



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

**DATE:** May 18, 2011  
**TO:** Historic Preservation Commission  
**FROM:** Timothy Frye, Acting Preservation Coordinator, (415) 575-6822  
**RE:** Delegation of Minor Scopes of Work to be approved by the  
Planning Department as an Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness

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

Reception:  
**415.558.6378**

Fax:  
**415.558.6409**

Planning  
Information:  
**415.558.6377**

---

Charter Section 4.135 provides that the Historic Preservation Commission ("HPC") may delegate approvals for minor work (Certificates of Appropriateness for Article 10 and Permits to Alter for Article 11) to the Planning Department ("Department"). These approvals are subject to direct appeal to the HPC.

On October 10, 2010 and March 2, 2011, the HPC passed Motion Nos. 0083, and 0106, respectively, permitting properties within Article 11 to have work approved at staff level. The Motion outlined scopes of work considered to be minor, and delegated the authority of approving these scopes of work to the Department. Collectively called Minor Permits to Alter, these permits can be appealed directly to the HPC within 20 days of issuance (10 days if it is a sign or awning).

The Department is requesting that the HPC review, approve, and delegate minor scopes of work for individual landmarks and properties in historic districts that are within Article 10 of the Planning Code. The approvable scopes of work are defined to be found compatible with Article 10 landmarks and/or landmark districts. As with Minor Permits to Alter, the new "Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness" is appealable directly to the HPC within 20 days from date of issuance.

Attached, please find a draft Motion that outlines scopes of work that the Department considers minor in scope and can be approved by Preservation staff, as well as an example of an Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness Motion. The Department envisions the process being similar to that of Minor Permits to Alter, and believes that it will expedite the permitting of these minor scopes of work. There will be a 20 day "Request for Hearing" period, allowing the HPC or any interested party to have the HPC review the Department's decision.

In sum, the Department recommends that the HPC approve the minor scopes of work as outlined in the draft HPC Motion, delegate the ability for the Department to issue Administrative Certificates of Appropriateness, and the draft Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness Motion.



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## Historic Preservation Commission Motion No. XXXX HEARING DATE MAY 18, 2011

IDENTIFICATION AND DELEGATION OF SCOPES OF WORK DETERMINED TO BE MINOR ALTERATIONS PURSUANT TO CITY CHARTER SECTION 4.135 FOR APPROVAL, MODIFICATION, OR DISAPPROVAL OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS BY THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT.

1. WHEREAS, Section 4.135 of the City Charter provides that the Historic Preservation Commission ("HPC") may, for properties designated individually or within a historic district under Article 10 of the Planning Code, (1) determine alterations considered to be minor in scope; and (2) delegate the ability to approve, disapprove, or modify applications ("Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness") for minor alterations to individual landmarks or properties within historic districts to Planning Department staff; and
2. WHEREAS, the HPC, at its regular hearing of May 18, 2011, reviewed a list of projects considered to be minor in scope, the Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness application and review process by the Department, and the appeal process of these decisions to the HPC; and
3. WHEREAS, in appraising a proposal for an Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness, the Department, on behalf of the HPC, shall determine that all proposed alterations to exterior features on individual landmarks and on buildings within historic districts shall be consistent with the architectural character of the building and/or district, the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*, and shall comply with the following specific requirements, where applicable:
  - a. The distinguishing historic qualities, features, and character of the building should not be obscured, damaged, or destroyed.
  - b. The integrity of distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship that characterize a building shall be preserved.
  - c. Distinctive architectural features which are deteriorated shall be repaired rather than replaced, whenever possible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material shall match the historic material in composition, design, color, profile, texture and other visual qualities. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features shall be based on historic, physical or pictorial evidence, if available,

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

Reception:  
415.558.6378

Fax:  
415.558.6409

Planning  
Information:  
415.558.6377

rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures.

- d. For any building within a historic district, all exterior alterations shall be compatible in scale and design with the District as set forth in the applicable Article 10 Appendix which describes the District.

SO MOVED that the Commission hereby ADOPTS the following list of work to be minor in scope and approved in an Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness, and the procedures outlined in Exhibit A of this Motion for delegation to the Department for approval, modification, or disapproval of said Administrative Certificates of Appropriateness.

1. **Ordinary Maintenance and Repair:** Work determined to be ordinary maintenance and repair which is defined as any work, the sole purpose and effect of which is to correct or repair deterioration, decay, or damage, including repair of damage caused by minor fire or other disaster.
2. **Exploratory and Investigative work:** Removal of a limited amount non-historic material to conduct investigations regarding structural systems and/or to determine the existence of historic material. This work will be limited to no more than 5% of the total surface area on an exterior façade.
3. **Front stairways and railings:** The replacement of non-historic materials with more appropriate compatible stairways and/or railings provided that the proposal is based on physical or documented evidence or is found to be compatible with the character-defining features of the building and/or district. This does not include replacement of porticos, porches, or other architectural components of the entry.
4. **Window Replacement:** The replacement of windows in existing openings. This does not apply to enlarging or modifying window openings on any façade.
  - a. **Primary (Visible) Facades:** Window replacement on primary elevations must match the historic (extant or not) windows in terms of configuration, material, and all exterior profiles and dimensions.
  - b. **Secondary Facades:**
    - i. **Visible:** Windows must be compatible in terms of configuration and material.
    - ii. **Non-visible:** Windows must match the size of the existing openings.
5. **Signs & Awnings:** New tenant signs and awnings or a change of copy on existing signs & awnings that do not obscure or cover any exterior features and are compatible in terms of material, location, size, method of attachment, and method of illumination with the building and/or district. Applications for new signs and awnings must include the removal of any abandoned conduit, outlets, attachment structure, and related equipment.

6. **Installation of Rooftop Appurtenances (excluding dormers, elevator penthouses, and cellular installations):**
  - a. Rooftop equipment that is not visible from the public right-of-way, does not result in additional of height of 8-feet; does not cover more than 20% of the total roof area, and is setback from the exterior walls of the building;
  - b. Rooftop equipment that can be easily removed in the future without disturbing historic fabric and is installed in a manner that avoids harming any historic fabric of the building; and,
  - c. Solar panel structures and skylights that have a low profile and are mounted flush with the slope of the roof and are located a minimum of 20 feet from the front façade.
  
7. **Rear yard decks and stairways:** The repair and replacement of rear yard decks and stairways (and associated structural materials) that are not visible from the public way.

The Commission GRANTS this delegation as an interim procedure that will expire within one year of the date of this Motion or may be revoked at any time within the interim period at the Commission's discretion.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Motion was adopted by the Commission at its meeting on May 18, 2011.

Linda D. Avery  
Commission Secretary

AYES:

NAYS:

ABSENT:

ADOPTED: May 18, 2011

## EXHIBIT A

### INTERIM PROCEDURES FOR WORK DETERMINED TO BE MINOR AND DELEGATED TO THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT FOR APPROVAL AS AN ADMINISTRATIVE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 4.135

Section 4.135 of the City Charter provides that the Historic Preservation Commission ("HPC") may, for properties designated individually or within a historic district under Article 10 of the Planning Code, (1) determine alterations considered to be minor in scope; and (2) delegate the ability to approve, disapprove, or modify applications ("Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness") for minor alterations to individual landmarks or properties within historic districts to Planning Department staff. These Administrative Certificates of Appropriateness are appealed directly to the HPC.

The scopes of work identified in Motion No. XXXX are determined to be minor and the review and approval process shall be delegated to the Department under the following interim procedures. These procedures do not include any other entitlements that may be required as part of the proposal and the HPC retains discretion to revise or rescind these procedures as necessary.

- Upon receipt of a Certificate of Appropriateness application, the Department shall review the proposed project to determine if it falls within the HPC's minor scopes of work listed in Motion No. XXXX and shall open a Certificate of Appropriateness case (an "A" case).
- If the proposed project meets the requirements set forth in HPC Motion No. XXXX, for an Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness, the Department shall draft findings that explain how the proposed project complies with the requirements and will issue the Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness.
- If the project does not meet the requirements set forth in HPC Motion No. XXXX or if Department staff finds that the project needs HPC review and approval, then the Department reserves the right to bring the application to the HPC for a public hearing. All regular procedures for the public hearing will be followed.
- If no HPC is required, then the final Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness will include a photograph of the subject building and a minimum of one 11"x17" sheet that illustrates the proposed scope of work.
- The Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness will be sent to each of the HPC Commissioners, the Applicant, as well as any interested parties who make a request in writing to the Department.
- Any member of the public or the HPC may file for a "Request for Hearing" within 20 calendar days of the date of issuance of the Administrative Certificate of

Appropriateness. If no request is received by the Department, then the Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness shall be deemed approved.

- To file for a Request for Hearing, the interested parties shall file an “Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness Request for Hearing Application” with the Department.
- If a Request for Hearing is received by the Department, the hearing will be scheduled and noticed for a future hearing before the HPC.
- The hearing notice shall be mailed to the property owner, project sponsor, applicant, as well as all interested parties who make a request in writing to the Department.
- At the time of the hearing, the HPC may choose to uphold, modify, or disapprove the Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness.



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## Certificate of Appropriateness ADMINISTRATIVE (DRAFT EXAMPLE)

*Date:* June 1, 2011  
*Case No.* 2010.XXXA  
*Project Address:* 890 Grove Street  
*Landmark/District:* Alamo Square Historic District  
*Zoning:* RH-3 (Residential, House, Three-Family)  
*Block/Lot:* 0797/019  
*Applicant:* Tristan Warren  
Architecture Firm  
156 South Park  
San Francisco, CA 94107  
*Staff Contact* Timothy Frye - (415) 558-6625  
[tim.frye@sfgov.org](mailto:tim.frye@sfgov.org)

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

Reception:  
**415.558.6378**

Fax:  
**415.558.6409**

Planning  
Information:  
**415.558.6377**

This is to notify you that pursuant to the process and procedures adopted by the Historic Preservation Commission ("HPC") in Motion No. XXXX and authorized by City Charter Section 4.135, your request for an Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness at **ADDRESS** is determined to be a minor alteration as defined by the HPC.

The scope of work identified in this Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness has been delegated to the Department in accordance with HPC Motion No. XXXX and the Department grants **(APPROVAL OR APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS)** in conformance with the architectural plans dated XXXXXXXX and labeled Exhibit A on file in the docket for Case No. **2010.0000A**.

### ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW STATUS

The Planning Department has determined that the proposed project is exempt/excluded from environmental review; pursuant to CEQA Guideline Section 15301 (**ENTER CLASS HERE e.g. CLASS 1- MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR OF EXISTING FACILITY**) because the project is an alteration of an existing structure and meets the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.

### FINDINGS

The proposed scope of work includes (**INSERT SCOPE e.g. the replacement of five (5) one-over-one double-hung vinyl windows on the front façade with five (5) new one-over-one double-hung wood windows that will match the historic in terms of configuration, materials, details, and finish**) and complies with the following requirements:

**1. Compliance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties:**

- a. The distinguishing historic qualities and character of the building may not be damaged or destroyed.

*No historic fabric is proposed to be removed as part of this proposal.*

- b. The integrity of distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship that characterize a building shall be preserved.

*The proposal will remove existing non-historic vinyl windows at the front façade. No other work is proposed.*

- c. Distinctive architectural features which are deteriorated shall be repaired rather than replaced, whenever possible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material shall match the historic material in composition, design, color, profile, texture and other visual qualities. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features shall be based on historic, physical or pictorial evidence, if available, rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures.

*The new wood windows will match the historic windows in terms of size, configuration, material, and detail and is in keeping with the historic character of the building and the historic district.*

- d. Contemporary design of alterations is permitted, provided that such alterations do not destroy significant exterior architectural materials, including historic storefronts, and that such design is compatible with the size, scale, color, profile, texture, material and character of the building and its surroundings.

*N/A*

- e. All exterior alterations, including signage and awnings, shall be compatible with the character-defining features of the building and/or the historic district.

*The proposal is found to be compatible with the Alamo Square Historic District as outlined in Appendix E of Article 10 of the Planning Code.*

**2. General Plan Compliance.** The proposed Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness, on balance, is consistent with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan:

**I. URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT**

**THE URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT CONCERNS THE PHYSICAL CHARACTER AND ORDER OF THE CITY, AND THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PEOPLE AND THEIR ENVIRONMENT.**

**GOALS**

*The Urban Design Element is concerned both with development and with preservation. It is a concerted effort to recognize the positive attributes of the city, to enhance and conserve those attributes, and to improve the living environment where it is less than satisfactory. The Plan is a definition of quality, a definition based upon human needs.*



OBJECTIVE 1

EMPHASIS OF THE CHARACTERISTIC PATTERN WHICH GIVES TO THE CITY AND ITS NEIGHBORHOODS AN IMAGE, A SENSE OF PURPOSE, AND A MEANS OF ORIENTATION.

POLICY 1.3

*Recognize that buildings, when seen together, produce a total effect that characterizes the city and its districts.*

OBJECTIVE 2

CONSERVATION OF RESOURCES WHICH PROVIDE A SENSE OF NATURE, CONTINUITY WITH THE PAST, AND FREEDOM FROM OVERCROWDING.

POLICY 2.4

*Preserve notable landmarks and areas of historic, architectural or aesthetic value, and promote the preservation of other buildings and features that provide continuity with past development.*

POLICY 2.5

*Use care in remodeling of older buildings, in order to enhance rather than weaken the original character of such buildings.*

POLICY 2.7

*Recognize and protect outstanding and unique areas that contribute in an extraordinary degree to San Francisco's visual form and character.*

The goal of a Certificate of Appropriateness is to provide additional oversight for buildings and districts that are architecturally or culturally significant to the City in order to protect the qualities that are associated with that significance.

The proposed project qualifies for an Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness and therefore furthers these policies and objectives by maintaining and preserving the character-defining features of the subject building and/or Conservation District for the future enjoyment and education of San Francisco residents and visitors.

3. **Prop M Findings.** The proposed project is generally consistent with the eight General Plan priority policies set forth in Section 101.1 in that:

- a. The existing neighborhood-serving retail uses will be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses will be enhanced:

*The proposed project is not neighborhood-serving.*

- b. The existing housing and neighborhood character will be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods:

*The proposed project will strengthen neighborhood character by respecting the character-defining features of the subject building and/or Conservation District in conformance with the requirements set forth in HPC Motion No. XXXX and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.*

- c. The City's supply of affordable housing will be preserved and enhanced:

*The proposed project will have no adverse effect on the City's supply of affordable housing.*

- d. The commuter traffic will not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking:

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

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

*The proposed project will not affect the City's diverse economic base and will not displace any business sectors due to commercial office development.*

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

*Preparedness against injury and loss of life in an earthquake is unaffected by the proposed amendments. Any construction or alteration associated would be executed in compliance with all applicable construction and safety measures.*

- g. That landmark and historic buildings will be preserved:

*The proposed project respects the character-defining features of the subject building and/or Conservation District and is in conformance with the requirements set forth in HPC Motion No. XXXX and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards*

- h. Parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas will be protected from development:

*The proposed Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness will not impact the City's parks and open space.*

For these reasons, the above-cited work is consistent with the intent and requirements outlined in HPC Motion No. XXXX and will not be detrimental to the subject building and/or the historic district.

**REQUEST FOR HEARING:** If you have substantial reason to believe that there was an error in the issuance of this Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness, or abuse of discretion on the part of the Planning Department, you may file for a Request for Hearing with the Historic Preservation Commission within 20 days of the date of this letter. Should you have any questions about the contents of this letter, please contact the Planning Department at 1650 Mission Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor or call 415-575-9121.

cc: Historic Preservation Commission, 1650 Mission Street  
San Francisco Architectural Heritage, 2007 Franklin Street

**[OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES]**