during the hearing and the two members seemed to be satisfied with our effort and asked that we continue with the effort. I offered to attend training classes offered by SOTF and asked the commission for information about them. I also stated that I would continue working on and producing the minutes as required by the Sunshine Ordinance.
C. MATTERS OF THE COMMISSION

2. President’s Report and Announcements

Commission Chase:

- Reported that he and Commissioner Damkroger appeared before the Mayor’s Disability Council to discuss the inter-relationship between what HPC does with issues associated with universal access to historic properties and what they do. The assumption that HPC has power over what happens to building is translated into that it can adjudicate all the issues around accessibility, which is not really the HPC purview or place. We do have that [power] in reviewing applications that come before us and with the subset of buildings that are within our direct purview in how we deal with accessibility access in the approval process. We went through a number of examples, and one was the Mills Wright Cottage in Golden Gate Park recently submitted to us where we had actually increased the level of accessibility. This was an opportunity to increase a dialogue with the Disability Council to promote that historic preservation is not an enemy but a friend to the disabled community. We should work towards developing a policy of mutual agreement on accessibility with historic building. Primarily the interest is in public buildings where public business is taking place to provide universal access to all, not just wheelchair accessibility that ADA requirements call for, but also looking at other aspects of all the impediments that may have come to members of the disabled communities to access public activities. The reference to the North Beach Library was part of the issue on accessibility that stimulated the request for HPC to come before the Council. Our response to that, in the landmarking of those properties, does not preclude universal accessibility to that property. It is actually the responsibility of those who design the renovation and rehabilitation to meet that requirement.

3. Consideration of Adoption:

a. Draft minutes of Regular Hearing of December 16, 2009

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Approved the minutes as corrected to add Bradley Wiedmaier’s question re: 2750 Vallejo Street still on the agenda as an informational item, and change Adjournment from 1:43 P.M. to 4:43 P.M.

AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram, Damkroger, Matsuda, Chase

4. Disclosures

Commissioner Wolfram Buckley: Met with the architect of the Filbert Street Cottages for a site tour.

Commissioner Martinez: Initiated a contact with Chris VerPlanck over the Sacred Heart nomination.

Commissioner Chase: Contacted Mr. Junius, attorney for the Filbert Street Cottages.

Commissioner Damkroger: Had an offer to tour [Filbert Street Cottages] but did not take the offer. She would like to discuss the opportunities for the HPC to do full commission tours from time to time.
5. **Election of Officers**  
   **SPEAKERS:** None  
   **ACTION:** Charles Chase as President and Courtney Damkroger as Vice President  
   **AYES:** Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase

6. **Commission Comments/Questions**  
   **Commissioner Martinez:** Asked for a time frame to agendize 2750 Vallejo Street as an action item to write a letter to the Board of Appeals.  
   **Preservation Coordinator Tam** responded it is scheduled for February 3 in the advance calendar.  
   **Commissioner Wolfram:** Asked to agendize an item to modify the HPC Rules and Regulations. **Commission Secretary Avery** reminded them that there is a 10 days noticing requirement to hear this item and that a copy of the document would be in their packets for the next hearing.  
   **Commissioner Martinez:** Requested that an item be agendized around the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) analysis and findings on buildings that don't have impacts in the historic resource evaluation even though they don't meet the Secretary of Interior Standards. **Preservation Coordinator Tam** responded it would be scheduled in March or April as CEQA Part II. **Commission Chase:** Commented that it should be agendized as a discussion rather than action the first time around

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

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

   **51-99 Grove Street** - The Bill Graham Civic Auditorium, historically known as the Exposition Auditorium, Assessor's Block 0812; Lots 001. Bound by Hayes, Grove, Larkin, and Polk Streets. The subject building is a contributing structure to the Civic Center Historic District. It is located within a P (Public) District with an 80-X Height and Bulk limit. The proposal is a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove the existing light box sign on the Hayes Street elevation and to install a sign indicating the theater name and an LED marquee to promote theater events.  
   **Recommendation:** Approval with Conditions  
   (Continued from the Regular Meeting of December 16, 2009)  
   **(Proposed for indefinite continuance)**  
   **SPEAKERS:** None  
   **ACTION:** Approved for indefinite continuation.  
   **AYES:** Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase
E. CONSENT CALENDAR

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

8. 2009.1104H (A. Threadgill: 415/558-6602)  
456 Post Street - located on the north side of Post Street between Powell and Mason Streets, Lot 009 in Assessor's Block 0296. **Request for a Permit to Alter** for the reconstruction of a third floor exterior balcony, including a new terra cotta balustrade and underside ornamentation based on physical and pictorial evidence, as well as, extensive repairs to the south elevation, including repointing of masonry, patching or replacing damaged masonry, and gentle facade cleaning of the San Francisco Lodge No. 3 Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks. The subject building is a high-rise, steel framed, brick and terra cotta-clad Spanish-Gothic architectural resource rated as a Category I (Significant) Building in the Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter Conservation District under Article 11 of the Planning Code. The subject building is in a C-3-G (Downtown General Commercial) Zoning District and an 80-130-F Height and Bulk District.  
**Preliminary Recommendation: Approval**

Note: Commissioner Chase disclosed that the firm for which he works has an interest in Items 8 and 9 and asked to be recused.

ACTION: Commissioner Chase recused from participation in items 8 & 9  
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase

On the item:  
SPEAKERS: None  
ACTION: Approved  
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger  
RECUSED: Chase  
MOTION NO: 0045

F. REGULAR CALENDAR

9. 2010.0006U (M. Smith: 415/558-6322)  
2301 San Jose Avenue, northwest corner of San Jose and Geneva Avenues, in Assessor's Block 6972, Lot 036. **Request for Review and Comment** on the nomination of the Geneva Office Building and Power House (Landmark No. 180) to the National Register of Historic Places. The subject property is located within a P (Public) District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District.  
**Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt a Resolution recommending nomination to the National Register of Historic Places**

PRESENTERS: Nicole Avelyn – Executive Direction of the Geneva Car Barn, She gave an overview of the project  
SPEAKERS: Daniel Weaver – Board Chair of the Geneva Office Power and House, re: Affirmed the Geneva Power House in the

ACTION: Approved a resolution recommending the nomination to the National Register of Historic Places under criterion A and C.

AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger

RECUSED: Chase

RESOLUTION NO: R641

10. 2009.1141U (M. Smith for A. Starr: 415/558-6362) 2266 California Street, northeast corner of California and Webster Streets, in Assessor’s Block 0637, Lot 011. Request for Review and Comment on the nomination of the Temple Sherith Israel to the National Register of Historic Places. The subject property is located within a RM-1 (Residential, Mixed, Low-density) District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District. Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt a Resolution recommending nomination to the National Register of Historic Places

PRESENTERS: Michael Corbett – Preparer for the nomination

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Approved a resolution recommending the nomination to the National Register of Historic Places under criterion A and C.

AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase

RESOLUTION NO: R642

11. 2009.1138U (M. Smith for A. Starr: 415/558-6362) 554 Fillmore Street, southeast corner of Fillmore and Fell Streets, in Assessor’s Block 0828, Lot 022. Request for Review and Comment on the nomination of the Sacred Heart Church to the National Register of Historic Places. The subject property is located within a RM-1 (Residential, Mixed, Low-density) District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District. Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt a Resolution recommending nomination to the National Register of Historic Places

PRESENTER: Christopher VerPlanck – President of Kelley and VerPlanck Historic Resource Consultants, re: Stated reasons why this project has eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places; Robert Pritachard – Member of Save Our Sacred Heart, re: The sale of Sacred Heart and its unknown future for reuse gave rational for landmarking the project now.

SPEAKERS: Meryl Easton – Member of Save Our Sacred Heart, Architect, and former President of Victorian Alliance, re: Spoke in favor of the nomination.

ACTION: Recommended nomination and to include HPC comments that the building represents an amalgamation of styles in the Bay Area by local architects as an evolution of Romanesque as it moved toward the West Coast; it reflects the changing social character of the neighborhood that includes a constituency of African-American Catholic population; and it is eligible under Criterion C.
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase
RESOLUTION NO: R643

1338 Filbert Street, Filbert Street Cottages, north side between Polk and Larkin.
Assessor’s Block 0524, Lot 031 – Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to rehabilitate the cottages and site for residential use. The Filbert Street Cottages are San Francisco Landmark No. 232. The site is zoned RH-2 (Residential, Two-Family) District and is in a 40-X Height and Bulk District.
Preliminary Recommendation: Approval with Conditions

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Without hearing, item continued to February 17, 2010
AYES: Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase
NAYES: Buckley

ADJOURNMENT: 3:31 P.M.

The minutes was proposed for adoption at the Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission on Wednesday, March 17, 2010

ACTION: Approved
AYES: Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase
ABSENT: Buckley, Hasz
San Francisco Planning Commission & Historic Preservation Commission

Meeting Minutes of Joint Hearing

Commission Chambers - Room 400
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Thursday, January 28, 2010
10:30 AM

Planning
Commissioners Present: Miguel, Olague, Antonini, Lee, Moore, and Sugaya
Commissioners Absent: Borden

Historic Preservation
Commissioners Present: Chase, Damkroger, Martinez, and Wolfram
Commissioners Absent: Buckley, Matsuda, and Hasz

The meeting was called to order by Planning Commission President Miguel at 10:38 A.M.

Staff In Attendance: John Rahaim – Director of Planning, Larry Badiner – Zoning Administrator, Alicia John-Baptiste, Elaine Forbes, Kelley Amdur, David Alumbaugh, Bill Wycko, Tina Tam, Chris Haw, and Linda Avery – Commission Secretary.

A. Special Calendar

1. (E. Forbes: (415) 558-6417)
   FY 2010-2011 Budget Development: Review of Draft FY2011 Budget and Draft Work Program - Informational presentation and discussion only. No action is required by the Planning Commissions.

Speakers:
   - Aaron Goodman – the issues regarding preservation in this city are unique and the issues that both commissions review in regards to large scale projects is critical right now. Park Merced is one of them. My concern is we need to complete adequate surveys and the review of such landscapes. We need to look seriously at what types of preservations alternatives are available and what is being impacted overall. Please look seriously at the fee issues and the possibility of funding adequately surveys
   - Zach Stewart – I am interested in how much money is allocated separately for each commission
Joan Wood – I’m preoccupied with the North Beach Library. I’m very unhappy about the proposed 8.5% overall reduction to the Historic Preservation Commission. It looks like the survey program would be affected. The designations would be affected and that would impact the North Beach Library. We would like as much money as possible to go to landmarking and to increase whatever is possible for the Historic Preservation Commission.

Jack Gold, Executive Director of San Francisco Architectural Heritage – We recognize that these difficult economic times demand sacrifice from all city departments. The preservation community and the Historic Preservation Commission must do its fair share to help balance the city’s budget. Adequate staff and efficient planning will be essential to the successful performance of both commissions during these trying times. We believe that it is important for the Department to follow through with the completion of neighborhood plans and surveys, including the Department’s commitment that designates historic districts identified by area plan efforts. We urge that any staff reductions or reallocations be implemented in a manner that is fair and equitable for both commissions and does not single out the Historic Preservation Commission for reductions in staff or other support.

Peter Warfield, Executive Director of Library Users Association – I agree with previous speakers, in particular about disproportionate reductions for the Historic Preservation Commission. According to the Department’s memo, the reduction in survey staffing is from 3.37 to 1.57 FTE. That is a 53% reduction. I think that 53% is out of proportion and not in proportion with other funding actions that are being proposed. I think it is very important to fully fund the Historic Preservation Commission. The HPC needs funding for all of its proposed duties including for the provision of sufficient public information so that folks can follow what is going on with minutes. We brought a complaint about those minutes and the Sunshine Task Force found that the minutes were not adequate and not lawful. I’m glad to say that the HPC appears to be making efforts to improve that, but to the degree that requires staffing, that should be fully funded.

Sue Cauthen – The Historic Preservation Commission was created by a substantial vote of the electorate. I think there is a real will in San Francisco for a separate body that can deal with preserving our historic resources and thus adding to our urban fabric. I would add my voice to those who call for proportionate funding for the Historic Preservation Commission. I’m also concerned about the cut in the Preservation staff. The Commission has recently started a procedure of landmarking 8 Appleton & Wolfard Libraries. Five of the eight have been declared historic resources. The most egregious one is North Beach. It is the only one that does not have a permit, and is the only one in which a landmarking designation could affect the outcome as to whether it is demolished or preserved. The area plans for the various neighborhoods need to proceed, but I am making a special pitch for historic preservation.
Howard Wong, Friends of Appleton & Wolfard Libraries –
Both the Planning Commission and the HPC are two of the most demanding commissions in the city. Both these commissions shouldn’t be fighting over a fixed sum gain. The new commission warrants attention and has legal mandates established by the voters to be equivalent to the Planning Commission. The funding needs to flow appropriately as mandated by the voters. Both commissions need to work together to demand your rightful funding from the total General Fund to commiserate proportion to the amount of work and case load that you carry. I think you have a great deal of support from neighborhoods throughout the city. You should work with staff to request an appropriate level.

Gee Gee Platt – I want to talk about how the Landmarks Board was always taken care by the Planning Department (staffing wise) since its founding in 1967. About 14 years ago there was a definite switch in how the Landmarks Board was handled. It was a political decision. I think the lack of effort and energy devoted to the Landmarks Board over the last 12 years had a great deal to do with the passage of Prop J. I think that staff needs to go back and look at Prop J and see what the Historic Preservation Commission mandates are and figure out a way to realign staff. We were told at the Historic Preservation Fund Committee that there are 11 people on staff that are considered qualified historic preservation professionals. This is not going out and hiring somebody, it is simply moving them around. The Director has explained that the choice of Ms. Avery to take care of the Historic Preservation Commission equates with the care the Planning Commission gets. That’s great, but Ms. Avery does not have a degree in historic preservation, preservation, or planning at all. I don’t think she has worked for another landmarks commission and I don’t think she has any preservation legal training. The Historic Preservation Commission needs some of that. I agree that everybody has to take there hits proportionately, but I’m not sure that staff adequately understands what the preservation issues are – either that or they want to ignore them. I am going to show up throughout this process to make sure this is remedied. You’ve got qualified professionals and they need support. The only support they have now doesn’t have the background to do the follow up for them, to say nothing of designation reports. Three to five of the 11 staff identified have the necessary qualifications to help the HPC. I do want to know what this Preserve America Grant is. None of us have ever heard of it. I don’t see a request in the State Historic Preservation Office for a grant. I think that you need to do the work that you need to do in this down year and it is a good time to get surveys done. The Department should not be underwriting the Mills Act. You should be charging the public for those items if they come in. I also don’t see TDR in the work program.

Mark Riser – I am associated with two different entities that from time to time have made grants to the Department and I have two questions with respect to the Historic Preservation activity as shown on page two. One showed a reduction in FTE devoted to preservation staff training and professional development. [I’m wondering] if there is a quick and easy answer to the reason for
that. That has been funded in the past by grants from the Friends of City Planning. The other item is with respect to item A, and I know that it has had some comment – the Preservation Survey Program – I know it has been funded over the last couple of years in part by grants from the Historic Preservation Fund Committee. I’m assuming with the reduction there the Department does not propose to approach the Fund Committee for this fiscal year. I just want to ask if I have a correct understanding of that.

ACTION: Informational presentation and discussion only. Although no action was taken, the HPC instructed that this item be calendared for further discussion at its February 3, 2010 meeting. Commissioner Sugaya from the Planning Commission requested that a member of the HPC come to the regular meeting of the Planning Commission on 2/4/10 and report on HPC’s 2/3/10 budget discussion.

Adjournment: 1:15 p.m.

The minutes was proposed for adoption at the Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission on Wednesday, March 17, 2010

ACTION: Approved
AYES: Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase
ABSENT: Buckley, Hasz
SAN FRANCISCO
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes

Hearing Room 400
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Wednesday, February 3, 2010
12:30 P.M.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:  Chase, Damkroger, Hasz, Martinez
COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:  Buckley, Matsuda, Wolfram

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT CHASE AT 12:38 P.M.

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:  Tina Tam – Preservation Coordinator, John Rahaim - Planning Director, Shelley Caltagirone, Moses Corrette, Pilar LaValley, Linda Avery – Commission Secretary

A.  PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS:
Mark Duffett – President of SPEAK, the Sunset Parkside Education Action Committee, re: Would like to pursue landmark application for the [Flash Pool Building] and Mother’s Building and bring the completed application to the HPC as soon as possible.
Peter Warfield – Library Users Association, re: 1) Stated minutes in some cases have progressed but don’t think it is sufficient; 2) Park Branch Library - Urged HPC to document the agreements reached with regards to not landmarking in exchange for improvements and to schedule review of plans and progress at HPC in six months or perhaps sooner.
Bradley Wiedmaier – Independent Member of San Francisco Preservation Consortium, re: 1) Thanked HPC for helping his campaign for opening the Assessor’s file photos to public access; 2) Quoted a cost of $30,000 to $40,000 to SFGTV to televise the HPC hearings as compared to $75,000 from budget discussion this fall or winter; 3) There is room for improvement to state an individual’s position in the minutes.

B. STAFF REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. HPC’s 2010-2011 Budget Discussion – Response to the questions raised at the January 28, 2010 joint public hearing with the San Francisco Planning Commission and discussion regarding the HPC’s recommendation on priority setting for the Department’s work program.

Planning Director Rahaim

Budget Schedules – The HPC has today and February 17th to discuss the budget, the Planning Commission has February 4th [11th] for further discussion and on February 18th they must act on the budget. The budget is due to the Mayor’s Office on February 22nd.

Out of the $4.5 Million deficit, the Department is able to solve about $3 Million through a combination of revenue sources including a modest fee increase, leaving about $1.5 Million deficit. This figure translates to about 11 Full Time Employees (FTE).

The three unions which represent Planning staff has set up a Joint Labor Management Committee (JLMC) to look at and develop recommendations to resolve the remaining $1.5 Million deficit. Recommendations are not finalized at this time.

There are three to four major issues that come from the joint HPC and CPC meeting last week –

- Several members among the HPC felt the Department’s first priority is the permit review process; the second is district designations; and the third is decreasing staff effort relative to the sustainable strategy required in Senate Bill 375 dealing with regional planning and transportation issues.
- Consider different processes to deal with district designations, perhaps outsourcing the work.
- The HPC hearings should be televised.
- Compared the various cost of HPC to Landmark Preservation Advisory Board (LPAB) by quantifiable costs and non-quantifiable costs. Three quantifiable costs are 1) Attorney cost of about $45,000 as an increased cost for reviewing reports and CEQA findings now that HPC is a Chartered and therefore formal decision making body; 2) Additional administrative cost of about $69,000 for staff to do minutes and other support functions; and 3) the additional health coverage cost of $21,000 for this Commission to cover 4 of the 7 Commissioners who chose to use it. That totals about $132,000. The non-quantifiable cost is additional staff time spent on CEQA reviews, HRER(s) and preparation time on these documents. More time is being spent on these non-quantifiable than the LPAB had spent before.

It’s a question of how the Department spends the resources to complete designation work and implement surveys. Staff necessary to do permit review is slower than the Department would like. How much do we cut from that in order to do the other functions of the Department?

Sustainable development strategy – the Department proposed 4 FTE and the minimum to do the required to do the work, as asked by Commissioner Damkroger,
is about 2 FTE. It is possible that the Department could do that.

SPEAKERS:
Jack Gold – SF Heritage – re: 1) Raising fees associated with project review is onerous; 2) Focus on designations; and 3) do a spreadsheet comparing HPC and LPAB budgets.
Bradley Wiedmaier – Architectural Historian and Member of Preservation Consortium – re: 1) Applauded Planning Department’s efforts to keep staff; 2) Suggested a progressive permit fee structure based on size of projects; 3) Supports televising HPC hearings; and 4) Moving forward the district designations.
Peter Warfield – Library Users Association – re: 1) Needed more time to study the memo; 2) Questioned additional administrative staff support to Commission Secretary Avery; and 3) Asked whether televising HPC hearings is a mandate under the law.

ACTION: Informational/discussion only. Although the HPC did not take action, they did decide to write a memo and present it to the Planning Commission at its February 11, 2010 hearing when this item is scheduled for consideration. Commission Secretary Avery would collaborate with HPC to list key points around televising HPC hearings, finishing area plans with designations, sustainability initiative, fees, and staff retention.

Preservation Coordinator Tam with other Staff Report items:
Mission/Dolores Survey is currently scheduled for the 3/17/10 HPC hearing.
Market/Octavia Draft Augmentation Survey is scheduled for the 4/12/10 HPC hearing.
The HPC recommendation for initiation of both districts and individual properties in these areas and the overlapping properties between Mission/Dolores and Market/Octavia is scheduled in May or June.

C. MATTERS OF THE COMMISSION

2. President’s Report and Announcements
None

3. Consideration of Adoption:
a. Draft minutes of Regular Hearing of January 20, 2010

SPEAKER(S):
Bradley Wiedmaier – Added “supporting the appellant” for 2750 Vallejo Street in the draft minutes of January 6, 2010 under Public Comment
Peter Warfield – Noted the considerable reporting in the minutes of Commissioner’s own discussions under Matters of the Commission.

ACTION: Approved the minutes as corrected – to change what Commissioner Martinez meant in Action under Item 4 from Staff was directed to include language dealing with landscape feature for historic and significant trees in the historic resource part of the DEIR to Direct staff to study whether or not the trees along El Camino Real were a historic landscape and a cultural resource; to change, Action under Item 5 from fence to front fence; corrected speaker name under Item 8 from Churney to Cherney

AYES: Hasz, Martinez, Damkroger, Chase
ABSENT: Buckley, Wolfram, Matsuda
4. Disclosures

Commissioner Damkroger lives within 500 feet of 900 North Point scheduled on today's calendar under the Consent Calendar and asked to be recused.

5. Commission Comments/Questions

Commissioner Hasz asked to agendize an item to discuss the definition of Disclosure. Commissioner Damkroger would like to bring to this discussion whether the HPC does site tours and how to do them if HPC decides it should.

Commissioner Damkroger commented that Black History Month was Friday and that San Francisco State University's Black Student Union was being recognized as one of the first. She would support the designation of a plaque to recognize the original founding of Black Student Unions.

Commissioner Martinez asked the Library to present on how the HPC concerns were incorporated into the working drawings of the Park Branch Library.

Preservation Coordinator Tam responded that Merced and Parkside are scheduled for 3/3/10, but would now also include the Park Branch Library. Copies of Page and Turnbull's report would be made available.

D. CONSENT CALENDAR

6. 2009.1122A

900 North Point (a.k.a. 851 Beach Street), Ghirardelli Square, on block bound by Beach, North Point, Larkin, and Polk Streets. Assessor's Block 0086, Lots 001-058. Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the Bank of America signage at the south façade of the Woolen Mill Building. Ghirardelli Square is designated San Francisco Landmark No. 30 and is listed on the National and California Registers of Historic Places. The site is zoned C-2 (Commercial) District and is in a 40-X Height and Bulk District, and is also within the Northern Waterfront Special Use District No. 2.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approval

NOTE: Commissioner Damkroger asked to be recused from hearing this case earlier at Disclosure.

SPEAKER: Peter Warfield – re: 1) Every item on the calendar requires Public Comment; 2) substantiate the new Disclosure item; and 3) practice proper recusal procedures

ACTION: Recusal for Commission Damkroger

AYES: Hasz, Martinez, Damkroger, Chase

ABSENT: Buckley, Wolfram, Matsuda

ACTION: Without hearing, item continued to February 17, 2010

AYES: Hasz, Martinez, Chase

ABSENT: Buckley, Wolfram, Matsuda

RECUSED: Damkroger

E. REGULAR CALENDAR

7. 2750 Vallejo Street

Informational Presentation and Discussion regarding the appeal of a Building Permit Application No. 2008.08.14.9201. This Building Permit Application is currently under appeal to the Board of Appeals (Appeal No. 09-152) and is scheduled for hearing before the Board of Appeals on
Wednesday, February 24, 2010. The Historic Preservation Commission may direct staff to draft a letter from the Commission to the Board of Appeals regarding the appeal of the Building Permit Application approval.

SPEAKERS: Bradley Wiedmaier – re: Urged that comments and questioning on the compliance with neighborhood standards be conveyed by this Commission.

ACTION: Continued to February 17, 2010

AYES: Hasz, Martinez, Damkroger, Chase

ABSENT: Buckley, Wolfram, Matsuda

8. 2010.0037U (M. Corrette: 415/558-6295)

OMI Context Statement - San Francisco’s Ocean View, Merced Heights, and Ingleside (OMI) Neighborhoods 1862 – 1959 Historical Context. The area under study consists of the blocks bounded by Ocean Avenue to the north; Interstate 280 to the east and south; Brotherhood Way to the south; and Junipero Serra to the west. Consideration to adopt, modify, or disapprove the San Francisco’s Ocean View, Merced Heights, and Ingleside (OMI) Neighborhoods 1862 – 1959 Historical Context.

Preliminary Recommendation: Motion to Adopt the San Francisco’s Ocean View, Merced Heights, and Ingleside (OMI) Neighborhoods 1862 – 1959 Historical Context.

PRESENTER: Woody Labonte – Western Neighborhood Project, re: Appreciated funding received from the Preservation Historic Fund Committee to do this work and urged the Commission to move forward on this project.

ACTION: Adopted the OMI Context Statement as corrected to correct a couple of spelling errors: .

AYES: Hasz, Martinez, Damkroger, Chase

ABSENT: Buckley, Wolfram, Matsuda

MOTION: M0046

9. 2009.1145A (P. LaValley: 415/575-9084)

35 – 37 Liberty Street, south side of street between Guerrero and Valencia Streets, in Assessor’s Block 3608, Lot 037 or 090-091. Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a horizontal rear addition, stair penthouse, and roof deck at rear of building. The subject property is a contributing resource to the Liberty-Hill Historic District and is within a RH-3 (Residential, House, Three-Family) District with a 40-X Height and Bulk limit.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approval with conditions

PRESENTER: Todd Davis – Architect of the project – gave an overview of the project;

SPEAKERS: Keaton Fronck – Owner of Upper Unit – 1) asked which is a better plan to use to better achieve neighbor’s preservation of light and air, the Planning Department or the owners and neighbors in agreement; And 2) asked whether conditioning the 3-foot set-back requirement is relevant to the Certificate of Appropriateness. Lawrence Syracuse – Owner of Adjacent Property – spoke in support of sponsor’s original plan.

ACTION: Approved the Certificate of Appropriateness without any
condition.

**AYES:** Hasz, Martinez, Damkroger, Chase

**ABSENT:** Buckley, Wolfram, Matsuda

**MOTION:** M0047

**ADJOURNMENT:** 2:45 P.M.

The minutes was proposed for adoption at the Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission on Wednesday, March 17, 2010

**ACTION:** Approved

**AYES:** Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase

**ABSENT:** Buckley, Hasz
A. PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS:
Bradley Wiedmaier, Architectural Historian – re: 2750 Vallejo Street, responded to issues raised in the staff report given by the case planner.

B. STAFF REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Planning Department’s FY 2010-2011 Budget Discussion of Department’s proposed balanced budget. (E. Forbes: 558.6417)

Planning Director Rahaim
Through a powerpoint presentation, the Director highlighted the Department’s Proposed Balanced budget & Work Program

SPEAKERS:
Sara Jones – San Francisco Planning - MEA Division, and Member of the Joint
Labor Management Committee (JLMC), re: Although she did not elaborate on the various proposals in the report, she did state that the proposed recommendations developed to address the Department’s deficit by the JLMC was a collaborative effort from many staff.

Cynthia Servetneck – E-group Moderator for the S.F. Preservation Consortium, re: The Department must continue with the survey work as it is an essential component of long range planning. She supports funding Article 10; local historic districts first, national register districts second, and she supports televising HPC hearings on SFGTV. She asked how much of the grant person’s time would be spend on contacting organizations.

Peter Lewis – President of Mission Dolores Association, re: Proposed moving the final integration of the historic districts to the plan after final adoption hearings, especially Market/Octavia.

Jack Gold – Executive Director - S.F. Architectural Heritage, re: Urged the Planning Department to embrace and listen to the HPC and to take advantage of these highly qualified professionals. The Department needs to focus on the importance of survey work and local designations.

Gee Gee Platt – re: 1) Questioned how many of the 11 preservation planners would be taken from the 6 FTEs for application review; 2) She is disturbed that the Department didn’t think it has the capability to do in-house designation reports; 3) She is supportive of getting local designation work done; 4) The Department should ask the Fund Committee for help; and 5) The Department’s FY10-11 budget could be more creative.

ACTION: Informational only – although the Commission did not take action, following are its comments:

- The HPC appreciates the Department’s hard work in presenting the current draft balanced budget.
- The HPC feels the Department should include the opportunity of requesting funds from the Historic Preservation Fund Committee for preservation related needs, such as survey and designation.
- The HPC feels the Department should increase staff time by .7 from .3 to 1.0 FTE for designation work (particularly those coming from the Market/Octavia Area Plan). The HPC also feels that the Department should encourage the private sector to pursue local designations and an increase in staff resources would help to demonstrate the Department’s commitment to assist.
- During the public comment period Gee Gee Platt stated her willingness to work with the Department to assist in Department/HPC initiated designations. Mrs. Platt also stated her desire to see greater creativity on the part of the Department in undertaking designation reports in house. The HPC agreed with Mrs. Platt’s points.
- The HPC felt that as the economy begins to recover, the Department must have a plan for addressing important work items that have been shelved due to the budget crisis. The HPC would like to be a part of ensuring that preservation priorities are included in these future planning efforts.

The HPC also commented on the February 3, 2010 Memo that provided a Cost Analysis between the LPAB and HPC:
• There was no consideration of the cost savings of not having to take LPAB recommendations to the Planning Commission.
• Questioned whether there has been a significant change in the level of public comment and participation between LPAB and HPC.
• Staff and City Attorney (CA) Time: We recognize that there may be more CA time due to the institution of the new HPC; however, it is expected that this will decrease over time. The HPC also expects that CA time to review complicated staff reports, General Plan and CEQA compliance would take place regardless of whether there is a LPAB or an HPC.
• Administrative Staff Support: While the attention to the contents and extent of the minutes has been significant over the last several months, this has largely been an issue of public request and Sunshine Compliance. We recognize that it is still a cost associated with the HPC, but it may not be an item specifically associated with the transition from LPAB to HPC.
• ARC Items: We believe the number of items going to the ARC have not been significantly different. The level of complexity may simply be a function of the projects rather than HPC vs. LPAB.

ON THE MATTER OF THE COST ANALYSIS MEMO:

SPEAKERS:
Cynthia Servetneck – Member of SF Preservation Consortium, re: The cost comparisons between LPAB and HPC for City Attorney fees is nominal
Bradley Wiedmaier - Member of SF Preservation Consortium, re: Coming in compliance with minutes and the function of a full commission is a requirement.

ACTION: This item was considered as part of the Department’s budget. The Cost Analysis memo was part of the informing material on the budget. Although the Commission did not take action on this memo, its comments on the memo are listed above.

2. Disclosure: A discussion to establish the Commission’s definition of disclosure that could include disclosure of contacts individual commissioners may have or have had with parties outside of the public hearing regarding matters under the jurisdiction of the Historic Preservation Commission. (T. Tam: 415/558.6325)

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Without hearing, continued to March 3, 2010
AYES: Damkroger, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda and Wolfram
ABSENT: Chase and Buckley

C. MATTERS OF THE COMMISSION

3. President’s Report and Announcements

4. Consideration of Adoption:
   a. Draft minutes of Regular Hearing of January 20, 2010
   b. Draft minutes of Joint CPC/HPC Hearing of January 28, 2010
   c. Draft minutes of Regular Hearing of February 3, 2010

5. Disclosures
6. Commission Comments/Questions

NOTE: Because of time constraints, items under MATTERS OF THE COMMISSION (3 – 6) were considered and voted on as one item.

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Without hearing, continued to March 3, 2010

AYES: Damkroger, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda and Wolfram

ABSENT: Chase and Buckley

D. CONSENT CALENDAR

Item 7 was taken out of order and heard after item 1.

7. 2009.1122A (S. Caltagirone: 415/558-6625)

900 North Point (a.k.a. 851 Beach Street), Ghirardelli Square, - on block bound by Beach, North Point, Larkin, and Polk Streets. Assessor’s Block 0086, Lots 001-058. Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the Bank of America signage at the south façade of the Woolen Mill Building. Ghiradelli Square is designated San Francisco Landmark No. 30 and is listed on the National and California Registers of Historic Places. The site is zoned C-2 (Commercial) District and is in a 40-X Height and Bulk District, and is also within the Northern Waterfront Special Use District No. 2.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approval

NOTE: Commissioner Damkroger asked to be recused from hearing this because she lives within 500 feet to the property. She designated Commissioner Martinez as Chair.

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Commission Damkroger recused

AYES: Wolfram, Martinez, Matsuda, Damkroger and Hasz

ABSENT: Buckley and Chase

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Approved Certificate of Appropriateness

AYES: Wolfram, Martinez, Matsuda, Damkroger and Hasz

ABSENT: Buckley and Chase

MOTION #: M0048

E. REGULAR CALENDAR

8. (S. Caltagirone: 415/558-6625)

2750 Vallejo Street - Informational Presentation and Discussion regarding the appeal of a Building Permit Application No. 2008.08.14.9201. This Building Permit Application is currently under appeal to the Board of Appeals (Appeal No. 09-152) and is scheduled for hearing on Wednesday, February 24, 2010. The Historic Preservation Commission may direct staff to draft a letter from the Commission to the Board of Appeals regarding the appeal of the Building Permit Application approval.

SPEAKER: Bradley Wiedmaier – Architectural Historian and Individual Member of Preservation Consortium, re: The addition would bring a change in existing patterns; the dormer exceeds 26% of what is proposed in the Residential Design Guidelines; and the change of
materials proposed would removed the differentiation between floors.

**ACTION:** No action required for this Item – Information only.

1338 Filbert Street, Filbert Street Cottages - north side between Polk and Larkin.
Assessor’s Block 0524, Lot 031 – **Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness** to rehabilitate the cottages and site for residential use. The Filbert Street Cottages are San Francisco Landmark No. 232. The site is zoned RH-2 (Residential, Two-Family) District and is in a 40-X Height and Bulk District. **Preliminary Recommendation:** Approval with Conditions

**PRESENTERS:** Andrew Junius – Representing Project Sponsor, David Lowe – Project Sponsor, Jerome Butterick – Project Architect

**SPEAKER:** Winnie Seagull – Neighbor, re: Supported the proposed project

**ACTION:** Approved with modifications – new windows in the existing cottages are to be painted wood; semi permanent color at least as dark as Golden Khaki Deep; south face of the new addition is to be pulled northward half the distance that intersects the shed roof and still allow vertical passage connections; the sun-screens of the new addition is to stop where the alley ways are.

**AYES:** Wolfram, Martinez, Matsuda, Damkroger and Hasz

**ABSENT:** Buckley and Chase

**MOTION #:** M0049

*Item 10 was taken out of order and heard after item 11.*

280 Divisadero Street - east side between Haight and Page Streets. Assessor's Block 1238, Lot 023 - **Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness** to convert the carriage house located at the rear of the subject property to a residential unit, resulting in a de facto demolition of the existing building per the demolition standards set forth in Section 1005(f) of the Planning Code and the construction of a new residential building with attached garage. The carriage house is a contributing feature of the Charles Hinkel House property, San Francisco Landmark No. 190. The site is zoned NC-2 (Small-Scale Neighborhood Commercial) District and is in a 40-X Height and Bulk District. **Preliminary Recommendation:** Disapproval

**PRESENTERS:** Richard Zillman – Owner of Project, Brett Gladstone – Attorney for Project Owner

**SPEAKER IN FAVOR OF THE PROJECT:** Ellen Dudley – Tour Leader for SF City Guide; Judith Centonie – General Contractor; Jason Allen –Roumon – President of Victorian Alliance; Ben Allison – President of Alamo Square Neighborhood Association; Skeeter Jones – Builder; Jim Warshell – President of Victorian Alliance; Mark Hulbert – Preservation Architect; Michael Hutter – Har-Bro General Contractor; John Lenon – Artisan; Joseph Meyers – SF Victorian Alliance; Louise Bea – Resident of City and County of SF; Mike Hammonds; Ansel Wettersten; Richard Reutlinger – SF Victorian Alliance; Owen O’Donnell;
Roger Reid – SF Victorian Alliance; James Hitchcock; Donald Stroh – SF Victorian Alliance; JoAnn Vandenberg; Robert Speer – Real Estate Broker & SF Victorian Alliance; Susan Van Kuiken – Property Owner and Alamo Square Neighborhood Association; Bill Mason – SF Victorian Alliance; Donald Beilke; Stephen Haigh – Neighbor and SF Victorian Alliance; Angela Scott – Neighbor; Bob Bukter – Color Consultant; [Gucioni] – Adjacent Neighbor

SPEAKER IN OPPOSITION OF THE PROJECT: Jack Gold – SF Architectural Heritage

ACTION: Continued to the date yet to be determined or the first date after a publicly noticed site visit.

AYES: Wolfram, Martinez, Matsuda, Damkroger and Hasz

ABSENT: Buckley and Chase

**Item 11 was taken out of order and heard after item 9.**

3418-26th Street – located on the west side between Bartlett Street and Osage Alley, in Assessor’s Block 6529, Lot 034. **Request for review pursuant to the Eastern Neighborhoods Interim Permit Review Procedures for Historic Resources.** The proposed project is to construct a new 13-unit, five-story, 53'-0" tall, residential building on a vacant lot within RTO-M (Residential, Transit Oriented, Mission Neighborhood) District, in a 55-X Height and Bulk District, and within the Mission Area Plan. The Department is reviewing an Environmental Evaluation application and Historic Resource Evaluation Report for the project. **Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt Motion**

SPEAKER: None

ACTION: No action was taken on this item. However, the Commission commented that the proposal mitigates potential visual impacts.

**ADJOURNMENT: 5:00 P.M.**

The minutes was proposed for adoption at the Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission on Wednesday, March 17, 2010

ACTION: Approved

AYES: Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase

ABSENT: Buckley, Hasz
SAN FRANCISCO
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes

Hearing Room 400
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Wednesday, March 3, 2010

12:30 P.M.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Wolfram, Martinez, Matsuda, Damkroger, Hasz, Chase, Buckley

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT CHASE AT 12:38 P.M.

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Tina Tam – Preservation Coordinator, Tim Frye, Angela Threadgill, Pilar LaValley, Sophie Hayward, Linda Avery – Commission Secretary

A. PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS:
Kathy Howard – She requested HPC to review the Soccer Field Project and to request a full Environment Impact Report (EIR) if appropriate. She provided the HPC two letters one by SF Architectural Heritage and the other by Historic American Landscape Survey, both supported a full EIR of the project. She reviewed briefly the project’s California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) history.
Peter Warfield – Library Users Association, re: - He continued his opinion that the HPC minutes are still deficient.

B. STAFF REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Disclosure: A discussion to establish the Commission’s definition of disclosure that could include disclosure of contacts individual commissioners may have or
have had with parties outside of the public hearing regarding matters under the jurisdiction of the Historic Preservation Commission.
(Continued from the Regular Meeting of February 17, 2010)

SPEAKERS:
Catherine Howard – Friends of Music Concourse – she asked the HPC to think seriously about getting a balanced and fair input, and to give equal time to different parties of a project.
Peter Warfield – Library Users Association – he thought accepting time with project sponsors and not inviting those opposing the project for equal time and opportunity has potential problems.

ACTION: The HPC requested Deputy City Attorney to provide language on some options and procedures for disclosure. The item was continued to April 7, 2010.

C. MATTERS OF THE COMMISSION

2. President’s Report and Announcements

Preservation Coordinator Tam:
280 Divisadero Street site visit on March 11 was unsuccessful for a number of reasons including date, time, and lack of quorum. Another site visit has been set on March 25. The case will continue in April.
2727 Pierce Street, the Casebolt House, City Landmark 51 – the Board of Appeals heard an appeal of a denial of a building permit to repair and replace a historic un-reinforced brick wall without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness (C of A). The Board agreed with the Planning Department and directed the project sponsor to file a C of A application.
2750 Vallejo Street – the Board of Appeals voted 3-2 to uphold the Planning Department’s approval of the building permit for this project.
The Certified Local Government (CLG) Report will be included in the 3/17/10 HPC packet.

3. Consideration of Adoption:
a. Draft minutes of Regular Hearing of January 20, 2010
b. Draft minutes of Joint CPC/HPC Hearing of January 28, 2010
c. Draft minutes of Regular Hearing of February 3, 2010
(All continued from the Regular Meeting of February 17, 2010)

SPEAKERS:
Peter Warfield – Public Library Association – copies of the minutes are not included in the public packet at the meeting today and he suggested postponing the adoption of the minutes until minutes were available to the public.

ACTION: Motion to adopt the minutes of 1/20, 1/28 and 2/3/10 as corrected from notes of the Commissioners.

AYES: Hasz, Matsuda, Wolfram
NAY: Buckley, Martinez, Damkroger, Chase
NOTE: Motion failed

ACTION: All were continued to March 17, 2010
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase

4. Disclosures
Commissioner Martinez met with the project sponsor of the Miller-Joost House and visited the site.

5. Commission Comments/Questions
Commissioner Damkroger – 1) She expressed concern about the Soccer Field proposal and would like the HPC to have a discussion with the Recreation and Park Department; 2) She asked whether the Planning Department plans to respond to the National Alliance Preservation Commission’s survey of commissions across the country. She feels that would be important because the surveys are able to pull together a lot of information about local governments around the country. She is willing to help complete the survey.

Commissioner Martinez – 1) He requested explanation of why the Masonic Auditorium alteration was not brought to the HPC since it’s either a potential landmark or a potential historic district; 2) He would like the Planning Department to look into the Trust that controls the Veteran’s Memorial Building – the bottom of the fence between the Opera House and the Veteran’s Building is rusted and in serious disrepair; 3) He shared what he learned from the Ethics Training with the HPC that staff and president's report and announcements in the agenda are required to list subject matters that are going to be discussed in the hearing; and 4) He would like the HPC to discuss the fairness of public response time limits on projects.

Commissioner Buckley – He would like to agendize a discussion on his continued concern about how Categorical Exemptions get judged. This discussion is apart from but linked to CEQA Training Part 2 scheduled for April 21.

D. CONSENT CALENDAR

280-284 Union Street, north side of Union Street near the intersection of Union and Montgomery Streets, in Assessor’s Block 0106; Lots 065 - Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the existing windows and doors at the 1st and 2nd floors with new wood windows and doors. The subject property is a non-contributing structure to the Telegraph Hill Historic District. It is within a RH-3 (Residential, House, Three-Family) Zoning District and is in a 40-X Height and Bulk District.
Recommendation: Approval.

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Approved
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase
MOTION #: M0050

Item 7 was pulled off the Consent Calendar and heard after item 8 as a Regular Calendar item.

7. 2010.0070A (A. Threadgill: 415/558-6602)
150 Broadway Street, northeast corner of Broadway and Battery Streets, in Assessor’s Block 0141, Lot 011 - Request for Certificate of Appropriateness to install four (4) wireless telecommunication antennas mounted to the existing
rooftop penthouse and for the installation of four (4) wireless telecommunication equipment cabinets located adjacent to the existing rooftop penthouse within a new 10 ft. x 20 ft. screen enclosure. The property is non-contributory to the Northeast Waterfront Historic District. It is within a C-2 (Community Business) Zoning District and a 65-X Height and Bulk District. The site is also within the Waterfront Special Use District No. 3.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approval

SPEAKER: Peter Warfield – He stated that many people have serious concerns regarding potential health threats from wireless. He also asked to see pictures of how devices are attached to the building because they might have definite historical preservation impacts.

PRESENTER: Joe Camicia – Representative for T-Mobile, re: He presented the proposal and addressed the commissions limits regarding the health concern raised.

ACTION: Approved

AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase

MOTION #: M0052

8. 2010.0023A  (P. LaValley: 415/575-9084)
375 Lexington Street, east side of street between 20th and 21st Streets, in Assessor’s Block 3609, Lot 063. Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for window glazing and garage door replacement at front façade, construction of a horizontal rear extension and new rear deck and stair, and construction of a new wall along the south property line. The subject property is a potentially contributing resource to the Liberty-Hill Historic District and is within an RTO-Mission (Residential, Transit-Oriented - Mission) District with a 40-X Height and Bulk limit.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approval

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Approved

AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase

MOTION #: M0051

D. REGULAR CALENDAR

9. 2010.0044A  (S. Hayward: 415/558-6372)
3224 Market Street, The Miller-Joost House, southwest corner of Market Street at 19th Street in Assessor’s Block 2704, Lot 040 – Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to rehabilitate the single-family home for a project that includes a horizontal addition to the side, the addition of sky lights, a roof deck, and fenestration changes at the rear. The Miller-Joost House is San Francisco Landmark No. 79. The site is zoned RH-2 (Residential, House, Two-Family) Zoning District and is in a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approval with Conditions

PRESENTERS: Michael Bauer – Project Sponsor, re: He presented a detailed project overview.
Elisa Skaggs – Page and Turnbull, re: She gave a PowerPoint presentation of the project

SPEAKERS: There were no public speakers
ACTION: Approved with modifications to reduce the number of skylights to two; to relocate the doors and windows to provide more space; to incorporate basic documents of the wash house to the landmark designation report; to not use salvage siding on the new east elevation.

AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase

MOTION #: M0053

(10) Informational Presentation by the San Francisco Public Library regarding the renovation projects at Merced Branch (155 Winston Drive), Parkside Branch (1200 Taraval Street), and Park Branch (1833 Page Street) Libraries.

PRESENTERS: Jill Bourne – Deputy City Librarian on brief update of the libraries.

SPEAKERS: Peter Warfield – Library Users Association – 1) he was disappointed about the memo the Library provided today; 2) He didn’t see the improvements the Library made to the libraries on drawings from the Department of Public Works; 3) He said the agreements made with the Library were not documented; 4) The grand volume of one library was wrecked; and 5) He questioned the use of money by the Library on un-described changes and contracted work of architects.

Jack Gold – SF Architectural Heritage – he said the Page and Turnbull reports should point out the windows, especially on the facade at Park Branch Library have been changed. He expressed that there is a need, not in this scope of work, but for the future, that these windows be changed out to more appropriate windows.

ACTION: No action required for this Item – Information only.

ADJOURNMENT: 3:07 P.M.
SAN FRANCISCO
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes

Hearing Room 400
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Wednesday, March 17, 2010
12:30 P.M.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Wolfram, Martinez, Matsuda, Damkroger, Chase,
COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Buckley, Hasz

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT CHASE AT 12:38 P.M.

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Tina Tam – Preservation Coordinator, Pilar LaValley, Moses Corrette, Matt Weintraub, Linda Avery – Commission Secretary

A. PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS:
Kathy Howard – Friends of Music Concourse, re: She repeated her request that HPC agendize Golden Gate Park (GGP) Beach Chalet Soccer Field on 4/7/10 HPC hearing. Recreation and Park like to move the project for a final approval in April as soon as Planning Department has finished their review.
Peter Warfield – Library Users Association, re: He was disappointed that 1) the HPC did not question further Deputy City Librarian comments on the libraries’ update and 2) the Library did not come with materials presented in advance; 3) He remarked on the change of plan for library shelving; 4) He questioned the 1.3 million the Library added to the Park Branch renovation budget.
Ed Yarbrough – Member of the Historic American Landscape Survey Northern California Chapter, re: He urged the HPC to agendize GGP Beach Chalet Soccer Field project at the west end on 4/7/10 HPC hearing. Some of the Recreation and Park’s proposal would radically affect the character of the landscape.
B. STAFF REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Preservation Coordinator Tam:
Status of Masonic Auditorium – The project didn’t come to HPC for these reasons - the building is determined through a Section 106 process; eligible for listing on the National Register; however it is not a local landmark nor located within a historic district. Therefore, the building is considered a potential historic resource for the purposes of the California Environment Quality Act (CEQA). When Planning Staff review the project in late 2008, it was solely for interior restorations and did not cause significant adverse impact to the potential resource. As a result, it was given a Categorical Exemption (Cat Ex). The Conditional Use authorization was approved by the Planning Commission on March 4, 2010 with a 4 to 2 vote.

Review schedule for GGP Soccer Field Project – Planning Department on February 16, 2010 requested Recreation and Park Department for additional information and has yet to hear back from them.

The Certified Local Government Annual Report has been completed.

C. MATTERS OF THE COMMISSION

1. President’s Report and Announcements

   Commissioner Chase:
   Follow up on 1/15/10 Mayor’s Disability Council (MDC) hearing attended by Commissioners Damkroger and Chase– at the hearing they stated to the MDC they would bring back to the HPC a request to develop a policy consistent with universal accessibility and the Secretary of Interior Standards for potential historic resources and landmark buildings. MDC Co-Chairs Ross Woldall and Jule Lynn-Parson offered a letter to HPC indicating they are willing to begin the process. Commissioner Chase would like to agendize a discussion to develop a policy statement for the HPC on universal accessibility.
   Follow up information from Deputy City Librarian, Jill Bourne - she submitted to Commissioner Chase information she omitted from 3/3/10 HPC hearing presentation. It was available in this hearing for the public.
   Staff’s conflict with Sunshine Ordinance – He read into record an email from Sue Cauthen that the Education Training and Outreach Committee had found HPC minutes has been complied with and the matter is closed.
   Golden Gate Park Soccer Field – He had a discussion with the Director of Recreation and Park about information provided to Ms. Tam and the Planning Department. There was a request to hear this item and HPC would like to agendize it on April 7, 2010. However, the date is predicated on receiving the information soon enough for Planning Department to make a determination on the course of action.

2. Consideration of Adoption:
   a. Draft minutes of Regular Hearing of January 20, 2010
   b. Draft minutes of Joint CPC/HPC Hearing of January 28, 2010
   c. Draft minutes of Regular Hearing of February 3, 2010
      (Items 2a, 2b, 2c are continued from the Regular Meeting of February 17, 2010)
   d. Draft minutes of Regular Hearing of February 17, 2010
ACTION: Approved as corrected – January 20, 2010 draft minutes on page 5, Disclosure – Commissioner Buckley Wolfram; Approved as drafted minutes of January 28, February 3, and February 17, 2010.

AYES: Wolfram, Martinez, Matsuda, Damkroger, Chase
ABSENT: Buckley, Hasz

3. Disclosures
Commissioner Martinez talked to Peter Lewis about Mission Dolores Survey.

4. Commission Comments/Questions
Commission Wolfram – He suggested to agendize a hearing to discuss revisions and to develop some language to Articles 10 and 11 so they are in compliance with Proposition J.
Commission Damkroger – She would like a CEQA discussion in April and asked if the Chair would appoint a subcommittee of commissioners to develop discussion items important to the HPC. (A Policy Subcommittee was established. Commissioners Damkroger, Martinez, and Wolfram serve as members, and Commissioner Matsuda as committee ex-officio.)
Commission Martinez – 1) HPC needs time to discuss a wide range of public policies such as CEQA, handicap accessibility. Proposition J, local interpretation of Secretary of Interior Standards and to find a way to codify their interpretations; 2) He asked for plans Jill Bourne had promised him; 3) He asked whether Golden Gate Park is a potential historic district. Preservation Coordinator Tam responded it is already a designated National Registered District; 4) He asked whether Planning Department has a policy on when a project in the potential historic district would be brought to the HPC for review and comments; 5) He asked what to do with incomplete projects in the work program under the Landmarks Board.
Commission Chase – He mentioned several times to his fellow commissioners to look into the rules of procedures but has received nothing. He had encouraged to agendize a non project related hearing before and asked if it’s possible to agendize a hearing for comprehensive issues of interest to HPC without any project scheduled on the calendar. Preservation Coordinator Tam responded that a possible date for a non-project hearing can be in either May or June or a special hearing on HPC’s off-day, but not in April. Commissioner Secretary Avery added if it is in April, she would need to check with City Hall for room availability. Otherwise, Planning Department has room and a 15-day notice is required.

D. CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS PROPOSED FOR CONTINUANCE

5. 2009.1180TZ (T. Sullivan: 415/558-6257)
Amending San Francisco Zoning Map ZN01 to change the zoning of Block 0241, Lots 011 & 012 – 680 California Street, aka Old St. Mary’s Church – from Chinatown Mixed Use District to C-3-O and amendments relating to Planning Code Section 128 to require that proceeds from the sale of transferable development rights from certain Transfer Lots be spent on the rehabilitation and maintenance of the Transfer Lot property. Ordinance that would amend the San Francisco Zoning Map ZN01 to change the use district of
680 California Street, aka Old St. Mary’s Church from Chinatown Mixed Use District to C-3-O and to amend Planning Code Section 128 (Transfer of Development Rights in C-3 Districts) to require that the proceeds of transfer development rights from a Transfer Lot which contains a designated landmark pursuant to Article 10 of the Planning Code be spent on the rehabilitation and maintenance of the landmark building; making environmental findings and findings of consistency with the General Plan and priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1.

_Preliminary Recommendation: Approval._
_(Proposed for Continuance to April 7, 2010)_

**SPEAKER:** None  
**ACTION:** Motion to recuse Commissioner Chase  
**AYES:** Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase  

**ACTION:** Item was not heard and to be continued to April 7, 2010 regular hearing  
**AYES:** Wolfram, Martinez, Matsuda, Damkroger  
**RECUSED:** Chase  
**ABSENT:** Buckley, Hasz

### E. REGULAR CALENDAR

6. **2009.0901A** (P. LaValley: 415/575-9084)  
679-685 3rd Street, - east side of street between Townsend and Brannan Streets, in Assessor’s Block 3788, Lot 015.  
Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for removal of infill at ground floor openings, installation of new storefront systems in existing openings, repair of stucco at ground floor, and installation of new tenant signs.  
The subject property, formerly known as the Gale Building, is a contributing structure to the South End Historic District and is located in a SLI (Service/Light Industrial) District with a 50-X Height and Bulk limit.

_Preliminary Recommendation: Approval_

**SPEAKER:** None  
**ACTION:** Approved based on recommendation.  
**AYES:** Wolfram, Martinez, Matsuda, Damkroger, Chase  
**ABSENT:** Buckley, Hasz  
**MOTION:** [M0054](#)

Bayview Hunters Point, Area B Survey - Consideration to adopt, modify, or disapprove the Historic Context Statement.  
The area under study consists of the blocks generally bounded by Cesar Chavez Street to the North, US 101 to the West, San Mateo County to the South, and the San Francisco Bay to the East.  
_Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt the Historic Context Statement: Bayview Hunters Point, Area B Survey._

**SPEAKER:** None  
**PRESENTERS:** Lyla Husein – SF Redevelopment Agency, presented background of project.  
Tim Kelly – Kelley & VerPlanck, introduced the team
Christopher VerPlanck – Kelley & VerPlanck, presented context statement and a slide show of the survey

ACTION: Approved with modifications, correction of typos noted by commissioners, and dates noted by staff.
AYES: Wolfram, Martinez, Matsuda, Damkroger, Chase
ABSENT: Buckley, Hasz
MOTION: M0055

8. 2010.0140U (M. Weintraub: 415/575-6812)
Mission Dolores Neighborhood Survey - Consideration to adopt, modify, or disapprove the community-sponsored survey. The survey area is generally bounded by Market Street to the North, 20th Street to the South, Dolores Street to the East, and Church/Sanchez Streets to the West.

PRESENTERS: Erica Shultz – Architectural Historian with Carey and Company, presented brief overview of the survey components and the methodologies used to make evaluations and conclusions.

SPEAKERS IN FAVOR OF A LARGER HISTORIC DISTRICT: Peter Lewis – President of Mission Dolores Neighborhood Association (MDNA); Marius Starkey – Resident of Mission Dolores (MD); Cynthia Aldridge – Resident of MD; Ted Olson – Resident, City Guide, and Board Member of MDNA; Rafael Mandelman – Resident; Stephen Haigh – Property Owner in MD; Arnie Lerner – Resident and Board Member of MDNA; Lucia Bogatay; Jonathan Lammers – Architectural Historian and Resident; Jack Gold – Executive Director of SF Architectural Heritage.

ACTION: Adopted as modified (please see attachment or the link to Mission Dolores transcript on Commissioners’ deliberation of this item.)
AYES: Wolfram, Martinez, Matsuda, Damkroger, Chase
ABSENT: Buckley, Hasz
MOTION: M0056

NOTE: The HPC felt there is a need for Planning Department to discuss with the community and project sponsor about resources, criteria, time tables and expectation for the initiation of a district. It is not appropriate to establish a deadline given the financial condition but would encourage the discussion to begin for the fruition of a district nomination come forward to HPC.

ADJOURNMENT: 3:49 P.M.

The minutes was proposed for adoption at the Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission on Wednesday, April 21, 2010

ACTION: Approved
AYES: Wolfram, Martinez, Matsuda, Damkroger, Chase
ABSENT: Buckley, Hasz
SAN FRANCISCO
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes
Hearing Room 400
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Wednesday, April 7, 2010
12:30 P.M.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Hasz, Martinez, Damkroger, Chase,
COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Buckley, Matsuda, Wolfram

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT CHASE AT 12:36 P.M.

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Tina Tam – Preservation Coordinator, Shelley Caltagirone, Pilar Lavallely, Aaron Starr, Tim Frye, Erika Lovejoy, Kelley Amdur – Director of Neighborhood Planning, Linda Avery – Commission Secretary

A. PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS:
[Name] – He asked HPC to focus on getting Golden Gate Stables and the Grand Stand Facility rehabilitated with Historic Preservation Funds.

B. STAFF REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Review and Comment on Draft Motion of the Mission Dolores Neighborhood Association Survey (T. Tam: 415/558-6325)

Preservation Coordinator Tam:
Draft Motion for Mission Dolores Neighborhood Survey – Because the original draft motion presented by Planning Department was different from what the HPC has adopted, Ms. Tam highlighted the following points to ensure
there was no outstanding issue: 1) The HPC adopted the boundaries proposed for the Mission Dolores 1906 Fire Survivors and reconstruction of historic district as prepared by Carey & Company, and not the boundaries as recommended by the Planning Department; 2) The HPC approved the DPR 523B forms for seven properties prepared by Kelley and Company, i.e. 666-668 Church Street; 690, 700, 740 Church Street; and 207, 215, 223 Dorland Street; 3) The new draft motion reflects HPC desire to see the Mission Dolores neighborhood 1906 Fire Survivors and reconstruction district be nominated for official designations; 4) The HPC recommended research be done to expand historic district boundaries to consider additional properties within the neighborhood such as the Golden Fire Hydrant, and buildings constructed in the 20s and 30s, like the public schools; 5) The new draft motion includes HPC 2nd motion concerning Dolores Street cultural landscape and it identified components; 6) There is sufficient information contained in the survey itself to conclude Dolores Street median in Mission Dolores Park has deep historic cultural association with potential historic resources for the purposes of CEQA; and 7) the new draft motion clarifies in order to finalize the Mission Dolores survey the Project Sponsor, Mission Dolores Neighborhood Association, shall make the technical edits and changes as stated in the 3/17 hearing, and the revisions to the context statement incorporated the information from Jonathan Lammers. **Commissioner Martinez** – asked where in the new draft is language about endorsing the boundaries of the historic district as proposed by Carey and Company. **Preservation Coordinator Tam** – responded that it is in the fourth “Whereas” on page 2, and can add to that sentence “as proposed by the Carey & Company in their survey.” **Commission Secretary Avery** – stated that HPC actually took an action that is very different from what staff has presented. Staff wanted to be very careful and make sure HPC had a chance to weigh in on what staff have drafted before actually finalizing the motion. This would be the only thing she could see the HPC and Carey and Company could comment on. They can't change the substance of the already adopted motion.

**Revival of the Survey Advisory Group** – Tam announce the need to work with the HPC and understand HPC’s definition and criteria for establishing a historic district. Tam suggested re-establishing the Survey Advisory Group a group with participation from the previous Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board. She asked through the Chair for either an appointment or a volunteer from the HPC. **Commissioner Damkroger volunteered.**

**Leave of Absence Transition** – This was the last hearing Ms. Tam will be participating in before returning in late summer or early fall. She designated Tim Frye and Sophie Hayward to cover her responsibilities as a Preservation Coordinator. Mr. Frye will be attending the HPC hearings, reviewing case reports and working with Ms. Avery on agendas and the advance calendar. Ms. Hayward will be working in the area of historic resource evaluations, historic resource evaluation responses, and reviewing projects. Collectively, they will be co-managing the survey program of the Planning Department.
Letter from Planning Director, John Rahaim, to HPC - Mr. Rahaim is interested in attending the HPC hearings on a more frequent and regular basis. He plans to attend the May 5th hearing for the discussion on rules and regulations, and general HPC policies and other non-project related items.

SPEAKERS:
Peter Lewis – President of Mission Dolores Neighborhood Association, re: He brought up an email received from Carey and Company which stated Dolores Park and the median are contributory resources to the district, which is contrary to Planning Department’s new draft motion on page 2, paragraph 4 that stated research and evaluation is required to determine Dolores Street, central median and Dolores Park are contributory properties to the historic district.

Dawn Kamalanathan – Director of Policy and Public Affairs of SF Recreation and Parks, re: She urged HPC to do an in-depth evaluation of the Mission Dolores Park. The evaluation could be used to inform SF Recreation and Parks potential role and obligations for their massive renovation.

NOTE: The HPC directed staff to correct the motion to include additional research on the cultural landscape portion, and the boundaries language that were made in the motion from the last hearing.

C. MATTERS OF THE COMMISSION

2. President’s Report and Announcements

Commissioner Chase
He received a letter dated April 7th from the Planning Director, John Rahaim, about attending the HPC’s May meeting on rules and regulations, and the need to better understand the establishment of district. He said HPC looks forward to Mr. Rahaim’s presence.

3. Consideration of Adoption:
a. Draft minutes of Regular Hearing of March 3, 2010

ACTION: Approved as corrected, Page 3, Item 5, point 2) – National Land Preservation Commission

AYES: Hasz, Martinez, Damkroger, Chase
ABSENT: Buckley, Wolfram, Matsuda
SPEAKER: None

4. Disclosures
Commissioner Damkroger spoke briefly with Kathy Howard about the UTube file of the Golden Gate Park
Commissioner Chase communicated with Bessie Flagg and Kathy Howard about Golden Gate Park Fields.

5. Commission Comments/Questions
None
D. CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS PROPOSED FOR CONTINUANCE

   680 California Street, aka Old St. Mary’s Church – Amending San Francisco
   Zoning Map ZN01 to change the zoning of Block 0241, Lots 011 & 012 from
   Chinatown Mixed Use District to C-3-O and amendments relating to
   Planning Code Section 128 to require that proceeds from the sale of
   transferable development rights from certain Transfer Lots be spent on the
   rehabilitation and maintenance of the Transfer Lot property. Ordinance that
   would amend the San Francisco Zoning Map ZN01 to change the use district of
   680 California Street, aka Old St. Mary’s Church from Chinatown Mixed Use
   District to C-3-O and to amend Planning Code Section 128 (Transfer of
   Development Rights in C-3 Districts) to require that the proceeds of transfer
   development rights from a Transfer Lot which contains a designated landmark
   pursuant to Article 10 of the Planning Code be spent on the rehabilitation and
   maintenance of the landmark building; making environmental findings and
   findings of consistency with the General Plan and priority policies of Planning
   Code Section 101.1.

   Preliminary Recommendation: Approval.
   (Continued from March 17, 2010)
   (Proposed for Continuance to April 21, 2010)

   SPEAKER: None
   ACTION: Continued as proposed
   AYES: Hasz, Martinez, Damkroger, Chase
   ABSENT: Buckley, Wolfram, Matsuda

   280 Divisadero Street, east side between Haight and Page Streets. Assessor's
   Block 1238, Lot 023 - Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to convert
   the carriage house located at the rear of the subject property to a residential unit,
   resulting in a de facto demolition of the existing building per the demolition
   standards set forth in Section 1005(f) of the Planning Code and the construction
   of a new residential building with attached garage. The carriage house is a
   contributing feature of the Charles Hinkel House property, San Francisco
   Landmark No. 190. The site is zoned NC-2 (Small-Scale Neighborhood
   Commercial) District and is in a 40-X Height and Bulk District.
   (Proposed for Continuance to May 19, 2010)

   SPEAKER: None
   ACTION: Continued as proposed
   AYES: Hasz, Martinez, Damkroger, Chase
   ABSENT: Buckley, Wolfram, Matsuda

E. CONSENT CALENDAR

All matters listed hereunder constitute a Consent Calendar, are considered to be routine
by the Historic Preservation Commission, and will be acted upon by a single roll call vote
of the Commission. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a
member of the Commission, the public, or staff so requests, in which event the matter
shall be removed from the Consent Calendar and considered as a separate item at this
or a future hearing.
8. **2010.0160A**
(S. Caltagirone: 415/558-6625)
2727 Pierce Street, west side between Vallejo and Green Streets. Assessor's Block 0560, Lot 005. **Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness** to remove and replace failed portions of the retaining wall that wraps around three sides of the residence. The Casebolt House is designated San Francisco Landmark No. 51. The site is zoned RH-1 (Residential, House, Single-Family) District and is in a 40-X Height and Bulk District. **Preliminary Recommendation: Approval**

**SPEAKER:** None  
**ACTION:** Approved  
**AYES:** Hasz, Martinez, Damkroger, Chase  
**ABSENT:** Buckley, Wolfram, Matsuda  
**MOTION:** M0057

9. **2010.0077A**
(P. LaValley: 415/575-9084)
601 Townsend Street (aka 700-768 7th Street, southwest corner of Townsend and 7th Streets, in Assessor's Block 3799, Lot 001. **Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness** to install two internally-illuminated tenant signs at the northeast corner of the building just below the cornice. The subject property, formerly known as the Baker & Hamilton Building, is City Landmark #193. The subject property is located in an UMU (Urban Mixed Use) District with a 68-X Height and Bulk limit. **Preliminary Recommendation: Approval**

**SPEAKER:** None  
**ACTION:** Approved  
**AYES:** Hasz, Martinez, Damkroger, Chase  
**ABSENT:** Buckley, Wolfram, Matsuda  
**MOTION:** M0058

10. **2010.0146A**
(P. LaValley: 415/575-9084)
1 South Park Avenue, southwest corner of South Park Avenue and 2nd Street, Assessor's Block 3775, Lots 001. **Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness** to install one indirectly-illuminated primary tenant sign and one non-illuminated secondary tenant sign on the 2nd Street façade of the building. The subject property is a contributing structure to the South End Historic District and is located within an SSO (Service/Secondary Office) District with a 65-X Height and Bulk limit. **Preliminary Recommendation: Approval**

**SPEAKER:** None  
**ACTION:** Approved  
**AYES:** Hasz, Martinez, Damkroger, Chase  
**ABSENT:** Buckley, Wolfram, Matsuda  
**MOTION:** M0059

11. **2010.0172A**  
(A. Starr: 415/558-6362)
1027 Hayes Street, south side between Pierce and Steiner Streets. Assessor's Block 0823, Lot 014 - **Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness** to demolish a portion of the structure at the rear of the lot constructed between 1946 and 1947. The Queen Ann-style, two-story over basement, four-family
residence is a part of the Alamo Square Historic District. It is located within an RH-3 (Residential, House, Three-Family) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approval

SPEAKER: None  
ACTION: Approved  
AYES: Hasz, Martinez, Damkroger, Chase  
ABSENT: Buckley, Wolfram, Matsuda  
MOTION: M0060

F.  REGULAR CALENDAR

12. Athletic Fields in Golden Gate Park  
   (T. Tam: 415/558-6325)
   Informational Presentation by Recreation and Park staff on the proposed renovation of the existing athletic fields, parking lot, and restroom facility at the western portion of Golden Gate Park.

PRESENTER: Dan Mauer – gave a presentation of the Beach Chalet Athletic Fields.

SPEAKER IN AGAINST:  
   Janet Gracyk – Historic American Landscape Survey, Northern California Chapter; Mary Nelson - Historic American Landscape Survey Group; Ed Yarbrough – Architectural Historian in SF; Kelley Watts – Local soccer players in SF; Alex Bevk – SF Architectural Heritage; Nancy Wuerfel – Resident of Sunset District and Citizen [Advocate] for Preserving Places of Historic Values and Open Space in the City; Cathy Garrett – President California Preservation Foundation & Founding Co-chair Historic American Landscape Survey Group, Northern California; Gregg Miller – Resident of SF; Betsy Flack – Landscape Architect and Worker for Garden Conservancy; Katherine Howard – Golden Gate Park Preservation Alliance

SPEAKER IN FAVOR:  
   Toby Rappolt – Soccer Players; Jeff Staben – Soccer Player, Jill Lounsbury – Soccer Coach; Jim Ketcham – High School Athletic Director; Rich Fern – President of Soccer Referee Association; Lindsay Kauffman – Serve on the Board of SF Co-ed Soccer League and President of Golden Gate Soccer League; Raul Garza – Resident of SF; Scott Burry – SF Referee Association; John Keleher – SF Referee Association; John Keleher – Resident of SF and Soccer Referee; John Zwolinski – Resident of Outer Sunset

ACTION: No action required for this Item – Information only.  
NOTE: Commissioners requested calendaring this item on 4/21/10 hearing as an Action Item.
13. **2010.0108A**

2113-2115 Bush Street, - south side between Fillmore and Webster Streets. Assessor's Block 0677, Lot 032 - **Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness**

to add new exterior lighting fixtures and deck heaters to the rear of the subject building; security cameras on the subject building and within the rear yard; add corrugated metal weather protection to the underside of the existing deck joists; add additional wood lattice screening to the existing rear deck; add new wood cladding over existing steel fire escape; and a new in-deck hot tub. The Italianate-style, two-story over basement, two-family residence is a part of the Bush Street - Cottage Row Historic District. It is located within an RM-1 (Residential, Mixed, Low Density) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District.

**Preliminary Recommendation: Approval**

**SPEAKER:** Jeff Staben – He asked how to determine when C of A of major and minor hearing notification be sent to neighborhood. He opposed the project; Alex Bevk – SF Architectural Heritage, re: We were not reviewing the project for the easement

**ACTION:** Approved as amended that the lattice not be added above the existing 3-feet level at the deck.

**AYES:** Hasz, Martinez, Damkroger, Chase

**ABSENT:** Buckley, Wolfram, Matsuda

**MOTION:** M0061

14. **2006.0536E**

Lower Crystal Springs Dam Improvements Project Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) - **Commission Review and Comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report.** The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) proposes to implement the Lower Crystal Springs Dam Improvements (LCSDI) project to lift the operating restrictions on Crystal Springs Reservoir imposed by the California Department of Water Resources, Division of Safety of Dams (DSOD), and to restore the reservoir’s historical storage capacity. Proposed improvements to the dam and spillway would enable floodwater associated with the Probable Maximum Flood and other very large and infrequent floods to pass safely over the Lower Crystal Springs Dam. In addition, following completion of the proposed improvements, the SFPUC proposes to modify operations of Crystal Springs Reservoir such that the maximum normal water surface elevation would be 287.8 feet, which is 4 feet higher than the currently restricted level and 4 feet lower than the historical maximum level. All project components are located in an unincorporated area of San Mateo County on lands owned by the City and County of San Francisco.

This public hearing is intended to assist the Historic Preservation Commission in its preparation of written comments on the Draft EIR. Comments made by members of the public at this hearing will not be considered comments on the Draft EIR and may not be responded to in the Final EIR. The Planning Commission will hold a public hearing to receive comments on the Draft EIR on April 8, 2010. Written comments on the Draft EIR will be accepted at the Planning Department until 5:00 p.m. on Friday, April 16, 2010.

**Preliminary Recommendation:** The Commission may direct staff to draft written comments of the Commission.
PRESENTERS: Tasio Mavroudis – PUC Project Manager, re: He presented an overview of the project; Brad Brewster – EAS Consultants

SPEAKER: None

ACTION: Directed staff to draft a letter listing the comments made by the HPC to the Environment Review Officer of the Planning Department.

AYES: Hasz, Martinez, Damkroger, Chase

ABSENT: Buckley, Wolfram, Matsuda

ADJOURNMENT: 3:44 P.M.

The minutes was proposed for adoption at the Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission on Wednesday, April 21, 2010

ACTION: Approved

AYES: Hasz, Martinez, Damkroger, Chase

ABSENT: Buckley, Wolfram, Matsuda
SAN FRANCISCO
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes

Hearing Room 400
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Wednesday, April 21, 2010
12:30 P.M.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
Regular Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, and Chase

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT CHASE AT 12:35 P.M.

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Tim Frye – Acting Preservation Coordinator, Ben Fu, Tara Sullivan, Sophie Hayward, Pilar LaValley, and Linda Avery – Commission Secretary

A. PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS: None

Note: Categories B and C followed item 9.

B. STAFF REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Acting Preservation Coordinator Frye:
The Mills Act historical property contract for 166-170 Townsend Street – was heard at the Budget and Finance Committee on April 14, 2010. Two supervisors could not support the project. The Committee questioned the project sponsor about back taxes owed on other properties, HUD financing, a $33 million ABAG bond, and other financing details. They also questioned on general the Planning Department’s Mills Act Program, Mills Act approved properties, and the type of work that occurred associated with those contracts. The contract was first heard at the Budget Committee on May 13, 2009, and was heard again on January 27 and February 10 of 2010. The HPC heard the contract on December 16, 2009 and recommended approval to the Board of Supervisors with a 6-1 vote.
The volunteers for the Survey Advisory Group have been selected. They are HPC Vice President Courtney Damkroger, former Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board member Bob Cherny, and consultant Tim Kelley. The first meeting is on April 26, 2010 at the Planning Department.

Filbert Street Cottages – The Planning Commission granted a Conditional Use authorization to the project at its April 28, 2010 hearing. The Zoning Administrator granted a variance related to open space, rear yard, and the expansion of a non-complying structure. The HPC issued a Certificate of Appropriateness for the project on February 17, 2010.

May 5, 2010 HPC hearing is a non-project related hearing. Because the HPC will be discussing its Rules and Regulations, there is a 10-day extended notification required. So the public will be notified by Friday, April 23, 2010.

Beach Chalet Athletic Fields – The Planning Commission heard the project at its April 9, 2010 hearing and voted unanimously to issue a Categorical Exemption (Cat Ex) to approve the project. The Department of Recreation and Parks heard the item on April 15, 2010 and has given the first approval of the project. Planning Department’s MEA staff and Ms. Tam attended this hearing on behalf of the Planning Commission and as staff of the HPC. Ms. Tam reminded the Recreation and Parks Commission that the HPC had outstanding issues regarding the project and that the project would be heard at today’s meeting as an agendized action item. [While informing this commission of the recent action surrounding this project, Mr. Frye reminded and informed the HPC that they might want to consider as part of its action today, drafting and forwarding their comments to the Environment Review Office, or, to the Planning Director of the Planning Department.] The HPC could also draft a letter to the Board of Supervisors. Commissioner Damkroger asked if there was a period of time when an appeal could be filed. Deputy City Attorney Byrne responded that any appeal could be made between the first approval action and the final approval action by the Recreation and Parks Commission.

C. MATTERS OF THE COMMISSION

1. 2010.0016E

Beach Chalet Athletic Fields in Golden Gate Park - The project includes but is not limited to renovation of four existing grass soccer fields with new synthetic turf; installation of lighting, black vinyl fencing, player benches, bleachers, picnic tables and barbecue pits; construction of a maintenance shed and pedestrian pathways; renovation of the existing restroom building; construction of a concrete paved entry plaza and raised platform; installation of a play area and structure, bicycle racks, drinking fountains, trash/recycling receptacles, irrigation and storm drainage improvements; and re-configuration and expansion of the existing parking lot.

Possible Action: Prepare comment letter to the Environmental Review Officer of the Planning Department, Recreation and Park Commission, and/or Board of Supervisors.

SPEAKERS:

Joan Wood – Resident of North Beach and third generation San Franciscan - re: There needs to be an Environmental Impact Review (EIR) for this project.

Greg Miller – Resident of San Francisco for 35 years - re: The proposal is not a minor or routine renovation of the existing field. It is replaced with
artificial, rectilinear, flat turf for a high intensity professional sports complex unlike the rest of the park. From a historical point of view, the proposed work would be a disruptive change. It is something the entire city should understand, discuss and debate openly via an EIR.

Mary Nelson – Represented Historic American Landscape Survey (HALS) Northern California Chapter - re: She referenced two letters addressing concerns over Planning Department’s decision to issue a Cat Ex, exemption vs. an EIR, and the potential significant adverse impact of the proposed work on the historic resource. The renovation should be subjected to review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Alexandra Bevk – SF Architectural Heritage - re: There is a need for a full EIR to help create some alternatives in which all stakeholders can reach their objective and ensure a safe and high quality recreation facility. She would support the appeal to the BOS when filed.

Jennifer Gates – Field Services Director for California Preservation Foundation (CPF) - re: She has two concerns, 1) The Cat Ex issued by the Planning Department is inadequate by not listing Class 31 that the project is in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards, and 2) The role of the HPC in the review process for environment review in accordance to Proposition J and Article 10. By moving forward, the Recreation and Parks Commission has disregarded both sections of the Charter and the code. CPF urges the HPC to write a letter to the BOS outlining the need for environment review and CPF would support the appeal of the Cat Ex.

Katherine Howard – Landscape Architect and member of Golden Gate Park Preservation Alliance - re: She urged the HPC to write a letter to the BOS about significant adverse impacts. The Alliance plans to appeal and will submit it soon.

ACTION: Approved a decision to draft a letter (Commissioner Karl Hasz) to the ERO of the Planning Department with a copy to the Recreation and Parks Department and Commission, and to the BOS; to include comments made today; and to include reference to the Commissions’ concern about the process for Cat Ex.

AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase

2. President’s Report and Announcements
None

3. Consideration of Adoption:
a. Draft minutes of Regular Hearing of March 17, 2010
b. Draft minutes of Regular Hearing of April 7, 2010

ACTION: Approved as corrected on both March 17 & April 7, 2010 minutes on the first page, from Commissioners Present to Commissioners Absent.

AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase

4. Disclosures

5. Commission Comments/Questions
Commissioner Wolfram:
He would like to add to the calendar for discussion: 1) Request the project sponsor do an informational presentation on the Alexandria Theater on Geary Blvd., 2) Partner with the Department of Public Works and SF Visitors Bureau to develop an interpretive plan for signage in historic districts and on appropriate websites.

Commissioner Martinez:
He would like to add an item to the next hearing to discuss what is required for the HPC to initiate historic districts. That question arose in part from what happened with the Mission Dolores survey.

Commissioner Buckley:
He asked to find ways to disseminate survey and context statement information to the public. He is willing to work with whatever agencies HPC could partner with. Commissioners Damkroger and Chase suggested that the libraries and National Park Services are good partners.

D. CONSENT CALENDAR

921 Minnesota, east side between 20th and 22nd Streets, in Assessor's Block 4107 and Lot 020 - Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the project proposing (1) interior remodeling and ground floor development, (2) a two-story rear horizontal extension to accommodate a new bedroom on the first floor and an expanded kitchen and deck on the second floor, and (3) to increase the floor-to-ceiling height at the rear by replacing the existing shed roof with a new flat roof, on the existing two-story-over-garage, single-family contributory building in the Dogpatch Historic District, and in a RH-3 (Residential, House, Three-Family) Zoning District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approval.

SPEAKER: None
ACTION: Approved
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase
MOTION NO. M0062

E. REGULAR CALENDAR

680 California Street, aka Old St. Mary's Church - Ordinance amending Section 128 of the San Francisco Planning Code to require that proceeds from the sale of Transferable Development Rights (TDR) be spent on rehabilitation and maintenance of the Transfer Lot property, to establish reporting procedures regarding the rehabilitation and maintenance, and to allow the sale of TDR from an individually landmarked building to any lot in a C-3 zoned district except Redevelopment Areas; amending the San Francisco Zoning Map by amending Zoning Use District Map ZN01 to change the use classification of 680 California Street (Old St. Mary's Cathedral), Block 0241, Lots 011 and 012, from Chinatown Visitor Retail District to C-3-0 District; adopting findings, including environmental findings and findings of consistency with the General Plan and the Priority Policies of Planning Code Section 101.1.

The Historic Preservation
Commission will consider a resolution recommending this Text Amendment to the Board of Supervisors.
(Continued from March 17, and April 7, 2010 hearings)

Preliminary Recommendation: Recommend Approval to the Board of Supervisors

SPEAKER: None
ACTION: Without hearing, continued to June 2, 2010
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase

8. 2009.1095E
(P. LaValley: 415/575-9084)
80 Julian Avenue, west side between 14th and 15th Streets, in Assessor’s Block 3547, Lot 027. Presented for review pursuant to the Eastern Neighborhoods Interim Permit Review Procedures for Historic Resources. The proposed project is to demolish an existing, two-story, vacant, residential building, and construct a four-story building housing medical and dental clinics as well as transitional housing. The subject property is located within the Valencia NCT (Neighborhood Commercial Transit) District with a 45-X Height and Bulk limit. The Department is processing an Environmental Evaluation application and Supplemental Information Form for Historic Resources for the project.

PRESENTER: Martin Walker [Zuh] – Project Sponsor, Chief Executive Officer of the Native American Health Center, Inc.
SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Approved advocacy and recommendations to the Planning Department
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase

Note: Items 9a and 9b were called and heard together

9a. 2008.1398TZA
(D. Sanchez: 415/575.9082)
150 Otis Street, west side between McCoppin Street and Duboce Avenue, in Assessor’s Block 3513, Lot 007. Request for a Planning Code Amendment proposed to be added as Section 249.46, “Veterans Commons” Special Use District, with associated amendments to the Zoning Map Sheet SU07, which would overlay the site and which would permit uses consistent with the RTO (Residential Transit Oriented) Zoning District subject to exceptions from the rear yard, useable open space, exposure, bicycle parking, dwelling unit mix and dwelling unit density requirements to allow the establishment of 76 units of affordable housing. The site is currently zoned P (Public Use). The Historic Preservation Commission will consider a resolution recommending this Text Amendment to the Board of Supervisors.

Preliminary Recommendation: Recommend Approval to the Board of Supervisors

PRESENTERS: Kim Piechota – Project Manager of the Chinese Community Development Center, re: She explained where the project is under the federal review process; Jim [Flaggler] – Gelfand Partners Architects, re: He described the project’s scope of work.
SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Approved Planning Code and Zoning Map Amendments with the comment to the Planning Commission that the review was adequate.
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase
RESOLUTION: R644
9b. 2008.1398TZA (D. Sanchez: 415/575.9082)
150 Otis Street, west side between McCoppin Street and Duboce Avenue, in Assessor's Block 3513, Lot 007. **Request for a Zoning Map Amendment** pursuant to Planning Code 302 to amend MapSU07 of the Official Zoning Map of the City and County of San Francisco, to establish the "Veterans Commons" Special Use District (SUD) and to amend Map HT07 of the Zoning Map to change the height and bulk district from 85-X to 125-X at the subject site. The Historic Preservation Commission will consider a resolution recommending these Zoning Map Amendments to the Board of Supervisors.

*Preliminary Recommendation: Recommend Approval to the Board of Supervisors*

**PRESENTER:** Same as those listed in item 9a  
**SPEAKERS:** None  
**ACTION:** Approved Planning Code and the Zoning Map Amendments with the comment to the Planning Commission that the review was adequate.  
**AYES:** Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase  
**RESOLUTION:** R644

9c. 2008.1398TZA (P. LaValley: 415/575-9084)  
150 Otis Street, west side between McCoppin Street and Duboce Avenue, in Assessor's Block 3513, Lot 007. **Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness** for adaptive use and rehabilitation of the existing building for low-income housing. The former Juvenile Court and Detention Home, designed by architect Louis Christian Mullgardt and constructed in 1916, is Landmark #248. The site is zoned P (Public) District and is in an 85-X Height and Bulk District.

*Preliminary Recommendation: Approval with conditions*

**PRESENTER:** Martin Walker [Zuh] – Project Sponsor, Chief Executive Officer of the Native American Health Center, Inc  
**ACTION:** Approved with the condition to include interpretive signage to emphasize the importance of Mullgardt’s work as part of the project, and to add language to the decision regarding adopting the final negative declaration.  
**AYES:** Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase  
**MOTION NO:** M0063

F. TRAINING


Presentation by Planning Department staff on the process for the evaluation of proposed projects and the determination of Categorical Exemptions for known and potential historic resources.

**PRESENTER:** PowerPoint Presentation by Tara Sullivan, Tim Frye, and Sophie Hayward followed by discussion and comments by commissioners  
**ACTION:** None – This was an open discussion and training session without Commission action

**ADJOURNMENT:** 3:44 P.M.
The minutes was proposed for adoption at the Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission on Wednesday, May 19, 2010

ACTION: Approved
AYES: Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram Damkroger
ABSENT: Buckley, Chase
SAN FRANCISCO
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes

Hearing Room 400
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Wednesday, May 5, 2010
12:30 P.M.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chase, Damkroger, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, and Wolfram
COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Buckley

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT CHASE AT 12:36 P.M.

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: John Rahaim – Director of Planning, Kelley Amdur – Director of Neighborhood Planning, Tim Frye – Acting Preservation Coordinator, Angela Threadgill, Linda Avery – Commission Secretary

A. PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS:
Kathy Howard – Golden Gate Preservation Alliance Group (GGPAG) and California Preservation Foundation (CPF) filed an appeal on the ruling regarding the Beach Chalet to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) last Wednesday. Department of Recreation and Park issued press releases on Friday that an Environment Impact Report will be done. GGPAG & CPF would request a scoping hearing as a next step. They will continue to work with Recreation and Park in an effort to shape the project that benefits the soccer players and the Park’s land. Ms. Howard urged HPC to continue to participate in the process.

Christopher VerPlanck – Cofounder and Co-ring Leader of SOS Tonga Room – He requested HPC to take action to amend the existing case report on the Fairmont Hotel to include the Tonga Room as an important interior space. He believes the Tango Room is subject to Certificate of Appropriateness approval.
Erika Shultz – Member of SOS Tonga Room – The SOS has submitted an amendment to the Fairmont Hotel Landmark case report to include the Tonga Room as a significant interior feature. She requested HPC take action on this amendment.

Alice Carey – Request a ruling on open meetings law for the public seeking to meet with commissioners.

Gee Gee Platt – commented that the Fairmont Hotel project has to be looked at more carefully.

B. STAFF REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Acting Preservation Coordinator:

The Library Commission – Planning staff, at the request from the Library Commission, made an informational presentation regarding the landmark designation process, Proposition J, Article 10 and Planning Code at their May 6, 2010 hearing.

2462 – 27th Avenue – At the April 7, 2010 Board of Supervisors (BOS) hearing, the BOS heard an appeal of the determination of the exemption of the exemption from an Environmental Impact Report for the site. The BOS voted 10-0 upholding the Categorical Exemption issued by the Planning Department.

Park Merced Project – An informational presentation on the proposed project was given to the Planning Commission and did not include DEIR discussion. The DEIR is scheduled for HPC review and comment on June 2nd and to the Planning Commission June 17th, respectively.

Director Rahaim announced that he plans to join HPC for at least the first hearing of each month, if not more. He looks forward to those meetings.

C. MATTERS OF THE COMMISSION

President’s Report and Announcements

Commissioner Chase:

[ Misner Stein] from Mayor’s Disability Counsel requested HPC’s presence at their 5/21/10 hearing to report on accessibility policy for HPC actions. He requested a member of HPC to go in his place because can’t attend that day.

Meetings and Conferences for people who are interested in historical restoration:

2. Association for Preservation Technology in Denver, Colorado - October 6-9.

3. Rules and Regulations

a) Disclosure – Discussion of the definition of disclosures including, process, and options for the Commission.

Deputy City Attorney Ruiz-Esquide – She will present several options for the HPC regarding communications and disclosure at the next hearing.

Commissioner Martinez asked the reason for having a disclosure discussion.

Commissioner Wolfram explained that he went to the National Trust Conference and attended a Best Practices session that discussed ex-parte communication with project sponsors. Ex-parte meaning individual commissioners who meet with project sponsors might form a personal relationship and could develop an opinion outside of the hearings. That
was discussed as not a good practice. He didn’t see the benefit of learning more information when the rest of the Commissioners do not have the same benefit.

Planning Director Rahaim stated that generally the recommendation is not to have such contact, but there are other options for consideration. There’s is a range from where contacts are not permitted to contact is a default at a hearing. These are the range of things that are being considered and for City Attorney’s Office to provide some options for those ranges.

Commissioner Chase said HPC could come to a conclusion by establishing a policy based on one of the four options or a variation that is within the confines of state law and city regulations.

Commissioner Damkroger agreed with what Commissioner Wolfram had outlined and felt uncomfortable with individual contact. She felt that individual members could get information that may not be made available to the public. Often the contact was combined with a tour of the site where one might see something the others might not get to see. One way to get around that and to discourage individual meetings for sites that are difficult to access easily is to do a special site visit that requires notification. People will be able to see the site and have equal access to information that seems most pertinent.

Commissioner Martinez valued certain meetings with project sponsors where he could ask technical questions without wondering if he was using the limited time of the hearing. Unfortunately there’s a negative connotation to these meetings. If HPC does have a disclosure policy, he would prefer to not meet with project sponsors at all. He suggested one actual improvement is to have a disclosure category next to the item. Members of the public may not be here at the beginning of the hearing when the current disclosure category typically happens. Commissioners should say what they learned at the meeting and share the benefit with the rest of the commissioners and the public. That way it balances things out.

Commissioner Wolfram said the HPC gets an excellent preservation staff in the Planning Department. They work through the whole Certificate of Appropriateness (C of A) process with the project sponsor for a period of time. It is the last step of the process when the project comes to us and it should not be at that time that HPC learns something they don’t know about. Leaving staff out of individual meetings with commissioners can be confusing. HPC needs to be really careful and conscious of including the Planning Staff.

Commissioner Chase mentioned that Commissioner Wolfram recently prompted for a project to go through staff. It took more staff time but there was a quality of uniformity and clarity of what the HPC and Planning Department were hearing.

Commissioner Damkroger – It should not be one’s judgment that someone else is interested in a particular question. There maybe someone in the audience or the commissioners who would benefit from that information despite the fact that we might be uncomfortable while asking some arcane question or taking too long. The benefit is having a more predictable way of learning each project.

Commissioner Hasz expressed that he thought the Commissions job here was to balance staff out – hear what staff is saying and hear what project
sponsors is saying, and balance it out. He would not want to set up something where HPC is under the view of staff all the time. That is too influential on one side. He preferred it separate, as HPC is set up as a separate body from the staff. Neither would he want to set up a policy where project sponsor and public access to Commissioners is not balanced. HPC would want to have equal representation regarding access.

**Commissioner Matsuda** agreed with Commissioner Wolfram that HPC members rely on staff and the public to provide information. Staff objectively provides information to HPC members and to the public to talk about concerns and issues that affect the project. She also agreed with Commissioner Damkroger that HPC should schedule site visits as needed to respond to issues that need in-depth approach. Given the alternatives or information from the City Attorney's Office, a number of options would be available to us.

**SPEAKERS:**

Bridget Maley – Former Landmarks Preservation Board Member – She thought there should be some guidelines flexible enough for the Commissioners to react to the public and project sponsor but at the same time let people know when they cross the line. The C of A packet should have enough information included for the HPC to come to some conclusion. It would be good to have the guidelines and adequate information as a set of policies for projects could move forward with a reasonable pace.

Gee Gee Platt – She suggested that none of the commissioners should ever see a project sponsor alone. The idea of flexibility is good and she encouraged HPC to have site visits as often as possible.

b) Hearing Procedures related to receipt of new information during a public hearing.

**Commissioner Chase** – This discussion is about what HPC should do when new information is provided at the hearing and establish the rebuttal process for the new information.

**Commissioner Martinez** asked staff to explain why receiving new information from the public or project sponsor was a problem.

**Director Rahaim** – The concern that Planning staff has had at the hearing was related to the Market/Octavia Survey. The concern raised in that situation was the consultant representing the project sponsor and had prepared the survey brought new information to the hearing that staff had not seen and presented that to the Commission. He said the Planning Commission made it really clear that if they don’t have material in their packets several days in advance, they will not consider new information brought to the hearing, whether there’s a change to a drawing or whatever. They have informally made that a policy that a new drawing brought forward the day before or the morning of the hearing is not something they will consider because they haven’t have a chance to look at it. The concern expressed by staff, and the way the survey was brought forward, by whichever organization, is equivalent to having a project sponsor come forward with the project. It seems that information should be submitted in advance so everyone has a chance to review it.
Commissioner Damkroger supported the last page of the Planning Commission’s Rules and Regulations which stated revisions submitted at the hearing are discouraged and only considered at the commissioners' discretion.

Commissioner Martinez supports that HPC adopt the Planning Commission’s language.

Commissioner Chase – Formal representation of information that has not been provided [to staff] by the project sponsor was the larger issue here. HPC could establish, as the Planning Commission has, a deadline for new information that comes forward. If there is new information from the project sponsor at the hearing, formal rebuttal then is a request by staff to defer or have a continuance.

SPEAKERS:
Gee Gee Platt – She thought what had happened with Market/Octavia needed a significant conversations on 1) bigger district versus worm like districts; 2) Planning Department’s idea of districts; and 3) the feeling that the Department is unwilling to consider Article 10 historic districts such as Alamo Square if the concern about larger districts is that they won’t be manageable.

Acting Preservation Coordinator Frye responded to Ms. Platt’s comment and said the Survey Advisory Group at its first meeting in April had discussed the issue of large scale versus small definitive finite districts. He hoped to bring the result of the discussion back throughout the summer as part of the survey adoption. The main concern he had was that the consultant had prepared a fairly lengthy rebuttal that staff did not have the opportunity to digest and fully understand. The staff should have certainly deferred to a continuance.

Commissioner Damkroger asked if the Planning staff did not get the rebuttal opportunity in advance. Mr. Frye responded that staff did not.

Director Rahaim addressed Ms. Platt’s concern on staff’s recommendation. If the draft motion did not reflect the commission’s final wishes, the motion is to redraft the document to come back at a later meeting for final action as an intent to approve or disapprove. He agreed it may be good to have a broader discussion in the coming month about the nature of directions on historic districts - one that encompasses a very big area, and the other a very small finite areas where there is consistency or clear historic patterns.

Commissioner Martinez – He suggested that HPC rules state the Planning Commission’s Rules and Regulations language on “Motion of Intent” on Section 6, subsection b. explicitly.

Commissioner Damkroger – She asked that the draft form be brought back at the next meeting for review and adoption. Commissioner Chase concurred.

Commissioner Wolfram – The Planning Commission’s Rules and Regulations mentioned time limits in the hearing procedures. In an organized opposition testimony, a project getting three minute increments would sometimes last for hours; it may all be organized but is not acting in an organized manner.

Commission Secretary Avery – There’s a time limit for all categories. Organized opposition must make a case in advance for a 15 minute block
of time. Their case will then be forwarded to the Commission’s president or whoever chairs the hearing for a decision.

Commissioner Chase – He asked how to hear from individuals who are not representing the organization but are associated with that block of time and if that’s the only time the organization gets to speak?

Director Rahaim – It is a judgment call. There is a sense that they are speaking for the organization as they request the time, but it doesn’t mean other people who didn’t speak within that 15 minute time can’t speak their own 3 minutes. They are not necessarily speaking for that organization.

Commissioner Wolfram – He suggested under Standard Cases III.j for DEIR to change “all speakers will be limited to a period not to exceed 3 minutes” to “all individual speakers will be limited to a period not to exceed 3 minutes”

Commissioner Martinez – He suggested adopting Planning Commission’s Rules and Regulation around time limits for different categories.

Commission Secretary Avery – She recommended adopting the Planning Commission’s Rules and Regulations for Standard Cases.

Commissioner Matsuda – Planning’s Rules were adopted May 8, 2008. She asked Ms. Avery if there were anything she would improve, amend or recommend to HPC in terms of procedures.

Commission Secretary Avery – Only that the HPC Rules and Regulations should be as precise as the Planning Commission’s.

SPEAKER(S):

Bridget Maley – It would be helpful to have the block of time, but there should be some clarification on what that time limit is to be prior to the hearing.

Commissioner Secretary Avery – The request for the block of time needs to be in writing 24 hours in advance of a hearing. More than one group can ask for a block.

Commissioner Martinez – He requested that under HPC Rules and Regulations’ Duties of Officers should be amended to explicitly say the president is to approve the agenda. It also should say the Commission as a whole by a majority can hear something on a particular date. HPC has the power to control its own agenda. If other commissioners agree, those two things should be added somewhere to HPC’s Rules and Regulations. The reason why he wanted it in there was before this Commission, the LPAB said they wanted to talk about something and then it never happened. It fell through the cracks. This is a mechanism where it becomes real instead of just a good idea.

Commissioner Chase – He didn’t disagree.

Director Rahaim – He expressed his understanding and has no problem with the proposal.

Commissioner Matsuda – She asked to correct a typo under III, Section 2 “appoint one of the number to act temporarily as President” to “appoint one of the members to act temporarily as President”.

Commission Secretary Avery – She would add Commissioner Martinez points under Article IV, Section 1, Regular Meetings.
c) Discussion on the format and material required for submittal of Historic Preservation Commission Hearing Packets.

**Commissioner Chase** – The HPC receives paper volumes of DEIRs. The document HPC is responsible for reviewing is a very small percentage compared to the full DEIR. He asked if HPC could get the DEIRs electronically by CDs or in PDF format.

**Commissioners Chase and Martinez** stated their preference is to get both DEIRs and HPC regular hearing packets electronically.

**Commissioners Wolfram, Damkroger, Hasz, and Matsuda** preferred to get DEIRs electronically but HPC regular hearing packets in paper.

**Commissioner Martinez** – He asked HPC to consider a discussion on reviewing and commenting on actual applications for Certificates of Appropriateness, CEA, landmarks, and historic districts. He also asked whether or not the HPC needs to use the AND forms for local designations. Submittals to HPC do not include enough information on surrounding buildings, especially those in interim controls. After some discussion with the HPC members, he summarized that minimum information should include physical context, adjacency, back and facing properties across the right-of-way to illustrate the historic context of the project; and possibly more if staff feels that is necessary to communicate the relationship between the project and its surroundings.

**Commission Secretary Avery** – stated that using the Planning Commission’s Rules and Regulations, Appendix A, Standard Cases, II - Content of Submittals, as a guide, along with the suggestions offered by Commissioner Martinez, she will draft modified HPC Rules and Regulations for the Commission’s consideration.

**SPEAKERS:**

**Bridget Maley** – The C of As are reviewed at the schematic stage and often do not have structural, mechanical, and electrical details. In many cases, the huge part of potential impact to a historical building is inserting all the building systems. It’s good to have a clearer and stronger guideline for the project sponsors to understand what they need to submit for the HPC to make a timely decision. She suggested that reviewing the Preservation Bulletin and this [HPC’s Rules and Regulation] at the same time would make sense.

**Gee Gee Platt** – She would like to see the return to a stepped process for C of A approval on an as needed basis. Project sponsors would get a limited approval based on information provided and understand that he has to return for final approval. She would like HPC to see explicit documents before finalizing the project so project sponsors know precisely what HPC has approved. She wanted HPC to start being precise and legalistic about their approval for documents and not leaving it to staff.

**Johanna Street** – She wondered why historic structural reports are not required. Preservation architects do these reports before they do a project. If all projects come forward with historic structural reports, everything is laid out in a scientific and direct way of going about a project. She encouraged that HPC use the National Register format for designations.
Commissioner Chase – He asked Mr. Frye what is the expectation of the Planning Department in the C of A process for documents that come before the HPC? Mr. Frye replied that traditionally it is whatever is submitted as required for a site permit is forwarded to the HPC for review. Additional information like window details and etc. that staff feels the HPC would benefit from would also be brought to HPC for review. There is nothing specified anywhere that requires that information to be provided.

Commissioner Wolfram – He asked Mr. Frye if the preservation specialist review the building permit to make sure that it is in conformance with the C of A and does it come back to staff for final inspection? Mr. Frye replied, generally the preservation specialist is the same planner assigned to the permit, or if it is assigned to another planner, the planner will work in consultation with the preservation specialist to make sure all conditions of approval within the C of A is complied with. And, when the permit is at the Building Inspection phase, it is in the hands of the Building Department. However, the Planning Department requires that the C of A be part of the documents of the site permit.

Commissioner Hasz – He commented that Ms. Platt’s two tiers for the C of A process was something to talk about. The amount of money it takes for a smaller scale project for a built out drawing to include a mechanical system is much higher.

Commissioner Martinez – Smaller projects haven’t done value engineering about mechanical systems when the enveloped of the project is just blocked out. It might be helpful to have some preliminary procedure where somebody could find out if the volume is workable first before spending too much money. He would be open to approving the volume and the details later when they come back to HPC.

Commissioner Damkroger – She thought that the two tier process could be cumbersome and expansive. It might be helpful to repeat the motion at the end of the hearing to insure that all points are taken.

Commissioner Wolfram – He suggested that at HPC’s disgression, one method could be to give project sponsors a conditional approval, but he wouldn’t open it up that much and would be cautious because there might be a complete change to the whole mechanical system.

Director Rahaim – There are pros and cons. Conditional approval might be a way, but it would be the responsibility of the Commission to say what HPC is and isn’t approving. It ought to be very clear to the staff and the project sponsor what they can move ahead with and what they need to change. If HPC is able to do it, it would be very helpful. HPC probably has to call it something different. Legally, C of A has a specific meaning. For projects that require both commissions approval, HPC has to approve the C of A first. In an ideal world it would be better to approve step one and then it went to the Planning Commission, but a straight reading of Proposition J suggests that HPC has to approve everything first. That might be something to discuss - whether there is any flexibility with that. There is an important legal distinction between what the C of A approval is vs. what some other approval is. We need to figure out with the C of A what could be possible and what kind of C of A “light” could trigger others.

Commissioner Chase – Until HPC grants a final C of A it is not a C of A? Planning Director Rahaim – A straight reading of the proposition would suggest that. It would be an interesting question for the City Attorney.
**Commissioner Damkroger** – The C of A can be amended though.

**Acting Preservation Coordinator Frye** – A new C of A would need to be filed when a project sponsor adds an additional scope of work. The C of A could move on to the Planning Commission for a conditional use. But if any scope of work under the conditional use requires additional review by HPC, Planning would not be able to move it forward to the Planning Commission until HPC has granted that final C of A associated with that additional scope of work.

**SPEAKERS:**

**Gee Gee Platt** – HPC needs to be able to see the typed up proposal from staff regarding the C of A approval process at the next meeting to ensure it reads the way HPC wants it. Project sponsors have to come back to give HPC more information when they know more about maintenance and construction of the building.

**d)** Discussion on the submittal requirements for applications for Historic District Designation.

**Commissioner Martinez** – After reading Section 1004.1 of Article 10, “Initiating designation.......,” he said this Commission does have the power to initiate. He would at least like to see a report on the district or the project before designation. If the public requests the HPC or individual members to take up designation on their own, there should be some guidelines. He would like to have a discussion about what HPC would want to see to do that.

**Director Rahaim** – Maybe HPC and the Planning Department should figure out a way to have a focused and lengthier discussion on this and probably a couple of others topics. He suggested organizing a Preservation Summit where the preservation and neighborhood communities, HPC, and City Hall development community could spend a day together and have a detailed discussion. It would also help informing the final resolution on Articles 10 and 11.

**Commissioners Chase, Martinez and Damkroger** – They thought it was a great idea. Commissioner Martinez didn’t want to wait too long. Commissioner Damkroger would like to see the full commission and the public involved but not the developers at this time. She would like to set three to four discrete topics that are policy related on an agenda in advance.

**SPEAKERS:**

**Gee Gee Platt** – For Alamo Square and Webster Street, the neighborhood wanted to designate their district and got together to do this and paid for the research. They brought their work to the Department and they wouldn’t have done so if they didn’t have substantial concurrence. She would like to think that for this to continue, which is the hope, that neighborhoods that have done its work will come in to the Department. With Market/ Octavia and other plan areas, the Department has done its notices. The notice will be out there and the public will have plenty of time to make comments. She didn’t want a checklist to see how many will sign on supporting an initiation, for that is a great burden.
Bridget Maley – She thought initiating designation is a bigger discussion and would hope the item be calendared as an agenda item. The HPC cannot take it on itself to try to get something designated because it is much too involved. She would like to see HPC and the Department take on a proactive stance about getting historic designations achieved in the city. The City needs to do more outreach to neighborhood associations to talk to them about the benefits of designation and clarify mis-information.

Note: A resolution honoring Angela Threadgill for her contribution to the San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission was added to the calendar. Commissioner Wolfram amended the resolution to add a “Where As” to the resolution to say Ms. Threadgill is an expert and strong advocate for the City’s modern resources. Commissioner Chase asked that “the” be omitted in the title adopting findings in the second line. Commission Secretary Avery read the resolution for the record.

ACTIONS: Adopted resolution
AYES: Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase
ABSENT: Buckley
RESOLUTION: R645

4. Drafting a policy statement consistent with Universal Accessibility and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards at the request of the Mayor’s Disability Council.

Note: After some discussion, the HPC members felt the item needed further discussion for appropriate language that the HPC could adopt as a policy. Commissioner Chase would communicate the HPC stance with the representative of the Mayor’s Disability Council. This item was continued to a future hearing date to be determined.
SPEAKER(S): None

5. Discussion of the thresholds used to determine eligibility of historic districts.
[A unanimous vote of the Commission continued this item to June 2, 2010]

6. Discussion of the pending Articles 10 and 11 Planning Code amendments and possible interim edits to bring the existing Code sections in compliance with Proposition J.
[A unanimous vote of the Commission continued this item to June 2, 2010]

7. Explore partnership with other City Agencies regarding promotion and identification of designated City Landmarks and raising awareness about history of neighborhoods.
Note: Item was discussed and continued to a future hearing date to be determined.
SPEAKER(S): None

8. Discussion of general historic preservation policies including, local interpretations of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and options to codify those interpretations.
[A unanimous vote of the Commission continued this item to June 2, 2010]

ADJOURNMENT:  4:21 P.M.
The minutes were proposed for adoption at the Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission on Wednesday, June 16, 2010.

ACTION: Approved
AYES: Buckley, Chase, Damkroger, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, and Wolfram
SAN FRANCISCO
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes

Hearing Room 400
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Wednesday, May 19, 2010
12:30 P.M.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Damkroger, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, and Wolfram
COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Chase and Buckley

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT CHASE AT 12:07 P.M.

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Tim Frye – Acting Preservation Coordinator, Shelley Caltagirone, Pilar LaValley, Jeremy Battis, Sarah Jones, Devyani Jain, and Linda Avery – Commission Secretary

At the beginning of the hearing, requests were made for continuance of Item 7 – 1050 Valencia Street and Item 9 – Appleton & Wolfard Libraries. The following speakers presented their view on continuance.

SPEAKERS:
Risa Jeitelbaum – Liberty Hill Historic District (LHHD), re: LHHD had filed an appeal to the 1050 Valencia Street EIR. She would like the hearing to be after the appeal hearing.
Howard Wong – Friends of the Appleton & Wolfard Libraries, re: Requested continuance of Item 9 to allow time to gather supporters, material, and thoughts.
Stephen Antonaros – Architect of 1050 Valencia Street, re: Requested to move project forward at this hearing because it is only informational to HPC as part of the Eastern Neighborhood Area Plan Interim Control procedures.
[Name was not clear] – Requested continuance of Item 9.
ACTION: Motion to continue Item 7 - 1050 Valencia Street to June 16, 2010  
AYES: Matsuda and Hasz  
NAY: Wolfram and Damkroger  
RECUSED: Martinez  
ABSENT: Buckley and Chase  
NOTE: Motion did not carry because it received a split vote. Item 7 was heard

ACTION: Continued Item 9 – Appleton & Wolfard Libraries to June 16, 2010  
AYES: Wolfram, Martinez, Matsuda, Damkroger, Hasz  
ABSENT: Buckley and Chase

A. PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS:
Zack Steward – Architect and Resident of North Beach, re: He wanted to bring to the attention of HPC that the landmarked grassy area in North Beach’s Washington Square is destroyed by the annual North Beach Fair.
Tony Gantner – He urged that the permit application for North Beach Fair at Washington Square Park come before HPC for permission before going to Recreation and Parks.
Aaron Goodman – Re: Parkmerced. He urged HPC to tour Parkmerced and to look at Parkmerced’s California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) alternatives for landscape and transit.
Katherine Howard – Golden Gate Park Preservation Association, re: She gave an update on Beach Chalet athletic Fields and urged HPC to write a letter to describe their concerns for potential significant negative impacts for this project.
Kathleen Courtney – Chair of Housing and Zoning for Russian Hill Community Association, re: She requested to put 1268 Lombard Street on the agenda for a full HPC hearing.
Joseph Butler – AIA and Little House Committee, re: He urged full HPC to hear 1268 Lombard Street.
Joan Joaquin-Wood – re: She stated that 1268 Lombard Street has been handled badly and urged HPC to prevent this from happening in the future.

B. STAFF REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Acting Preservation Coordinator Frye:  
424 Francisco Street – On April 27th, the Board of Supervisor (BOS) heard an appeal on the exemption from environment review, and overturned the Categorical Exemption (Cat Ex) given to this project by the Planning Department. In addition, the BOS made findings that the Department must require Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for all proposed garage installations in the area affected by Supervisor Chiu’s Garage Legislation; the EIR must study traffic impacts to historic resources, land use and affordable housing; and the Administrative Code provision for noticing is to mean that all Cat Ex by the Department must be noticed. The Department is working to provide procedures to respond to these new findings and the Department will keep the HPC informed.
C. MATTERS OF THE COMMISSION

1. President’s Report and Announcements

None.

Note: Commission Damkroger would like to add to the action list 1) Washington Square issue brought up by the public, 2) HPC to write a letter as requested by Kathy Howard; Commissioner Martinez would like to 3) Agendize 1268 Lombard Street, and 4) Routinely distribute ARC comment letters to ARC and the HPC.

2. Rules and Regulations

a. Disclosure – Discussion of the definition of disclosures including process and options for the Commission.

Deputy City Attorney Ruiz-Esquide reported that the draft on disclosure was being reviewed by her office and she would work with staff on when to schedule the next hearing date.

3. Drafting a policy statement consistent with Universal Accessibility and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards at the request of the Mayor’s Disability Council.

Note: After some discussion, the Commissioners preferred not to adopt anything at this time. Commissioner Martinez volunteered to attend the Mayor’s Disability Council’s meeting to listen to their concerns and to find out what the real issues are in order to begin to continue an on-going conversation. He would report back to HPC. Tim would work with Commissioner Martinez after he attends the hearing.

SPEAKERS: None

4. Consideration of Adoption:

a. Draft minutes of Regular Hearing of April 21, 2010

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Approved with corrections: – on first page under Staff Report change “because two supervisors” to “Two supervisors”; page 2, “Bob Churney” to “Bob Cherney”; page 3, “draft letter to the ERO” to “draft letter (Karl Hasz) to the ERO”.

AYES: Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, and Damkroger

ABSENT: Buckley and Chase

D. REGULAR CALENDAR

5. 2008.0312A (S. Caltagirone: 415/558-6625)

280 DIVISADERO STREET, east side between Haight and Page Streets. Assessor’s Block 1238, Lot 023 - Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to convert the carriage house located at the rear of the subject property to a residential unit, resulting in a de facto demolition of the existing building per the
demolition standards set forth in Section 1005(f) of the Planning Code and the construction of a new residential building with attached garage. The carriage house is a contributing feature of the Charles Hinkel House property, San Francisco Landmark No. 190. The site is zoned NC-2 (Small-Scale Neighborhood Commercial) District and is in a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

(Continued from February 17, 2010 regular meeting and April 28, 2010 special meeting at project site.)

Preliminary Recommendation: Disapproval

NOTE: On 2/17/10, the Commission held a public hearing on this project. Following public testimony, the item was continued to allow the Commission to hold a special public meeting to allow a site visit prior to taking final action. The special meeting site visit was held on 4/28/10 that allowed public participation. The public hearing remains open.

SPEAKER(S): John Barbey
ACTION: Continued to July 21, 2010.
AYES: Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, and Damkroger
NAY: Wolfram
ABSENT: Buckley and Chase

6. 2010.0143A (P. LaValley: 415/575-9084)
837-849 22ND STREET, southeast corner of 22nd and Minnesota Streets, in Assessor’s Block 4171, Lot 015.

Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter ground floor fenestration, install several new openings at ground floor, and remove and reinstall existing horizontal wood siding. The subject property is a contributing structure to the Dogpatch Historic District and is located within a NCT-2 (Moderate-Scale Neighborhood Commercial Transit) District with a 45-X Height and Bulk limit.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approval with conditions

PRESENTER: Daniel Piechota – Project Architect, re: Gave an overview on the scope of the project; Christopher VerPlanck representing KVP, re: Addressed the main points of the project and how the project complied with the Secretary of Interior Standards.

SPEAKER(S): None
ACTION: Approved
AYES: Damkroger, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, and Wolfram
ABSENT: Buckley and Chase
MOTION NO: M0065

7. 2007.1457E (J. Battis: 415/575-9022)
1050 VALENCIA STREET, west side between 21st and 22nd Streets at the southwest corner of Valencia Street and Hill Street; Lot 008 of Assessor’s Block 3617 – Review of the proposed project, per the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan Interim Permit Review Procedures for Historic Resources, involving the construction of a mixed-use development with restaurant and residential uses. The proposed project would also include the demolition of an existing 1,670-square foot (sq ft), one-story commercial building constructed in 1970, originally in use as a Kentucky Fried Chicken and now occupied by Spork restaurant. The new proposed five-story, 55-foot-high, approximately 16,000-sq ft building would have 16 dwelling units over a ground-floor full-service restaurant. The existing building has one off-street parking/loading space, which would
remain.

Preliminary Recommendation: Adoption of motion regarding review of proposed project per the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan Interim Permit Review Procedures.

PRESENTER: Stephen Antonaros - Architect for the project, re: Showed photos of the project.

SPEAKER(S): Risa Jeitelbaum – Liberty-Hill Historic District, re: Requested a reduction of 2 stories to the proposed project and the project design needs to relate more to the historic district; John Barbey – Resident of Liberty Street and Member of SF Preservation Consortium, re: Request to postpone the item

ACTION: Directed staff to draft a comment letter that the Commissioners’ would like to see context include existing and proposed streetscapes, greater setbacks, materials, and scale of the projects. Item was continued to June 16, 2010 with the public hearing remaining open.

AYES: Hasz, Matsuda, Wolfram, and Damkroger

RECUSED: Martinez

ABSENT: Buckley and Chase

   950 MASON STREET, FAIRMONT HOTEL, CITY LANDMARK #185, bound by California, Mason, Powell and Sacramento Streets. Assessor's Block 0244, Lot 001 - Review and Comment on the Draft Environment Impact Report. The proposed project includes: 1) renovation of portions of the landmark 1906 Fairmont Hotel building, including consolidation of up to 60 hotel rooms; 2) reconfiguration of some existing hotel uses; 3) demolition of the 1961 23-story Fairmont Hotel tower above the five-story podium; and 4) construction of a new 160–unit, 26-story residential tower and five-story midrise residential component, both above a five-story podium, on the site of the existing hotel tower and podium (proposed to be demolished). The proposed project would include below-grade parking for about 350 vehicles. The 113,400-square-foot project site is located in an RM-4 (Residential Mixed-High Density) Use District and the Nob Hill Special Use District (SUD), and in 200-E, 300-E and 320-E Height and Bulk Districts. The proposed project would require Conditional Use (CU) authorization for height and bulk and for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) including exceptions to the 25 percent rear yard requirement, as well as require Planning Commission approval under the “Large Tourist Hotel Conversion Ordinance,” Administrative Code 41F.3(f), among other approvals. The proposed exterior changes to the historic 1906 Fairmont Hotel building would also require a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Historic Preservation Commission. The Draft EIR found that implementation of the proposed project would result in a significant unavoidable environmental impact on cultural resources, related to demolition of the Tonga Room, which has been identified as a historic resource under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

This public hearing is intended to assist the Commission in its preparation of comments on the Draft EIR. Comments made by members of the public at this hearing will not be considered comments on the Draft EIR and may not be responded to in the Final EIR. The Planning Commission will hold a public hearing to receive comments on the Draft EIR on June 10, 2010. Written
comments on the Draft EIR will be accepted at the Planning Department until 5:00pm on June 16, 2010.

Preliminary Recommendation: The Historic Preservation Commission will discuss the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) to frame their written comments on the adequacy of the DEIR, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

SPEAKERS in opposition of the project: Chris VerPlank – Cofounder of SOS Tonga; Aaron Goodman; Kip Potter – Property Owner and Member of Historic Nob Hill Association (HNH); Paul Fisher – Member of HNH; Brenda Osborne – President of HNH; Irma Zigas – Member of HNH; Laura Potter - Member of HNH; Jim Fotenos – Chair of 840 Powell Home Owner Association; Alice Carey - Member of HNH; Robert Varni – Neighbor.

SPEAKERS in favor of the project: Callaghan Fritz-Cope – Fritz Property Group and Resident of 1000 Mason Street

ACTION: Commissioners Martinez, Damkroger and Wolfram will work with staff on the draft letter.

AYES: Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, and Damkroger

ABSENT: Buckley and Chase

APPLETON & WOLFARD LIBRARIES – Marina Branch Library, 1890 Chestnut Street: Assessor's Block 0469, Lot 001; North Beach Branch Library, 2000 Mason Street: Assessor's Block 0074, Lot 001. Review of the adequacy of the documentation for the post-war branch libraries designed by the firm Appleton & Wolfard and a Resolution to approve, modify, or disapprove the recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to designate the Marina and North Beach Branch Libraries as San Francisco Landmarks under Article 10 of the Planning Code. The properties are zoned P (Public) and/or Open Space (OS).
Recommendation: Staff will identify branches to be recommended for designation at the hearing.

ACTION: Without hearing, continued to June 16, 2010

AYES: Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, and Damkroger

ABSENT: Buckley and Chase

ADJOURNMENT: 3:47 P.M.

The minutes was proposed for adoption at the Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission on Wednesday, July 7, 2010

ACTION: Approved
AYES: Chase, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Buckley
ABSENT: Damkroger
THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT CHASE AT 12: 35 P.M.

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:  Tim Frye – Acting Preservation Coordinator, Shelley Caltagirone, John Rahaim – Planning Director, Sophie Hayward, Pilar LaValley, and Linda Avery – Commission Secretary

A.  PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS:  None

B.  MATTERS OF THE COMMISSION

1.  Pending Articles 10 and 11 Planning Code amendments.
    (Continued from regular hearing of 5/5/10.)

Director Rahaim stated the status of the legislation is still pending at the Board of Supervisors (BOS) since April of last year. He asked the HPC how and what action the Planning Department should take to move it forward, or, whether the BOS would do that or not. He suggested one possibility is to move Articles 10 and 11 separately if that would enable a discussion. Another possibility might be to discuss the two sets of issues as a joint
committee of the HPC and Planning Commissions.

**Commissioner Wolfram** asked if it would be worthwhile to do a reduced version of the language of Proposition J so that Article 10 and 11 actually reflect what’s in the Charter. Another possibility might be if HPC just took the literal language of Proposition J and did maybe an interim change so at least Article 10 and 11 would reflect what’s in Proposition J.

**Commissioner Martinez** agreed separating Articles 10 and 11 for the purpose of discussion was a possibility since there wasn’t a lot of disagreement on Article 11. He raised the point that there are actually four versions of the proposed draft – the original before the BOS, HPC’s, Planning Commission’s, and SPUR’s. HPC needs to look at all four versions because the BOS will be looking at those. If HPC has a discussion, it might be worthwhile to go over points of difference between the two commissions as a starting point and then the language of the other two competing version to those specific points.

**Commissioner Buckley** asked whether a committee of the commission or the full body of the commission has to be part of that conversation.

**Commissioner Chase** said a joint review by HPC and Planning Department would be a way to start consolidating concerns and to reach a compromise on differences and open-end items amongst the commissions. There is enough interest by all the commissioners that he thought all the members of each commission should participate because it will become the set of regulations in which all would operate under. It is important enough to have a public hearing when we have these joint discussions.

**Director Rahaim** responded that certainly there will be public hearings. He asked whether or not to start with a smaller discussion and then bring it to hearing.

**Commissioner Damkroger** said perhaps looking at staff scheduling will help to decide whether a smaller discussion would be enough, unless Mr. Rahaim felt strongly about going to both commissions first.

**Deputy Attorney Byrne** brought to the attention of the HPC that there is either a Board rule or some other requirement of the BOS that if legislation is not acted within a certain amount of time it actually dies. At this point, this legislation under the BOS rule could be dead and would need to be reintroduced. She will get the information on what the deadline is for the Commission and have that available at the next hearing.

**Commissioner Chase** suggested it’s valuable to have the City Attorney’s information on the validity of the pending legislation at this point.

**SPEAKER(S):** Peter Warfield – Library Users Association, re: He asked what the versions are, what they are called, and where those could be found, including the chart in the packet.

2. Policy to address situations of “Demolition by Neglect” and related actions that allow historic properties to fall into disrepair.

**Commissioner Martinez** stated that whatever happened at 1268 Lombard Street, the current property owners would benefit from the demolition by neglect. With this ordinance in place, it is less likely to happen, but still there is not an ultimate penalty for having it happen because there is still value in doing it. That seems to him the outstanding issue.
**Commissioner Chase** – The concern he has is the blatancy and the evidence of active negligence found at 1268 Lombard Street. It was intentional and yet there is no consequence currently within the City’s rules and regulations to either prevent that or to create penalties for that type of action. It seems to him there would need to be an interest to develop legislation that would prevent that.

**SPEAKERS:** Rose Hilson – Jordan Park Improvement Association, re: The consequence needs to be either monetary or scorched earth or minimized the number of square feet on the lot; Peter Warfield – Library Users’ Association, re: Not having a penalty for a wrong action is not only to leave a loop-hole but also encourage bad action.

3. Draft a letter to the Planning Commission regarding the Candlestick Point / Hunters Point Shipyards EIR Alternatives.

**SPEAKER:** Peter Warfield – Library Users’ Association, re: He would like to see the materials distributed to the Commissioners prior to the meeting that he couldn’t find in the public file. Wells Lawson, with the Office of Economic and Work Force Development, responded that the materials were made available to the public for some time.

**ACTION:** Commissioner Wolfram volunteered to draft a letter to express concerns HPC has to the certification of the adequacy of the EIR by Redevelopment Planning Commissions.

**RECUSED:** President Chase for work related reasons

**AYES:** Buckley, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, and Damkroger

**ABSENT:** Hasz

4. Disclosure

**Commissioner Matsuda** met with Mr. VerPlanck regarding the Tonga Room

**Commissioner Martinez** talked to Mr. Gladstone about 1268 Lombard Street.

**Commissioner Damkroger** emailed Mr. Knapp about Lombard, but didn’t connect, and contacted Nancy Shanahan about CEQA reform.

**Commissioner Chase** had a telephone conversion with Mr. Charles [last name] about 1269 Lombard

C. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

5. 2010.0395A (P. LaValley: 415/575-9084)  
1 SOUTH PARK AVENUE, UNIT 407, southwest corner of South Park Avenue and 2nd Street, Assessor’s Block 3775, Lot 007. **Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness** to replace non-historic windows at penthouse, which was added to building in 2007. The subject property is a contributing structure to the South End Historic District and is located within an SSO (Service/Secondary Office) District with a 65-X Height and Bulk limit.  
**Preliminary Recommendation:** Approval

**SPEAKERS:** None

**ACTION:** Approved

**AYES:** Buckley, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, and Chase

**ABSENT:** Hasz

**MOTION NO.** M0066
D. **REGULAR CALENDAR**

6. **2008.0021E**  
PARKMERCED -The proposed project is a long-term mixed-use development program to comprehensively re-plan and re-design the approximately 116 acre site. The proposed project would increase the residential density, provide new commercial and retail services, provide new transit facilities, and improve existing utilities within the development site. Of the existing 3,221 residential units that exist on the site, approximately 1,683 units located within the 11 existing towers would remain. Over a period of approximately 30 years, the remaining 1,538 existing apartments would be demolished and replaced in a phased work program. An additional 5,679 net new units would also be added to the site for a project total of 8,900 units. Neighborhood-serving retail and office space would also be constructed as part of the proposed project. The proposed new neighborhood core would be located within walking distance of all the residences within Parkmerced. Small neighborhood-serving retail establishments would be constructed outside of the neighborhood core, in close proximity to residential units throughout the site. A new school and daycare facility, fitness center, and new open space uses including athletic fields, walking and biking paths, a new organic farm, and community gardens would also be provided on the project site. The proposed project includes a series of transportation improvements including re-routing the existing M Ocean View line from its current alignment along 19th Avenue.

This public hearing is intended to assist the Commission in its preparation of comments on the Draft EIR. Comments made by members of the public at this hearing will not be considered comments on the Draft EIR and may not be responded to in the Final EIR. The Planning Commission will hold a public hearing to receive comments on the Draft EIR on June 17, 2010. Written comments on the Draft EIR will be accepted at the Planning Department until 5:00pm on June 28, 2010.

**Preliminary Recommendation:** The Historic Preservation Commission will discuss the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) and may provide oral comments or may direct staff to prepare written comments on the adequacy of the DEIR, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

**SPEAKERS in opposition of the project:** Inge Horton; Pierluigi Serrano; Aaron Goodman

**SPEAKERS in favor of the project:** Mike Smith – Resident of Parkmerced and Member of Parkmerced Organization; Daniel W. Philip – President of Parkmerced Residential Organization; Jeanie Scott – Resident of Parkmerced; William Baumgardner – Transportation Engineer and Resident of San Francisco, Dan Brook – Resident of Parkmerced, Tim Colen – Executor Director of San Francisco Housing Action Coalition

**NOTE:** Commissioner Damkroger will work with staff to draft a letter to the Planning Commission that expresses the concerns of the HPC.

**RECUSED:** Commissioner Wolfram
7. 009.0443DD and 2010.0165DD (S. Caltagirone: 415/558-6625)
1269 LOMBARD STREET, - south side of between Polk and Larkin Streets; Lot 023 in Assessor's Block 0501 - Request for Review and Comment by the Planning Commission on a project undergoing Mandatory Discretionary Review per Section 317 of the Planning Code. The project proposes to demolish the existing single-family, two-story building located at the rear of the lot and to construct two new single-family buildings, located at the front and rear of the lot on a property located within an RH-2 (Residential House, Two-Family) District and a 40-X Height/Bulk District.

Preliminary Recommendation: The Commission may direct staff to draft written comments of the Commission.

PRESENTER: Charles Schultz provided history of the site.
Frederick Knapp - Architect, prepared the Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE)
Brett Gladstone – represented the project sponsor

SPEAKERS in opposition of the project: Joe Butler, Architect; John [Haubers], Resident of 1265 Lombard Street; Frank Marrow, Owner of 1249 and 1251 Lombard Street, Rod Handerlin, Owner of 1263, 1265, and 1267 Lombard Street.

ACTION: Staff was directed to send a letter to the Planning Commission expressing the concerns of the HPC

8. 2009.1180TZM (T. Sullivan: 415/558-6257)
Amendments to Planning Code Section 128 (Transfer of Development Rights), San Francisco Zoning Map ZN01, and the Chinatown and Downtown Elements of the General Plan. The proposed amendments will change the zoning of Block 0241, Lots 011 & 012 – 680 California Street, aka Old St. Mary’s Church – from Chinatown Mixed Use District to C-3-O; amending the Chinatown and Downtown Elements of the General Plan to reflect this rezoning; and amendments relating to Planning Code Section 128 to allow the transfer of TDR from any Individual Landmark located within a C-3 Zoning District to another lot within a C-3 Zoning District, and to require that proceeds from the sale of transferable development rights from certain Transfer Lots be spent on the rehabilitation and maintenance of the Transfer Lot property. The Commission will make recommendations on the proposed Ordinance to the Board of Supervisors.

(Continued from regular meeting of March 17, April 7, and April 21, 2010)
Recommendation: Approval.

ACTION: Recommended the ordinance proceed at the BOS and to allow the HPC to discuss broader ways of how this program might work.

AYES: Buckley, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, and Damkroger
RECUSED: Chase
ABSENT: Hasz
RESOLUTION NO: R646

Amendments to Administrative Code Concerning CEQA Appeals and Notice. [BOS File No. 10-0495]. Hearing of a proposed Ordinance introduced by Supervisor Alioto-Pier that would amend Administrative Code Chapter 31 to provide for appeals to the Board of Supervisors of environmental decisions and
determinations under the California Environmental Quality Act, and provide public notice of such decisions and environmental documents. The Commission will make recommendations on the proposed Ordinance to the Board of Supervisors. Recommendation: Approval with modifications.

SPEAKER: Bill Barnes – on behalf of Supervisor Alioto-Pier, re: Briefly talked about the appeal procedure and asserted that the HPC recommendation would be included in the CEQA Appeal process.

ACTION: Continued to 6/16/10
AYES: Buckley, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, and Chase
ABSENT: Hasz

E. STAFF REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS
None

F. MATTERS OF THE COMMISSION

10. President’s Report and Announcements
None

11. General historic preservation policies including local interpretations of the Secretary of the Interiors Standards and options to codify those interpretations. (Continued from regular hearing of 5/5/10.)

ACTION: Continued to 6/16/10 hearing
AYES: Buckley, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, and Chase
ABSENT: Hasz

12. Thresholds used to determine eligibility of historic districts. (Continued from regular hearing of 5/5/10.)

ACTION: Continued to 6/16/10 hearing
AYES: Buckley, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, and Chase
ABSENT: Hasz

ADJOURNMENT: 4:39 P.M.

The minutes was proposed for adoption at the Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission on Wednesday, July 7, 2010

ACTION: Approved
AYES: Chase, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Buckley
ABSENT: Damkroger
SAN FRANCISCO
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes
Hearing Room 400
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Wednesday, June 16, 2010
12:30 P.M.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Wolfram, Martinez, Matsuda, Damkroger, Hasz, Buckley, Chase

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT CHASE AT 12:31 P.M.

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Tim Frye – Acting Preservation Coordinator, Shelley Caltagirone, AnMarie Rodgers, Bill Wycko, Pilar LaValley, Linda Avery – Commission Secretary

A. PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS:
Don Trennert – Middle Polk Neighborhood Association, re: Requested the HPC to weigh in the Environment Impact Report (EIR) and to review this case.
Siu-Mei Wong – Requested the HPC to recommend landmarking Sacred Heart Church so it could be preserved and protected during renovation/ construction.
Aaron Goodman – Urged HPC to attend and raise their concern related to Parkmerced at the Planning Commission meeting tomorrow.
Kathy Howard – Golden Gate Preservation Alliance, re: Talked about the Recreation and Park (Rec & Park) current policies; notified HPC that Rec & Park is working on a miniature golf course that may or may not be at Golden Gate Park; reminded the HPC to complete the Beach Chalet Athletic Fields letter if they have not done so; asked that Rec & Park to come before HPC for proposals that affect Golden Gate Park landmarks.
Chris Folker – Resident of 45 Lloyd Street next to Duboce Park District, re: Planned filing an application to put landmark status on the 100-130 years old trees in a vacant lot near his resident. He asked support from Board of Supervisors, HPC, or City Department head. He also requested to give Department of Public Work time to evaluate the trees historic and significant values to determine if trees meet criteria for landmark status.

David [Aldrid] – Resident of San Francisco, re: He has a deep concern about the Park being parceled out and asked if the HPC has a general historical preservation oversight aspect to protect and preserve the general sense and legacy of Golden Gate Park.

B. STAFF REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Acting Preservation Coordinator Frye:
Sacred Heart Church – Planning Department had received calls from the community about possible interior work and the removal of the rose windows at Sacred Heart Church. Since then Building Department had inspected the condition of the site and issued a stop-work order; the Planning Department had issued an enforcement notice; the Board of Supervisor had a resolution - urging the owner to comply with the stop-work order, and a Deputy City Attorney had been assigned to this case. When more information was gathered, Planning Staff would present it to the HPC.

C. MATTERS OF THE COMMISSION

1. President's Report and Announcements

Commissioner Chase:
Last week Commissioners Chase and Hasz met with Phil Ginsberg, Director of Recreation and Park Department, and some of his staff to discuss concerns on how Beach Chalet Athletic Fields was handled. Mr. Ginsberg assured them that Recreation and Park would bring proposals for Golden Gate Park to HPC for review and would keep HPC updated on both the built and cultural resources in the Park. Commissioners Chase and Hasz have had the opportunity to build a bridge with Recreation & Park, and made an opportunity for HPC to understand future developments and their budgetary process in the Park over the coming years.

2. Discussion of Options for Draft Rules Regarding Ex-Parte Communications and Disclosure

This item was for discussion only and will be brought back at another time.

SPEAKER: None

3. Consideration of Adoption:
   a. Draft minutes of Regular Hearing of May 5, 2010

   ACTION: Approved for adoption.
   AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase
4. Disclosures

Commissioners Damkroger and Buckley met with Fairmont Hotel’s sponsor. Commissioners Chase and Hasz met with the Director and a member of Recreation and Parks Department.

5. Commissioner Comments/Questions

Commissioner Buckley

1) Sacred Heart Church – He liked to know what HPC could do to support Church at this point. Commission Damkroger suggested local landmarking of Sacred Heart Church could start from looking at the recently listed National Register nomination for the building to pull together a local landmark designation for submission to Planning Department. Mr. Frye pointed out that the National Register for the building is on the eligibility list only because the owner objected to the nomination prepared by Chris VerPlanck. Commissioner Martinez thought HPC could initiate landmark designation. He stated that HPC has the power to initiate what it pleases and doesn’t need to wait for the public to submit something to the Planning Department. He would like to calendar a discussion on the initiation of Sacred Heart Church so that HPC could bring the owner to the hearing for a discussion.

2) Larkin Street – He suggested HPC to look at State law which prohibits landmarking the church because it is being sold by a religious organization to a private entity. He suggested and later volunteered to write a letter in time for the June 24 Planning Commission hearing to tell them that HPC has an interest to comment, to ask them to look at how the proposal for Larkin Street has evolved over time, and to put off hearing the project. Commissioner Damkroger supported HPC to send a comment letter regarding Larkin Street to the Planning Commission and also to note in the letter that LPAB had previously commented on it. She suggested that it would be worthwhile for the HPC to review those comments. Commissioner Chase requested Planning staff to provide previous comments from Landmark Preservation Advisory Board to HPC, and concurred with Commissioner Buckley to draft the letter, and other commissioners to weigh in before sending it to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Damkroger

3) Tree in the garden – She has an interest in the issue of the tree that went with the historic house brought up today by speaker Chris Folker – Resident of 45 Lloyd Street, and stated that HPC should give every opportunity for a thorough evaluation to determine it is significant or not. Commissioner Martinez asked whether or not the [sub bureau] of Forestry under Department of Public Works was reviewing whether or not the trees are landmarked trees. Mr. Frye responded that he did not know the details but would prepare something for the next HPC hearing.

Commissioner Wolfram

4) Hunter’s Point Shipyard – He asked whether Planning staff had prepared an update from last week Planning and Redevelopment Commissions’ hearing on Hunter’s Point Shipyard for the HPC. Mr. Frye would prepare an update for the next HPC hearing.

5) He asked whether or not HPC might want to calendar again a discussion on writing a letter expressing preservation concerns to BOS.
NOTE: HPC Policy on Disability Access for Public Buildings was added by Commissioner Chase under Matters of the Commission for discuss only.

Commissioner Martinez together with Commissioner Damkroger met with Susan Mizner of the Mayor’s Office of Disability (MOD) to hear their concerns, and later with Department and Building Inspection (DBI) to discuss interdepartmental review process on Certificate of Appropriateness (C of A). Planning Department and DBI would work together to provide MOD the opportunity to review the design of accessibility before the (C of A) comes to HPC. He felt the language before made HPC too responsible and not within its jurisdiction to decide on what was a good solution in terms of accessibility. He felt that when the C of As came to HPC, they are deemed appropriate and accessible. HPC would decide whether the design impacted historical resources or not. If it did, HPC would then work out the design. He read the four points from the DRAFT Policy for HPC and Access.

SPEAKERS: Bob Planthold supported the draft policy. He commented on captioning as the way of communication for the deaf and not having it on the screens could be a programmatic problem. This was one example of disabilities and he urged how and why disability inputs should be considered for HPC’s deliberation on building and projects; Peggy Coster supported the draft policy and Bob Planthold’s comments. She added even people with a disability couldn’t see somebody else’s need. That was easy to miss because one has not experienced with those disabilities.

NOTE: The Commissioners had a discussion on Point 3 regarding certified plans and Point 4 regarding wheelchair lifts of the Draft Policy that resulted with minor changes for the language before the HPC today. This Draft Policy would be calendared for the next available hearing for a vote.

D. CONSENT CALENDAR

Item 5 was taken off the consent calendar and was heard as a regular item.

5. 2010.0322A (S. Caltagirone: 415/558-6625)

5 COTTAGE ROW, east side of Cottage Row between Bush and Sutter Streets. Assessor’s Block 0677, Lot 037 - Request for Certificate of Appropriateness to install a pair of windows within a new opening at the ground floor level of the front façade. The subject property is a contributing building within the Bush Street-Cottage Row Historic District. The property is zoned RM-1 (Residential, Mixed, Low Density) and is in a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approval

ACTION: Recused Commissioner Matsuda
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase
SPEAKER(S): None
ACTION: Approved with modifications to adding a gap of one row of siding between the base window and the trim, and some differentiation in the profiles from the historic windows.
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase
RECUSAL: Commissioner Matsuda
MOTION NO: M0067

E. REGULAR CALENDAR

6. 2010.0336U (A. Rodgers: 415/558.6395)
   Amendments to Administrative Code Concerning CEQA Appeals and Notice. [BOS File No. 10-0495].
   Hearing of a proposed Ordinance that would amend Administrative Code Chapter 31 to provide for appeals to the Board of Supervisors of environmental decisions and determinations under the California Environmental Quality Act, and provide public notice of such decisions and environmental documents. The Commission will consider an Ordinance introduced by Supervisor Alioto-Pier that would amend the Administrative Code as described in the Ordinance with additional modifications as recommended by the Planning Department. The Commission will consider making recommendations on the proposed Ordinance to the Board of Supervisors.
   Preliminary Recommendation: Approval with Modifications
   (Continued from regular hearing of 6/2/10)

PRESENTER: Bill Barnes on behalf of Supervisor Alioto-Piers
SPEAKER(S): Aaron Goodman talked about problems with the process of noticing Negative Declaration (Neg Dec) for various projects. He said it is important to look at the ordinance carefully that we are not disfranchising a large population. Nancy Shanahan made the following points, that the Public Resources Code doesn’t say an appeal could be made only by someone who participated in a lower hearing; that the summary does not show all details of the amendments; that the way the ordinance is written is restrictive; that it ignores the Charter amendments that created the HPC to review all CEQA & [NAPA] documents on any project that impacts historic resources; that it is unclear how adequate notices for Cat Ex will be provided to the public; that establishing a 10/20 day limit is inappropriate unless the public knows when the Cat. Ex or other determinations have been made. Rose [Hilson] from Jordan Park Improvements Association, said it was odd that notification is not required to inform the public for projects that are citywide in scope or where land exceed 5.5 acres. Tim Cohen from San Francisco Housing Coalition pointed out that the EIRs have a definite appeal period whereas Cat Ex and Nec Dec have none. It is not a healthy situation in which smaller projects having far less environmental impact than bigger projects requiring an EIR could be appeal at point, presumably until they are built. Steve Atkinson from Lewis Forad Hamilton & Scripps said the lack of procedures and lack of review periods in the code has been a problem that persisted for a long time. There is no appeal
procedure for Neg Dec and Cat Ex. They can be appealed until after the building permit has issued. This problem needs to be dealt with and he urged not let it persist any longer.

**ACTION:** Continued to July 7, 2010 with Commissioners’ comments, including the four points by Commissioner Buckley, and to receive Supervisor Alioto-Piers office’s response in a week.

**AYES:** Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase

**MOTION NO:** R647

7.  **2007.1457E**  
1050 VALENCIA STREET, west side between 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> Streets at the southwest corner of Valencia Street and Hill Street; Lot 008 of Assessor’s Block 3617 – Review of the proposed project, per the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan Interim Permit Review Procedures for Historic Resources, involving the construction of a mixed-use development with restaurant and residential uses. The proposed project would also include the demolition of an existing 1,670-square foot (sq ft), one-story commercial building constructed in 1970, originally in use as a Kentucky Fried Chicken and now occupied by Spork restaurant. The new proposed five-story, 55-foot-high, approximately 16,000-sq ft building would have 16 dwelling units over a ground-floor full-service restaurant. The existing building has one off-street parking/loading space, which would remain.

**Preliminary Recommendation:** Adoption of motion regarding review of proposed project per the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan Interim Permit Review Procedures.

(Continued from regular hearing of 5/19/10)

**ACTION:** Recused Commissioner Martinez

**AYES:** Buckley, Hasz, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase

**PRESENTER:** Stephen Antonaros updated progress of work requested by HPC from the May 19, 2010 hearing.

**SPEAKERS AGAINST THE PROJECT:**
Peter Heinecke – Liberty Hill Neighborhood Association (LHNA), Mike Maier – LHNA, John Barbey – LHNA, John Levin – LHNA, Risa Teitelbaum – LHNA

**ACTION:** Adopted as recommended and added HPC comments that staff to work with project sponsor and the community to find a compatible design.

**AYES:** Buckley, Hasz, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase

**RECUSAL:** Martinez

**MOTION NO:** M0068

8.  **2000.0618E**  
801 BRANNAN/ 1 HENRY ADAMS, in Assessor’s Block 3783, Lot 001 and Assessor’s Block 3911, Lot 001. Presented for review pursuant to the Eastern Neighborhoods Interim Permit Review Procedures for Historic Resources. The proposed project involves two project sites: 801 Brannan Street (3783/001), which is a block bounded by Brannan, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 8<sup>th</sup> streets and Brannan Alley; and, 1 Henry Adams Street (3911/001), which is a block bounded
by Henry Adams, Division, Alameda, and Rhode Island streets. On both project
sites, the existing buildings and surface parking would be demolished and new
mixed-use buildings would be constructed. The new construction would be
approximately 68’ in height and would consist of residential over commercial and
parking. The project sites are located within an UMU (Urban Mixed Use) District
with a 68-X Height and Bulk limit. The Department is processing an
Environmental Evaluation application and Historic Resource Evaluation Reports
for each project site for the project.

Preliminary Recommendation: Adoption of motion regarding review of proposed
project per the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan Interim Permit Review
Procedures

ACTION: Recused Commissioner Chase
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase

PRESENTER: David Baker presented an overview of massing study of the
project.

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Adopted as proposed with mitigation measures as part of the
comments.

AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger
RECUSAL: Chase

MOTION NO: M0069

Item 9 was heard after Item 10

APPLETON & WOLFARD LIBRARIES – Marina Branch Library, 1890 Chestnut
Street: Assessor’s Block 0469, Lot 001; North Beach Branch Library, 2000
Mason Street: Assessor’s Block 0074, Lot 001. Review of the adequacy of the
documentation for the post-war branch libraries designed by the firm Appleton &
Wolfard and Resolutions to approve, modify, or disapprove the
recommendations to the Board of Supervisors to designate the Marina and
North Beach Branch Libraries as San Francisco Landmarks under Article
10 of the Planning Code. The properties are zoned P (Public) and/or Open
Space (OS).

Recommendation: Approval of the recommendation to designate the Marina
Branch and the disapproval to designate the North Beach Branch Library.
(Continued from regular hearing of 5/19/10)

SPEAKERS IN FAVOR OF DESIGNATION:
Aaron Goodman, Aaron Cohen, Zach Stewart, Nancy Shanahan, Nan Roth, June Osterberg, Sarah Kliban, Joan
Wood, Howard Wong,

SPEAKER IN OPPOSITION OF DESIGNATION:
Bob Planthold, Peggy Costner, Elizabeth Diaz, Sue Blackman,
Julie Christensen, Jill Bourne, Karen Manney-Brodek

ACTION: Initiated designation for Marina and North Beach Branch
Libraries at this hearing but the language for a vote in future
hearing to be scheduled.

AYES: Buckley, Martinez, Matsuda, Damkroger
NAYS: Hasz, Wolfram, Chase
1 LORAINE COURT, San Francisco Memorial Columbarium, north end of court between Geary Boulevard and Anza Street. Assessor's Block 1084, Lot 002 and Assessor's Block 1132, Lot 001 - **Request for Certificate of Appropriateness** to expand the existing support building to the east and to construct two new single-story support buildings at the east and west perimeter of the site. The subject property is Landmark No. 209 and it is listed on the Here Today Survey and the Planning Department 1976 Architectural Survey. The site is zoned RH-1 (Residential, House, Single-Family) District and is in a 40-X Height and Bulk District.  
**Preliminary Recommendation: Approval**

**PRESENTER:** Kerry Mantez – Project Sponsor, Patrick Karney – Project Architect, Grey Miller – Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman  
**SPEAKERS:** [Name] and Rose Hillson supported the project  
**ACTION:** Adopted as proposed  
**AYES:** Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase  
**MOTION NO:** M0070

**ADJOURNMENT: 4:55 P.M.**

The minutes was proposed for adoption at the Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission on Wednesday, July 21, 2010  
**ACTION:** Approved  
**AYES:** Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Chase  
**ABSENT:** Damkroger
SAN FRANCISCO
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes

Hearing Room 400
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Wednesday, July 7, 2010
12:30 P.M.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Wolfram, Martinez, Matsuda, Hasz, Buckley, Chase
COMMISSIONER ABSENT: Damkroger

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT CHASE AT 12:32 P.M.

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Tim Frye – Acting Preservation Coordinator, Aaron Hollister, Shelley Caltagirone, AnMarie Rodgers, Linda Avery – Commission Secretary

A. PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS:
Katherine Howard, Golden Gate Preservation Alliance Group, had filed Beach Chalet scoping letter for Environmental Impact Report and read it to HPC.
Ross Woodall, Co-chair of Mayor’s Disability Council, asked HPC to ratify and move the discussion for equal access to City’s owned buildings; and invited HPC to celebrate the 20th anniversary of American Disability Act.
John Paul Scott, Deputy for the Mayor’s Office of Disability (MOD), expressed dismay that the proposed policy on access for persons with disability was not on today’s agenda. He stated by definition wheelchair lifts is not part of the accessible routes and MOD’s intent is to prohibit use of wheelchair lifts in alteration and additions in City owned buildings and facilities.
Zach Stewart, Landscape Architect and Resident of North Beach, thanked HPC for serving and doing a great job.
Joseph Butler, Architect and Member of Save St. John’s First United Methodist Church, suggested a design opportunity for addition of an accessible ramp could be provided at the back of the North Beach Library’s large playground.

Sarah [Clevan], long time Resident of San Francisco, thanked HPC for their service and commented that HPC could do just as well in renovating old buildings than tearing them down and build new ones.

Sue Cauthen expressed respect for Commissioners’ service and their enunciating Proposition J to protect architectural heritage.

B. STAFF REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Articles 10 and 11 codes clean up.

Planning Director Rahaim proposed these steps:
- Recognize HPC by replacing Landmark Preservation Advisory Board and to reflect the difference between HPC and Planning Commission (PC) work in the Charter.
- Prepare a series of policy HPC and PC could adopt that help direct Planning Department’s work regarding to preservation activity. They could be done at the policy level and not requiring code changes at this time.
- Gather interested individual and commissioners for the Preservation Summit to discuss preservation topics in San Francisco – how to do a better job and address the intent of Proposition J and the larger issue of preservation issues.
- Actual amendments to the code to Articles 10 and 11 could probably be early next year. Phasing of the amendments could be determined at the Summit and testing of the policies would take place over the next few months. He committed staffing for this work.

NOTE: In addressing the concerns from the Commissioners, Director Rahaim stated the PC has adopted interim policies, as opposed to amend the code at this time, in several occasions, e.g. the Eastern Neighborhood Area Plan Interim Policy. These policies direct work at the interim period during the planning phase. HPC could do the same regarding Articles 10 & 11. He reassured HPC that Board of Supervisor (BOS) had took an action to keep Articles 10 & 11 alive.

The HPC found the proposal agreeable and made consensus to move forward Director Rahaim’s proposal for Articles 10 & 11 codes clean up.

SPEAKER: Gee Gee Platt suggested for a focused discussion, it would be helpful if HPC could review the last two drafts and the one before the BOS.

2. Summary of Planning Commission actions regarding 1601 Larkin Street.

Acting Preservation Coordinator Frye:
1601 Larkin Street – The request letter by the HPC to PC for continuance of the project was not granted and the entitlements were heard at the June 24th PC hearing with a motion to certify the DEIR failed by the vote of 6 to 1 disapproving the project. The PC found there was a lack of maintenance of the building; the lack of a feasible alternative by owner to reuse the structure; and the project’s incompatibility with the established neighborhood context. A rare yard variance was also disapproved by the Planning Department.
NOTE: Commission Buckley wanted to clarify that under state law a religious institution has potentially the rights not to landmark a building could apply for a demolition permit to tear down a building. He further asked if there was a policy (to safeguard) buildings that could potentially be let fall down and then become an imminent safety hazard? Mr. Frye responded that the DEIR was not certified by PC and if the owners were to move forward, it would be re-evaluated under California Environment Quality Act (CEQA) review. DBI has the jurisdiction over the demolition permit if it's an imminent threat to public safety. The Planning Department’s Zoning Administrator would review the demolition permit. For buildings that were purposely let fall down, the blight ordinance and vacant building ordinance were the only new mechanisms. Director Rahaim supplemented that under CEQA the Department must determined whether a project is a historic resource and even if it is a historic resource, the Department still has to determine whether a demolition is appropriate given the factors weighed in the EIR. Planning Staff recommendation was that it was not appropriate to demolish the building for a replacement building. The PC agreed with Staff. There is a distinction to be made between whether a building could be landmarked vs. the CEQA process. The CEQA process is still in place. Commission Chase added that property owners of religious institution still have to meet zoning requirements based on property location and zoning district.

SPEAKERS: Dawn Trennert, Middle Polk Neighborhood Association, brought to the HPC’s attention that the protective fencing around the church was removed, leaving the building without any lights and protection at the site. She would like to see the site protected and to hear HPC formal position at this time. Joseph Butler, Architect representing Save St John’s United Methodist Church, stated that demolition could be possible and an emergency order would need the signature of the Zoning Administrator. He suggested that HPC should ask for and assign an engineer experienced with historic building to report whether or not there is imminent danger at 1601 Larkin Street. He would like the HPC to make a statement that asks the City to put this building on the list and be subjected to all of those requirements.

C. MATTERS OF THE COMMISSION

3. President’s Report and Announcements

Commissioner Chase reported that he have had the opportunity to speak to reporters of San Francisco Business Time and the Chronicles concerning the activities in the last 18 months of HPC work in reference to general preservation matters in the City. He thanked the member of the public who spoke to the issue on S.F. Business Time.

4. Consideration of Adoption:
   a. Draft minutes of Regular Hearing of May 19, 2010
   b. Draft minutes of Regular Hearing of June 2, 2010

   ACTION: Approved for adoption the two sets of minutes
   AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Chase
   ABSENT: Damkroger
5. Disclosures

Commissioner Wolfram had phone conversation with Carolyn Kiernat from Page and Turnbull regarding 211 Sutter Street; received numerous emails from people in opposition and in favor of the North Beach Branch Library; and a letter regarding the CEQA appeal.

Commissioner Martinez had conversation with Johanna Street about Sutter Street; and received emails about the library.

Commissioner Matsuda received a phone call from Supervisor Chiu and Mr. Ginsberg on agenda item E.8 (the North Beach Library); and emails supporting and opposing that measure.

Commissioner Buckley had the same contact as Commissioner Matsuda.

Commissioner Chase received emails on the library issues.

6. Commissioner Comments/Questions

Commissioner Martinez asked to schedule a discussion on American Disability Act and asked Commissioner Wolfram to work with him to discuss the language.

Commissioner Buckley asked to agendize 1601 Larkin Street, as clarified by Commissioner Chase, to discuss the process of defining blight, the process to put that on Department of Building Inspection (DBI) list, requirements for emergency order, and ways to objectively acquire and identify structural condition of the building.

Commissioner Hasz asked is there any precedence for the Department to warn the neighbors of 1601 Larkin Street who didn’t know the case to be attentive and watchful of the site’s current status.

NOTE: Commissioner Martinez reconsidered Item 6, Commissioner Comments/Question.

Commissioner Martinez commented that Planning Department’s impartiality on controversial items should be brought to the HPC for discussion. He felt there should be a discussion on Planning Department’s impartiality if needed.

Commissioner Hasz wanted the Commissioners and the public to know that he has started preliminary work to legislate emergency demolition and intentional blight. He asked the HPC for support and would conference with fellow members of the commission and staff before it is submitted.

D. CONSENT CALENDAR

7. 2010.0441A (A. Hollister: 415/575-9078)
   463 PACIFIC AVENUE - Assessor’s Block 0175; Lot 025, between Sansome and Montgomery Streets, the subject property is a non-contributory structure in the Jackson Square Historic District. A request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for new tenant signage. The subject building is located within a C-2 (Community Business) Use District, the Jackson Square Special Use District and the Washington-Broadway Special Use District #2 with a 65-A Height and Bulk limit.
   Recommendation: Approval
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E. REGULAR CALENDAR

APPLETON & WOLFARD LIBRARIES – North Beach Branch Library, 2000 Mason Street: Assessor’s Block 0074, Lot 001; Adoption of A Revised Resolution Recommending Designation to the Board of Supervisors of the North Beach Branch Library as a San Francisco Landmark under Article 10 of the Planning Code, and Making Findings in Support of Such Recommendation. The property is zoned P (Public) and/or Open Space (OS). The item was heard on June 16, 2010, and the Commission passed a resolution recommending to the Board of Supervisors landmark designation under Article 10 of the Planning Code, without findings. Accordingly, the item is now before the Commission to make the required findings.

(Continued from regular hearing of 5/19/10 and 6/16/10)

PRESENTER: Jill Bourne, Deputy City Librarian, gave reasons why the Library opposed designation of the North Beach Branch Library (NBBL). Karen [Montebroderick], Planner with S.F. Recreation and Park, asked HPC not to landmark NBBL and allowed the environment review process to evaluate expansive alternatives along side with community needs.

SPEAKERS IN OPPOSITION OF DESIGNATION:
SPEAKERS IN FAVOR OF DESIGNATION:
Sarah Kliban – Resident of San Francisco, Joan Wood – Coalition for a Better North Beach Library, Joseph Butler – AIA and Neighbor, Inge Horton, June Osterberg, Sue Cauthen – Telegraph Hill Dwellers and North Beach Resident, Howard Wong – Friends of Appleton & Wolfard Libraries,

SPEAKER NEUTRAL OF DESIGNATION: Zach Stewart

ACTION: Motion to adopt staff findings for designation
AYES: Buckley, Martinez, Matsuda
NAYS: Hasz, Wolfram, Chase
ABSENT: Damkroger
MOTION FAIL: (+3 and -3)

ACTION: Continue item to September 1, 2010 for full Commission participation with public comments closed.
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Chase
ABSENT: Damkroger

211 SUTTER STREET - Assessor's Block 0293; Lots 001, located at the southwest corner of Kearny and Sutter Streets and historically known as the Sherman Clay & Company Building. The subject building is a Category I Building within the Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter Conservation District. It is located within a C-3-O (Downtown Office) District with an 80-130-F Height and Bulk limit. The proposal is a request for a Permit to Alter to replace the terra cotta cornice and selective spot replacement on the 8th and 9th floors with glass fiber reinforced concrete (GFRC).
Recommendation: Approval with conditions.

PRESENTER: Carolyn Kiernat – Principal of Page and Turnbull
SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Approved with amendments to staff recommended condition - changing terra cotta to GFRC, and Commissioners to review glaze and color samples when they become available.
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Matsuda, Wolfram, Chase
NAY: Martinez
ABSENT: Damkroger
MOTION NO: M0072

NOTE: Commissioner Chase had to leave early for business travel and asked Commissioner Martinez to chair the balance of this hearing

10. 2010.0336U (A. Rodgers: 415/558.6395)
Amendments to Administrative Code Concerning CEQA Appeals and Notice. [BOS File No. 10-0495]. Hearing of a proposed Ordinance that would amend Administrative Code Chapter 31 to provide for appeals to the Board of Supervisors of environmental decisions and determinations under the California Environmental Quality Act, and provide public notice of such decisions and environmental documents. The Commission will consider an Ordinance introduced by Supervisor Alioto-Pier that would amend the Administrative Code as described in the Ordinance with additional modifications as recommended by
the Planning Department. The Commission will consider making recommendations on the proposed Ordinance to the Board of Supervisors.
(Continued from 6/16/10 hearing)

Preliminary Recommendation: Approval with Modifications

PRESENTER: Bill Barnes on behalf of the sponsor Supervisor’s Alioto-Piers Office went through additional information requested by HPC.

SPEAKERS: Joe Butler, Architect, commented that CEQA appeal is an imperfect process but asked the HPC to try to make it better. He had no comment on the language of this item.

ACTION: HPC recognized what Planning Commission had approved; and the addition of HPC comments that supports the idea that the legislation should strike the prior participation requirement for appellant of statutory Categorical Exemption (Cat Ex) and Community Plan; that HPC referrals be codified in the Administration Code; that the legislation includes languages that help to publicize the process by which the public is notified of the CEQA findings and all CEQA activity, and informs them how those actions have the right to appeal; that HPC supports broad dissemination of the information of Cat Ex and encourages the City to have information posted on the internet; that HPC supports language that would state any landmark or historic district hearing pending during an appeal and required the hearing recommence once the environment document is certified.

AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram

ABSENT: Damkroger, Chase

RESOLUTION NO: R649

1268 LOMBARD STREET, north side between Polk and Larkin Streets. Assessor’s Block 0500, Lot 015 - Request for Review and Comment on a project undergoing environmental review by the Planning Department. The project proposes to construct a new 4-unit, 5-story residential building on an existing vacant lot. The property is located within the vicinity of the potential West Slope of Russian Hill historic district. The site is zoned RH-3 (Residential, House, Three-Family District) and is in a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

Preliminary Recommendation: The Commission may direct staff to draft written comments of the Commission.

PRESENTER: Joe Butler – Architect for the project

SPEAKERS: Alexandria [Kinkert]

NOTE: This item was for review and comments only, no action was taken.

ADJOURNMENT: 4:31 P.M.
A. PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS: None

B. STAFF REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Update on the Candlestick Point – Hunters Point Shipyard Development Project

   **Acting Preservation Coordinator Frye:**

   June 3, 2010, the Planning Commission (PC) and the Redevelopment Commission (RC) held a joint hearing. The PC certified the DEIR and adopted all resolutions and motions, including the General Plan, Planning Code and Zoning Map amendments. They amended their approval of the design development document which acts as the planning code for the project by inserting the inclusion of a history walk along the shipyard
shoreline open space; the requirement that the [Redevelopment] Agency seek the HPC’s review and comments prior to making a final decision regarding preservation options; and the requirement that building 813B be evaluated as for historic significance.

July 12, 2010 - the Board of Supervisors’ (BOS) Land Use Committee heard the project action items and moved it on to the Full Board without making a recommendation for the July 27 hearing.

Since then, President Chiu introduced an amendment to the various actions that dealt with further design review, clean up of the ship yard, work force development, expansion of the South-East Health Center, and further feasibility study for the project’s use of public power.

July 13, 2010 - The BOS heard an appeal of the final EIR. Four separate appeals were filed and one was withdrawn at the hearing. The BOS upheld the certification of the appeal, held a public hearing on the amendments to the redevelopment plans, closed the public hearing and continued the hearing to July 27, 2010 when they would consider all required BOS actions for the project. In closing, before making a final decision regarding the preservation options, the Redevelopment Agency will ask the HPC to review and comment on the proposal.

SPEAKERS: None

C. MATTERS OF THE COMMISSION

2. President’s Report and Announcements

Commission Chase had no formal report.

3. Consideration of adoption of a policy statement consistent with ADA Requirements and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards at the request of the Mayor’s Disability Council.

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Approved Daft Policy C with amendment that the last sentence ends at “.......As a matter of policy, the HPC will not accept wheelchair lifts in government owned buildings.”

AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Chase

ABSENT: Damkroger

MOTION NO: R650

4. Consideration of Adoption:

a. Draft minutes of Regular Hearing of June 16, 2010

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Approved with corrections to change “...one of his staff” to “...some of his staff” under President’s Report, and “Susan Misner” to “Susan Mizner” on page 4

AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Chase

ABSENT: Damkroger
5. **Disclosures**

Commissioner Buckley went to the Divisadero project site. Commissioner Chase attended a meeting with members of the planning staff regarding the Fairmont Hotel to review revisions from the last comments provided by the Architectural Review Committee.

6. **Commissioner Comments/Questions**

**Commissioner Buckley** made reference to the opportunity to publicize information collected through projects and district surveys via a program sponsored by the California Council for Humanities called the California Documentary Project that has a research and development program of about $5,000. **Commissioner Chase** appointed him to report back to the HPC on results, if any, and asked Mr. Frye to work with him. **Commissioner Matsuda** volunteered to be part of a working committee. **Commissioner Hasz** was concerned about the developer for 1268 Lombard Street not showing up at the last HPC hearing. He said, “...them not showing up even though their project is on the agenda just smells very suspect...... to say their project didn’t have a fair chance [that could] lead to potential legal action by them.” He would like not to call up a special architectural meeting or anything for any reason.

**Commissioner Chase** noted that a number of Commissioners would like to see what’s coming up on the agendas. He informed commissioners that if they would like to put an item on the agenda to let Tim and him know by Tuesdays prior to the hearings in order to appropriately schedule them before the HPC and the public.

**Commissioner Wolfram** with Commissioner Matsuda have met to jump start the idea of developing an interpretive program for historic districts. They are coming up with a case statement and have started reaching out to the Visitors’ Bureau and some non-profit organizations.

---

**D. CONSENT CALENDAR**

814 MONTGOMERY STREET - Assessor’s Block 0175; Lots 016, northeast corner of Gold and Montgomery Streets. **Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness** to construct a penthouse structure on the roof of the building to accommodate an elevator override. The subject building is a contributing structure to the Jackson Square Historic District. It is located within a C-2 (Community Business) District with a 65-A Height and Bulk limit and the Washington-Broadway-Jackson Square Special Use District and the Jackson Square Special Sign District.  
**Recommendation:** Approval  

**SPEAKERS:** None  
**ACTION:** Approved  
**AYES:** Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Chase  
**ABSENT:** Damkroger  
**MOTION NO:** M0073
E. REGULAR CALENDAR

Amendments to the Planning Code, including but not limited to Sections 121.2, 136.1, 151, 185, 186, 201, 204.2, 205, 205.1, 205.3, 207.2, 209.3, 209.8, 217, 249, 303, 309, 311, 340, 317, 602.25, 602.26, 607.1, 790.44, 803.2, 803.3, 3 890.133, 890.44, 703.2, and various sections of Articles 7, 10, and 11. Ordinance sponsored by the Planning Department that would amend the Planning Code. The proposed amendments are mainly clerical clean-up in nature, with Sections 121.2, 136.1, 151, 185, 186, 201, 204.2, 205, 205.1, 205.3, 207.2, 209.3, 209.8, 217, 249, 303, 309, 311, 340, 317, 602.25, 602.26, 607.1, 790.44, 803.2, 803.3, 3 890.133, 890.44, 703.2, and Articles 7, 10, and 11 being amended.
Recommendation: Approval of Proposed Ordinance to Board of Supervisors.
SPEAKERS: Gee Gee Platt commented on a request for continuance
ACTION: Without hearing, continued to August 4, 2010
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Chase
ABSENT: Damkroger

Ordinance Amending the Planning Code by adding Section 787 to establish the 1800 Market Street Community Center Project Special Use District for the property located on B/L: 0871/014; amending Zoning Map SU07 to reflect this new SUD. Ordinance introduced by Supervisor Dufty that would create the 1800 Market Street Community Center Project Special Use District and associated Zoning Map amendments for the property located at the northwest corner of Market Street & Octavia Boulevard, (aka Landmark No. 223, the Carmel Fallon Building); adopting findings, including environmental findings, Planning Code Section 302 findings, and findings of consistency with the General Plan and the priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.
Recommendation: Approval of the Ordinance to the Board of Supervisors.
SPEAKERS: Rebecca Rolfe – Executive Director of San Francisco LGBT Community Center
ACTION: Approved
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Chase
ABSENT: Damkroger
RESOLUTION NO: R651

10. 2010.0484U  (M. Corrette: 415/558-6295)
MARKET AND OCTAVIA AUGMENTATION SURVEY, Consideration to adopt, modify, or disapprove the findings of the historic resource survey. The survey consists of 198 DPR 523B forms, and an update to the extant Hayes Valley California Register Historic District. The general boundaries of the survey area are coterminous with the Market & Octavia Neighborhood Plan Area, and include roughly eighty blocks spanning both sides of Market Street, from Noe and Scott streets on the west to Ninth and Larkin Streets to the east. The southernmost boundary is Sixteenth Street in Eureka Valley and the northernmost street is Turk Street in the Western Addition.

SPEAKERS in opposition to the survey: Peter Lewis – President of Mission Dolores Neighborhood Association (MDNA), Marius Starkey – MDNA, Lucia Bogatay – MDNA, Gideon Kramer - MDNA

ACTION: Adopted the resolution with two changes: adopt the designations for those buildings that were in the Mission Dolores Survey that HPC has already adopted; and that the designation of the buildings that are overlapping with the Mission Dolores Survey (the ones that are not directly on Market Street), and the neighborhood reads as Mission Dolores – the HPC clarified withholding adoption on the two overlapping properties.

AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Chase
ABSENT: Damkroger

MOTION NO: M0076

11. 2010.0483U (M. Corrette: 415/558-6295)
AUTOMOTIVE SUPPORT STRUCTURES HISTORIC SURVEY, Consideration to adopt, modify, or disapprove the findings of the historic resource survey and accompanying historic context statement. The survey consists of a context statement, 122 DPR 523B forms and one DPR 523D district record. The general boundaries of the survey area include Broadway Street to the north, Mission and Otis Streets to the south, Hyde Street to the east, and Gough Street to the west.

Preliminary Recommendation: Adopt the context statement entitled: VAN NESS AUTO ROW SUPPORT STRUCTURES; DPR 523B forms; and DPR 523D district record.

PRESENTER: William Kostura – Author of the Van Ness Auto Report
SPEAKER: Frank Yuen – Owner of 1946 Van Ness Avenue
ACTION: Adopted
AYES: Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Chase
NAYS: Buckley
ABSENT: Damkroger

MOTION NO: M0077

12. 2010.0318A (S. Hayward: 415/558-6372)
988-990 GUERRERO STREET, Assessor’s Block 3618, Lot 071, west side of Guerrero Street between 21st and 22nd Streets. Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior modifications in order to accommodate a dwelling unit at the ground level, to reconfigure the parking at the rear, and to add four dormers and two skylights to the existing hipped roof. The subject building is a contributing structure to the Liberty Hill Historic District and is located within an RH-3 (Residential, House, Three-Family) District with a 40-X Height and Bulk limit.

Preliminary Recommendation: Approval with modifications
PRESENTER: George Hauser – Project Architect

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Approved with conditions that a skylight is to replace the dormer on the north-east side; to shift the south dormer and skylight on the east side back six feet; to reduce the height of all dormers so they are no higher than the ridge of the roof line.

AYES: Buckley, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Chase

NAYS: Hasz

ABSENT: Damkroger

MOTION NO: M0074


280 DIVISADERO STREET, Assessor's Block 1238, Lot 023, east side between Haight and Page Streets. Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to convert the carriage house located at the rear of the subject property to a residential unit, resulting in a de facto demolition of the existing building per the demolition standards set forth in Section 1005(f) of the Planning Code and the construction of a new residential building with attached garage. The carriage house is a contributing feature of the Charles Hinkel House property, San Francisco Landmark No. 190. The site is zoned NC-2 (Small-Scale Neighborhood Commercial) District and is in a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

Continued from February 17, 2010 Regular Meeting, April 28, 2010 Special Meeting at Site, and May 19, 2010 Regular Meeting.)

Preliminary Recommendation: Disapproval

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Motion to disapprove

AYES: Martinez, Matsuda, Chase

NAYS: Buckley, Hasz, Wolfram

ABSENT: Damkroger

MOTION FAILED: (+3, -3)

ACTION: Continued to 9/1/10 to allow the absent commissioner the opportunity to participate in the final action. The public hearing is closed.

AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram

NAYS: Chase and Matsuda

ABSENT: Damkroger

ADJOURNMENT: 3:00 P.M.

The minutes was proposed for adoption at the Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission on Wednesday, August 18, 2010

ACTION: Approved

AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger

ABSENT: Chase
SAN FRANCISCO
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes

Hearing Room 400
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Wednesday, August 4, 2010

12:30 P.M.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Wolfram, Martinez, Matsuda, Hasz, Buckley, Chase
COMMISSIONER ABSENT: Damkroger

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT CHASE AT 12:33 P.M.

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: John Rahaim – Planning Director, Tim Frye – Acting Preservation Coordinator, Pilar LaValley, Tara Sullivan, Michael Jacinto, Rick Cooper, Sophie Hayward, Linda Avery – Commission Secretary

A. PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS: Mike Buhler, new Executive Director of S.F. Heritage - introduced himself and gave a brief summary of his professional background.

B. STAFF REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Discussion of HPC Landmark Designation Work Program

Acting Preservation Coordinator Frye made these points:
Planning Department (Dept.) requested the HPC to develop their own Designation Work Program for Fiscal Year 2010-2011
The allotted FTE for Designation Work Program is 2080 staff hours. It includes:

- Non-productive hours like sick leave, holidays, and weekly staff meetings.
- Approximately 55 of the FTE hours have been used to date on the Appleton/ Wolfard Library designations.
- Other outstanding libraries initiated by the HPC; eligible resources identified in recent surveys; and the work loads associated with each of the designations.

The HPC may want to consider passing a resolution that identifies the priorities of this Commission. The HPC may also want to consider scheduling a future hearing to solicit requests from the public regarding Article 10 designations.

The Dept. proposed a quarterly reporting structure to monitor resource allocations for landmark designations and to allow the HPC and the Dept. to prioritize these designations as appropriate. The Dept. would like to present what the structure would look like to HPC in late October or early November.

The Dept. would like to confirm if any of the Landmark Board’s Work Program should be carried over to the new fiscal year.

In conjunction with requesting HPC to develop their own Designation Work Program, Mr. Frye gave a brief summary on how the Landmark Preservation Advisory Board (LPAB) had identified and prioritized landmarks: In 1998 the Dept. established the Landmark Designation Work Program to identify 8 to 10 buildings, structures, sites, districts, objects that were potentially eligible for designation as city landmarks. In 1999 and 2000, the Landmarks Board set priorities for the selection of potential landmark designations. Those priorities were to address and engage the cultural and social history of San Francisco; to focus on unrepresented or undeveloped neighborhoods in the program; to involve communities of people -- be it ethnic communities, communities of interest, or cultural communities in the designation process; and to focus on the recognition of public spaces, common grounds, and architecturally significant buildings. It was a common procedure for the Landmarks Board to agendize an item soliciting potential designations from the public, the Department, or other commissions.

**SPEAKER:** Bradley Wiedemier, Architectural Historian in San Francisco: He suggested to the HPC that the last remaining waterfront block of buildings in the Central Seawall District, 101-190 Stewart Street to 100 – 198 the Embarcadero is a district that should be considered to be put on the work program. This block, containing 45-foot wide lots, is under tremendous pressure for development because of it location to the waterfront.

**Commissioner Wolfram** asked had any analysis been done for under-represented neighborhoods, building types, and building periods. He suggested it is a good time to focus comprehensively on what’s been landmarked in buildings and districts in the City now and to see where the missing pieces are in neighborhood districts and building types. He asked about the status of the existing work program that was under the LPAB. He commented that the HPC needs to be careful in asking for public solicitation because there was a certain level of frustration from being ignored [in the past]. Mr. Frye responded that some landmark information was in the annual Certified Local Government Report. For a comprehensive look at what’s been landmarked, he suggested Dept. staff could work with their GIS specialist to provide HPC some maps and...
general description of each landmark and districts. The information generated may help to target areas for initiation of landmark designation. In regards to the status, he mentioned an earlier report prepared by Ms. Tam for the HPC that had everything on the 2006-2007 LPAB Work Program that shows between 10% to 25% completed. The case reports and designations reports from the public may need additional work to be deemed complete though. **Commissioner Martinez** was concerned that too much of a study might exhaust the allotted resources. Maybe there could be something that mapped out existing landmarks with the construction dates and location of each landmark as a cursory symbol categorization that talk about their significance.

**Commissioner Matsuda** didn't see from the report where some communities that did not make the list might definitely have potential resources that should be considered. She wanted to know how the designation process took place and who was contacted, particularly for communities that are usually considered under-represented. **Mr. Frye** responded that the process of initiation was largely left to the LPAB, the Dept. and the Board of Supervisors (BOS). For HPC’s landmark work program, outreach to the public and communities could be improved as part of the public education. **Commissioner Martinez** said there was a concern that the southern and the western part of the City started to be more represented, but he didn’t remember any specific mechanism to try to do that other than favoring those items which just happened to show up just because somebody brought them to the then LPAB.

**Commissioner Martinez** expressed concern about prioritizing landmarks of the 2006-2007 Work Program from the LPAB at this hearing and suggested calendaring the discussion when actually there are photos and information on them. He added that part of the discussion in prioritizing should also deal with development pressure on these landmarks and perhaps the state of decay.

**Director Rahaim** confirmed that what he is hearing from Commissioners is to take a fresh look, do more outreach, and how it should be done. He suggested that one way was to look at existing landmarks and existing districts; and another was to look at existing survey areas which have lots of information as well. He thought development pressures came primarily from within the area that the Dept. is working on or has recently done neighborhood plans for. He suggested starting the discussion with a hearing item with a series of maps of existing and proposed survey areas and development pressures and see where it would go from there.

**Commissioner Chase** agreed with Director Rahaim that the Commission probably should take a slightly different look at needs and demands and how to approach this with the new Commission. He expressed that often times people who had the energy and resources were able to bring items forward to the Commission to address their interests -- either they like the building or they had the intent for development. The larger view was how to relate this to the resources in the City. The more specific issues around development were the South of Market area, for instance. Evaluations done over time had said there are potential districts available. If there are resources within those potential districts that needed to be considered, he thought that was one way to begin the discussion around individual sites.
NOTE: The discussion would be calendared sometime around fall of 2010.

C. MATTERS OF THE COMMISSION

2. President’s Report and Announcements: None

3. Consideration of Adoption:
   a. Draft minutes of Regular Hearing of July 7, 2010

   SPEAKERS: None
   ACTION: Approved, with the correction to the date on 8/4/10 agenda
   AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Chase
   ABSENT: Damkroger

4. Disclosures: None

   NOTE: Commissioner Secretary Avery responded to Commissioner Wolfram’s inquiry that discussion on Disclosures would be brought back to the HPC together with the draft HPC’s Rules and Regulations later in the year [September].

5. Commissioner Comments/Questions: None

D. REGULAR CALENDAR

6. 2009.0880E (P. LaValley: 415/575-9084)
   2100 MISSION STREET, southwest corner of 17th and Mission Streets, in Assessor's Block 3576, Lot 001. Presented for review pursuant to the Eastern Neighborhoods Interim Permit Review Procedures for Historic Resources. The proposed project is to demolish an existing, one-story, industrial/commercial building (dba Dollar Store), and construct a six-story residential over commercial and parking building. The subject property is located within the Mission Street NCT (Neighborhood Commercial Transit) District with a 65-B Height and Bulk limit. The Department is processing an Environmental Evaluation application and Historic Resource Evaluation Report for the project. Preliminary Recommendation: Adoption of motion regarding review of proposed project per the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan Interim Permit Review Procedures.

   PRESENTER: Stan Saitowitz – Natoma Architects
               Frederic Knapp – Knapp Architects
   SPEAKERS: None
   ACTION: Accepted staff findings for the evaluation of the historic building and forwarded HPC comments about the new building.
   AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Chase
   ABSENT: Damkroger
   MOTION NO: M0075
7. **2010.0080T**  
(T. Sullivan: 415/558-6257)  
Amendments to the Planning Code, including but not limited to Sections 121.2, 136.1, 151, 185, 186, 201, 204.2, 205, 205.1, 205.3, 207.2, 209.3, 209.8, 217, 249, 303, 309, 311, 340, 317, 602.25, 602.26, 607.1, 790.44, 803.2, 803.3, 3 890.133, 890.44, 703.2, and various sections of Articles 7, 10, and 11.  
Ordinance sponsored by the Planning Department that would amend the Planning Code. The proposed amendments are mainly clerical clean-up in nature, with Sections 121.2, 136.1, 151, 185, 186, 201, 204.2, 205, 205.1, 205.3, 207.2, 209.3, 209.8, 217, 249, 303, 309, 311, 340, 317, 602.25, 602.26, 607.1, 790.44, 803.2, 803.3, 3 890.133, 890.44, 703.2, and Articles 7, 10, and 11 being amended. The Planning Commission will hear and act on this item on August 5th.  
(Cont’d from 7/21/10 hearing)  
Recommendation: Approval of Proposed Ordinance with modifications to Board of Supervisors.

**SPEAKERS:**  
Joan Wood: concerned about revisions to Sections 311, 10 & 11 and thought the items should be postponed at least 60 days.  
Mike Buhler, from SF Heritage: requested to continue the item; a red-line version of the code revision be distributed; clarification of how a continuance if recommended by the HPC would impact the process of the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors’ review. He asked the commissioners to curtail discussion to non-substantive changes.  
Aaron Peskin: stated that Articles 10 and 11 are inconsistent with the Charter and applauded the Dept. and the HPC in attempting to find a way to reconcile them with the Charter; made comments on Sections 1006.3 – Notices and 1004.4 – Designations; made reference to dual process for tenant’s right to appeal and stated there are 10-day, 15-day, 20-day periods to the Board of Appeals; thought that to deal with substantive issues later was not the right approach; agreed with others that the changes should be combined into one revision; thought all should work together to have one voice; conforming Articles 10 and 11 is likely to be the only substantial work that is done over the next decade or two.  
Gee Gee Platt: asked for a red-lined and cohesive revision. She urged the HPC not to go ahead with this item today. She asked the qualifications for the commissioners be put into the code and not the Charter.

**NOTE:**  
Planner Ms. Sullivan discussed her Item on the various sections in particular Article 10 with the Commissioners. Discussion on Article 11 was continued to the next hearing because of time constraints. Commissioner Martinez requested a clean copy of Articles 10 with what’s been discussed. Commissioner Wolfram requested that the whole code clean-up be in one package to the Board of Supervisors.

**ACTION:**  
Continued the item to discuss Article 11 on August 18, 2010.  
**AYES:**  
Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Chase  
**ABSENT:**  
Damkroger
8. 2006.0868E (M. Jacinto: 415/575-9033)

800 PRESIDIO - southeast corner of Presidio Avenue and Sutter Streets
(Assessor’s Block 1073, Lot 13) The project sponsors, Booker T. Washington Community Services Center in association with the San Francisco Mayor’s Office of Housing, propose to demolish the existing 12,600-square-foot Booker T. Washington Community Center building, presumed an historic resource for purposes of environmental review and to construct a mixed-use structure, which would replace and enlarge the community/recreation center and include new residential units. The project would encompass approximately 70,000 square feet of space on six levels, five above grade and one below at a height of 55 feet along Presidio Avenue. The roughly 19,000 square-foot community center space would accommodate the center’s current and future programs and would also include a gymnasium, meeting space, and several classrooms. The project would include 47 residential units in a mix of unit sizes, half of which would be designated below market rate (BMR) rental housing for emancipated foster youth and the other half BMR units available to both individuals and families. The project proposes 22 parking spaces in a basement garage accessible from a proposed curb cut on Sutter Street. The subject property is within an RM-1 Zoning District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District. The sponsor seeks to amend the Planning Code by establishing a “Presidio-Sutter Special Use District” (SUD) to modify building height and bulk, density, off-street parking, year yard configuration, and open space requirements. The proposed SUD would necessitate text and map amendments (rezoning), which would require approval by the Board of Supervisors.

Note: This public hearing is intended to assist the Commission in its preparation of comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). Comments made by members of the public at this hearing will not be considered comments on the DEIR and may not be responded to in the Final EIR (FEIR). The Planning Commission will hold a public hearing to receive comments on the DEIR on August 5, 2010. Written comments on the DEIR will be accepted at the Planning Department until 5:00 p.m., August 10, 2010.

Preliminary Recommendation: The Historic Preservation Commission will discuss the DEIR and may provide oral comments or may direct staff to prepare written comments on the adequacy of the DEIR, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

PRESENTERS: Pat Scott, Executive Director: talked about the services provided to foster youth. Steve [Allen], Project Architect: gave a synopsis of the building.

SPEAKERS in opposition: Steve Williams

ACTION: The Commission expressed that the draft EIR was adequate per CEQA and did not feel it necessary to draft a letter. However, they did make comments that staff will forward to the ERO that did not detract from the document’s adequacy.
9. **2007.0903E**

(R. Cooper: 415/575-9027, S. Hayward: 415/558-6372)

**Redevelopment Plan for the Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island Project** –

The Treasure Island Development Authority, the redevelopment agency for the project, is proposing a Redevelopment Plan for the Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island Project (Redevelopment Plan) that would provide the basis for redevelopment of the portions of Naval Station Treasure Island, still owned by the Navy, once they are transferred to the Treasure Island Development Authority. The proposed Redevelopment Plan would be carried out by Treasure Island Community Development, LLC. The Proposed Project would include development on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island of up to 8,000 residential units; up to 140,000 square feet (sq. ft.) of new commercial and retail space; up to 100,000 sq. ft. of new office space; adaptive reuse of three historic buildings on Treasure Island with up to 311,000 sq. ft. of commercial, retail, and/or flex space; about 500 hotel rooms; rehabilitation of the historic buildings on Yerba Buena Island; new and/or upgraded public and community facilities; new and/or upgraded public utilities; about 300 acres of parks and public open space including shoreline access and cultural uses such as a museum; new and upgraded streets and public ways; bicycle, transit, and pedestrian facilities; landside and waterside facilities for the Treasure Island Sailing Center; landside services for an expanded marina; and a new Ferry Terminal and intermodal Transit Hub. Construction and buildout of the proposed Development Plan would be phased and would be anticipated to occur over an approximately 15- to 20-year period.

This public hearing is intended to assist the Commission in its preparation of comments on the Draft EIR. Comments made by members of the public at this hearing will not be considered comments on the Draft EIR and may not be responded to in the Final EIR. The Planning Commission will hold a public hearing to receive comments on the Draft EIR on **August 12, 2010**. Written comments on the Draft EIR will be accepted at the Planning Department until 5:00pm on **August 26, 2010**.

*Preliminary Recommendation: The Historic Preservation Commission will discuss the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) and may provide oral comments or may direct staff to prepare written comments on the adequacy of the DEIR, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).*

**RECUSED:** Commissioner Wolfram

**SPEAKERS:** None

**ACTION:** The Commission expressed that the draft EIR was adequate per CEQA and did not feel it necessary to draft a letter. However, they did make comments: the gun has significance; concern was expressed that any development might visually block Building One on the island; and there should be some display of the military history of the island on the property.

**ADJOURNMENT:** 3:51 P.M.
The minutes were proposed for adoption at the Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission on Wednesday, September 1, 2010

ACTION: Approved

AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase
SAN FRANCISCO
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes

Hearing Room 400
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Wednesday, August 18, 2010
12:30 P.M.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Wolfram, Martinez, Matsuda, Hasz, Buckley, Chase
COMMISSIONER ABSENT: Damkroger

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT CHASE AT 12:31 P.M.

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: John Rahaim – Planning Director, Tim Frye – Acting Preservation Coordinator, Loretta Cimmarusti – Planning Department Intern, Chelsea Fordham, Michael Smith, Lisa Gibson, Kate Conner, Tara Sullivan, Linda Avery – Commission Secretary

A. PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS: None

Item B was heard after Item C - Matters of the Commission

B. STAFF REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS


NOTE: Planning Department Intern Cimmarusti presented the revised Certificate of Appropriateness Application and Preservation Bulletin #4. Commissioners reviewed, commented, and made minor revisions on the documents. No action taken.
2. Resolution - Adoption of Design Recommendations for Consent Calendar
Scopes of Work

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Adopted staff recommendations with Commissioners’ revisions based on some final feedbacks to the Planning Department and without the item actually coming back to the HPC.

AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger

ABSENT: Chase

RESOLUTION: R652

C. MATTERS OF THE COMMISSION

3. President’s Report and Announcements: None

4. Consideration of Adoption:
   a. Draft minutes of Regular Hearing of July 21, 2010

SPEAKERS: None

ACTION: Approved

AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger

ABSENT: Chase

5. Disclosures

Commissioner Matsuda talked on phone with Susan Mizner from the Mayor’s Office of Disability regarding Certificate of Appropriateness issues that will appear on HPC September calendar.

Commissioner Buckley and Matsuda met with members of S.F. Heritage to discuss various ways to encourage neighborhoods to get involved in historic preservation matters.

Other Commissioners talked on phone with Susan Mizner as well.

Commissioner Damkroger spoke with Nancy Shanahan regarding Item 8 on today’s agenda.

6. Commissioner Comments/Questions: None

D. REGULAR CALENDAR

7. 2006.0848E (C. Fordham: 415/575-9071)

25-35 DOLORES STREET- east side of Dolores Street between Clinton Park and 14th Street (Lot 069 in Assessor’s Block 3534). The proposed project includes demolition of 25-35 Dolores Street and new construction of a four-story, 62,030 square-foot, 47 unit residential building. The existing two contiguous garage buildings on the site were built in 1917-1918 and are historic resources. The project site is located in a RTO (Residential, Transit-Oriented) Zoning District and 40-X height and bulk district. The proposed project would require Conditional Use Authorization for density greater than one unit per 600 square feet, off-street parking at greater than 0.75 spaces per unit, and development of a lot greater than 10,000 square feet; and a rear yard variance.
This public hearing is intended to assist the Commission in its preparation of comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). Comments made by members of the public at this hearing will not be considered comments on the DEIR and may not be responded to in the Final EIR (FEIR). The Planning Commission will hold a public hearing to receive comments on the DEIR on September 2, 2010. Written comments on the DEIR will be accepted at the Planning Department until 5:00 p.m., September 7, 2010.

**Preliminary Recommendation:** The Historic Preservation Commission will discuss the DEIR and may provide oral comments or may direct staff to prepare written comments on the adequacy of the DEIR, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

**PRESENTER:** Frederic Knapp gave a historic background of the properties. Toby Levy, Project Architect, spoke about alternative reuse.

**SPEAKER:** None

**ACTION:** Commissioner Damkroger would work with staff to draft a letter to include all HPC’s comments to Dept’s ERO.

**AYES:** Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger

**ABSENT:** Chase

**MOTION NO:** L0001


Amendments to the Planning Code, including but not limited to Sections 121.2, 136.1, 151, 185, 186, 201, 204.2, 205, 205.1, 205.3, 207.2, 209.3, 209.8, 217, 249, 303, 309, 311, 340, 317, 602.25, 602.26, 607.1, 790.44, 803.2, 803.3, 3 890.133, 890.44, 703.2, and various sections of Articles 7, 10, and 11. Ordinance sponsored by the Planning Department that would amend the Planning Code. The proposed amendments are mainly clerical clean-up in nature, with Sections 121.2, 136.1, 151, 185, 186, 201, 204.2, 205, 205.1, 205.3, 207.2, 209.3, 209.8, 217, 249, 303, 309, 311, 340, 317, 602.25, 602.26, 607.1, 790.44, 803.2, 803.3, 3 890.133, 890.44, 703.2, and Articles 7, 10, and 11 being amended. The Planning Commission will hear and act on this item on August 5th.

(Cont’d from 7/21/10 & 8/4/10 hearing)

**Recommendation:** Approval of Proposed Ordinance with modifications to Board of Supervisors.

**SPEAKERS:** Mike Buhler, from SF Heritage, submitted a letter at the hearing that outlined basis principals to help guide the review of the amendments. The amendments should reflect and fully incorporate the language of the City Charter. Aaron Peskin pursued that Articles 10 and 11 to be in conformance with Proposition J.

**NOTE:** Following discussion, the Commission 1) passed a motion of intent to amend Section 1004.1 with proposed language to come back to them on 9/1/10 hearing. The vote was (+5, -1) with Commission Buckley voted against and Commission Chase absent; 2) held public hearing against and discussed Sections 1006.8 and 1006.3 but took no action; 3) continued the item to 9/1/10.
ACTION: Continued the Item to September 1, 2010  
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Damkroger  
ABSENT: Chase, Wolfram  

ADJOURNMENT: 4:29 P.M.
The minutes was proposed for adoption at the Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission on Wednesday, September 1, 2010  
ACTION: Approved  
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase
SAN FRANCISCO
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes

Hearing Room 400
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Wednesday, September 1, 2010
12:30 P.M.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

____________________________________________________________

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:  Buckley, Has, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT CHASE AT 12:35 P.M.

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:  John Rahaim – Planning Director, Kelley Amdur – Director of Neighborhood Planning, Tim Frye – Acting Preservation Coordinator, Tara Sullivan, Jonas Ionin – Acting Commission Secretary

A.  PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS:  Art Persyko, Resident of Pacific Heights - in support of preserving the Clay Theater as a community theater that serves residents of San Francisco and the Bay Area;  Rebecca Sills, San Francisco Film Society - in support of saving the Clay Theater and would negotiate with the landlord for a lease to make it the home of the Film Society in the event that the current tenant leaves.  She would hope to agendize the issue in the future with the HPC;  Catherine Howard, Friends of the Music Concourse – 1) Extended an invitation to HPC for the Music Concourse restoration ceremony and expressed thanks to the former LPAB for having the space protected; 2) The SFPUC was starting the EIR for a 30-foot high and approximately 40,000 square foot Water Treatment Plant in the western end of Golden Gate Park; 3) The EIR for the Soccer Athletic Fields hasn’t started and would like very much for the HPC to write a letter to express their concerns;  Zack Stewart, Architect - thanked the HPC;  Anita Denz, Resident of Pacific Heights and Member of the Victorian Alliance - in support of saving the Clay Theater;  Lee Goodin - read the Examiner
editorials regarding Transbay Terminal and the North Beach Library; Jim Warshell, Vice President of the Victorian Alliance - urged HPC to weigh in on the outpour of public support from a wide and diverse group for 280 Divisadero Street on the initial hearing of the project when HPC evaluate it; Joan Wood, Native San Franciscan - urged HPC to preserve San Francisco heritage and to remember why they were elected; Ray Hartz, Director of San Francisco Open Government - had concerns and thought it was inappropriate not allowing the pubic to comment on two items on the agenda where public comment was closed; Peter Warfield, Library Users' Association - said HPC meeting minutes do not summarize what members of the public say, and urged the HPC to allow full public comment on items 6 and 7; Sara Kliban - said San Francisco is an amalgamation of taste and style from 1800 to now. She urged HPC to think twice before changing the legacy of the City and thanked HPC for being conservation conscious; Sue Cauthan, member of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force - said she knew HPC got a lot of pressure from developers and a major daily newspaper company. She commended HPC for being strong and doing the right thing for San Francisco; Carol [Verberg], North Beach resident - asked HPC to consider the amount of community input that came with the work under their jurisdiction. She commented that nowadays the loudest and the most strident would be heard the most, but thought that when the process works it way with great care through community deliberation, that all would be taken just as seriously.

B. STAFF REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Discussion – Identification of Article 11 minor scopes of work and potential delegation to Planning Department (Dept.)

Acting Preservation Coordinator Frye presented a memo that included the outline of the proposed Minor Alteration / Permit to Alter Requirements and Scopes of Work. His goals were 1) to clarify what should be considered as minor alteration for delegation to Planning Staff under Article 11; and 2) to determine what would be the review and notification process associated with that. If delegation is to occur, the Department would like the HPC to adopt criteria listed on the memo, and recommend that this delegation be implemented as an interim procedure that expires within one year to allow a review of the process. On the memo, the Department included a process to initiate hearing requests for minor alterations for the HPC and the public. The process would work like this:

- A building permit application is filed. The Dept. would draft findings and issue a letter of Minor Alteration Permit to Alter that would be sent to HPC and any interested parties that are listed on file with the Department
- With this letter, instead of 10 days, there would be a 15-day notification request period. If no request for hearing is filed at the Department, the permits would be approved on the 16th day. If a request for hearing was filed with the Department, a re-notice would be sent to the applicant, the project sponsor and all interest parties that a hearing would be scheduled at the HPC.
- A hearing would be scheduled where in the HPC would have to make two determinations – 1) if the project meets the definition of Minor Alteration; and 2), was the Department consistent in the application of the criteria.
Based on those two determinations, there would be four anticipated outcomes - HPC would approve, disapprove, modify, or request for new information under Major Alteration.

Mr. Frye stated the Department was open to any suggestions the HPC might have for developing more specific criteria or guidelines for these scopes of work. The Department would bring revisions back at the 9/15/10 hearing.

Commissioners Comments and Questions:
Commissioner Buckley asked how Minor Alterations would be notified. Would it be on the agenda or tagged in the Department and DBI’s system; and how would the public find out when minor Alteration applications for permits are filed?

Commissioner Damkroger asked how to provide the public with information on standards for Minor Alteration scopes of work?

Commissioner Martinez asked if the permit applications could be posted on the web and would there be extra fees for the permits.

Commissioner Chase brought up that in one previous HPC hearing, public notice on Minor Alterations was discussed as being part of the staff report at Commission hearings or being part of the item on the regular agenda where staff identifies for the HPC the number of alterations that have been submitted for review, approved and appealed. In delegating the responsibility to staff, these statistics are important to the HPC.

Commissioner Wolfram commented on the memo that contemporary design, rooftop mechanical equipment, wireless telecommunication work should be more narrowly defined in the proposed Minor Alteration / Permit to Alter scopes of work.

Commissioner Hasz suggested the HPC look at the 36 Minor Alteration permits approved last year as a package/sample.

SPEAKERS: Gee Gee Platt opposed the delegation to staff anything other than ordinary repair and maintenance; and staff needed to expand and develop the materials more fully for discussion to begin; Ray Hartz said he would follow the process closely to determine whether or not the recommendation presented are reflective of the actual circumstances; Aaron Peskin said 36 permits were issued when Proposition J does not allow their issuance until the HPC delegates that authority. He suggested that HPC look at those as samples in figuring out what should be minor and major and to see what kind of things would fall within the type of projects that the HPC reviewed; Bradley Wiedmaier has a concern about storefront alterations - that many wonderful remnants of storefronts that were passed down have been removed and as a result has lessened the historic framing of the buildings; Zack Stewart expressed that Planning’s employees should be shifted under the jurisdiction of the HPC.

NOTE: After Commissioners’ discussion and public testimony, Director Rahaim clarified that the HPC is just not delegating something to staff. The HPC is delegating something to the staff that will have the authority to approve certain types of projects according to the guidelines; and whether something comes to HPC or not is the guideline that staff has to use. The item was continued to September 15, 2010. At that hearing Mr. Frye would 1) provide the storefront, awning, and sign guidelines;
2) revise the procedures based on HPC and public comments heard today; 3) provide the 36 letters of determination that have been approved since Proposition J.

C. MATTERS OF THE COMMISSION

2. President’s Report and Announcements: None

3. Consideration of Adoption:
   a. Draft minutes of Regular Hearing of August 4, 2010
   b. Draft minutes of Regular Hearing of August 18, 2010

SPEAKERS: None
ACTION: Approved August 18th, 2010 and amended August 4, 2010 minutes – Page 3, last paragraph Commissioner to Commission
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase

4. Disclosures
Commissioner Damkroger spoke with Brett Gladstone and Mark [Cobert] regarding 280 Divisadero; spoke with Nancy Shanahan regarding Articles 10 & 11; and received many emails and phone calls regarding 280 Divisadero – some of which she couldn’t reply to.

5. Commissioner Comments/Questions
Commissioner Damkroger asked the status on Theaters Landmark Designation. Mr. Frye responded it was conducted under the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board. The survey/report on single-screen theaters might have been developed by the Mayor’s Office in 2006, but there hasn’t been any movement for a number of years. The Department has the data in-house but it’s only in draft form.

Commissioner Buckley asked what landmarks data the Department has in GIS format and if it be made permanent on the Department’s web-site. Mr. Frye responded that the Department was working on it and planned to bring information back in late October. The historical data maps could be a permanent data base on the web.

D. REGULAR CALENDAR

6. 2008.0312A
280 DIVISADERO STREET, Assessor's Block 1238, Lot 023, east side between Haight and Page Streets. Request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to convert the carriage house located at the rear of the subject property to a residential unit, resulting in a de facto demolition of the existing building per the demolition standards set forth in Section 1005(f) of the Planning Code and the construction of a new residential building with attached garage. The carriage house is a contributing feature of the Charles Hinkel House property, San Francisco Landmark No. 190. The site is zoned NC-2 (Small-Scale Neighborhood Commercial) District and is in a 40-X Height and Bulk District. At the 7/21/10 hearing public comment was closed on this matter. The Historic Preservation Commission will only hear public comment on new information received by the Historic Preservation Commission since the 7/21/10 hearing.
Preliminary Recommendation: Disapproval


SPEAKERS: Peter Warfield asked the HPC to lift the restriction on public comment for this and the next item; Gee Gee Platt agreed with Planning Staff's recommendation.

Motion: Motion to approve the project as proposed by Project Sponsor
AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Wolfram
NAYS: Martinez, Matsuda, Damkroger, Chase
NOTE: Motion failed (+3, -4)

ACTION: Disapproved the project as per findings of Planning Department
AYES: Martinez, Matsuda, Damkroger, Chase
NAYS: Buckley, Hasz, Wolfram
MOTION NO: M0078

APPLETON & WOLFARD LIBRARIES NORTH BEACH BRANCH – North Beach Branch Library, 2000 Mason Street: Assessor’s Block 0074, Lot 001;
Adoption of A Revised Resolution Recommending Designation to the Board of Supervisors of the North Beach Branch Library as a San Francisco Landmark under Article 10 of the Planning Code, and Making Findings in Support of Such Recommendation. The property is zoned P (Public) and/or Open Space (OS). The item was heard on June 16, 2010, and the Commission passed a resolution recommending to the Board of Supervisors landmark designation under Article 10 of the Planning Code, without findings. Accordingly, the item is now before the Commission to make the required findings. At the 7/7/10 hearing public comment was closed on this matter. The Historic Preservation Commission will only hear public comment on new information received by the Historic Preservation Commission since the 7/7/10 hearing.

SPEAKERS: Ray Hartz, SF Open Government - commented on public comment being closed on this item; Gee Goodin, North Beach - spoke in favor of the proposed library; Howard Wong commented on the extensive public media campaign of an article from SF Chronicle that had been frustrating to the preservation community; Peter Warfield spoke in favor of landmarking the North Beach Library; Joe Butler, AIA, gave design perspective on making North Beach Library handicap accessible; Karen Mauney-Brodek, Recreation and Park, remarked that supporters of the proposed North Beach Library Master Plan did not come today because public comment was closed; Joan Wood spoke about how a development in Los Angeles had incorporated and retained historic aspects of the Old Century Plaza Hotel; Richard Ow spoke in favor of expanding the library in whatever form or shape to
accommodate the growing community; Bradley Wiedmaier spoke in favor of landmarking the library; Sue Cauthen spoke in favor of landmarking.

**ACTION:** Adopted the resolution as amended

**AYES:** Buckley, Martinez, Matsuda, Damkroger

**NAYS:** Hasz, Wolfram, Chase

**RESOLUTION NO:** R653


Amendments to the Planning Code, including but not limited to Sections 121.2, 136.1, 151, 185, 186, 201, 204.2, 205, 205.1, 205.3, 207.2, 209.3, 209.8, 217, 249, 303, 309, 311, 340, 317, 602.25, 602.26, 607.1, 790.44, 803.2, 803.3, 3 890.133, 890.44, 703.2, and various sections of Articles 7, 10, and 11. Ordinance sponsored by the Planning Department that would amend the Planning Code. The proposed amendments are mainly clerical clean-up in nature, with Sections 121.2, 136.1, 151, 185, 186, 201, 204.2, 205, 205.1, 205.3, 207.2, 209.3, 209.8, 217, 249, 303, 309, 311, 340, 317, 602.25, 602.26, 607.1, 790.44, 803.2, 803.3, 3 890.133, 890.44, 703.2, and Articles 7, 10, and 11 being amended. The focus of this hearing will be on Article 10, Section 309, and parts of Article 11.

(Continued from regular hearing of 7/21/10, 8/4/10 and 8/18/10)

Recommendation: Approval of Proposed Ordinance with modifications to Board of Supervisors.

**NOTE:** The Commissioners discussed various sections of Article 10 with Planning Staff and opened the discussion to the public. The speakers were [Stu Bartoli], Gee Gee Platt and Mike Buhler who made comments on the various sections being discussed. Following discussion, the Commission continued the item.

**ACTION:** Continued to September 15, 2010

**AYES:** Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase

**ADJOURNMENT:** 4:25 P.M.

The minutes was proposed for adoption at the Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission on Wednesday, October 6, 2010

**ACTION:** Approved

**AYES:** Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase

**ABSENT:** Matsuda, Buckley
SAN FRANCISCO
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes

Hearing Room 400
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Wednesday, September 15, 2010
12:30 P.M.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Has, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram , Damkroger, Chase
COMMISSIONER ABSENT: Buckley

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDENT CHASE AT 12:33 P.M.

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: John Rahaim – Planning Director, Kelley Amdur – Director of Neighborhood Planning, Tim Frye, Sophie Hayward, Tara Sullivan, Linda Avery – Commission Secretary

A. PUBLIC COMMENT

SPEAKERS: Catherine Howard, Friends of the Music Concourse, requested that a Certificate of Appropriateness be required for concession stands at the Music Concourse in Golden Gate Park; Jakkee Bryson requested the HPC to pull together an ADA compliant policy for the City’s historic and non-historic buildings; Jill Fox, Member of India Basin Neighborhood Association, brought to HPC attention that historic landmark #250, the Shipwright’s Cottage at 900 Innes has been fire damaged and the Historic Docks are falling down in Hunter’s Point. She asked if it’s possible to agendize an item in the future to develop general rules and guidelines for the care and maintenance of identified historic buildings; Joe Butler, AIA and member of Little House Committee, commented on over-the-counter permits for Category B buildings over 50 years old; Ray Hartz, Director of SF Open Government, commented on the two items that were closed for public comments at the last hearing; George Williams, representing SPUR, commented that perhaps the provision in Old St. Mary’s legislation that the sale of TDR proceeds must be
used for on-going maintenance and rehabilitation of the building is a good idea, but it raised havoc for a number of projects and for lenders because under the loan agreement they have the obligation as to how to use the value of the property. He also brought into focus Transbay Transit Center to the HPC that TDR is necessitated in order to provide capital for the project. He urged all – the HPC, Planning Commission, and others to rethink the TDR scheme; Nancy Wuerfel, requested that HPC agendize an item to protect properties mentioned by the two previous speakers - Butler and Fox; Gee Gee Platt asked how would a concern citizen/neighbor appeal a project that didn't need CEQA, and how could it be done.

B. STAFF REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. (T. Frye: 415/575-6822) Discussion of Article 11 minor scopes of work and delegation to Planning Department. (Continued from regular hearing of 9/1/10)

Mr. Frye broke down the discussion into several components:
The 36 letters of Minor Alteration: He went over a few samples with the HPC and noted all letters of minor alteration were submitted to interested parties and the HPC. The Department did not receive any comment on these projects. There would have been an appeal process if there was any objection, but there was none.
Storefront, Sign and Awning standards – the documents are in draft form and need to be updated with better samples, photos, and language from Proposition J. Staff has engaged the public - Gee Gee Platt and the Union Square Business Improvement District - for their comments. The amended resolution reflecting these comments would come back to HPC in the Fall of 2010 for review and formal approval.
Resolution – Amended Whereas, No. 3 c and d, and discussed the definition of Ordinary Maintenance and Repair, and Installation of Rooftop Equipment being minimally visible.
Exhibit A – Department simplified the phrase ‘Minor Alteration Permit to Alter’ to “Minor Permit to Alter”. Mr. Frye brought to the attention of the HPC that if a request for hearing is filed, notification will follow the standard hearing noticing requirement of the HPC. This will be based on what the Commission agrees to as adopted by the Board of Supervisors with the code clean-up.

SPEAKERS: Ray Hartz, SF Open Government, reminded HPC that delegating any authority does not remove their responsibility. He preferred a 21-day notification period; Aaron Peskin has not heard from staff 1) what’s going to be done with the 36 minor alteration permits issued by the Zoning Administrator in contravention of Proposition J; 2) staff’s intent on what they want to do on the not vested. He recalled Commissioner Hasz’s suggestion to look at the 36 permits to see what should be delegated to staff. Gee Gee Platt wanted HPC to see most of the storefront requests. Regarding the substantial heights and minimal visibility, she was not sure what half a story set-back is. She suggested that using something more definitive would be helpful.
Commissioners Martinez and Wolfram discussed the scopes of work on Ordinary Maintenance and Repair. Commissioner Chase suggested staff refine the definition on what is repair and replacement.

Commissioner Hasz and Chase asked whether the letters of Minor Alterations could be provided formally as part of the agenda or packet because it would help HPC understand the quantity and breathe of the requests, where the bulk of them come from, and to define delegating responsibility for staff approvals. Mr. Frye responded that including Minor Alterations in the packet would be onerous because it would require distribution of 17 full size packets and analysis for every awning, for example, within the Kearny, Market, Mason and Sutter District. The Department suggests that we send letters to the HPC, include the letters in the HPC correspondence folder, and put Minor Alteration as an agenda item for discussion. If something that is a concern, the letter could be pulled off, or revisited at that time. This would provide an opportunity for discussion.

Commissioner Chase commented that part of the urban clutter was allowing the installation of new signs without the removal of old signs, their respective conduit, transformer boxes, and repainting over them.

NOTE: At the close of the discussion, Mr. Frye summarized outstanding issues that would be brought back to the Commission: 1) The 15-day vs 21-day notification; 2) agreement about photos on the 11x17 sheet outlining the scope of work; and 3) resolve Ordinary Maintenance and Repair issues.

C. MATTERS OF THE COMMISSION

2. President’s Report and Announcements: None

3. Disclosures

Commission Wolfram met with Ms. Mizner and representatives of the Bureau of Architecture regarding the Board of Supervisor’s ramp, Item 5, on today’s agenda.

4. Commissioner Comments/ Questions

Commissioner Wolfram asked the status on policy discussion for vacant buildings HPC heard regarding 1600 Larkin and 900 Innes. Mr. Frye responded that he contacted Lawrence Kornfield of the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) but a formal request was required. Staff was drafting the letter but DBI will decide when their staff is available. Commissioner Martinez informed that the BOS has passed that legislation and would like staff to report on the status of 900 Innes to see whether it is at a point of enforcement required by the legislation. Commissioner Damkroger wondered if SF Heritage should contact property owners of 900 Innes. Commissioner Chase asked this item be agendize and echoed the commissioners’ issues on the Vacant Building policies. He commented that one of the big items the public ends up paying a great price for is the notion of dilapidated buildings and code enforcement. Historically, it’s been a difficult thing for the community to deal with, but it continues to erode the neighborhood. The notion around trying to get better cooperation with DBI was the key to the issue.
Commissioner Martinez spoke on:

**Music Concourse** – He would like to agendize the Music Concourse to discuss whether a C of A is required for concession stands as brought up by Katherine Howard under Public Comment. He would like an explanation of why a C of A is not required for permanent objects like bicycle racks. **Commissioner Damkroger** was interested in the cumulative impact from all bit by bit changes and thought there should be a plan for the Music Concourse area.

**Permits Already Approved** – He would like a report from staff on the status of the storefront permits that HPC approved to see if legal action needs to be taken to clarify the legal status.

**Over the Counter Approval** – To address Joe Butler's concern about over-the-counter permits for Category B buildings, he requested staff to report on the Department's drawing requirements on minor repair for window replacements.

**Commissioner Damkroger** suggested to post on the web HPC adopted policies on historic buildings and ADA access. She thanked the National Trust Heritage paper for an editorial written about HPC’s vote at the September meeting on the North Beach Library.

### D. CONSENT CALENDAR

The following two consent items were removed from the Consent Calendar and were heard as part of the Regular Calendar.

5. **2010.0677A** (S. Hayward: 415/558.6372)

- **Dr. Carleton B. Goodlett Place (City Hall)** – Assessor's Block 0787; Lot 001, on the block bounded by McAllister, Grove, and Polk Streets and Van Ness Avenue. The subject property is the Board of Supervisors' Chamber in City Hall, a contributing structure to the Civic Center Historic District, local San Francisco Landmark Number 21. The site is zoned P (Public) with an 80-X Height and Bulk limit. The proposal is a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness in order to make the president's dais and the clerk's desk in the Board of Supervisors' chamber accessible to persons with disabilities. The scope of work for the proposed project is limited to the president’s dais and the clerk’s desk within the Board of Supervisors’ chamber in City Hall.

  **Preliminary Recommendation:** Approval

  **PRESENTER:** Susan Mizner - Director of Mayor's Office on Disability; Stanley So - Department of Public Work

  **SPEAKER:** Jackkee Bryson filed a complaint on the temporary ramp that was done without a permit in City Hall's Supervisor's Chambers.

  **ACTION:** Approved as amended by staff and Martinez

  **AYES:** Hash, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase

  **ABSENT:** Buckley

  **MOTION NO:** M0079

6. **CONSERVATION EASEMENT** (T. Frye: 415/575.6822)

- **4705 3rd STREET SOUTH** - Assessors Block 5311; Lot 011, City Landmark No. 8: SAN FRANCISCO OPERA HOUSE. Recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to grant a Conservation Easement, encompassing interior and
exterior features of the subject building, to San Francisco Architectural Heritage to meet a condition required by the National Park Service's Save America's Treasures Grant Program. **Preliminary Recommendation: Approval**

**RECUSED:** Commissioner Chase

**PRESENTER:** Director of Bayview Opera House

**SPEAKER:** Judy Nemzoff - Program Director of SF Arts Commission, Mike Buhler - SF Heritage

**ACTION:** Approved as amended by staff

**AYES:** Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase

**ABSENT:** Buckley

**RESOLUTION NO:** R654

---

**E. REGULAR CALENDAR**


**Amendments to the Planning Code, including but not limited to Sections 121.2, 136.1, 151, 185, 186, 201, 204.2, 205, 205.1, 205.3, 207.2, 209.3, 209.8, 217, 249, 303, 309, 311, 340, 317, 602.25, 602.26, 607.1, 790.44, 803.2, 803.3, 3 890.133, 890.44, 703.2, and various sections of Articles 7, 10, and 11.**

Ordinance sponsored by the Planning Department that would amend the Planning Code. The proposed amendments are mainly clerical clean-up in nature, with Sections 121.2, 136.1, 151, 185, 186, 201, 204.2, 205, 205.1, 205.3, 207.2, 209.3, 209.8, 217, 249, 303, 309, 311, 340, 317, 602.25, 602.26, 607.1, 790.44, 803.2, 803.3, 3 890.133, 890.44, 703.2, and Articles 7, 10, and 11 being amended. The focus of this hearing will be on Article 10, Section 309, and parts of Article 11.

(Continued from regular hearing of 7/21/10, 8/4/10, 8/18/10 and 9/1/10)

**Recommendation: Approval of Proposed Ordinance with modifications to Board of Supervisors.**

**NOTE:** The Commissioners discussed sections 1004.1, 1014a, 1006.3, 1006.8 under Article 10 in detail with Planning Staff. Aaron Peskin, Gee Gee Platt and Mike Buhler made public comments during the discussion. Ms. Sullivan would have Article 10 redrafted for the Commission to take a vote and start the discussion of Article 11 at the next hearing. Pending a room’s availability in City Hall, a special all day meeting on either September 29th or October 13th would be calendared for the discussion on Article 11.

---

**ADJOURNMENT: 4:28 P.M.**

The minutes was proposed for adoption at the Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission on Wednesday, October 6, 2010

**ACTION:** Approved

**AYES:** Hasz, Martinez, Wolfram, Damkroger, Chase

**ABSENT:** Matsuda, Buckley
A. SPECIAL CALENDAR

1. **2010.0080T**

   (T. Sullivan: 415/558-6257)

   Amendments to the Planning Code, including but not limited to Sections 121.2, 136.1, 151, 185, 186, 201, 204.2, 205, 205.1, 205.3, 207.2, 209.3, 209.8, 217, 249, 303, 309, 311, 340, 317, 602.25, 602.26, 607.1, 790.44, 803.2, 803.3, 3 890.133, 890.44, 703.2, and various sections of Articles 7, 10, and 11. Ordinance sponsored by the Planning Department that would amend the Planning Code. The proposed amendments are mainly clerical clean-up in nature, with Sections 121.2, 136.1, 151, 185, 186, 201, 204.2, 205, 205.1, 205.3, 207.2, 209.3, 209.8, 217, 249, 303, 309, 311, 340, 317, 602.25, 602.26, 607.1, 790.44, 803.2, 803.3, 3 890.133, 890.44, 703.2, and Articles 7, 10, and 11 being amended. The focus of this hearing will be on completing review of Article 10 and review of Article 11.
(Continued from regular hearing of 7/21/10, 8/4/10 and 8/18/10, 9/1/10 and 9/15/10)

Recommendation: Approval of Proposed Ordinance with modifications to Board of Supervisors.

NOTE: The Commissioners continued and, for the most part, concluded their discussion of Article 10 and started the discussion of Article 11. They expect to have two more hearings on this item to address any remaining concerns on October 6th and October 13th. Members of the public – Gee Gee Platt, Steve Vettel, Aaron Peskin, and Mike Buhler contributed to the discussion. Commissioner Damkroger requested that staff provide the list of 16 Category 3 buildings outside of the conservation districts and Section 309 at the October 6th hearing. Prior to adjourning, President Chase urged his fellow Commissioners to come prepare with comments as they try to move forward to conclude the item at the joint hearing with the Planning Commission on October 21, 2010.

ADJOURNMENT: 4:28 P.M.

The minutes was proposed for adoption at the Regular Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission on Wednesday, October 20, 2010

ACTION: Approved

AYES: Buckley, Hasz, Martinez, Matsuda, Wolfram, Damkroger

ABSENT: Chase