



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## Historic Preservation Commission Motion No. 0052

HEARING DATE: MARCH 3, 2010

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

Reception:  
**415.558.6378**

Fax:  
**415.558.6409**

Planning  
Information:  
**415.558.6377**

*Filing Date:* February 3, 2010  
*Case No.:* **2010.0070A**  
*Project Address:* **150 Broadway**  
*Zoning:* C-2 (Community Business)  
65-X Height and Bulk District  
*Block/Lot:* 0141/011  
*Applicant:* Joe Camicia  
(415) 722-1183  
*Staff Contact* Angela Threadgill - (415) 558-6602  
angela.threadgill@sfgov.org  
*Reviewed By* Tina Tam – (415) 558-6325  
tina.tam@sfgov.org

**ADOPTING FINDINGS FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR PROPOSED WORK DETERMINED TO BE APPROPRIATE FOR AND CONSISTENT WITH THE PURPOSES OF ARTICLE 10, TO MEET THE STANDARDS OF ARTICLE 10 AND TO MEET THE SECRETARY OF INTERIOR'S STANDARDS FOR REHABILITATION, FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED ON LOT 011 IN ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 0141, WITHIN AN C-2 (COMMUNITY BUSINESS) ZONING DISTRICT, AND A 65-X HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICT.**

### PREAMBLE

WHEREAS, On February 3, 2010, Mr. Joe Camicia (hereinafter "Project Sponsor") filed an application with the San Francisco Planning Department (hereinafter "Department") for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the installation of 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. enclosure (hereinafter "Project") at the subject building located on Lot 011 in Assessor's Block 0141.

WHEREAS, The Project was determined by the Department to be categorically exempt from environmental review. The Historic Preservation Commission (hereinafter "Commission") has reviewed and concurs with said determination.

WHEREAS, On March 3, 2010, the Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing on the current project, Case No. 2010.0070A ("Project") for its appropriateness.

WHEREAS, In reviewing the Application, the Commission has had available for its review and consideration case reports, plans, and other materials pertaining to the Project contained in the

Department's case files, has reviewed and heard testimony and received materials from interested parties during the public hearing on the Project.

**MOVED**, that the Commission hereby grants the Certificate of Appropriateness, in conformance with the architectural plans dated December 9, 2009 and labeled Exhibit A on file in the docket for Case No. 2010.0070A based on the following findings:

## **FINDINGS**

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

1. The above recitals are accurate and also constitute findings of the Commission.
2. Findings pursuant to Article 10:
  - That the proposed wireless communication facilities have been strategically positioned to be minimally visible from adjacent public rights-of-way and public open spaces.
  - That the four (4) proposed wireless communication antennas would be located on a secondary elevation and on an existing rooftop penthouse at a height not to exceed the structure to which the antennas are attached; therefore, no antenna would disrupt the existing cornice or parapet lines.
  - That the equipment cabinets and screen enclosure would be sufficiently setback from street-facing elevations and the height would not exceed approximately 7 feet above the roof surface, or 2 feet above the height of the parapet; thereby reducing visibility.
  - That the new screen enclosure and cabinets are located downslope on the south side of the much taller penthouse, thus hidden within the viewscape from Telegraph Hill.
  - The proposed project meets the following *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*:  
**Standard 9.**  
New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
3. For these reasons, the proposal overall, is appropriate for and consistent with the purposes of Article 10, meets the standards of Article 10, and the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
4. **General Plan Compliance.** The Project is consistent with the Objectives and Policies of the General Plan in that:

## URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT

### Objectives and Policies

#### 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.

5. **Planning Code Section 101.1(b)** establishes eight priority-planning policies and requires review of permits for consistency with said policies. On balance, the project does comply with said policies in that:

- A. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses be enhanced.

*The proposed project would not displace any existing neighborhood-serving businesses.*

- B. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods.

*The proposed project is located in a C-2 Zoning District characterized by low- and mid-rise office uses interspersed with residential and ground-floor commercial uses. The proposed project would not effect the current cultural and economic diversity of the Northeast Waterfront.*

- C. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced,

*Although the proposed Project is located at a site occupied by affordable housing, the Project would not remove or displace the existing affordable housing.*

- D. That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking.

*The proposed Project would not generate commuter traffic nor impede MUNI transit service.*

- E. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced.

*The proposed project would not displace any tenants, and would have no material effect on industrial or service sector space.*

- F. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.

*The Project will conform to the structural and seismic requirements of the San Francisco Building Code through its methods of attachment.*

- G. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved.

*The proposed project would involve a non-contributory building to the Northeast Waterfront Historic District and would have no adverse effect on the building's interior or exterior architectural features. The Project preserves the architectural and historic importance of the District through sensitive placement of the wireless telecommunication facilities.*

- H. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

*The Project will not impact parks, open space, or their access to sunlight or vistas.*

**DECISION**

That based upon the Record, the submissions by the Applicant, the staff of the Department and other interested parties, the oral testimony presented to this Commission at the public hearings, and all other written materials submitted by all parties, the Commission hereby **GRANTS Certificate of Appropriateness No. 2010.0070A** attached hereto as "EXHIBIT A" which is incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth.

**APPEAL AND EFFECTIVE DATE OF MOTION: APPEAL: Any aggrieved person may appeal this Motion to the Board of Appeals within fifteen (15) days after the date of this Motion No. 0052. The effective date of this Motion shall be the date of this Motion. For further information, please contact the Board of Appeals in person at 1650 Mission Street, (Room 304) or call 575-6880.**

I hereby certify that the Historical Preservation Commission ADOPTED the foregoing Motion on March 3, 2010.

Linda D. Avery  
Commission Secretary

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

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ADOPTED: March 3, 2010

EXHIBIT A

# Certificate of Appropriateness

Case No: 2010.0070A

Assessor's Block: Lot: 0141/011

Address of Property: 150 Broadway

Date Application Filed: February 3, 2010

Historic District: Northeast Waterfront Historic District

**Description of Work Proposed:**

The proposed project is for the installation of 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. enclosure (either chain link with dark slats or a solid wall painted to match the penthouse). The antennas will be partially screened and painted to match the surface to which they are attached.

**Final Action by the Historic Preservation Commission on March 3, 2010:**

The Commission has reviewed the proposed work and has determined that the work would not have a significant impact upon and would not be potentially detrimental to the subject building or the Northeast Waterfront Historic District. A motion to **Approve** was passed 7-0 by the Historic Preservation Commission in conformance with the drawings stamped Exhibit A, on file in the docket for **Case No. 2010.0070A**, based upon the following findings:

**Findings of the Historic Preservation Commission:**

- The proposed wireless communication facilities have been strategically positioned to be minimally visible from adjacent public rights-of-way and public open spaces.
- The four (4) proposed wireless communication antennas would be located on a secondary elevation and on an existing rooftop penthouse at a height not to exceed the structure to which the antennas are attached; therefore, no antenna would disrupt the existing cornice or parapet lines.
- The equipment cabinets and screen enclosure would be sufficiently setback from street-facing elevations and the height would not exceed approximately 7 feet above the roof surface, or 2 feet above the height of the parapet; thereby reducing visibility.
- The new screen enclosure and cabinets are located downslope on the south side of the much taller penthouse, thus hidden within the viewscape from Telegraph Hill.
- The proposed project meets the following *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*:

***Standard 9.***

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

For these reasons, the proposal overall, is appropriate for and consistent with the purposes of Article 10, meets the standards of Article 10, and the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

**Duration of this Certificate of Appropriateness:** This Certificate of Appropriateness is issued pursuant to Article 10 of the Planning Code and is valid for a period of three (3) years from the effective date of approval by the Historic Preservation Commission. Implementation of this Certificate of Appropriateness is accomplished by completion of construction work (verified through a job card signed by a District Building Inspector) after issuance of an appropriate Building Permit.

**APPEAL:** Any aggrieved person may appeal the action on this Certificate of Appropriateness by appeal of the issuance of the Building Permit required to implement the proposed work. Contact the Board of Appeals (575-6880) for instructions on filing a permit appeal.

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