



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## Historic Preservation Commission Motion Final Motion No. 0053

HEARING DATE: MARCH 3, 2010

*Hearing Date:* March 3, 2010  
*Filing Date:* January 21, 2010  
*Case No.:* **2010.0044A**  
*Project Address:* **3224 Market Street**  
*Historic District:* N/A  
*Zoning:* RH-2 (Residential, House, Two-Family)  
40-X Height and Bulk District  
*Block/Lot:* 2704/ 040  
*Applicant:* Michael Bauer and Emily He  
2820 Balboa Street  
San Francisco, CA 94121  
*Staff Contact* Sophie Hayward - (415) 558-6372  
sophie.hayward@sfgov.org  
*Reviewed By* Tina Tam – (415) 558-6325  
[tina.tam@sfgov.org](mailto:tina.tam@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**

**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 040 IN ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 2704, SAN FRANCISCO LANDMARK NUMBER 79, WITHIN AN RH-2 (RESIDENTIAL, HOUSE, TWO-FAMILY) ZONING DISTRICT, AND A 40-X HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICT.**

### PREAMBLE

WHEREAS, on January 21, 2010, Michael Bauer and Emily He (Project Sponsors) filed an application with the San Francisco Planning Department (hereinafter "Department") for a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations include the demolition of the existing wash house, an addition that measures approximately 380 square feet, the addition of roof skylights, the addition of a new roof deck accessed from the existing attic through a hatch skylight door, the removal of an existing exterior door on the south elevation in order to accommodate the proposed horizontal addition, the removal of an existing window on the south elevation in order to accommodate the proposed horizontal addition, the replacement of an existing window on the rear elevation, and the addition of one new window and one new door to the exterior on the rear elevation on the subject building located on Lot 040 in Assessor's Block 2704, San Francisco Landmark Number 79.

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. 2010.0044A ("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 February 11, 2010 and labeled Exhibit A on file in the docket for Case No. 2010.0044A based on the following findings:

#### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

- That the existing wash house will be documented by the Project Architect with as-built drawings and photographs, and that the additional documentation will be added to the case file for Landmark No. 79 (the Miller-Joost House).
- That the total number of roof skylights on the center bay will be reduced to two, including the north skylight which will be used for access to the roof deck.
- That salvaged siding from the wash house will not be used on the east (front) elevation of the existing building in order to differentiate the new addition from the original structure.
- That the new door proposed for the west elevation will be moved in order to provide more space between the window and the new door.

#### **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:

The Historical Preservation Commission has determined that the proposed work is compatible with the character of the landmark as described in the designation report dated November 7, 1975.

- That the proposed horizontal addition at the south side of the subject building will not detract from the historic character of the property and will not cause result in a significant impact to historic material, spaces or features which characterize the property.
- That the proposed horizontal addition will read as an addition, rather than as historic fabric, but will be compatible with the form, scale, details, and finishes of the subject building.
- That the new window and door proposed for the rear elevation will not be visible from the public right-of-way, and will be consistent with the existing fenestration pattern.
- That the proposed roof deck on the north side of the subject building will be constructed on an existing flat roof, and that the access to the deck (via a skylight hatch) and the proposed new railing will be sufficiently set back from the front building wall that the new roof deck will be minimally visible from public rights-of-way and will not impact the ability of the subject property to convey its historic significance.
- That the proposed skylights will be flat on the existing roofline in order to minimize the visual impact of the new openings from public rights-of-way.
- That the proposed demolition of the existing wash house will not negatively impact the historic setting of the subject property.
- That the proposal respects the character-defining features of Landmark 79, the Miller-Joost House.
- The proposed project meets the following Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:

***Standard 1.***

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

***Standard 2.***

*The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*

***Standard 3.***

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

***Standard 4.***

*Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.*

***Standard 5.***

*Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.*

***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.*

**Standard 10.**

*New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*

3. **General Plan Compliance.** The proposed Certificate of Appropriateness is, on balance, 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 a Certificate of Appropriateness and therefore furthers these policies and objectives by maintaining and preserving the character-defining features of the Miller-Joost House (Landmark No. 79) for the future enjoyment and education of San Francisco residents and visitors.*

4. 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 includes alterations to a single-family home and will not have any impact on neighborhood serving retail uses.*

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

*The proposed project will strengthen neighborhood character by respecting the character-defining features of Miller-Joost House (Landmark Number 79) in a manner that is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties.*

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

*The proposed project will have no impact to housing supply.*

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

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

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

*The proposed project will not have any impact on industrial and service sector jobs.*

- 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 work. Any construction or alteration associated will be executed in compliance with all applicable construction and safety measures.*

- G) That landmark and historic buildings will be preserved:

*The proposed project is in conformance with Article 10 of the Planning Code and the Secretary of the Interior's Standard and Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties.*

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

*The proposed project will not impact access to sunlight or vistas for parks and open space.*

5. 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.

**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. 2010.0044A.**

**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. 0053. 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, Wolfrom

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ADOPTED: March 3, 2010

**Motion No. 0053**  
**Hearing Date: March 3, 2010**

**CASE NO 2010.0044A**  
**3224 Market Street**