



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## Historic Preservation Commission Resolution No. 667

**Planning Code Text Changes: Article 11**  
HEARING DATE: NOVEMBER 2, 2011

*Project Name:* **Proposed Amendments to Article 11**  
*Case Number:* 2011.0167T  
*Initiated by:* John Rahaim, Director of Planning  
*Initiated:* July 8, 2010  
*Staff Contact:* Sophie Hayward, Legislative Affairs  
sophie.hayward@sfgov.org, 415-558-6257  
*Reviewed by:* Tim Frye, Preservation Coordinator  
tim.frye@sfgov.org, 415-575-6822

*Recommendation:* **Approve Article 11 Amendments with Modifications**

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

Reception:  
**415.558.6378**

Fax:  
**415.558.6409**

Planning  
Information:  
**415.558.6377**

**RECOMMENDING THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPT WITH MODIFICATIONS AN ORDINANCE INITIATED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION THAT WOULD AMEND THE PLANNING CODE ARTICLE 11 – PRESERVATION OF BUILDINGS AND DISTRICTS OF ARCHITECTURAL, HISTORIC, AND AESTHETIC IMPORTANCE IN C-3 DISTRICTS PER HPC DRAFT DATED OCTOBER 19, 2011; ADOPTING FINDINGS, INCLUDING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS AND PLANNING CODE SECTION 101.1 FINDINGS.**

### PREAMBLE

WHEREAS, on February 3, 2010, the Planning Director requested that amendments be made to the Planning Code under Case Number 2010.0080T; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Planning Code text changes would amend several sections of the Code and in particular, to Articles 10 and 11; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing to consider the initiation of the proposed Ordinance on July 8, 2010; and

WHEREAS the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 18133 initiating amendments to the Planning Code on July 8, 2010; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing to consider the proposed Ordinance on August 5, 2010; and

WHEREAS the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 18157 recommending approval with modifications of the proposed ordinance to the Board of Supervisors on August 5, 2010; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Charter Section 4.135, any proposed ordinance concerning historic preservation issues must be submitted to the Historic Preservation Commission (“HPC”) for review and recommendation to the Board of Supervisors; and

WHEREAS, the Historic Preservation Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearings to consider the proposed amendments to Articles 10 & 11 on July 21<sup>st</sup>, August 4<sup>th</sup>, 18<sup>th</sup>, September 1<sup>st</sup>, 15<sup>th</sup>, 29<sup>th</sup>, October 6<sup>th</sup>, 15<sup>th</sup> November 3<sup>rd</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> and December 1<sup>st</sup> 2010 and August 17, 2011, September 7, 2011, September 21, 2011, October 5, 2011, October 19, 2011, and November 2, 2011; and

WHEREAS, the Historic Preservation Commission will transmit the October 5, 2011 draft Ordinance to the Planning Commission for its re-review; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Ordinance has been determined to be categorically exempt from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act Section 15060(c); and

WHEREAS, the HPC has heard and considered the testimony presented to it at the public hearing and has further considered written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of Department staff and other interested parties; and

WHEREAS, the all pertinent documents may be found in the files of the Department, as the custodian of records, at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco; and

WHEREAS, the HPC has reviewed the proposed Ordinance; and

**MOVED**, that the HPC hereby recommends that the Board of Supervisors *approve with modifications* the proposed ordinance for Article 11 as detailed in the draft dated November 2, 2011.

## **FINDINGS**

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

1. This Historic Preservation Commission was created in the fall of 2008 when the voters passed amendments to the San Francisco Charter establishing Section 4.135.
2. Article 10 (Preservation of Historical and Architectural and Aesthetic Landmarks) and Article 11 (Preservation of Buildings and Districts of Architectural, Historical, and Aesthetic Importance in the C-3 Districts) are the Planning Code chapters that outline the designation and permit review processes for historic buildings.
3. These Articles have not been updated and do not conform to Charter Section 4.135. The proposed revisions will simply make them consistent with Charter Section 4.135.

4. The additional changes proposed to Articles 10 and 11 will update preservation practices and policies and help streamline the designation and permit review processes.
5. Therefore, the HPC recommends *approval of Article 11 with modifications in the draft dated October 19, 2011 of the proposed Ordinance, which include edits recommended by the City Attorney in order to approve the proposed Ordinance as-to-form.*
6. **General Plan Compliance.** The proposed Ordinance is, on balance, consistent with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan:

#### **I. COMMERCE & INDUSTRY ELEMENT**

THE COMMERCE & INDUSTRY ELEMENT SETS FORTH OBJECTIVES AND POLICES THAT ADDRESS THE BROAD RANGE OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES, FACILITIES AND SUPPORT SYSTEMS THAT CONSTITUTE SAN FRANCISCO'S EMPLOYMENT AND SERVICE BASE. THE PLAN SERVES AS A COMPREHENSIVE GUIDE FOR BOTH THE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTORS WHEN MAKING DECISIONS RELATED TO ECONOMIC GROWTH AND CHANGE.

#### **GOALS**

*The objectives and policies are based on the premise that economic development activities in San Francisco must be designed to achieve three overall goals: 1) Economic Vitality - the first goal is to maintain and expand a healthy, vital and diverse economy which will provide jobs essential to personal well-being and revenues to pay for the services essential to the quality of life in the city; 2) Social Equity - the second goal is to assure that all segments of the San Francisco labor force benefit from economic growth. This will require that particular attention be given to reducing the level of unemployment, particularly among the chronically unemployed and those excluded from full participation by race, language or lack of formal occupational training; and 3) Environmental Quality - the third goal is to maintain and enhance the environment. San Francisco's unique and attractive environment is one of the principal reasons San Francisco is a desirable place for residents to live, businesses to locate, and tourists to visit. The pursuit of employment opportunities and economic expansion must not be at the expense of the environment appreciated by all.*

#### **OBJECTIVE 1**

MANAGE ECONOMIC GROWTH AND CHANGE TO ENSURE ENHANCEMENT OF THE TOTAL CITY LIVING AND WORKING ENVIRONMENT.

#### **POLICY 1.3**

Locate commercial and industrial activities according to a generalized commercial and industrial land use plan.

#### **OBJECTIVE 6**

MAINTAIN AND STRENGTHEN VIABLE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL AREAS EASILY ACCESSIBLE TO CITY RESIDENTS.

#### **POLICY 6.1**

Ensure and encourage the retention and provision of neighborhood-serving goods and services in the city's neighborhood commercial districts, while recognizing and encouraging diversity among the districts.

**POLICY 6.3**

Preserve and promote the mixed commercial-residential character in neighborhood commercial districts. Strike a balance between the preservation of existing affordable housing and needed expansion of commercial activity.

**POLICY 6.8**

Preserve historically and/or architecturally important buildings or groups of buildings in neighborhood commercial districts.

**II. 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.

**III. DOWNTOWN ELEMENT**

THE DOWNTOWN PLAN GROWS OUT OF AN AWARENESS OF THE PUBLIC CONCERN IN RECENT YEARS OVER THE DEGREE OF CHANGE OCCURRING DOWNTOWN — AND OF THE OFTEN CONFLICTING CIVIC OBJECTIVES BETWEEN FOSTERING A VITAL ECONOMY AND RETAINING THE URBAN PATTERNS AND STRUCTURES WHICH COLLECTIVELY FOR THE PHYSICAL ESSENCE OF SAN FRANCISCO.

**OBJECTIVE 1**

MANAGE ECONOMIC GROWTH AND CHANGE TO ENSURE ENHANCEMENT OF THE TOTAL CITY LIVING AND WORKING ENVIRONMENT.

**OBJECTIVE 12**

CONSERVE RESOURCES THAT PROVIDE CONTINUITY WITH SAN FRANCISCO'S PAST.

**Policy 12.1**

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.

*The goal of the proposed Ordinance is to update Articles 10 and 11 to make it conform to Charter Section 4.135.*

7. The proposed replacement 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 Ordinance would not significantly impact existing neighborhood-serving retail uses or opportunities for employment in or ownership of such businesses.*

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 Ordinance will not impact existing housing and neighborhood character.*

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

*The proposed Ordinance will not impact the supply of affordable housing.*

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

*The proposed Ordinance 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 Ordinance would not adversely affect the industrial or service sectors or future opportunities for resident employment or ownership in these sectors.*

- 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.*

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

*The proposed Ordinance will update the Planning Code to reflect Charter Section 4.135 to incorporate the Historic Preservation Commission.*

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

*The proposed Ordinance will not impact the City's parks and open space.*

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED by the San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission on November 2, 2011.

Linda D. Avery  
Commission Secretary

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

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ADOPTED: November 2, 2011

Exhibit A: Draft Ordinance with amendments to Article 11