



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## Historic Preservation Commission Motion 0062

HEARING DATE: APRIL 21, 2010

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

Reception:  
**415.558.6378**

Fax:  
**415.558.6409**

Planning  
Information:  
**415.558.6377**

*Hearing Date:* April 21, 2010  
*Filing Date:* August 22, 2009  
*Case No.:* **2009.0800A**  
*Project Address:* **921 Minnesota Street**  
*Zoning:* RH-3 (Residential, House, Three-Family)  
40-X Height and Bulk District  
*Block/Lot:* 4107 / 020  
*Applicant:* Shawn Gorman  
366 Pennsylvania Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94107  
*Staff Contact* Ben Fu - (415) 558-6613  
ben.fu@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 020 IN ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 4107, WITHIN AN RH-3 (RESIDENTIAL, HOUSE, THREE-FAMILY) ZONING DISTRICT AND A 40-X HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICT.**

### PREAMBLE

WHEREAS, on August 26, 2009, Shawn Gorman (Project Sponsor) filed an application with the San Francisco Planning Department (hereinafter "Department") for a Certificate of Appropriateness to expand the existing single-family located on the subject property on Lot 020 in Assessor's Block 4107. The work includes (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.

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 April 21, 2010, the Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing on the current project, Case No. 2009.0800A ("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 received July 29, 2009 and labeled Exhibit A on file in the docket for Case No. 2009.0800A 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:

The Historical Preservation Commission has determined that the proposed work is compatible with the character of the Dogpatch Historic District.

- The proposed project would remove existing rear undocumented deck and patio.
- The proposed location of the extension would utilize space on the site that does not currently contribute to the historic character of the district and that would require minimal removal of historic materials.
- The proposed scale of the extension would be compatible with the existing scale of the subject building and setting. The extension would not exceed the height of the existing building at the street frontage.
- The design of the extension would be sufficiently differentiated from the historic buildings through the use of contemporary architectural details while maintaining a compatible appearance through the use of elements such as horizontal wood cladding and framed window openings.
- Historic features dating from the periods of significance (cladding, windows, doors, paving, etc.) would be retained.
- The proposed project would not add any conjectural historical features or features that add a false sense of historical development. The design of the new extension and other new features such as windows and cladding would be clearly distinguished as contemporary features of the site.
- If the proposed extension were removed in the future, the essential historic form and integrity of the subject building would remain intact.

- The proposed project meets the following Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:

**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 5.**

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

**Standard 6.**

*Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*

**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 921 Minnesota Street 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 is for the rehabilitation of a residential property 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 the historic district in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.*

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

*The project will not reduce the affordable housing supply as the existing single-family dwelling is currently occupied by the property owner.*

- 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. The proposal does not increase the number of units on site.*

- 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 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.

*The subject building was designed to conform to the structural and seismic safety requirements of the Building Code. This proposal will not impact the property's ability to withstand an earthquake.*

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

*The proposal will not alter the existing building street façade and is in conformance with Article 10 of the Planning Code and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.*

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

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

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, General Plan and Prop M findings of the Planning Code.

**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** for the property located at Lot 020 in Assessor's Block 4107 for proposed work in conformance with the renderings and architectural sketches dated March 20, 2009, and labeled Exhibit A on file in the docket for Case No. 2009.0800A.

**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. 0062. 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.**

**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. The authorization and right vested by virtue of this action shall be deemed void and canceled if, within 3 years of the date of this Motion, a site permit or building permit for the Project has not been secured by Project Sponsor.

**THIS IS NOT A PERMIT TO COMMENCE ANY WORK OR CHANGE OF OCCUPANCY UNLESS NO BUILDING PERMIT IS REQUIRED.**

**PERMITS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION (and any other appropriate agencies) MUST BE SECURED BEFORE WORK IS STARTED OR OCCUPANCY IS CHANGED.**

I hereby certify that the Historical Preservation Commission ADOPTED the foregoing Motion on April 21, 2010.

Linda D. Avery  
Commission Secretary

AYES: Charles Edwin Chase, Courtney Damkroger, Karl Hasz, Alan Martinez, Diane Matsuda, James Buckley, and Andrew Wolfram

NAYS: NA

ABSENT: NA

ADOPTED: April 21, 2010