



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

Historic Resource Evaluation Response

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

Project Address: **448 Diamond**
Block/Lot: 2768/008
Case No.: 2010.0353E
Date of Review: May 21, 2010
Planning Dept. Reviewer: Sophie Hayward
(415) 558-6372 | sophie.hayward@sfgov.org

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

PROPOSED PROJECT Demolition Alteration

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project includes the demolition of the existing single-family home, and the construction of a new, single-family home. According to the information submitted by the Project Sponsor, the existing subject building includes approximately 2,600 square feet, including one off-street parking space. As proposed, the new building will measure approximately 4,800 square feet including two off-street parking spaces.

PRE-EXISTING HISTORIC RATING / SURVEY

The County Assessor’s records indicate that the building was constructed in 1908, which is consistent with information submitted by the Project Sponsor. Although the subject building is not included on any historic surveys and is not included on the National or the California Registers, its recorded date of construction makes it a “Category B” building for the purposes of CEQA review by the Planning Department.¹ It does not appear that the subject building is an historic resource for the purposes of CEQA review.

HISTORIC DISTRICT / NEIGHBORHOOD CONTEXT

The subject building is located on the west side of Diamond Street in the block between 21st and 22nd Street, within an RH-2 Zoning District in the Noe Valley Neighborhood. The subject building is located on a block characterized by a range of architectural styles (including buildings constructed in Edwardian, modified Queen Anne, and contemporary architectural styles) and dates of construction. It does not appear that the subject property is located within a potential historic district for the purposes of CEQA.

- 1. California Register Criteria of Significance:** Note, a building may be an historical resource if it meets any of the California Register criteria listed below. If more information is needed to make such a determination please specify what information is needed. *(This determination for California Register Eligibility is made based on existing data and research provided to the Planning Department by the above*

¹ Please see “Preservation Bulletin #16,” available online at: http://www.sfgov.org/site/uploadedfiles/planning/projects_reports/PresBulletin16CEQA10_8_04.PDF (November 2, 2007)

named preparer / consultant and other parties. Key pages of report and a photograph of the subject building are attached.)

- Event: or Yes No Unable to determine
Persons: or Yes No Unable to determine
Architecture: or Yes No Unable to determine
Information Potential: Further investigation recommended.
District or Context: Yes, may contribute to a potential district or significant context

If Yes; Period of significance:

Notes: Below is an evaluation of the subject property against the criteria for inclusion on the California Register; it does not appear that the subject property is eligible for the California Register. The Project Sponsor submitted an Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE), prepared by Tim Kelly of Kelly and VerPlanck, dated November, 2007. The report finds that the subject property is neither individually eligible for the California Register, nor that the subject building is located within a potential historic district. Staff concurs with the submitted report.²

Criterion 1: It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States;

Based on a review of historic Sanborn Fire Insurance Survey maps, it appears that the existing pattern of neighborhood development on Diamond Street at this location occurred after the 1906 Earthquake and fire. Both the 1886 and the 1900 Sanborn Maps show that the subject block was very sparsely populated immediately preceding the earthquake, which is likely because, as noted in the submitted HRE, "Collingwood and Diamond Streets south of 20th Street were not paved, therefore access to the subject block would have been difficult."³ It does not appear that the subject building is associated with a specific event that has made a significant contribution to broad patterns of local or regional history, and that the subject building is not eligible for listing on the California Register under Criterion 1.

Criterion 2: It is associated with the lives of persons important in our local, regional, or national past;

There is no known association between the subject property and persons important in our local, regional, or national past. The first known owners and occupants of the subject lot were Scottish immigrants Donald and Jane Munroe. It does not appear that the subject building is eligible for listing on the California Register under Criterion 2.

Criterion 3: It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values;

² "Historic Resource Evaluation Report," Kelly and VerPlanck (November, 2007). The report is included in the case docket (Case No. 2010.0353E) for the proposed project, and is available for viewing by request at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, 4th Floor, San Francisco, CA, 94103.

³ Ibid., Page 11.

The subject building is rectangular in plan with a gabled roof, and is a two-story-over-basement, wood-frame, single-family dwelling designed in a modified Queen Anne architectural style. The subject building is clad in vinyl siding and supported by a concrete foundation. The street-facing elevation has two bays; the south bay features a bay window with aluminum slider windows with a garage centered below. The north bay features the primary entrance, accessed by concrete steps from grade that lead to an enclosed porch.

While the subject building is similar in style to many buildings in the Noe Valley, Glen Park, Bernal Heights, and Excelsior neighborhoods, it does not appear to be individually eligible for the California Register, nor does it appear to be architecturally distinctive. Staff concurs with the summary statement included in the submitted HRE, which notes that the subject building can not be "demonstrated to contribute to the evolution of 'an important phase of the architectural development of the area or community...'"

It does not appear that the subject building is representative of a type, period, region, or method of construction. It does not appear that the subject building is significant based on Criterion 3.

Criterion 4: It yields, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history;

It does not appear that the subject property is likely to yield information important to a better understanding of prehistory or history.

2. **Integrity** is the ability of a property to convey its significance. To be a resource for the purposes of CEQA, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the California Register criteria, but it also must have integrity. To retain historic integrity a property will always possess several, and usually most, of the aspects. The subject property has retained or lacks integrity from the period of significance noted above:

Location:	<input type="checkbox"/> Retains	<input type="checkbox"/> Lacks	Setting:	<input type="checkbox"/> Retains	<input type="checkbox"/> Lacks
Association:	<input type="checkbox"/> Retains	<input type="checkbox"/> Lacks	Feeling:	<input type="checkbox"/> Retains	<input type="checkbox"/> Lacks
Design:	<input type="checkbox"/> Retains	<input type="checkbox"/> Lacks	Materials:	<input type="checkbox"/> Retains	<input type="checkbox"/> Lacks
Workmanship:	<input type="checkbox"/> Retains	<input type="checkbox"/> Lacks			

Notes: Evaluation of integrity is not applicable as the subject building has not been shown to be significant under California Register criteria.

3. **Determination Whether the property is an "historical resource" for purposes of CEQA**

No Resource Present (*Go to 6. below*) Historical Resource Present (*Continue to 4.*)

4. If the property appears to be an historical resource, whether the proposed project would materially impair the resource (i.e. alter in an adverse manner those physical characteristics which justify the property's inclusion in any registry to which it belongs).

The project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the resource such that the significance of the resource would be materially impaired. (Continue to 5. if the project is an alteration).

The project is a significant impact as proposed. (Continue to 5. if the project is an alteration)


5. Character-defining features of the building to be retained or respected in order to avoid a significant adverse effect by the project, presently or cumulatively.

6. Whether the proposed project may have an adverse effect on off-site historical resources, such as adjacent historic properties.

Yes No Unable to determine

Notes: As noted above, the subject building does not appear to be an historic resource, nor does it appear to be located within a potential historic district. It does not appear that the proposed project would have an adverse effect on off-site historical resources.

PRESERVATION COORDINATOR REVIEW

Signature: 
Tim Frye, Acting Preservation Coordinator

Date: 5/24/10

CC:

Linda Avery, Commission Secretary, Historic Preservation Commission
Viraliza Byrd / Historic Resource Impact Review File

G:\DOCUMENTS\historic\448 Diamond Street.doc