

File No. 190275

Committee Item No. _____

Board Item No. 30

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: _____

Date: _____

Board of Supervisors Meeting

Date: April 16, 2019

Cmte Board

- | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Motion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Resolution |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Ordinance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Legislative Digest |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Budget and Legislative Analyst Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Youth Commission Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Introduction Form |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | MOU |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Information Form |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Subcontract Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Contract/Agreement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Award Letter |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Public Correspondence |

OTHER

- | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>Appeal Letter - March 4, 2019</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>Planning Department Appeal Response - April 8, 2019</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <u>Hearing Notice and Clerical Documents</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |

Prepared by: Brent Jalipa

Date: April 11, 2019

Prepared by: _____

Date: _____



LUBIN OLSON & NIEWIADOMSKI LLP

THE TRANSAMERICA PYRAMID
600 MONTGOMERY STREET, 14TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111
TEL 415 981 0550 FAX 415 981 4343 WEB lubinolson.com

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2019 MAR -4 PM 3:42

BY

March 4, 2019

CHARLES R. OLSON
Direct Dial: (415) 955-5020
E-mail: colson@lubinolson.com

HAND DELIVERY

Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Attn: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

**RE: Appeal of 2016-010079CUA Categorical Exemption
3620 Buchanan Street (the "Project")**

Dear President Yee and Honorable Members of the Board of Supervisors:

Our firm represents 1598 Bay Condominium Association ("1598 Bay"), the homeowner's association for the property located at 1598 Bay Street, which is immediately adjacent to 3620 Buchanan Street (the "Project"). This letter provides the following Statement of Appeal for a finding of Categorical Exemption under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). The Project consists of the demolition of one of two structures on one shared parcel, which parcel is subject to a Landmark Preservation Ordinance as explained below, and the construction of a new 4-story, eight unit residential building. The Planning Department determined that the Project qualified for a Class 32 Urban In-Fill Development Categorical Exemption despite the fact that the proposed Project could result in significant effects as a result of the likely presence of hazardous materials at the Project site and could adversely impact the significance of a historic resource. The Board of Supervisors should overturn the Planning Department's decision to issue a Categorical Exemption to support the Project's approvals and return the Project to staff for additional environmental review. 1598 Bay is also concurrently appealing the Project's Conditional Use Authorization in a separate statement of appeal.

The proposed Project does not qualify for reliance on the Class 32 exemption for several reasons. CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2 establishes exceptions to the application of a categorical exemption for a project. Furthermore, pursuant to San Francisco Planning Commission Resolution No. 14952, for Class 32 exemptions, this categorical exemption may be used only where it can be seen with certainty that the proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment. This is the same standard that appears in CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3), the so-called "general rule exemption", which is rarely relied upon in CEQA determinations because of the very high legal threshold involved. Given the facts below, this high threshold cannot be met, and the Planning Department could not provide with certainty that the proposed Project would not have a significant effect on the environment.

First, CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2(e) provides that a categorical exemption shall not be used for a project located on a site that is included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code. According to the “Hazardous Waste – EnviroStor/Geotracker” Database map attached hereto as Exhibit A and the Mediated Investigation of MGP Residues Case Report attached hereto as Exhibit B, the Project site is either located on or immediately adjacent to an identified site listed in Government Code Section 65962.5, which may result in a risk to the proposed Project, construction workers, neighbors and future residents. The Project site is also within a Maher Area, which means that it is on a site with known or suspected soil and/or groundwater contamination. In addition, as indicated in the Project’s Environmental Evaluation, the proposed Project would require the disturbance of more than 50 cubic yards of soil. The Project sponsor should prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for the Planning Department’s review in order to document the soil and groundwater conditions underlying the Project site, especially considering its location next to a former manufactured gas plant (which included a 250,000 cubic foot gas holding tank) then-turned gas station (which included underground storage tanks). The California Department of Toxic Substances Control apparently has also determined that contaminated soil (to a depth of 15 feet) will need to be removed from the Project site. As 1598 Bay is concerned that contaminated soils exist underneath the Project, the Planning Department should carefully review and analyze the results of any Phase I Environmental Site Assessment before determining that the Project would not result in significant impacts related to hazardous materials. If any cleanup of hazardous materials is required, the California Department of Toxic Substances Control and the Department of Public Health should work in concert with the Project sponsor to prepare a work plan in compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations related to hazardous materials. At this juncture, the Planning Department cannot be certain that the Project would not have a significant effect on the environment with regards to hazardous materials as construction workers, future residents and occupants of neighboring properties could be affected.

Second, CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2, subdivision (f), provides that a categorical exemption shall not be used for a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. The proposed Project is located on the same lot that contains the Merryvale Antiques building, the courtyard, and the garden house, all of which are designated as part of Landmark No. 58 (the designating ordinance applies to the entire property and is attached hereto as Exhibit C). While the Historic Preservation Commission (“HPC”) approved the Certificate of Appropriateness for the Project by a 4-3 vote, the HPC did not appear to consider the spaces and spatial relationships of the Landmark site. The garden house will be demolished and a portion of the existing landscaped courtyard will be significantly diminished by approximately 25% to 33% based on the scope of the proposed Project. This will severely impact the spatial relationships between the Merryvale Antiques building and the proposed Project, and cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the historic resource as it involves a “physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource *or its immediate surroundings* such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired.” See CEQA Guidelines 15064.5(b)(1) (emphasis added). As such, the demolition of a portion of Landmark No. 58 will be a significant impact under CEQA. An exception to the Class


President Norman Yee and
Honorable Members of the Board of Supervisors
March 4, 2019
Page 3

32 Urban Infill Categorical Exemption applies. The Planning Department should require the Project to undergo further environmental review, including the preparation of an initial study and a focused environmental impact report to address this issue.

Third, CEQA Guidelines Section 15332(a) requires that Class 32 In-Fill Development Projects meet a number of conditions, including the condition that the project is "consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations." Pursuant to the NC-2 (Neighborhood Commercial) District's zoning regulations and Planning Code Section 134, the proposed Project requires a rear yard modification because it provides no rear yard where a rear yard of at least 25% of lot depth is required, but in no case less than 15 feet. Nor can the proposed Project satisfy any of the three conditions to granting a rear yard modification under Planning Code Section 134(e). The proposed Project does not indicate how it will be able to provide a comparable amount of usable open space nor is that calculation and analysis located anywhere in the Project's Conditional Use Authorization. Accordingly, the Project is not consistent with the zoning (Planning Code) regulations and a Class 32 exemption cannot be used.

We respectfully request that the Board of Supervisors affirm the appeal, and require the Project to undergo additional environmental review.

Sincerely,



Charles R. Olson

CRO/CJL

cc: Jody Knight, Esq. (jknight@reubenlaw.com)
Laura Ajello, San Francisco Planning Department (laura.ajello@sfgov.org)
1598 Bay Condominium Association

Enclosures: Copy of the CEQA Exemption Determination
Appeal to Board of Supervisors Fee

EXHIBIT A

“Hazardous Waste – EnviroStor/Geotracker” Database Map




EXHIBIT B

Mediated Investigation of MGP Residues Case Report



| CASE SUMMARY | | |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <u>REPORT DATE</u> <u>HAZARDOUS MATERIAL INCIDENT REPORT FILED WITH OES?</u> | | |
| <u>I. REPORTED BY -</u> | | <u>CREATED BY</u> |
| UNKNOWN | | UNKNOWN |
| <u>III. SITE LOCATION</u> | | |
| <u>FACILITY NAME</u> | | <u>FACILITY ID</u> |
| Mediated Investigation of MGP Residues | | |
| <u>FACILITY ADDRESS</u> | | <u>ORIENTATION OF SITE TO STREET</u> |
| 1575 North Point Street | | |
| San Francisco, CA 94123 | | <u>CROSS STREET</u> |
| SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY | | |
| <u>V. SUBSTANCES RELEASED / CONTAMINANT(S) OF CONCERN</u> | | |
| LEAD | | |
| POLYNUCLEAR AROMATIC HYDROCARBONS (PAHS) | | |
| <u>VI. DISCOVERY/ABATEMENT</u> | | |
| <u>DATE DISCHARGE BEGAN</u> | | |
| <u>DATE DISCOVERED</u> | <u>HOW DISCOVERED</u> | <u>DESCRIPTION</u> |
| <u>DATE STOPPED</u> | <u>STOP METHOD</u> | <u>DESCRIPTION</u> |
| <u>VII. SOURCE/CAUSE</u> | | |
| <u>SOURCE OF DISCHARGE</u> | | <u>CAUSE OF DISCHARGE</u> |
| <u>DISCHARGE DESCRIPTION</u> | | |
| <u>VIII. CASE TYPE</u> | | |
| <u>CASE TYPE</u> | | |
| Soil | | |
| Other Groundwater (uses other than drinking water) | | |
| <u>IX. REMEDIAL ACTION</u> | | |
| NO REMEDIAL ACTIONS ENTERED | | |
| <u>X. GENERAL COMMENTS</u> | | |
| <p>This case is a court-mediated investigation of manufactured gas plant residues in the Fisherman's Wharf and Marina neighborhoods for areas not already under oversight by the Regional Water Board or DTSC. Related projects where the Water Board is the lead regulatory agency include: SF Marina East Harbor (T10000005263) and Pier 39 Marina Sediment (T10000007367).</p> <p>DTSC is the lead regulatory agency for several sites with MGP-related residues including: PG&E Former Fillmore Manufactured Gas Plant (EnviroStor ID #60001254) PG&E Former North Beach Manufactured Gas Plant (EnviroStor ID #60001239) PG&E Former Beach Street Manufactured Gas Plant (EnviroStor ID #60001256) 1598 Bay Street (EnviroStor ID #60002282)</p> | | |

XI. CERTIFICATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE INFORMATION REPORTED HEREIN
IS TRUE AND ACCURATE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE.

XII. REGULATORY USE ONLY

LOCAL AGENCY CASE NUMBER

REGIONAL BOARD CASE NUMBER

T10000008919

LOCAL AGENCY

UNKNOWN

REGIONAL BOARD

| <u>CONTACT NAME</u> | <u>INITIALS</u> | <u>ORGANIZATION NAME</u> | <u>EMAIL ADDRESS</u> |
|--|---------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| ROSS STEENSON | RAS | SAN FRANCISCO BAY RWQCB (REGION 2) | rsteenson@waterboards.ca.gov |
| <u>ADDRESS</u> | | <u>CONTACT DESCRIPTION</u> | |
| 1515 Clay St., Ste 1400 OAKLAND, CA 94612 | | | |
| <u>PHONE TYPE</u> | <u>PHONE NUMBER</u> | <u>EXTENSION</u> | |
| PHONE | (510)-622-2445 | | |

[Back to Top](#)

[Conditions of Use](#)

[Privacy Policy](#)

[Accessibility](#)

[Contact Us](#)

Copyright © 2015 State of California

EXHIBIT C

Designating Ordinance for Landmark No. 58

0988700002/669685v3

1 DESIGNATING MERRYVALE ANTIQUES AS A LANDMARK PURSUANT TO ARTICLE 10 OF THE CITY
2 PLANNING CODE.

3 Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

4 Section 1. The Board of Supervisors hereby finds that Merryvale Antiques at
5 6640 Buchanan Street, being Lot 3 in Assessor's Block 459, has a special character
6 and special historical, architectural and aesthetic interest and value, and that its
7 designation as a Landmark will be in furtherance of and in conformance with the
8 purposes of Article 10 of the City Planning Code and the standards set forth therein.


9 (a) Designation. Pursuant to Section 1004 of the City Planning Code,
10 Chapter II, Part II of the San Francisco Municipal Code, Merryvale Antiques is
11 hereby designated as a Landmark, this designation having been duly approved by
12 Resolution No. 7076 of the City Planning Commission, which Resolution is on file
13 with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors under File No.

14 (b) Required Data. The location and boundaries of the landmark site, the
15 characteristics of the landmark which justify its designation, and the particular
16 features that should be preserved, described and included in the said Resolution,
17 are hereby incorporated herein and made a part hereof as though fully set forth.

18
19
20
21
22
23 APPROVED AS TO FORM:
24 THOMAS M. O'CONNOR
CITY ATTORNEY

RECOMMENDED:
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

25
26
27
28 By _____
Deputy City Attorney

By 
Allan B. Jacobs
Director of Planning

FILE NO. _____

ORDINANCE NO. _____

1 DESIGNATING MERRYVALE ANTIQUES AS A LANDMARK PURSUANT TO ARTICLE 10 OF THE CITY
2 PLANNING CODE.

3 Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

4 Section 1. The Board of Supervisors hereby finds that Merryvale Antiques at
5 2640 Buchanan Street, being Lot 3 in Assessor's Block 459, has a special character
6 and special historical, architectural and aesthetic interest and value, and that its
7 designation as a Landmark will be in furtherance of and in conformance with the
8 purposes of Article 10 of the City Planning Code and the standards set forth therein.

9 (a) Designation. Pursuant to Section 1004 of the City Planning Code,
10 Chapter II, Part II of the San Francisco Municipal Code, Merryvale Antiques is
11 hereby designated as a Landmark, this designation having been duly approved by
12 Resolution No. 7076 of the City Planning Commission, which Resolution is on file
13 with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors under File No.

14 (b) Required Data. The location and boundaries of the landmark site, the
15 characteristics of the landmark which justify its designation, and the particular
16 features that should be preserved, described and included in the said Resolution,
17 are hereby incorporated herein and made a part hereof as though fully set forth.


18
19
20
21
22
23 APPROVED AS TO FORM:

RECOMMENDED:

24 THOMAS M. O'CONNOR
CITY ATTORNEY

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

25
26
27
28 By _____
Deputy City Attorney

By 
Allen B. Jacobs
Director of Planning

29
30
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

SAN FRANCISCO BEAUTIFUL
TO MAINTAIN, RETAIN AND CREATE CIVIC BEAUTY
200 GREEN STREET • SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94133 • GA 1-2608
DOWNTOWN OFFICE: 120 BUSH STREET • SAN FRANCISCO, CA. 94104 • YU 6-1010

December 8, 1973

Planning and Development Committee
Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
Room 228 - City Hall
San Francisco, California 94102


TO: Supervisors Feinstein, Gonzales
and vonBeroldingen.

SAN FRANCISCO BEAUTIFUL wishes to support
the ordinance designating the Haslett
Warehouse located at 680 Beach Street, as
a landmark.

We wish to support also a similar ordinance
designating Merryvale Antiques located at
3450 Buchanan Street as a landmark.

These buildings are both not only of great-
est historic value but also are an economic
asset to their surroundings.

Sincerely,



(Mrs. Hans Klussmann)

P. D. 90-73-8



DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING 100 LARKIN STREET · SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102

November 13, 1973

Robert J. Dolan
Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors
235 City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Mr. Dolan:

In accordance with Article 10 of the City Planning Code, there is transmitted herewith for appropriate action a proposed ordinance for designation of a Landmark which designation was approved by the City Planning Commission in its Resolution No. 7076.

Three copies of the proposed ordinance and of the Resolution are enclosed.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Allan B. Jacobs".

Allan B. Jacobs
Director of Planning

Enclosures



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

100 LARKIN STREET · CIVIC CENTER · SAN FRANCISCO 2, CALIFORNIA

Landmark Submission
Case No. LM 73.3
November 1973

TO: Members of the Board of Supervisors
FROM: Director of Planning
RE: Approval of proposed designation as a landmark of:
Merryvale Antiques at 3640 Buchanan Street

Submitted herewith is background information on the above proposed designation which was approved by the City Planning Commission and is now before the Board of Supervisors for consideration in accordance with Article 10 of the City Planning Code.

1. The City Planning Commission Resolution No. 7076 approving the proposed designation at hearing of September 20, 1973. Attached to this resolution and incorporated into it, is
2. The Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board Resolution No. 88. This resolution incorporates all the historic and architectural description of the structure which appeared in the background case report prepared for that Board.
3. Additional information relative to ownership and surrounding land use of the subject property.
4. Excerpts from the minutes of the City Planning Commission meeting of September 20, 1973.

SAN FRANCISCO

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

RESOLUTION NO. 7076

WHEREAS, A proposal to designate Merryvale at 3640 Buchanan Street as a Landmark pursuant to the provisions of Article 10 of the City Planning Code was initiated by the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board on August 22, 1973, and said Advisory Board, after due consideration, has recommended approval of this proposal; and

WHEREAS, The City Planning Commission, after due notice given, held a public hearing on September 20, 1973, to consider the proposed designation and the report of said Advisory Board; and

WHEREAS, The Commission believes that the proposed Landmark has a special character and special historical, architectural and aesthetic interest and value; and that the proposed designation would be in furtherance of and in conformance with the purposes and standards of the said Article 10;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, First, that the proposal to designate Merryvale at 3640 Buchanan Street as a Landmark pursuant to Article 10 of the City Planning Code is hereby APPROVED, the location and boundaries of the landmark site being as follows:

Beginning at the point of intersection of the southerly line of North Point Street and the easterly line of Buchanan Street; thence easterly along the southerly line of North Point Street for a distance of 118 feet; thence at a right angle southerly for a distance of 69.917 feet; thence at a right angle westerly for a distance of 68.803 feet; thence at a right angle southerly for a distance of 104.75 feet; thence at a right angle westerly for a distance of 49.917 feet; thence at a right angle northerly along the easterly line of Buchanan Street for a distance of 174.667 feet to the point of beginning. Being Lot 3 in Assessor's Block 459, which property is known as 3640 Buchanan Street.

Second, That the special character and special historical, architectural and aesthetic interest and value of the said Landmark justifying its designation are set forth in the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board Resolution No. 88 as adopted on August 22, 1973, which resolution is incorporated herein and made a part hereof as though fully set forth;

Third, That the said Landmark should be preserved generally in all of its particular exterior features as existing on the date hereof and as described and depicted in the photographs, case report and other material on file in the Department of City Planning Docket LM 73-3;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Commission hereby directs its Secretary to transmit the proposal for designation, with a copy of this Resolution, to the Board of Supervisors for appropriate action.

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

RESOLUTION NO. 7076
Page Two

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED by the City Planning Commission at its regular meeting of September 20, 1973.

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

AYES: Commissioners Farrell, Fleishhacker, Porter, Ritchie, Rueda

NOES: None

ABSENT: Commissioners Mellon, Newman

PASSED: September 20, 1973

LANDMARKS PRESERVATION ADVISORY BOARD

of the

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

RESOLUTION NO. 88

WHEREAS, A proposal to designate Merryvale at 3640 Buchanan Street as a Landmark pursuant to the provisions of Article 10 of the City Planning Code has been heard and considered by the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board; and

WHEREAS, The Advisory Board believes that the proposed Landmark has a special character and special historical, architectural and aesthetic interest and value; and that the proposed designation would be in furtherance of and in conformance with the purposes and standards of said Article 10;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, First, that this Advisory Board intends to and does hereby formally initiate proceedings for the designation as a Landmark pursuant to the provisions of Article 10 of the City Planning Code of Merryvale at 3640 Buchanan Street; and that this Board recommends to the City Planning Commission that this designation proposal be APPROVED; the location and boundaries of the landmark site being as follows:

Beginning at the point of intersection of the southerly line of North Point Street and the easterly line of Buchanan Street; thence easterly along the southerly line of North Point Street for a distance of 118 feet; thence at a right angle southerly for a distance of 69.917 feet; thence at a right angle westerly for a distance of 68.803 feet; thence at a right angle southerly for a distance of 104.75 feet; thence at a right angle westerly for a distance of 49.917 feet; thence at a right angle northerly along the easterly line of Buchanan Street for a distance of 174.667 feet to the point of beginning.

Being Lot 3 in Assessor's Block 459, which property is known as 3640 Buchanan Street.

Second, that the special character and special historical, architectural and aesthetic interest and value of the said Landmark justifying its designation are as follows:

Established in 1873, the San Francisco Gas Light Company was the result of a series of mergers of various companies, the earliest of which was the San Francisco Gas Company, founded in 1852 by Forty-niners Peter Donahue and his brother James. The brothers, with other family members, had previously established the first iron works in California in 1849. Peter Donahue, to whose memory the Mechanics Monument at Market, Bush and Sansome Streets is erected, also headed the successful completion of the second railroad in California which ran between San Francisco and San Jose.

Within the merged gas companies, Peter Donahue held various offices, the last being that of President of San Francisco Gas Light Company from which he resigned in 1883, one year before his death. Upon his resignation, the Presidency of the San Francisco Gas Light

Company was passed on to Eugene P. Murphy who was succeeded in 1885 by Joseph B. Crockett. Although still extremely young, Mr. Crockett had been with the company since its founding twelve years earlier during which time he conceived the idea of a new gas works which would not only be modern but would also be more than adequate for the growing City's immediate needs. In 1884, under his direction, the company purchased three blocks between Webster, Laguna and Bay Streets with the northerly boundary being the Bay itself. In 1891 construction began on the predominately brick buildings which would comprise the new gas works. Also included was an oiler dock - oil was to replace more expensive coal in operating the boilers - a gasometer, and two storage tanks, one with a capacity of two million cubic feet making it the largest of its kind west of Chicago.

Upon its completion in 1893, the complex was hailed as the most modern and best designed in the United States, a tribute to Joseph B. Crockett to whom its design and architecture are attributed. The headquarters building, now occupied by Merryvale, Inc., antiques, and which is the only building of the original complex still standing, housed the company's business offices in the front, upstairs living quarters for the plant manager, and in the main room to the rear, two large gas compression cylinders whose operation was dependent on water pumped from the Bay. The warmed water, returned to the Bay through large pipes, made swimming in what has ever since been known as Gas House Cove, popular indeed.

On December 11, 1896, the firm merged with Edison Light and Power, the whole becoming the San Francisco Gas & Electric Company which was absorbed by Pacific Gas & Electric Company in 1905. By 1906, and after, this building was being used solely for storing company records, a use it continued to serve until it was sold to the present owners in the mid-1950's.

The handsomely-landscaped and spacious areas between the buildings in the original complex were used by refugees following the 1906 Earthquake and Fire as photographs of the period show. Also shown is the damage to a gas storage tank and an arched brick building.

The extremely sensitive restoration (by Mr. and Mrs. Dent W. MacDonough who engaged William Wurster of Wurster, Bernardi & Emmons for this work) and the re-use of the former headquarters building to display primarily Eighteenth Century antiques has been masterful. The most impressive interior feature is the main room which formerly housed the turbines. This two-story room is 28 feet high and approximately 50 feet square; large arched windows of hand-rolled glass contrast with walls of exposed brick, the whole being surmounted by a particularly handsome coffered ceiling, each large redwood square of which is set off by great beams. The former front offices are distinguished by paneled dados, high ceilings and tall, narrow doors with transoms above.

A year after Merryvale's formal opening in 1958, the owners added an equally impressive garden shop to the south which is directly accessible from the main building.

Also of interest is the iron fence which encloses the front lawn; it is similar to the original and was paced as part of the restoration.

Third, that the said Landmark should be preserved generally in all of its particular exterior features as existing on the date hereof and as described and depicted in the photographs, case report and other material on file in the Department of City Planning in Docket No. LM 73.3, the summary description being as follows:

Richardsonian-Romanesque in its styling, this red brick rectangular building is, except for a corner tower, of uniform height. It is capped by a hipped roof, without projecting eaves, resting on a corbelled cornice. On its narrower facade facing Buchanan Street, a centered arched main entrance is assymetrically balanced by the Queen Anne tower to the left whose conical roof rises to its apex at an elevation slightly higher than that of the roof ridge behind. From the exterior, the fenestration reflects the interior division of the building into two elements: the front, or westerly, one-third possessing windows indicating two floors with a heavy string course of brickwork at the upper floor level; the remaining two-thirds of the building, equal in height to the front, contains tall windows, divided into panes with fanlights above, whose sill line is uniform with those on the lower floor at the front, but whose tops extend upward about three-quarters of the total wall height. On its south elevation, two-story pilasters divide the building into six evenly spaced bays. However, on the north, along North Point Street, this same division is only partially carried out, the pilasters here defining only the four bays containing the taller windows. The rear of the building is divided, also by two-story pilasters, into three bays slightly wider than those on the north and south sides. The center bay houses a double doorway extending its full width and equal in height to the windows in the adjacent bays. The doorway is topped by a flattened arch similar in its arc to that above the second story windows on the front portion of the building; all other windows and the main entry have semi-circular arched tops. All wall openings are surmounted and protected by slightly projecting cast stone moldings and, except for that over the main entrance, are divided into sections containing a patera. The main entrance arch, resting on short brick pilasters, frames a recessed doorway; here a deeper molding than that over the windows retains the name of the original occupant of the structure:

S.F. GAS LIGHT CO.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board hereby directs its Secretary to report this action and to submit a copy of this Resolution to the Planning Commission for further action in accordance with the said Article 10.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board at its regular meeting of August 22, 1973.

Edward N. Michael
Secretary to the Board

AYES: de Losada, Jacobs, ~~Platt~~, Shumate, Whisler

NOES: None

ABSENT: Mailliard, McGloin, Whitaker

DATED: August 22, 1973

OWNER: Merryvale, Incorporated. (Mr. & Mrs. Dent W. Macdonough)

LOCATION: 3640 Buchanan, the southeast corner of Buchanan and North Point Streets, being Lot 3 in Assessor's Block 459.

HISTORY: Established in 1873, the San Francisco Gas Light Company was the result of a series of mergers of various companies, the earliest of which was the San Francisco Gas Company, founded in 1852 by Forty-niners Peter Donahue and his brother James. The brothers, with other family members, had previously established the first iron works in California in 1849. Peter Donahue, to whose memory the Mechanics Monument at Market, Bush and Sansome Streets is erected, also headed the successful completion of the second railroad in California which ran between San Francisco and San Jose.

Within the merged gas companies, Peter Donahue held various offices, the last being that of President of San Francisco Gas Light Company from which he resigned in 1883, one year before his death. Upon his resignation, the Presidency of the San Francisco Gas Light Company was passed on to Eugene P. Murphy who was succeeded in 1885 by Joseph B. Crockett. Although still extremely young, Mr. Crockett had been with the company since its founding twelve years earlier during which time he conceived the idea of a new gas works which would not only be modern but would also be more than adequate for the growing City's immediate needs. In 1884, under his direction, the company purchased three blocks between Webster, Laguna and Bay Streets with the northerly boundary being the Bay itself. In 1891 construction began on the predominately brick buildings which would comprise the new gas works. Also included was an oiler dock - oil was to replace more expensive coal in operating the boilers - a gasometer, and two storage tanks, one with a capacity of two million cubic feet making it the largest of its kind west of Chicago.

Upon its completion in 1893, the complex was hailed as the most modern and best designed in the United States, a tribute to Joseph B. Crockett to whom its design and architecture are attributed. The headquarters building, now occupied by Merryvale, Inc., antiques, and which is the only building of the original complex still standing, housed the company's business offices in the front, upstairs living quarters for the plant manager, and in the main room to the rear, two large gas compression cylinders whose operation was dependent on water pumped from the Bay. The warmed water, returned to the Bay through large pipes, made swimming in what has ever since been known as Gas House Cove, popular indeed.

On December 11, 1896, the firm merged with Edison Light and Power, the whole becoming the San Francisco Gas & Electric Company which was absorbed by Pacific Gas & Electric Company in 1905. By 1906, and after, this building was being used solely for storing company records, a use it continued to serve until it was sold to the present owners in the mid-1950's.

The handsomely-landscaped and spacious areas between the buildings in the original complex were ideal for refugees following the 1906 Earthquake and Fire as photographs of the period show. Also shown is the damage to a gas storage tank and an arched brick building.

HISTORY:
(Continued)

The present owners' restoration by William Wurster of Wurster, Bernardi & Emmons, and re-use of the former headquarters building to display primarily eighteenth century antiques has been masterful. The most impressive interior feature is the main room which formerly housed the turbines. This two-story room is 28 feet high and approximately 50 feet square; large arched windows of hand-rolled glass contrast with walls of exposed brick, the whole being surmounted by a particularly handsome coffered ceiling, each large redwood square of which is set off by great beams. The former front offices are distinguished by paneled dados, high ceilings and tall, narrow doors with transoms above.

A year after Merryvale's formal opening in 1958, the owners added an equally impressive garden shop to the south which is directly accessible from the main building.

Also of interest is the iron fence which encloses the front lawn; it is similar to the original and was placed as part of the restoration.

ARCHITECTURE:

Richardsonian-Romanesque in its styling, this red brick rectangular building is, except for a corner tower, of uniform height. It is capped by a hipped roof, without projecting eaves, resting on a corbelled cornice. On its narrower facade facing Buchanan Street, a centered arched main entrance is asymmetrically balanced by the Queen Anne tower to the left whose conical roof rises to its apex at an elevation slightly higher than that of the roof ridge behind. From the exterior, the fenestration reflects the interior division of the building into two elements: the front, or westerly, one-third possessing windows indicating two floors with a heavy string course of brickwork at the upper floor level; the remaining two-thirds of the building, equal in height to the front, contains tall windows divided into panes with fanlights above, whose sill line is uniform with those on the lower floor at the front, but whose tops extend upward about three-quarters of the total wall height. On its south elevation, two-story pilasters divide the building into six evenly spaced bays. However, on the north, along North Point Street, this same division is only partially carried out, the pilasters here defining only the four bays containing the taller windows. The rear of the building is divided, also by two-story pilasters, into three bays slightly wider than those on the north and south sides. The center bay houses a double doorway extending its full width and equal in height to the windows in the adjacent bays. The doorway is topped by a flattened arch similar in its arc to that above the second story windows on the front portion of the building; all other windows and the main entry have semi-circular arched tops. All wall openings are surmounted and protected by slightly projecting cast stone moldings and, except for that over the main entrance, are divided into sections containing a patera. The main entrance arch, resting on short brick pilasters, frames a recessed doorway; here a deeper molding than that over the windows retains the name of the original occupant of the structure:

S.F. GAS LIGHT CO.

SURROUNDING LAND
USE AND ZONING:

Zoning of the subject property is C-2 for a depth of 100 feet along Buchanan Street; the rear 18 feet of the parcel along North Point is zoned R-4. A PG&E substation is located to the east, a service station to the south. An apartment complex occupies most of the remainder of the block. Residential and commercial uses are located across Buchanan Street and a supermarket and parking lot across North Point Street faces into Gas House Cove. Fort Mason lies one block to the east.

EXCERPTS FROM MINUTES
OF
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 20, 1973

RE: LM 73.3
Merryvale Antiques
3640 Buchanan Street

When the question was called, the Commission voted unanimously to adopt Resolution No. 7075 and to approve the proposal to designate the Haslett Warehouse, 680 Beach Street, as a Landmark.

The Director requested that the State report to the Department of City Planning if landmark designation should, in fact, have the effect of lessening the sale value of the property. The Department of City Planning would then be in a position to use that alleged savings as leverage in working with the new owner of the building to achieve successful rehabilitation of the structure.

LM73.3 - CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSAL TO DESIGNATE THE MERRYVALE BUILDING,
3640 BUCHANAN STREET, AS A LANDMARK.

Edward Michael, Planner III, summarized the architectural and historic characteristics of the subject building as outlined in greater detail in a case report which had been prepared for the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board and which is available in the files of the Department of City Planning.

No one was present in the audience to speak in favor of or in opposition to the proposal to designate the building as a Landmark.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, recommended that the proposal to designate the building as a Landmark be approved.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Ritchie, seconded by Commissioner Rueda, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 7076 be adopted and that the proposal to designate the Merryvale Building, 3640 Buchanan Street, as a Landmark be approved.

PUBLIC HEARING ON WORK PROGRAM AND BUDGET FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF CITY
PLANNING FOR THE FISCAL YEAR JULY 1, 1974, THROUGH JUNE 30, 1975.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, summarized the major work elements in the Department's work program for the current fiscal year and mentioned additional projects which are being considered for inclusion in the 1974-75 work program.

Robert Kirkwood, President of the San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association, submitted and summarized the following prepared statement:

"My name is Robert Kirkwood, and I am President of SPUR, the San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association. In the past, SPUR has offered comments on the City Planning Department's proposed work program only after it was nearing completion. This year, SPUR is attempting to participate earlier in the process of developing a planning work program and budget.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY SHEET

File No. 90-73-8

Ordinance, Resolution, etc. Ordinance

Subject:

Designating Merryvale Antiques as a landmark pursuant to Article 10 of the City Planning Code.

(1) Initially introduced by or received from: City Planning

Date: 11/19/73

(2) Referred by President:

(a) To Committee on Planning & Dev. Date: 11/26/73

(b) Other disposition:

Date: _____

Record of Committee and Board Action:

12-18-73 Recommended

DEC 26 1973 PASSED FOR SECOND READING

JAN 2 1973 FINALLY PASSED

JAN 4 1974 APPROVED



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2019 MAR -4 PM 3:42

CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination

BY _____

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| Project Address | | Block/Lot(s) |
| 3620 Buchanan Street | | 0459003 |
| Case No. | | Permit No. |
| 2016-010079ENV | | 201610059619 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addition/ Alteration | <input type="checkbox"/> Demolition (requires HRE for Category B Building) | <input type="checkbox"/> New Construction |
| <p>Project description for Planning Department approval. Demolition of one of two existing structures on one shared parcel. Construction of a new 4-story, 8 unit residential building with eight bicycle parking spaces and one accessible vehicle parking space.</p> | | |

STEP 1: EXEMPTION CLASS

| | |
|--|---|
| *Note: If neither class applies, an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i> is required.* | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Class 1 - Existing Facilities. Interior and exterior alterations; additions under 10,000 sq. ft. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Class 3 - New Construction. Up to three new single-family residences or six dwelling units in one building; commercial/office structures; utility extensions; change of use under 10,000 sq. ft. if principally permitted or with a CU. |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <p>Class 32 - In-Fill Development. New Construction of seven or more units or additions greater than 10,000 sq. ft. and meets the conditions described below:</p> <p>(a) The project is consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations.</p> <p>(b) The proposed development occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than 5 acres substantially surrounded by urban uses.</p> <p>(c) The project site has no value as habitat for endangered rare or threatened species.</p> <p>(d) Approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.</p> <p>(e) The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.</p> <p>FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING USE ONLY</p> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Class _____ |

STEP 2: CEQA IMPACTS
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>If any box is checked below, an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i> is required.</p> | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Air Quality: Would the project add new sensitive receptors (specifically, schools, day care facilities, hospitals, residential dwellings, and senior-care facilities within an Air Pollution Exposure Zone? Does the project have the potential to emit substantial pollutant concentrations (e.g., backup diesel generators, heavy industry, diesel trucks, etc.)? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Air Pollution Exposure Zone)</p> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <p>Hazardous Materials: If the project site is located on the Maher map or is suspected of containing hazardous materials (based on a previous use such as gas station, auto repair, dry cleaners, or heavy manufacturing, or a site with underground storage tanks): Would the project involve 50 cubic yards or more of soil disturbance - or a change of use from industrial to residential? If yes, this box must be checked and the project applicant must submit an Environmental Application with a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. <i>Exceptions: do not check box if the applicant presents documentation of enrollment in the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) Maher program, a DPH waiver from the Maher program, or other documentation from Environmental Planning staff that hazardous material effects would be less than significant (refer to EP_ArcMap > Maher layer).</i></p> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Transportation: Does the project create six (6) or more net new parking spaces or residential units? Does the project have the potential to adversely affect transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle safety (hazards) or the adequacy of nearby transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities?</p> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Archeological Resources: Would the project result in soil disturbance/modification greater than two (2) feet below grade in an archeological sensitive area or eight (8) feet in a non -archeological sensitive area? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Archeological Sensitive Area)</p> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment: Does the project site involve a subdivision or lot line adjustment on a lot with a slope average of 20% or more? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography)</p> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Slope = or > 20%: Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required.</p> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Seismic: Landslide Zone: Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required.</p> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Seismic: Liquefaction Zone: Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones) If box is checked, a geotechnical report will likely be required.</p> |
| <p>If no boxes are checked above, GO TO STEP 3. If one or more boxes are checked above, an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i> is required, unless reviewed by an Environmental Planner.</p> | |
| <p>Comments and Planner Signature (optional): Stephanie Cisneros Sponsor enrolled in DPH Maher Program on 7/18/2016.</p> | |

STEP 3: PROPERTY STATUS - HISTORIC RESOURCE

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

| | |
|---|--|
| PROPERTY IS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING: (refer to Parcel Information Map) | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Category A: Known Historical Resource. GO TO STEP 5. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Category B: Potential Historical Resource (over 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 4. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Category C: Not a Historical Resource or Not Age Eligible (under 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 6. |

STEP 4: PROPOSED WORK CHECKLIST

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

| | |
|---|---|
| Check all that apply to the project. | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1. Change of use and new construction. Tenant improvements not included. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. Regular maintenance or repair to correct or repair deterioration, decay, or damage to building. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3. Window replacement that meets the Department's Window Replacement Standards. Does not include storefront window alterations. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. Garage work. A new opening that meets the Guidelines for Adding Garages and Curb Cuts, and/or replacement of a garage door in an existing opening that meets the Residential Design Guidelines. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 5. Deck, terrace construction, or fences not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 6. Mechanical equipment installation that is not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 7. Dormer installation that meets the requirements for exemption from public notification under Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 3: Dormer Windows. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 8. Addition(s) that are not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way for 150 feet in each direction; does not extend vertically beyond the floor level of the top story of the structure or is only a single story in height; does not have a footprint that is more than 50% larger than that of the original building; and does not cause the removal of architectural significant roofing features. |
| Note: Project Planner must check box below before proceeding. | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Project is not listed. GO TO STEP 5. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Project does not conform to the scopes of work. GO TO STEP 5. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Project involves four or more work descriptions. GO TO STEP 5. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Project involves less than four work descriptions. GO TO STEP 6. |

STEP 5: CEQA IMPACTS - ADVANCED HISTORICAL REVIEW

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Check all that apply to the project. | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1. Project involves a known historical resource (CEQA Category A) as determined by Step 3 and conforms entirely to proposed work checklist in Step 4. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. Interior alterations to publicly accessible spaces. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3. Window replacement of original/historic windows that are not "in-kind" but are consistent with existing historic character. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. Façade/storefront alterations that do not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 5. Raising the building in a manner that does not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 6. Restoration based upon documented evidence of a building's historic condition, such as historic photographs, plans, physical evidence, or similar buildings. |

| | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 7. Addition(s) , including mechanical equipment that are minimally visible from a public right-of-way and meet the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation</i> . |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 8. Other work consistent with the <i>Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties</i> (specify or add comments): New construction on a landmark site. Will be setback from historic building and will be differentiated yet compatible. Meets SOI Standards 2, 9, 10. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 9. Other work that would not materially impair a historic district (specify or add comments): (Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 10. Reclassification of property status. (Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation <input type="checkbox"/> Reclassify to Category A <input type="checkbox"/> Reclassify to Category C a. Per HRER dated (attach HRER) b. Other (specify): |
| Note: If ANY box in STEP 5 above is checked, a Preservation Planner MUST check one box below. | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Further environmental review required. Based on the information provided, the project requires an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i> to be submitted. GO TO STEP 6. |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Project can proceed with categorical exemption review. The project has been reviewed by the Preservation Planner and can proceed with categorical exemption review. GO TO STEP 6. |
| Comments (optional): | |
| Preservation Planner Signature: Stephanie Cisneros | |

STEP 6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION
TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Further environmental review required. Proposed project does not meet scopes of work in either (check all that apply): <input type="checkbox"/> Step 2 - CEQA Impacts <input type="checkbox"/> Step 5 - Advanced Historical Review STOP! Must file an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i>. | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No further environmental review is required. The project is categorically exempt under CEQA. There are no unusual circumstances that would result in a reasonable possibility of a significant effect. | |
| | Project Approval Action: Commission Hearing | Signature: Stephanie Cisneros |
| | If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project. | 11/07/2018 |
| Once signed or stamped and dated, this document constitutes a categorical exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code. In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, an appeal of an exemption determination can only be filed within 30 days of the project receiving the first approval action. Please note that other approval actions may be required for the project. Please contact the assigned planner for these approvals. | | |

STEP 7: MODIFICATION OF A CEQA EXEMPT PROJECT

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, when a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exempt project changes after the Approval Action and requires a subsequent approval, the Environmental Review Officer (or his or her designee) must determine whether the proposed change constitutes a substantial modification of that project. This checklist shall be used to determine whether the proposed changes to the approved project would constitute a "substantial modification" and, therefore, be subject to additional environmental review pursuant to CEQA.

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

| | | |
|--|------------------------------|---|
| Project Address (If different than front page) | | Block/Lot(s) (If different than front page) |
| 3620 Buchanan Street | | 0459/003 |
| Case No. | Previous Building Permit No. | New Building Permit No. |
| 2016-010079PRJ | 201610059619 | |
| Plans Dated | Previous Approval Action | New Approval Action |
| | Commission Hearing | |
| Modified Project Description: | | |
| | | |

DETERMINATION IF PROJECT CONSTITUTES SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

| | |
|---|--|
| Compared to the approved project, would the modified project: | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Result in expansion of the building envelope, as defined in the Planning Code; |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Result in the change of use that would require public notice under Planning Code Sections 311 or 312; |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Result in demolition as defined under Planning Code Section 317 or 19005(f)? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Is any information being presented that was not known and could not have been known at the time of the original determination, that shows the originally approved project may no longer qualify for the exemption? |
| If at least one of the above boxes is checked, further environmental review is required. | |

DETERMINATION OF NO SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

| | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | The proposed modification would not result in any of the above changes. |
| If this box is checked, the proposed modifications are categorically exempt under CEQA, in accordance with prior project approval and no additional environmental review is required. This determination shall be posted on the Planning Department website and office and mailed to the applicant, City approving entities, and anyone requesting written notice. | |
| Planner Name: | Date: |
| | |



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW FORM

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

| | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Preservation Team Meeting Date: | Date of Form Completion: 8/1/2018 |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|

| PROJECT INFORMATION | | |
|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------|
| Planner: | Address: | |
| Stephanie Cisneros | 3620 Buchanan Street | |
| Block/Lot: | Cross Streets: | |
| 0459/003 | Bay Street and North Point | |
| CEQA Category: | Art. 10/11: | BPA/Case No.: |
| A | Article 10 | 2016-010079ENV |

| PURPOSE OF REVIEW: | | | PROJECT DESCRIPTION: | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> CEQA | <input type="radio"/> Article 10/11 | <input type="radio"/> Preliminary/PIC | <input type="radio"/> Alteration | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Demo/New Construction |

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| DATE OF PLANS UNDER REVIEW: | 8/5/16; revised 7/31/2018 |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|

| PROJECT ISSUES: | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Is the subject Property an eligible historic resource? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | If so, are the proposed changes a significant impact? |
| Additional Notes: | |
| <p>The purpose of this review is to establish the historical significance of the 1-story garden house (3620 Buchanan Street) that is located on the landmark site with the Historic Gas Light Building, Landmark No. 58 (3636-40 Buchanan Street). The two buildings share a single L-shaped lot. A Historic Resource Evaluation Part 1 completed by Page & Turnbull (May 20, 2016; revised final July 2018) has been submitted.</p> | |

| PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW: | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Category: | <input checked="" type="radio"/> A | <input type="radio"/> B | <input type="radio"/> C |
| Individual | | Historic District/Context | |
| Property is individually eligible for inclusion in a California Register under one or more of the following Criteria: | | Property is in an eligible California Register Historic District/Context under one or more of the following Criteria: | |
| Criterion 1 - Event: | <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No | Criterion 1 - Event: | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No |
| Criterion 2 - Persons: | <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No | Criterion 2 - Persons: | <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No |
| Criterion 3 - Architecture: | <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No | Criterion 3 - Architecture: | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No |
| Criterion 4 - Info. Potential: | <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No | Criterion 4 - Info. Potential: | <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No |
| Period of Significance: | <input type="text"/> | Period of Significance: | 1893-1958 |
| | | <input type="radio"/> Contributor <input checked="" type="radio"/> Non-Contributor | |

| | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Complies with the Secretary's Standards/Art. 10/Art. 11: | <input type="radio"/> Yes | <input type="radio"/> No | <input type="radio"/> N/A |
| CEQA Material Impairment to the individual historic resource: | <input type="radio"/> Yes | <input type="radio"/> No | |
| CEQA Material Impairment to the historic district: | <input type="radio"/> Yes | <input type="radio"/> No | |
| Requires Design Revisions: | <input type="radio"/> Yes | <input type="radio"/> No | |
| Defer to Residential Design Team: | <input type="radio"/> Yes | <input type="radio"/> No | |

PRESERVATION TEAM COMMENTS:

According to the information presented in the Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) prepared by Page & Turnbull (July 2018) and information found in the Planning Department files, the subject building at 3620 Buchanan Street is a one-story vernacular garden house with Neo-French and Ranch elements. The garden house is located on the south end of the L-shaped lot occupied by City Landmark No. 58 (Merryvale Antiques/S.F. Gas Light Co. building). The lot also contains a garden between the landmark building and the garden house. The S.F. Gas Light Co. building was constructed ca. 1891 - 1893 and was owned and occupied by the S.F. Gas Light Company (later to become Pacific Gas & Electric) and was one component of the larger industrial complex surrounding the site named the Gas Cove Complex. The subject site became the main component of the S.F. Gas Light Co.'s North Beach Station.

The property was sold to Dent Macdonough and his wife Margaret in 1958. The Macdonoughs undertook an extensive rehabilitation of the property immediately upon ownership, which included restoration and reuse of the 1890s landmark building as a high end antique shop; construction of the garden house designed by Clifford Conly; construction of a garden designed by Jean Wolff (who often assisted with the execution of Thomas Church designs); and installation of the extant six-foot tall brick wall around the garden. The property was again sold in 1980 to the Pacific Union Land Company and again in 1998 to Roger Walther, a real estate developer, who also undertook extensive renovations to the entire site in 2000 as detailed in the HRE.

Staff is in agreement with the findings presented in the HRE regarding 3620 Buchanan Street. The building and garden do not appear to be significant under Criteria 1, 2 or 3 such that they would qualify individually for listing in the California Register. They are not associated with events or people that have made significant contributions to the broad patterns of local or regional history. Merryvale Antiques, who occupied the site from 1958 until 1980, does not appear to have made significant contributions to local, state or regional history. The building and garden are not architecturally distinct such that they would qualify individually for listing in the California Register.

Staff is also in agreement with the findings of the HRE that 3620 Buchanan Street and the adjacent garden are not contributing features of the landmark site. The site is significant for its association with the construction and operation of the S.F. Gas Light Co., the period of which can be defined as 1891-1958. The subject building and garden were constructed after this period.

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Signature of a Senior Preservation Planner/ Preservation Coordinator: | Date: |
|  | 8/21/2018 |

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2019 MAR -4 PM 3:42

BY

LUBIN OLSON & NIEWIADOMSKI LLP

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPT.

81668

Invoice Date Invoice Number

Invoice Amount

03/04/2019

03/04/2019

CLIENT# 9887-02

617.00

Date
03/04/2019

Check #
000081668

Check Total: 617.00

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>DOCUMENT INCLUDES MICR LINE, METERS, CHEMICAL REACTIVE PROPERTIES AND FEATURES, A FOIL HOLOGRAM</p> | | 81668 |
| <p>LUBIN OLSON LUBIN OLSON & NIEWIADOMSKI LLP GENERAL ACCOUNT 600 MONTGOMERY ST., 14TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111 (415) 981-0550</p> | | <p>FIRST REPUBLIC BANK 101 PINE STREET SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111</p> |
| <p>Pay: <i>Six Hundred Seventeen and 00/100 Dollars</i></p> | | <p>DATE 03/04/2019</p> |
| <p>PAY TO THE ORDER OF SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPT.</p> | | <p>AMOUNT \$617.00</p> |
| <p>TWO SIGNATURES REQUIRED FOR AMOUNTS GREATER THAN \$10,000.</p> <p><i>Charles R. Olson</i></p> | | <p>MP</p> |
| <p>Shield</p> | | <p>MP</p> |
| <p>WATER MARK PAPER, INK, MICR, HOLOGRAM VIEW</p> | | <p>HEAT SENSITIVE RED INK, AGE DISAPPEARS WITH HEAT</p> |

1939

Details on back Security Features included

Wong, Jocelyn (BOS)

From: BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Sent: Monday, April 8, 2019 11:35 AM
To: BOS Legislation, (BOS); Olson, Charles; jknight@reubenlaw.com
Cc: GIVNER, JON (CAT); STACY, KATE (CAT); JENSEN, KRISTEN (CAT); Rahaim, John (CPC); Teague, Corey (CPC); Sanchez, Scott (CPC); Gibson, Lisa (CPC); Jain, Devyani (CPC); Navarrete, Joy (CPC); Lynch, Laura (CPC); Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC); Sider, Dan (CPC); Starr, Aaron (CPC); Cisneros, Stephanie (CPC); Horner, Justin (CPC); Moore, Julie (CPC); BOS-Legislative Aides; Rosenberg, Julie (BOA); Cantara, Gary (BOA); Longaway, Alec (BOA); BOS-Supervisors; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS)
Subject: PLANNING DEPARTMENT RESPONSE MEMO: Appeal of CEQA Exemption Determination - Proposed 3620 Buchanan Street Project - Appeal Hearing on April 16, 2019

Good morning,

Please find linked below a response memo received by the Office of the Clerk of the Board from the Planning Department regarding the appeal of the determination of categorical exemption from environmental review under CEQA for the proposed project of 3620 Buchanan Street.

[Planning Department Memo - April 8, 2019](#)

The hearing for this matter is scheduled for 3:00 p.m. special order before the Board on April 16, 2019.

I invite you to review the entire matter on our [Legislative Research Center](#) by following the links below:

[Board of Supervisors File No. 190275](#)

Best regards,

Jocelyn Wong

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

T: 415.554.7702 | F: 415.554.5163

jocelyn.wong@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosure: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.



**SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2019 APR - 8 AM **MEMO**

AK

**Categorical Exemption Appeal
3620 Buchanan Street**

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

DATE: April 8, 2019
TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
FROM: Lisa Gibson, Environmental Review Officer – (415) 575-9032
Stephanie Cisneros – (415) 575-9186
RE: Board of Supervisors File No. 190275;
Planning Case No. 2016-010079ENV
Appeal of Categorical Exemption for 3620 Buchanan Street
HEARING DATE: April 16, 2019

ATTACHMENTS: A – California Department of Toxic Substances Control Approval of Property Investigation Report APN 0459003, PG&E Former North Beach Manufactured Gas Plant
B – Historic Resource Evaluation of 3620 Buchanan Street prepared by Page & Turnbull (dated July 2018)
C – August 15, 2018 Architectural Review Committee Meeting Notes
D – Historic Preservation Commission Motion No. 0360 (November 7, 2018 HPC Hearing)
E – SF Heritage Letter dated January 18, 2019

PROJECT SPONSOR: Jody Knight, Reuben, Junius & Rose, (415) 567-9000
APPELLANTS: 1598 Bay Condominium Association c/o Charles Olson, Lubin Olson & Niewiadomski LLP

INTRODUCTION

This memorandum and the attached documents are a response to the letter of appeal to the Board of Supervisors (the board) regarding the Planning Department's (the department) issuance of a categorical exemption under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA determination) for the proposed 3620 Buchanan Street project.

The department, pursuant to Title 14 of the CEQA Guidelines, issued a categorical exemption for the project on November 7, 2018 finding that the proposed project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as a Class 32 (In-Fill Development) categorical exemption.

The decision before the board is whether to uphold the department's determination to issue a categorical exemption and deny the appeal, or to overturn the department's determination to issue a categorical exemption and return the project to the department staff for additional environmental review.

SITE DESCRIPTION AND EXISTING USE

The project site is located in the Marina neighborhood on the block bounded by Buchanan Street to the west, Laguna Street to the east, North Point Street to the north and Bay Street to the south. The project site is located on the same parcel as City Landmark No. 58 (S.F. Gas Light Co./Merryvale Antiques) at the southernmost portion of assessor's block 0459, lot 003. The subject site consists of two buildings: a two-story Richardsonian-Romanesque brick building currently used as office space (S.F. Gas Light Co. building) and a one-story, vernacular style garden house also used as office space. The former building was constructed in 1891-1893 and the latter constructed in 1958. The property is located in a NC-2 (Neighborhood Commercial, Small Scale) zoning district and a 40-X height and bulk district. The surrounding context primarily includes two- to four-story residential complexes fronting Buchanan Street with some ground floor retail. The subject site is an approximately 13,480 square foot L-shaped parcel.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project is located on the same parcel as City Landmark No. 58 and involves the demolition of a non-contributory one-story garden house currently used as office space and demolition of a portion of the non-contributory garden patio and the construction of a new four-story, 13,279 square foot residential building. The new construction will include eight units, eight bicycle parking spaces, and one accessible vehicle parking space. The portion of the existing garden to remain will be utilized as open space. No interior or exterior changes to the S.F. Gas Light Co. building at 3636 Buchanan Street are proposed.

BACKGROUND

On August 3, 2016, Sutro Architects, on behalf of Roger Walther, filed an Environmental Evaluation Application, Historic Resource Evaluation¹, and Phase I Environmental Site Assessment to the department for the environmental review of the proposed project.

On October 5, 2016, a building permit application was filed with the Department of Building Inspection (the building department). This was routed to the planning department (hereinafter department) for review of the proposed demolition of one of two existing buildings on a landmark site, and the construction of a four-story, eight-unit residential building.

On July 21, 2016, the Project Sponsor enrolled in the Maher Program with the Department of Public Health.

On August 1, 2018, the department prepared a Preservation Team Review Form, determining that the subject building and adjacent garden patio were not eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) individually and were not eligible as contributing features to a

¹ A Historic Resource Evaluation prepared by an historic consultant on the department's qualified historic resources consultant list is required for projects that involve the proposed demolition of any building constructed at least 45 years ago where the historic resource status of the property is unknown (i.e., buildings not previously surveyed and not listed on local, state, or federal registers).

landmark site. Due to the proposed project's location on a landmarked site, the property is still considered an historical resource under CEQA.

On October 11, 2018, the department issued a Notice of Project Receiving Environmental Review.

On November 7, 2018, the department determined that the proposed project was categorically exempt under CEQA Class 32—Existing Facilities (in-fill development) and that no further environmental review was required. The Preservation Team Review Form was attached to the categorical exemption.

In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, approval of the Conditional Use Authorization by the Planning Commission on January 31, 2019 was considered the approval action for the project.

On January 22, 2019, the Planning Commission held a public hearing and approved the Conditional Use Authorization for the proposed project.

On March 4, 2019, Charles Olson of Lubin Olson & Niewiadomski, LLP on behalf of the 1598 Bay Condominium Association filed an appeal with the Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the categorical exemption determination for the 3620 Buchanan Street project.

On March 6, 2019, the department determined that the appeal of the CEQA determination was timely filed.

CEQA GUIDELINES

Categorical Exemptions

Section 21084 of the California Public Resources Code requires that the CEQA Guidelines identify a list of classes of projects that have been determined not to have a significant effect on the environment and are exempt from further environmental review.

In response to that mandate, the State Secretary of Resources found that certain classes of projects, which are listed in CEQA Guidelines Sections 15301 through 15333, do not have a significant impact on the environment, and therefore are categorically exempt from the requirement for the preparation of further environmental review. CEQA Guidelines section 15332, or Class 32 – In-Fill Development Projects, consists of projects characterized as in-fill development meeting the following conditions outlined in Section 15332(a)-(e):

- (a) The project is consistent with the applicable general plan designation and all applicable general plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation and regulations.
- (b) The proposed development occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than five acres substantially surrounded by urban uses.
- (c) The project site has no value as habitat for endangered, rare or threatened species.

- (d) Approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.
- (e) The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.

Additionally, CEQA Guidelines section 15300.2 establishes exceptions to the application of a categorical exemption. When any of the below exceptions apply, a project that otherwise fits within a categorical exemption must undergo some form of environmental review.

- (a) Location. Classes 3, 4, 5, 6, and 11 are qualified by consideration of where the project is to be located -- a project that is ordinarily insignificant in its impact on the environment may in a particularly sensitive environment be significant. Therefore, these classes are considered to apply all instances, except where the project may impact on an environmental resource of hazardous or critical concern where designated, precisely mapped, and officially adopted pursuant to law by federal, state, or local agencies.
- (b) Cumulative Impact. All exemptions for these classes are inapplicable when the cumulative impact of successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time is significant.
- (c) Significant Effect. A categorical exemption shall not be used for an activity where there is a reasonable possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances.
- (d) Scenic Highways. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which may result in damage to scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, historic buildings, rock outcroppings, or similar resources, within a highway officially designated as a state scenic highway. This does not apply to improvements which are required as mitigation by an adopted negative declaration or certified EIR.
- (e) Hazardous Waste Sites. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project located on a site which is included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code.
- (f) Historical Resources. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

In determining the significance of environmental effects caused by a project, CEQA State Guidelines Section 15064(f) states that the decision as to whether a project may have one or more significant effects shall be based on substantial evidence in the record of the lead agency. CEQA State Guidelines 15064(f)(5) offers the following guidance: "Argument, speculation, unsubstantiated opinion or narrative, or evidence that is clearly inaccurate or erroneous, or evidence that is not credible, shall not constitute substantial

evidence. Substantial evidence shall include facts, reasonable assumption predicated upon facts, and expert opinion supported by facts.”

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RESPONSES

The concerns raised in the appeal letter regarding hazardous materials and cultural resources impacts are addressed in the responses below in the order expressed by the appellants.

Concern 1: The project site is located on or adjacent to a former manufactured gas plant and gasoline service station which may pose a risk to the proposed project, construction workers, neighbors, and future residents.

Response 1: The California Department of Toxic Substances Control’s regulatory oversight of site remediation would ensure that any residual contamination would not have a significant effect on the environment, future residents, and neighbors.

As stated by the appellants, Pacific Gas and Electric Company’s (PG&E’s) former North Beach manufactured gas plant was located in the Marina District. A 250,000 cubic foot gas holding tank and subsequent gasoline service station was located on the appellants’ 1598 Bay Street property, adjacent to the project site. Soil and groundwater contamination at the 1598 Bay Street property was remediated with oversight by the California Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) prior to construction of the residential development several years ago.² The proposed project at 3620 Buchanan Street would be subject to the same regulatory oversight of site investigation and remediation to health-based cleanup standards that facilitated the redevelopment of the appellants’ property.

Investigation of the 3620 Buchanan Street property (APN 0459003) has been conducted on behalf of PG&E under a Voluntary Cleanup Agreement between DTSC and PG&E.³ A total of 120 soil samples and 50 soil vapor samples were collected in accordance with a DTSC-approved work plan. The site investigation report concluded that existing soil conditions at the property do not raise health risk concerns related to manufactured gas plant contamination for site occupants and nearby residents. The report noted that the property owner is planning to redevelop a portion of the parcel and once details are finalized, a remediation plan will be developed and submitted to DTSC. The DTSC concurred with the property investigation report conclusions and recommendations, noting that “the need for additional site characterization must be evaluated based on the final scope of the proposed redevelopment” (Attachment A).

In accordance with DTSC protocols, work plans for future site characterization and, if necessary, remediation of the 3620 Buchanan Street property would be developed for DTSC approval. Detailed mitigation plans and procedures would include the following: health and safety plan, soil management and disposal plan, dust control plan, and a stormwater pollution prevention plan in accordance with regulatory requirements. Compliance with mandatory regulations for the excavation, handling, and

² San Francisco Planning Department, Certificate of Determination, Exemption from Environmental Review, 1598 Bay Street, Case No. 2014-003157ENV, December 8, 2015.

³ Haley Aldrich, Property Investigation Report APN 0459003, Former North Beach Manufactured Gas Plant Site, San Francisco, California, File No. 130239-004, July 2018.

disposal of contaminated soil would minimize the potential for releases and possible exposure to hazardous materials in soil and, accordingly, would protect construction workers and the public from adverse health effects. Cleanup of the site would be performed to ensure any residual contaminants in soil are below the health-protective residential standards established by the DTSC human health risk assessment office, thus, cleanup would protect the health and safety of future site occupants.

The presence of contaminants in soil or groundwater due to historical land uses is fairly commonplace in the city and does not constitute an unusual circumstance. The State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker database identifies approximately 2,500 records of facilities in San Francisco County that are located on a site that is included on a list compiled pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5. Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance, routinely addresses development on sites with potentially hazardous soil or groundwater in order to protect public health and safety (unless oversight is under the purview of a State or federal agency as is the case here). Similar to the process described above, the Department of Public Health oversees the investigation and remediation of sites throughout the city to ensure that cleanup is performed to levels appropriate for site uses and remediation procedures are in accordance with regulations intended to safeguard the public and the environment. The Planning Department has determined that routine cleanup of subsurface contamination, such as at the 3620 Buchanan Street property (and previously the 1598 Bay Street property), would not have a significant effect on the environment with mandatory compliance with city, State, and federal hazardous materials regulations.

Concern 2: The demolition of the garden house and a portion of the adjacent garden patio will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the historic resource such that the significance of an historic resource would be materially impaired.

Response 2: Consistent with CEQA and departmental procedures, the department reviewed the subject building and adjacent garden patio for potential individual eligibility and contributory status to the Landmark Site and found that demolition of the garden house and a portion of the adjacent garden patio would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historic resource.

Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines sets forth the definition of historical resources, as cited below:

- (1) *A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code §5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.).*
- (2) *A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.*
- (3) *Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural,*

educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code §5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852) including the following:

- (A) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;*
 - (B) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;*
 - (C) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or*
 - (D) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.*
- (4) The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code), or identified in an historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code sections 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.*

The appellant contends that the demolition of the garden house and a portion of the adjacent garden patio "will severely impact the spatial relationships between the Merryvale Antiques and the Proposed Project, and cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the historic resource as it involves a 'physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired.'"

The subject property (0459/003) in its entirety is designated as City Landmark No. 58 (S.F. Gas Light Co./Merryvale Antiques) per the 1973 Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board (LPAB) Case Report and Resolution No. 88, City Planning Commission (CPC) Resolution No. 7076, and Board of Supervisors Ordinance No. 12-74 and is therefore considered a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA guidelines.

The subject property contains two buildings: the two-story S.F. Gas Light Co. building at the north end of the parcel (3636-3640 Buchanan Street) and a one-story garden house at the southern end of the parcel (3620 Buchanan Street). The two-story brick S.F. Gas Light Co. building was designed in the Richardsonian-Romanesque architectural style by architect Joseph B. Crockett. Constructed 1891-1893, the building was used as the company's administration building. The one-story, vernacular style garden house was constructed in 1958 and designed by Clifford Conly, Jr. The wood-framed building features minimally applied French ornamentation such as window surrounds. The property also features a garden patio between the two structures, designed by Jean Wolffe and also constructed in 1958.

Based on the information in the LPAB and CPC documents, the subject property is significant for its association with the development of the S.F. Gas Light Co.'s North Beach Station (Criterion 1 – Events) and as an outstanding example of Richardsonian-Romanesque architecture (Criterion 3 – Architecture). The S.F. Gas Light Co.'s North Beach Station formerly occupied the block bounded by Buchanan Street to the west, Laguna Street to the east, North Point Street to the north and Bay Street to the south and was in operation until the block was parceled off and sold to private developers sometime before 1953. The extant S.F. Gas Light Co. administration building on the subject site is the only remaining structure associated with and representative of the larger block's former history as a S.F. Gas Light Co. site⁴.

While the 1891-1893 administration building is discussed in great detail in the LPAB and CPC documents, the garden house and adjacent garden patio are mentioned in both documents as being part of the overall parcel, but are not discussed in great length with regard to its development history and any potential significance tied to the site. The department determined that additional information was needed related to the development history of the garden house and garden patio to determine if these entities would be considered individually-significant historical resources in their own right and/or if they would be considered contributing features of the landmark site per Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. The department requested a consultant-prepared Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) to assist in the review of the garden house and adjacent garden patio.

The garden house was constructed in 1958 by architect Clifford Conly, Jr. It is vernacular in nature with minimally applied French ornamentation and underwent alterations in the 1980s. The adjacent garden patio that separates the landmarked building to the north and the garden house to the south was also constructed in 1958 and was originally designed by Jean Wolff, a local gardener who often assisted with the construction of Thomas Church commissions. The garden patio also underwent extensive alterations before and in 2000. The construction of both the garden house and garden patio were part of a larger project that included the restoration and reuse of the S.F. Gas Light Co. administration building at 3636-3640 Buchanan Street into Merryvale Antiques – a high end antiques shop.

The Department determined that the garden house and garden patio were not individually eligible for listing on the California Register. No significant events occurred within either the garden house or garden patio such that they would be individually eligible for listing under Criterion 1 (Events). Although the LPAB and CPC documents describe the subject property as the "S.F. Gas Light Co./Merryvale Antiques" building, neither resolution discusses any (potential) significance of the Merryvale Antiques as a business tied to the landmark site. None of the owners or occupants of the property were identified as important to local, state or national history such that the garden house and garden patio would be considered individually eligible under Criterion 2 (People). The garden house is not an outstanding example of a type, period, region or method of construction and does not represent the work of a master or possess high artistic value such that it would be considered individually eligible under Criterion 3 (Architecture). Similarly, the adjacent garden patio was not designed by a master landscape architect and was substantially altered before and in 2000. The garden patio no longer maintains its original design such that it would be individually eligible for listing under Criterion 3.

⁴ The S.F. Gas Light Co. merged with Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) in 1905.

The garden house and garden patio were also assessed to determine if they were contributing features that conveyed the overall significance of the landmark site. Based on the historical narrative in the LPAB and CPC documents, the site was determined to be significant for its association with the development of the S.F. Gas Light Co.'s North Beach Station. The garden house and garden patio were constructed in 1958, after the S.F. Gas Light Co.'s (later merged with PG&E) ownership of the property ended. The garden house and garden patio were developed as part of the restoration and reuse of the property as Merryvale Antiques and, therefore, were determined not to be contributing features of the significance of the landmark site.

Although the garden house and garden patio were determined not to be individually eligible historical resources or to be contributing features to the significance of the landmark site, the proposed project still required review and the approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness, since the work would be occurring on a landmarked site. The proposed project underwent substantial design review to ensure conformance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the treatment of historic properties, Article 10 of the Planning Code, and with the department's Urban Design Guidelines.

The spatial relationship between the 1891-1893 administration building and the proposed new construction was thoroughly vetted internally by design staff and with the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) of the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) as well as the full HPC at two separate public hearings.

At the ARC hearing on August 15, 2018 and at the November 7, 2018 HPC hearing for the Certificate of Appropriateness, the spatial relationship of the 1891-1893 administration building and the project site and the historical versus current setting of the site were discussed. Given that the setting of the overall site (the former S.F. Gas Light Co. North Beach Station) historically included other predominantly brick buildings, an oiler dock, a gasometer, and two storage tanks, the HPC recognized that the setting had been drastically altered and transformed from a primarily industrial setting into a residential and mixed-use setting. The HPC also commented that the amount of the existing garden patio that would remain as part of the proposed project would provide the necessary relief between the 1891-1893 administration building and the new construction such that the setting would not be impacted. The HPC therefore granted the Certificate of Appropriateness.

Concern 3: The appellant contends that "the proposed project requires a rear yard modification because it provides no rear yard where a rear yard of at least 25% of lot depth is required, but in no case less than 15 feet." Therefore, the proposed project is not consistent with zoning designations and regulations applicable to the project site, as required under CEQA for the granting of a categorical exemption.

Response 3: Rear Yard Modifications, and the process of granting Rear Yard Modifications, are part of the San Francisco Planning Code and are thereby zoning regulations applicable to the project site. The Planning Commission/Zoning Administrator appropriately granted a Rear Yard Modification pursuant to Planning Code Section 134(e).

Rear Yard Modifications, and the process of granting Rear Yard Modifications, are part of the San Francisco Planning Code and are regulations applicable to the project site. A project that is granted a Rear Yard Modification is considered code-compliant and consistent with the requirements of the Planning Code.

Just because a project requires a Rear Yard Modification does not mean that the project is not consistent with the underlying zoning. Indeed, as the underlying zoning includes the option of requesting a Rear Yard Modification, requesting one cannot therefore be inconsistent with the underlying zoning. Typically, Guidelines Section 15332(a) disqualifies projects from a Class 32 exemption if they are inconsistent with the underlying zoning and require a rezoning to be made legal. This is not the case with the proposed project; the proposed project is consistent with the underlying zoning.

The proposed project sought a Rear Yard Modification to allow for no rear yard requirement given that the new construction on the site would be located within the rear yard and up to the rear yard property line. At the January 22, 2019 Planning Commission Hearing for the Conditional Use Authorization and Variance applications, the Zoning Administrator granted a Rear Yard Modification for the project pursuant to Planning Code Section 134(e).

CONCLUSION

The department has determined that the proposed project is categorically exempt from environmental review under CEQA on the basis that: (1) the project meets the definition of one or more of the classes of projects that the Secretary of Resources has found do not have a significant effect on the environment (Class 32), and (2) none of the exceptions specified in CEQA Guidelines section 15300.2 prohibiting the use of a categorical exemption are applicable to the project. No substantial evidence supporting a fair argument that a significant environmental effect may occur as a result of the project has been presented that would warrant preparation of further environmental review. The appellants have not provided any substantial evidence or expert opinion to refute the conclusions of the Department.

For the reasons stated above and in the November 7, 2018 CEQA Class 32 categorical exemption determination, the CEQA determination complies with the requirements of CEQA, and the project is appropriately exempt from environmental review pursuant to the cited exemption. The department therefore respectfully recommends that the board uphold the CEQA categorical exemption determination and deny the appeal of the CEQA determination.

Attachment A

California Department of Toxic
Substances Control Approval of
Property Investigation Report
APN 0459003, PG&E Former
North Beach Manufactured Gas
Plant



Department of Toxic Substances Control

Jared Blumenfeld
Secretary for
Environmental Protection

Meredith Williams, Ph.D.
Acting Director
700 Heinz Avenue
Berkeley, California 94710-2721

Gavin Newsom
Governor

March 18, 2019

Darrell Klingman, PG, CHG (via email: DSK5@pge.com)
Pacific Gas and Electric Company
3401 Crow Canyon Road, Room 177B
San Ramon, California 94583

SUBJECT: PROPERTY INVESTIGATION REPORT APN 0459003, PACIFIC GAS
AND ELECTRIC COMPANY FORMER NORTH BEACH
MANUFACTURED GAS PLANT, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA
(DTSC Site Code: 201868-11)

Dear Mr. Klingman:

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has reviewed the *Property Investigation Report* (PIR) and *Response to Comments* (RTC) for the Property located at San Francisco assessor's parcel number (APN) 0459003. This property is part of the larger Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) former North Beach Manufactured Gas Plant (MGP) Site.


The PIR is approved based on the scope of work outlined in the *Initial Site Investigation Revised Work Plan Addendum: Property APN 0459003* dated July 20, 2017.

Additionally, DTSC concurs with Section 7: Property Investigation Conclusions and Recommendations that, '[s]ome form of risk management may therefore be warranted to ensure the ongoing protection of human health' and that when "[redevelopment] details are finalized, a remediation plan will be developed and submitted to DTSC in a subsequent Remedial Design and Implementation Plan Report." DTSC notes that the need for additional site characterization must be evaluated based on the final scope of the proposed redevelopment.

Darrell Klingman
March 18, 2019
Page 2

If you have any questions, please contact me at (510) 540-3835 or via email at Jessica.Tibor@dtsc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



Jessica Tibor, PG
Project Manager
Site Mitigation and Restoration Program

cc: Angela Jade Olguin, PE
Haley & Aldrich, Inc.
via email: AOlguin@haleyaldrich.com


Gina M. Plantz
Haley & Aldrich, Inc.
via email: GPlantz@haleyaldrich.com

Attachment B

Historic Resource Evaluation of
3620 Buchanan Street prepared
by Page & Turnbull (dated July
2018)

3620 BUCHANAN STREET
HISTORIC RESOURCE EVALUATION, PART I
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA
[16060]

PREPARED FOR:
ROGER WALTHER



PAGE & TURNBULL

JULY 2018

imagining change in historic environments through design, research, and technology

1955

FINAL


TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| I. INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| METHODOLOGY..... | 2 |
| II. EXISTING HISTORIC STATUS | 3 |
| NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES..... | 3 |
| CALIFORNIA REGISTER OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES..... | 3 |
| SAN FRANCISCO CITY LANDMARKS..... | 3 |
| CALIFORNIA HISTORICAL RESOURCE STATUS CODE..... | 3 |
| 1976 DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING ARCHITECTURAL QUALITY SURVEY | 4 |
| HERE TODAY | 4 |
| III. BUILDING AND PROPERTY DESCRIPTION | 5 |
| EXTERIOR..... | 5 |
| SITE FEATURES..... | 8 |
| SURROUNDING NEIGHBORHOOD | 11 |
| IV. HISTORIC CONTEXT | 14 |
| EARLY SAN FRANCISCO HISTORY..... | 14 |
| SAN FRANCISCO GAS LIGHT COMPANY & NORTH BEACH STATION | 19 |
| V. PROJECT SITE HISTORY | 31 |
| SITE DEVELOPMENT | 31 |
| 3620 BUCHANAN STREET ARCHITECT / LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT..... | 36 |
| CONSTRUCTION CHRONOLOGY..... | 37 |
| VI. EVALUATION..... | 40 |
| CALIFORNIA REGISTER OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES..... | 40 |
| INTEGRITY..... | 41 |
| VII. CONCLUSION | 45 |
| VIII. REFERENCES CITED..... | 46 |
| PUBLISHED WORKS..... | 46 |
| PUBLIC RECORDS | 46 |
| NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS..... | 47 |
| INTERNET SOURCES | 47 |
| IX. APPENDIX | 48 |
| BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATIONS..... | 48 |

I. INTRODUCTION

This Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) Part 1 has been prepared at the request of Sutro Architects, on behalf of Roger Walther of The Walther Foundation, for the building at 3620 Buchanan Street (APN 0459/003) in San Francisco's Marina neighborhood. The building is on the same parcel as San Francisco Landmark No. 58, known as Merryvale Antiques and originally the administration building of San Francisco Gas Light Company's North Beach Station located at 3636 Buchanan Street (also addressed as 3640 Buchanan Street). The L-shaped parcel is on the east side of Buchanan Street, between North Point Street and Bay Street (**Figure 1**).

The parcel has an area of 13,480 square feet and is located in a NC-2 (Small-Scale Neighborhood Commercial) zoning district. The landmarked building occupies the northern end of the lot along North Point Street while the subject building at 3620 Buchanan Street is at the lot's southern end; a designed patio garden separates the two buildings on the lot. Formerly the garden house and workshop, the subject building was constructed in 1958 and designed by architect Clifford Conly, Jr. It, along with the adjacent patio garden, was built for Dent and Margaret Macdonough, owners of Merryvale Antiques, which occupied the lot from 1958 to 1980. The subject building is used currently as an office.



**Figure 1: Assessor's map of the subject block. The subject parcel is highlighted in yellow. The subject building at 3620 Buchanan Street is located at the south end of the lot.
Source: San Francisco Assessor's Office. Edited by Page & Turnbull.**

Due to the Landmark status, the parcel is assigned Category A, "Historic Resource Present," by the City of San Francisco. The property was surveyed by the Junior League of San Francisco, Inc. as part of the *Here Today: San Francisco's Architectural Heritage* survey. *Here Today* is also a published book, and the San Francisco Gas Light Company building is discussed on page 15 of the 1968 edition. The property was surveyed again in the 1976 Department of City Planning Architectural Quality Survey and was given a survey rating of "3." However, the subject building located at 3620 Buchanan Street was constructed well after the San Francisco Gas Light Company building for which the parcel is designated a landmark and was not evaluated in the previous surveys. The purpose of this HRE Part 1 is to determine if the subject building is eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) individually or in association with the existing Landmark No. 58 and its setting.

METHODOLOGY

This report follows the outline provided by the San Francisco Planning Department for Historic Resource Evaluation Reports, and provides a summary of the current historic status, a building description, and historic context for 3620 Buchanan Street. The report also includes an evaluation of the property's eligibility for listing in the California Register, including any association with Landmark No. 58 and its setting.

Page & Turnbull prepared this report using research collected at various local repositories, including the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, the San Francisco Assessor's Office, the San Francisco Planning Department, and the San Francisco Public Library History Center, as well as various online sources including Ancestry.com and the California Digital Newspaper Collection. Key primary sources consulted and cited in this report include Sanborn Fire Insurance Company maps, City of San Francisco Building Permit Applications, San Francisco City Directories, Assessor's Office records, and historical newspapers. All photographs in this report were taken during a site visit conducted by Page & Turnbull in April 2016 unless otherwise noted.

II. EXISTING HISTORIC STATUS

The following section examines the national, state, and local historical ratings currently assigned to the building at 3620 Buchanan Street. Additionally, this section mentions the existing historic status for the building at 3636 Buchanan Street (also referred to and addressed as 3640 Buchanan Street) because it is situated on the same parcel as 3620 Buchanan Street.

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

The National Register of Historic Places (National Register) is the nation's most comprehensive inventory of historic resources. The National Register is administered by the National Park Service and includes buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts that possess historic, architectural, engineering, archaeological, or cultural significance at the national, state, or local level.

Neither 3620 or 3636 Buchanan Street is currently listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

CALIFORNIA REGISTER OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES

The California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) is an inventory of significant architectural, archaeological, and historical resources in the State of California. Resources can be listed in the California Register through a number of methods. State Historical Landmarks and National Register-listed properties are automatically listed in the California Register. Properties can also be nominated to the California Register by local governments, private organizations, or citizens. The evaluative criteria used by the California Register for determining eligibility are closely based on those developed by the National Park Service for the National Register of Historic Places.

Neither 3620 or 3636 Buchanan Street is currently listed in the California Register of Historical Resources.

SAN FRANCISCO CITY LANDMARKS

San Francisco City Landmarks are buildings, properties, structures, sites, districts, and objects of "special character or special historical, architectural or aesthetic interest or value and are an important part of the City's historical and architectural heritage."¹ Adopted in 1967 as Article 10 of the City Planning Code, the San Francisco City Landmark program protects listed buildings from inappropriate alterations and demolitions through review by the San Francisco Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board. These properties are important to the city's history and help to provide significant and unique examples of the past that are irreplaceable. In addition, these landmarks help to protect the surrounding neighborhood development and enhance the educational and cultural dimension of the city.

The subject building at 3620 Buchanan Street is not currently designated as a San Francisco City Landmark or Structure of Merit. However, 3636 Buchanan Street is designated as San Francisco Landmark No. 58 (Merryvale Antiques; originally the San Francisco Gas Light Company). 3620 and 3636 Buchanan Street do not fall within the boundaries of any existing locally designated historic districts or conservation districts.

CALIFORNIA HISTORICAL RESOURCE STATUS CODE

Properties listed or under review by the State of California Office of Historic Preservation are assigned a California Historical Resource Status Code (Status Code) of "1" to "7" to establish their

¹ San Francisco Planning Department, *Preservation Bulletin No. 9 – Landmarks* (San Francisco: January 2003).

historical significance in relation to the National Register of Historic Places (National Register or NR) or California Register of Historical Resources (California Register or CR). Properties with a Status Code of "1" or "2" are either eligible for listing in the California Register or the National Register, or are already listed in one or both of the registers. Properties assigned Status Codes of "3" or "4" appear to be eligible for listing in either register, but normally require more research to support this rating. Properties assigned a Status Code of "5" have typically been determined to be locally significant or to have contextual importance. Properties with a Status Code of "6" are not eligible for listing in either register. Finally, a Status Code of "7" means that the resource has not been evaluated for the National Register or the California Register, or needs reevaluation.

3620 Buchanan Street is not listed in the California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS) database with a status code. The most recent update to the California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS) database for San Francisco County that lists the status codes was in April 2012. However, 3636 Buchanan Street is listed as the "Meter and Office House" of the San Francisco Gas Light Company (Landmark No. 58) with a Status Code of 7J, "Received by OHP for evaluation or action but not yet evaluated" (status date: 08/09/2000).

1976 DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING ARCHITECTURAL QUALITY SURVEY

The 1976 Department of City Planning Architectural Quality Survey (1976 DCP Survey) is what is referred to in preservation parlance as a "reconnaissance" or "windshield" survey. The survey looked at the entire City and County of San Francisco to identify and rate architecturally significant buildings and structures on a scale of "-2" (detrimental) to "+5" (extraordinary). No research was performed and the potential historical significance of a resource was not considered when a rating was assigned. Buildings rated "3" or higher in the survey represent approximately the top two percent of San Francisco's building stock in terms of architectural significance. However, it should be noted here that the 1976 DCP Survey has come under increasing scrutiny over the past decade due to the fact that it has not been updated in over twenty-five years. As a result, the 1976 DCP Survey has not been officially recognized by the San Francisco Planning Department as a valid local register of historic resources for the purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

3620 Buchanan Street is not listed in the 1976 DCP Survey; however, 3636 Buchanan Street was listed and was given a survey rating of "3."

HERE TODAY

Here Today: San Francisco's Architectural Heritage (Here Today) is one of San Francisco's first architectural surveys, undertaken by the Junior League of San Francisco, Inc. and published in book form in 1968. Although the *Here Today* survey did not assign ratings, it did provide brief historical and biographical information about what the authors believed to be significant buildings.

3620 Buchanan Street is not mentioned in *Here Today*; however, 3636 Buchanan Street was surveyed and is discussed on page 15 of the book.

III. BUILDING AND PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

EXTERIOR

The building at 3620 Buchanan Street is located on the east side of Buchanan Street, between North Point Street and Bay Street (**Figure 2**). Situated on a level parcel, the building is south of the main building on the parcel, 3636 Buchanan Street (Landmark No. 58) and a patio garden. The building is set back approximately 20 feet from the street, behind a brick wall and metal entrance gate that leads to the front concrete patio. The building's primary façade is oriented to the south and the rear façade looks onto the patio garden.

The wood frame building is one story in height, and approximately three bays wide, and two bays deep. It has a vernacular garden house with French decorative elements. The building has a hipped asphalt shingle roof in the shape of an "L," though the eastern section (bottom portion of the "L") is dropped and thus has a lower ridge. The western, upper portion of the roof has two three-lite skylights with wire glass. The volume that extends from the elbow of the "L" has a shed roof. The building's vertical wood board walls have wood trim and sit atop a concrete foundation. All doors are ten-lite wood French doors with wood surrounds and appear to be original.



Figure 2: 3620 Buchanan Street, San Francisco, facing south. Yellow shading roughly delineates the subject parcel; black dashed outline roughly delineates the subject building.

Source: Microsoft Bing Maps, 2016. Edited by Page & Turnbull.

Primary (South) Façade

The primary façade does not face the street, but rather, faces south towards the building's front patio (**Figure 3**). The first, western-most bay is part of the upper portion of the "L" and contains the main entrance, which has the standard door type and a fabric awning (**Figure 4**). The second, middle bay contains the volume that extends from the elbow of the "L" (**Figure 5**). It has a one-over-one double-hung wood sash window with a wood surround and frosted glazing. The third, eastern-most bay further protrudes, as it is the bottom portion of the "L" (**Figure 6**). Its south façade contains

two six-over-six double-hung wood sash windows with horns and wood surrounds, and its west façade facing the front patio garden features the standard door (Figure 7).




Figure 3: Primary (south) and west façades behind the perimeter brick wall, facing northeast.



Figure 4: Western-most bay, facing north.




Figure 5: Middle bay, facing northeast.




Figure 6: West façade of eastern-most bay, facing east.




Figure 7: South façade of eastern-most bay, facing northeast.

West Façade

The entire west façade directly abuts the six-foot-tall perimeter brick wall and is not visible (**Figure 8**).




Figure 8: Perimeter brick wall (left) and building's south façade (right) showing the lack of accessibility to the west façade, facing north.

Rear (North) Façade

The rear façade looks onto the patio garden and the south side façade of Landmark No. 58 (**Figure 9**). At the center of the rear façade is a 12-lite wood sash window, which is flanked by two standard doors (**Figure 10**). Above both doors, behind the climbing plants, is a half-circle sunburst motif that extends upward through the cornice line, creating an arched cross gable (**Figure 11**). The rest of the rear façade has wood lattice attached to the vertical wood board siding.




Figure 9: Rear (north) façade and patio garden, facing south.



Figure 10: Rear façade, facing southwest.



Figure 11: Sunburst motif seen above both doors, facing south.

East Façade

Similar to the west façade, the entire east façade directly abuts a tall brick wall and is not visible (Figure 12).



Figure 12: Brick wall (left) and building's north façade (right) showing the lack of accessibility to the east façade, facing southeast.

SITE FEATURES

As an 1893 brick two-story building, Landmark No. 58 dominates the parcel on which the subject building is situated (Figure 13). Formerly one of the San Francisco Gas Light Company complex's buildings, Landmark No. 58 is located on the corner of the property, at the southeast corner of Buchanan and North Point streets. Originally an industrial site, the property now features a patio garden (renovated in 2000) between Landmark No. 58 and the subject building and a driveway that has been converted into a brick-paved side patio along the east side of Landmark No. 58. Small street trees line the sidewalks.



Figure 13: Landmark No. 58 (left) and subject building (right), facing southeast.

An iron fence sits atop a low concrete wall and extends along the street-facing façades of Landmark No. 58. The iron entrance gate aligns with the main entrance of Landmark No. 58, which is on the building's west façade facing Buchanan Street (**Figure 14**). There is groomed landscaping and a gravel path between the building and the fence. The gravel path, which is only along the west side, connects to the patio garden south of the building, accessed by an iron gate (**Figure 15**).




Figure 14: Iron gate and main entrance to Landmark No. 58, facing east.



Figure 15: Gravel path and iron gate to patio garden, facing south.

The patio garden is bounded by six-foot-tall (or taller) brick walls to the west (along Buchanan Street) and east (neighboring property); both walls extend to surround the subject building at 3620 Buchanan Street. The northern end of the patio is bounded by Landmark No. 58, which has an entrance on its south façade leading to the patio garden (**Figure 16**). The southern end of the patio garden is the subject building's north façade and its two French doors accessing the garden. The patio paving is brick and outlined by a low brick wall, creating planters between the two brick walls. The formal, symmetrical landscaping includes groomed hedges, bushes, flowers, and small trees.

A brick path leads from the patio garden along the eastern half of Landmark No. 58's south façade to the east façade (**Figure 17**). The path is lined with groomed hedges, flowers, bushes, and small trees that form a canopy above it. South of the path is a tall wood lattice fence, and the east end of the path has a similar lattice fence and a wood lattice door (**Figure 18 and Figure 19**). The path connects to a small side brick patio east of the building, which has yet another entrance on its east façade (**Figure 20**). The side patio is bounded to the south and east by tall brick walls covered in lattice-patterned climbing plants. Groomed hedges and small trees with iron grills line the edges. At the north end, the side patio has a large, vehicle-sized iron gate supported by brick columns, and a small iron entrance gate to the west side (**Figure 21**). The brick paving extends on the other side of the iron gates to the sidewalk, which has a curb cut at the street.




Figure 16: Patio garden with Landmark No. 58 in the background, facing north.



Figure 17: Landmark No. 58 (left) and brick path (center), facing east.



Figure 18: Brick path and lattice door, facing east.




Figure 19: Lattice door and south brick wall of side patio, facing southwest.




Figure 20: East side patio and Landmark No. 58 (left), facing north.



Figure 21: Large iron gate and Landmark No. 58 (right) with driveway in foreground and side patio in background, facing south.

The subject building at 3620 Buchanan Street is either accessed by its rear entrance via the patio garden, or by the subject building's front (south) concrete patio (Figure 22). The brick walls that bound the patio garden and building at the west and east ends bound the concrete patio as well, with a brick wall also at the south end (Figure 23). There is a break in the west brick wall for the iron entrance gate, which leads from the sidewalk along Buchanan Street to the concrete patio and subject building. The patio is lined with groomed hedges and small evergreen trees.




Figure 22: Concrete patio and metal gate, facing southwest.




Figure 23: South brick wall of concrete patio with roofs of Landmark No. 58 and subject building in background, facing north.

SURROUNDING NEIGHBORHOOD

The subject parcel is bounded by North Point Street to the north, the property of 1570 Bay Street to the east, the property of 1598 Bay Street to the south, and Buchanan Street to the west. The neighborhood immediately surrounding 3620 Buchanan Street is a mixture of residential, commercial, and industrial buildings between one and five stories tall. Construction dates range from pre-1900 to 2006 (according to the San Francisco Assessor's Office) and architectural styles seen throughout the area have a similarly great range. Along North Point Street, immediately east of the subject property is the Pacific Gas and Electric's Marina Substation in a Modern style followed by a Third Bay Tradition apartment complex with a commercial ground floor (Figure 24). At the intersection of Buchanan and Bay streets, immediately south of the subject property, is an abandoned

gas station with no distinct architectural style (Figure 25). One block to the north is a Safeway grocery store and its parking lot, to the east is Fort Mason, to the south is the Moscone Recreation Center, and to the west (across Buchanan Street from the subject building) are residential buildings, some with a commercial ground floor (Figure 26 to Figure 30).




Figure 24: Marina Substation and the apartment complex, facing southwest.




Figure 25: Abandoned gas station, facing northeast.



Figure 26: Moscone Recreation Center, facing southwest.



Figure 27: View of Fort Mason from subject block, facing southeast.




Figure 28: Front of Safeway, facing south.




Figure 29: Rear of Safeway, which faces subject property, facing northeast.



Figure 30: Apartment building with commercial ground floor, west of subject block, facing west.

IV. HISTORIC CONTEXT

EARLY SAN FRANCISCO HISTORY

European settlement of what is now San Francisco took place in 1776 with the simultaneous establishment of the Presidio of San Francisco by representatives of the Spanish Viceroy, and the founding of Mission San Francisco de Asis (Mission Dolores) by the Franciscan missionaries. The Spanish colonial era persisted until 1821, when Mexico earned its independence from Spain, taking with it the former Spanish colony of Alta California. During the Mexican period, the region's economy was based primarily on cattle ranching, and a small trading village known as Yerba Buena grew up around a plaza (today known as Portsmouth Square) located above a cove in San Francisco Bay. In 1839, a few streets were laid out around the plaza, and settlement expanded up the slopes of Nob Hill.

During the Mexican-American war in 1846, San Francisco was occupied by U.S. military forces, and the following year the village was renamed San Francisco, taking advantage of that name's association with the Bay. Around the same time, a surveyor named Jasper O'Farrell extended the original street grid, while also laying out Market Street from what is now the Ferry Building to Twin Peaks. Blocks north of this then imaginary line were laid out in small 50-*vara* square blocks whereas blocks south of Market were laid out in larger 100-*vara* blocks.²

The discovery of gold at Sutter's Mill in 1848 brought explosive growth to San Francisco, with thousands of would-be gold-seekers making their way to the isolated outpost on the edge of the North American continent. Between 1846 and 1852, the population of San Francisco mushroomed from less than one thousand people to almost 35,000. The lack of level land for development around Portsmouth Square soon pushed development south to Market Street, eastward onto filled tidal lands, and westward toward Nob Hill. At this time, most buildings in San Francisco were concentrated downtown, and the outlying portions of the peninsula remained unsettled throughout much of the late nineteenth century.

With the decline of gold production during the mid-1850s, San Francisco's economy diversified over the following decades to include agriculture, manufacturing, shipping, construction, and banking.³ Prospering from these industries, a new elite class of merchants, bankers, and industrialists arose to shape the development of the city as the foremost financial, industrial, and shipping center of the West.

MARINA NEIGHBORHOOD HISTORY

3620 Buchanan Street is located within San Francisco's Marina neighborhood. The boundaries of the Marina are roughly defined by the San Francisco Bay to the north, Van Ness Avenue and Fort Mason to the east, Lombard Street to the south, and the Presidio of San Francisco to the west.

As shown on the 1869 U.S. Coast Survey map, most of what is today the Marina District was submerged beneath San Francisco Bay (**Figure 31**). The eastern part of the Marina District consisted of an enormous sand dune bounded approximately by Black Point (today's Fort Mason) on the north, Leavenworth Street on the east, Fillmore Street on the west, and Lombard Street on the south. Several lagunas, or lakes, are also shown south of Lombard Street. The largest of these was known as "Washerwoman's Lagoon" as it was the site of numerous laundry facilities, as well as other industries requiring large amounts of fresh water (**Figure 32**).

² *Vara* is derived from an antiquated Spanish unit of measurement.

³ Rand Richards, *Historic San Francisco: A Concise History and Guide* (2001) 77.




Figure 31: Overlay of 1869 Coast Survey map under current street grid. Washerwoman's Lagoon is at lower right. Red star indicates approximate location of the subject property. Source: David Rumsey Collection and Google Earth 2015. Edited by Page & Turnbull.




Figure 32: Circa 1860 view looking west toward Washerwoman's Lagoon and future Marina District. The future site of the subject property is northwest of the lagoon (upper right corner). Source: Carleton E. Watkins, Bancroft Library 1964.072.01 via Calisphere.

What is today the heart of the Marina District was still a shallow tideland with a "rural landscape of mud flats, shanties, pastures, and small farms."⁴ Only a handful of buildings existed, including a small cluster around the Fillmore Street Wharf, which allowed some of the farmers and dairy producers in

⁴ Christopher VerPlanck, "From Mud Flats to Marina: Building a San Francisco Neighborhood," *Heritage News* XXXV:3 (Summer 2007) 5.

the area to ship products around the bay.⁵ The primary routes through the area were the Presidio Road, developed during the 1840s, and the Bay Shore & Fort Point Road, a toll road developed in 1864, which ran from North Beach to the Presidio.⁶

To the east was Fort Mason, a military reservation created in 1850 at Black Point, a prominent outcropping of rock. Fort Mason was not fortified, however, until 1863 during the Civil War. Immediately southwest of Fort Mason was Lobos Square (currently the Moscone Recreation Center), bounded by Chestnut, Laguna, Webster, and Bay streets. The Square was reserved in 1855 by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, but remained vacant throughout the nineteenth century. As discussed in Randolph Delehanty's study of San Francisco parks: "It was the only true bayside reservation and fronted on the tidal marshes near what became Gashouse Cove and the Fulton Iron Works. Nothing was done to improve the site until the filling in of the marshes for the gigantic Panama-Pacific International Exposition of 1915."⁷

The "Gashouse Cove" (Gas House Cove) mentioned by Delehanty referenced the gas works constructed by the San Francisco Gas Light Company between 1891 and 1893. In particular, a massive gas storage tank was constructed at the northwest corner of Bay and Laguna streets. Built as the administration building, San Francisco Landmark No. 58 at 3636 Buchanan Street is the only remaining building of this complex. In addition to the gas works, other industrial plants located in the area included the California Pressed Brick Company, the Pacific Ammonia Chemical Company, and a soap and tallow works. Recreational facilities were also established, including Harbor View Park (1860s) which offered a beer garden, shooting range, restaurant, and hotel. The park proved so popular that its name was applied to the entire area.⁸

By the early 1890s, San Francisco businessman James Fair had purchased nearly forty-nine blocks in the Harbor View area, much of which consisted of submerged lands. In 1892, Fair convinced the city to build a seawall in order to fill in the area, which could then be used for further industrial development. The project was halted in 1894, however, with only 60 acres having been filled.⁹

After the 1906 Earthquake and Fire, earthquake refugee camps were established at Harbor View (Camp No. 8) and at Lobos Square (Camp No. 9). Some of the gas works buildings (not including Landmark No. 58) suffered from the disaster and were repaired or rebuilt nearby. By 1910, with San Francisco well on the way to recovery, San Francisco merchants raised over four million dollars to acquire the Harbor View area for the site of a World's Fair. They also formed the Exposition Company, which began leasing lands for the site of the fair—including large tracts owned by Virginia Vanderbilt and Theresa Oelrichs, the daughters of James Fair.¹⁰ Suction dredges were then used to pump sand and mud from San Francisco Bay to fill the remaining area behind James Fair's seawall (**Figure 33**). Existing buildings adjacent to the newly filled land were demolished to make way for the Exposition. However, most of the Gas Light Company remained – though by 1905 it was absorbed by and renamed the Pacific Gas and Electric Company.¹¹

The Panama-Pacific International Exposition (PPIE) opened in February 1915—celebrating both the completion of the Panama Canal and San Francisco's recovery from the Earthquake and Fire. Over

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Robert Bardell, "The Presidio Road," *The Argonaut*, Vol. 23, No. 2 (Winter 2012) 4-11.

⁷ Randolph Stephen Delehanty, *San Francisco parks and playground, 1839 to 1990: The history of public good in one North American city (Volumes I and II)* (Harvard University Thesis, 1992) 82-83.

⁸ VerPlanck, "From Mud Flats to Marina: Building a San Francisco Neighborhood," 6.

⁹ Ibid, 6-7.

¹⁰ Ibid, 7.

¹¹ Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board, "Merryvale Antiques (Formerly San Francisco Gas Light Company)," San Francisco Landmark No. 58 designation (1973).

18 million visitors came to the fair over the course of the year, marveling at an astonishing array of “temples” and “palaces” constructed at the site. The subject property was located between the Machinery Palace and The Zone (Amusement Concessions) (Figure 34).




Figure 33: Detail of the 1911 “Chevalier” map showing the Marina District and sea wall. Red star indicates approximate location of the subject property. Source: David Rumsey Collection. Edited by Page & Turnbull.




Figure 34: Detail of the 1914 Southern Pacific Company’s map of “San Francisco and Vicinity” showing the layout of the Panama-Pacific International Exposition. Yellow star indicates approximate location of the subject property. Source: David Rumsey Collection. Edited by Page & Turnbull.

The vast majority of the PPIE buildings were designed to be temporary, and by 1916, the only remaining buildings and features were the Yacht Harbor, the North Gardens (now Marina Green), the Palace of Fine Arts, and the Column of Progress (no longer extant). The streetcar lines established by the San Francisco Municipal Railway to provide access to the fair also remained in use, making the former PPIE lands extremely attractive for residential development. In 1922, the Marina Corporation was formed to develop 55 acres bounded by Fillmore, Scott, Chestnut, and Marina Boulevard. Here, diagonal and curvilinear streets were installed to provide bay views and promote the idea of a residential park. Elsewhere, the land owned by Virginia Vanderbilt and her sister Theresa

Oelrichs was sold off and developed with the standard street grid. Residential and commercial uses were generally segregated as the result of the passage of San Francisco's first zoning law in 1917.¹²

In the 1920s and 1930s, the new Marina District—as the former Harbor View area came to be known—experienced a sustained residential building boom. New houses, flats, and apartments were constructed in a variety of architectural styles, with Mediterranean Revival influenced designs by far the most popular. Other common influences included Spanish Eclectic designs, Classical, Renaissance, Tudor, and French Provincial Revival designs, as well as scattered examples of Art Deco buildings.

Civic development accompanied the growth of the Marina District. This included construction of the Funston Playground (now called Moscone Recreation Center) at Lobos Square, as well as the Marina Junior High School (1937) directly to the east. Chestnut Street evolved as the primary commercial corridor, largely because it marked the route of the D Geary-Van Ness streetcar line, later replaced by buses. By the late 1930s, the Marina District was almost completely built out (**Figure 35**). Promotional literature from the 1930s touted the Marina District's schools, parks, tennis courts, and thousands of beautiful homes as the “garden spot” of San Francisco.¹³



Figure 35: Detail of 1938 aerial photograph by Harrison Ryker, showing the Marina District with the Palace of Fine Arts at left, Lobos Square/Funston Playground towards the center, Fort Mason at upper right, and varying block patterns. Red star indicates approximate location of the subject property. Source: David Rumsey Collection. Edited by Page & Turnbull.

World War II brought a rush of military activity at Fort Mason and the Presidio. Fort Mason supervised transportation activities at other installations in the Bay Area and was used as a port of embarkation for military personnel. During the mid-twentieth century, Lombard Street—with its direct access to the Golden Gate Bridge—was developed with a large number of motels catering to auto tourists. The Marina District suffered severe damage during the 1989 Loma Prieta Earthquake, as liquefaction of the land filled for the PPIE caused buildings to collapse and gas mains to burst. The damaged properties have since been renovated or rebuilt.

¹² Christopher VerPlanck, “Marina District Development Takes Off,” *Heritage News*, Vol. XXXV, No. 4, Fall 2007, 5.

¹³ Sanborn Fire Insurance Company maps (1924-1949); San Francisco Public Library Vertical Files: “SF Districts: Marina;” VerPlanck, “From Mud Flats to Marina: Building a San Francisco Neighborhood,” 5-8.

SAN FRANCISCO GAS LIGHT COMPANY & NORTH BEACH STATION

There are several historical accounts of the San Francisco Gas Light Company and its North Beach Station (also known as the Buchanan Street Station) located at Gas House Cove in the Marina. Their sources include the San Francisco Landmark No. 58 designation from 1973, the Abbreviated Historic Structure Report (HSR) prepared by Patrick McGrew, Architect, AIA from 1998, and the historical context booklet, *A Place of Light and Power*, from 2000 commissioned by the Walthers and written by Gray Brechin. The latter provides the most comprehensive and accurate narrative, and thus is excerpted below for this historic context. Figures inserted throughout, however, were added by Page & Turnbull and do not appear in the book.

All cities require assured inputs of energy and water to accommodate growing numbers of inhabitants and to raise the value of urban land, a reality that an Irish immigrant named Peter Donahue understood and saw as an opportunity in the first years of the Gold Rush. On a spring morning in 1850, Donahue walked through the sand dunes south of Market Street as the burgeoning city covered the hills around Yerba Buena Cove. Turning to a companion, he prophesied, "This is going to be a great city at no distant day. There will have to be gas works and water works here, and whoever has faith enough to embark in either of these enterprises will make money from them."

And make money he did. Donahue and his two brothers established San Francisco's first foundry, a primitive enterprise in a tent near Portsmouth Square. Their business proved so successful that they soon moved to a larger site on the waterfront just south of Market Street. Their plant became the famous Union Iron Works, the nucleus of what was to become the greatest concentration of machine shops and iron works on Pacific shores. Until sold to the Bethlehem Steel Company in 1902, UIW produced and exported advanced mining machinery throughout the West and around the world.

Obtaining a franchise from San Francisco in 1852 to produce gas from coal, the Donahues started construction of a plant at First and Howard Streets, less than a block from their foundry. The iron works enabled them to make the retorts needed to heat coal to drive off flammable gas needed to light the city. Peter Donahue ordered twenty tons of anthracite from Australia to manufacture his company's first illuminating gas.

On February 11, 1854, the Donahues hosted a banquet at the Oriental Hotel to celebrate the inauguration of gas street lighting in downtown San Francisco. Donahue's prophecy was amply realized, for his San Francisco Gas Company quickly had so many subscribers that for decades it was able to maintain its lead in the city's energy market. In 1873, it merged with two competitors to create the San Francisco Gas Light Company.

With the backing of some of the city's leading capitalists, the SFGLC steadily expanded its operations so that by the time of Peter Donahue's death in 1885, he had become one of California's wealthiest citizens. His company continued to lay miles of underground pipes through which coal gas furnished the energy that served everincreasing numbers of residences and industries.

Unfortunately for the Donahues and everyone else interested in manufacturing or steam transportation, California is poor in coal. Lignite mined to the east of San Francisco on the flanks of Mount Diablo proved too poor in heat value to stoke the state's growing industrial base. The city's merchants and manufacturers compensated by exporting thousands of tons of California wheat around Cape Horn to the flour mills of Liverpool, England, while machinery was sent across the Pacific to Sydney. Anthracite coal returned to San Francisco from those ports to fuel the booming economy.

Essential as it was for the city's existence, few paid much attention to the unglamorous coal trade, for the gold and silver mines of Nevada's Comstock Lode provided the real excitement throughout the 1860s and 70s. The wildly oscillating fortunes of the mines beneath Virginia City created speculative frenzies around the San Francisco mining exchange, permanently fixing the intersection of California and Montgomery Streets as the financial epicenter of the western United States. Speculators invested their Comstock profits in real estate, industry, and lavishly ornamented office buildings and mansions. They also created power companies to compete with the San Francisco Gas Light Company.

Among the most successful of the Comstock speculators were two mining engineers, John Mackay and Jim Fair, who, together with the San Francisco stockbrokers William O'Brien and James Flood, controlled major mining operations at Virginia City. In 1873, Fair and Mackay's crews bored deep into the very heart of the Lode, discovering what became known as the Big Bonanza. That astonishing strike made the four men so wealthy that they were soon known as the Silver Kings. Like all mining men, they appreciated the need for cheap energy, while their sudden wealth enabled them to associate as social and business equals with other successful Irish immigrants such as the Donahues and the Tobins of the Hibernia Savings and Loan Society.

Founded by the Tobins in 1859, the Hibernia became San Francisco's largest savings bank on the strength of loans made largely to Irish clients who were building the houses, cottages, and tenements which followed the expanding network of gas and water mains and cable car lines out of the downtown. Those buildings became virtual machines for living in the 1880s as new inventions offered rising levels of comfort and cleanliness previously available only to the wealthy, if at all. Gas mantles replaced dangerous candles and kerosene lamps, and soon other uses for gas were offered to consumers. The San Francisco Gas Light Company opened a store on Post Street to display the latest in cooking stoves. The company advertised the safety and convenience of their modern appliances which freed their owners from the need to stoke the stoves with coal and to dispose of cinders. The company further promised that pipes passing in coils through the stoves would provide houses with hot running water. Advertisements debunked the rumor that gas used for cooking contaminated the food. Demand for gas increased gratifyingly.

In the 1873 merger which created the San Francisco Gas Light Company, the Donahue firm acquired, along with one of its rival's new gas plants east of Potrero Hill, an ambitious young engineer who had helped to build it. Joseph B. Crockett, Jr. rose rapidly through the company's hierarchy to become president in 1885 at the age of 35. Cable car inventor Andrew Hallidie could well have had the young engineer-president in mind when he wrote in an 1888 article praising the city's manufacturers:

"As nature in California is so robust and full of activity, it is not surprising that her citizens should share her energy, and with the vital force that such circumstances and conditions give, make her the home of industry and art." Through his presidency of the city's leading gas company, Crockett became wealthy and a noted collector and patron of the arts.

Like others in the gas industry, Crockett feared that the rapidly advancing technology of electrical generation and transmission threatened his company's dominance of the energy market. He also understood, however, that the state's rising production of petroleum offered his company the opportunity to produce a new and superior type of gas-sourced energy. He introduced into California a technique invented in Pennsylvania for the production of "water gas". The process involved forcing steam through incandescent anthracite coal to produce "blue gas" which was then mixed in a superheater with volatilized petroleum. The resultant water gas burned cleaner and hotter than simple coal gas. Crockett converted the SFGLC's Potrero plant to the manufacture of water gas while continuing to make coal gas at the older plant on Howard Street.

Farsighted as he may have been, Crockett realized that his two plants would soon be insufficient to furnish gas for the residential districts expanding westward. He saw the need to build a thoroughly modern gasworks to fill both present and future demand. Under his direction, the company purchased the city blocks lying between Bay, Laguna, Webster, and San Francisco Bay. These blocks occupied the eastern shoreline of a cove extending as far south as Francisco Street in what is today the Marina District. The plant's waterfront location would allow freighters to offload coal and crude oil directly onto the site. It would then manufacture and supply water gas to the rapidly growing districts of Pacific Heights and Cow Hollow. In 1889, the *San Francisco Examiner* noted that land values in the area had doubled in the previous two years...

In May, 1891, Crockett directed the beginning of construction of two brick buildings west of Buchanan Street between North Point and Bay for the production of water gas. On January 1, 1892, the *San Francisco Chronicle* praised the completed structures as "strongly built and worthy of a great and growing city". The buildings marked the beginning of what would be called the gas company's North Beach Station [Figure 36].

Across the street from the production facilities, Crockett indulged his aesthetic ambitions by constructing an elegant two-story administrative structure with a corner turret and gracefully arched windows trimmed with terra cotta [Landmark No. 58]. A large Romanesque arch bearing the name of the company in raised lettering announced the recessed front door. The door opened onto a comfortable first floor office which occupied the front of the building, while a spacious and well appointed apartment was provided for the plant manager on the second floor.

If the front exterior looked medieval, the rear two-thirds had a calmly classical demeanor with tall arched windows separated by brick pilasters. The windows provided plentiful light for an impressive two-story room occupying the rear two-thirds of the building. It housed an array of meters that recorded the flow of gas from the compressors through pipes linked to the company's thousands of customers. Crockett's chief assistant later recalled that the North Beach Plant "was

his pride and was recognized for many years as the finest gas works in the world". That pride is evident today in the fact that Crockett chose to roof the great meter room with a superb redwood coffered ceiling instead of the usual open trusses. In addition, he planned for a garden and lawn to separate this handsome brick edifice from two gas tanks on the same block, one of which contained two million cubic feet of gas and was reputed to be the largest west of Chicago [Figure 37]. An inspector for the Sanborn Fire Insurance Company described the North Beach Station as "exceptionally clean and tidy- buildings very substantial". The *Chronicle* reported that the machinery was kept so clean that it could be touched with kid gloves.

Architectural historians have admired the sophisticated proportions and detailing of the San Francisco Gas Light Company's administration building and have speculated as to its architect. That honor most likely belongs to Clinton Day, one of San Francisco's leading practitioners of the late Victorian Queen Anne style. Because Day had designed Crockett's Pacific Heights mansion and the SFGLC's downtown office building, that attribution seems justified, though Crockett always claimed credit for the exceptionally well-designed industrial structure. An 1893 Sanborn Insurance Company map shows that Crockett's company filled in a half block space extending two blocks north of its production facilities to create a broad jetty between Webster and Buchanan Streets [Figure 36]. The jetty had docking facilities for the delivery of fuel and accommodated a coal yard and oil tanks. A photograph published in the San Francisco News Letter in January of 1902 shows two scows laden with coal anchored in "Gas House Cove" east of the jetty. The brick buildings that housed the water gas machinery, along with an immense holding tank and the turreted administration building, stand near the sandy shore of the cove against the backdrop of the Pacific Heights ridge in the distance...

When Crockett completed the North Beach Station, he decommissioned the old coal gas plant on Howard Street. Despite his showcase gasworks, however, Crockett remained worried about the threat to the gas industry represented by electricity. In the summer of 1893, the year in which the administration building was completed, Crockett hosted the newly organized Pacific Coast Gas Association in San Francisco, which duly elected him its first president. The Association's chief objective was to develop a strategy to meet the incursions of electricity. The best policy, concluded the Association, was to merge gas and electrical companies and to promote niche marketing; gas would be advertised as ideal for cooking and heating and electricity for light and power.

The old gas company thus merged, on December 11, 1896, with its chief rival to create the San Francisco Gas and Electric Company (SFG&EC) [Figure 37]. The new firm boasted a capitalization of \$20 million and a board comprised of many of the city's leading capitalists, including Levi Strauss and Peter J. Donahue, nephew of the firm's chief founder. Crockett continued as president of the combined firms, but not for long.

In 1899, Crockett made the mistake of offending sugar king Claus Spreckels when he refused to discuss at the Pacific Union Club Spreckels's complaint that smoke from one of Crockett's plants was smudging a skyscraper he had recently built at Third and Market streets. The Spreckels Building was a landmark from the moment it was completed, and Claus felt for it the same pride that Crockett took in his

North Beach Station. Not one to be crossed, the Sugar King took his revenge by organizing a rival power company to give battle. The resultant rate war proved so disastrous that the SFG&EC stock plummeted, permitting Claus's estranged son Rudolph to buy large amounts of its securities at depressed prices and to gain a seat on its board. Charging mismanagement, Rudolph Spreckels forced Crockett's resignation from the presidency and his replacement by W. B. Bourn. Bourn succeeded in consolidating all the city's power companies on September 1, 1903; Crockett died less than four months later. Rudolph Spreckels sold his stock at a very large profit.

The San Francisco Gas and Electric Company lasted for less than two years after it absorbed the Spreckels Company, for in 1905 Bourn realized his dream of a larger consolidation by joining it with a regional company supplying hydroelectric power from the Sierra Nevada. That marriage created the Pacific Gas and Electric Company. From then on J. B. Crockett's pride, the North Beach Station, became a minor facility in the continually expanding and modernizing PG&E power grid. The earthquake of 1906 finished the plant's role as a production facility by extensively damaging the buildings west of Buchanan Street [Figure 38]. Because it was built on more solid ground, the administration building escaped serious damage.

Even more miraculously, it survived the Panama-Pacific International Exposition of 1915 [Figure 39]. The directors of the fair razed the old production facilities and filled what remained of the cove west of Buchanan Street [Figure 40]. PG&E replaced the gas meters in the rear of the administration building with electrical transformers to feed energy to the exposition. Incongruous as it appeared, the brick Victorian building remained standing between the imperial Roman splendor of the central fair and the Coney Island-like diversions of the Joy Zone to the east and south.

After the PPIE's closing, the former tidelands were cleared of exposition buildings. The old administration building stood on the edge of a vast vacant lot extending to the Presidio, which, in the 1920s, was covered with the stucco houses and apartment buildings of the present Marina District... PG&E used it [Landmark No. 58] for record storage, supplying the large tank to its rear with gas pumped from its Potrero plant.¹⁴

Throughout the rest of the twentieth century, residential and commercial development continued to fill in the blocks once occupied by the North Beach Station. The small gasholder tank south of the administration building was replaced by a gas station by 1938 [Figure 41 and Figure 42]. The auxiliary steam plant at North Beach Station, constructed ca. 1910 and also known as the North Beach Powerhouse, was demolished by 1959 to make way for the Safeway Grocery store built that year. The large gasholder tank southeast of the administration building was replaced by a ca. 1969 apartment complex. The administration building, Landmark No. 58, is the only surviving building of the North Beach Station and reportedly the "oldest intact survivor of the origins of the private utility company known as PG&E."¹⁵

¹⁴ Gray Brechin, *A Place of Light and Power: The Restored S.F. Gas Light Co. Building, San Francisco Landmark No. 58* (San Francisco: Tapestries Publishing, 2000) 7-20.

¹⁵ Patrick McGrew, "The San Francisco Gas Light Company: Abbreviated Historic Structure Report," December 22, 1998.




Figure 36: 1893 insurance map by the Sanborn-Perris Map Co. Yellow shading roughly delineates subject parcel and orange shading delineates future location of 3620 Buchanan Street.
Source: San Francisco Public Library. Edited by Page & Turnbull.




Figure 37: 1899 insurance map by the Sanborn-Perris Map Co. Yellow shading roughly delineates subject parcel and orange shading delineates future location of 3620 Buchanan Street. Source: San Francisco Public Library. Edited by Page & Turnbull.




Figure 38: 1906 photograph of Lobos Square Refugee Camp, showing the damaged North Beach Station in the background.

Source: San Francisco Public Library Historical Photograph Collection (AAC-3104).




Figure 39: 1914 photograph of the North Beach Powerhouse (left) and the Machinery Palace of the PPIE (right). Source: SFMTA Photography Department & Archive (U04635).




Figure 40: 1913 insurance map by the Sanborn Map Co. Yellow shading roughly delineates subject parcel and orange shading delineates future location of 3620 Buchanan Street.
Source: San Francisco Public Library. Edited by Page & Turnbull.




Figure 41: 1938 aerial photograph by Harrison Ryker. Yellow shading roughly delineates subject parcel and orange shading delineates future location of 3620 Buchanan Street.
Source: David Rumsey Map Collection. Edited by Page & Turnbull.




Figure 42: 1950 insurance map by the Sanborn Map Co. Yellow shading roughly delineates subject parcel and orange shading delineates future location of 3620 Buchanan Street.
Source: San Francisco Public Library. Edited by Page & Turnbull.




Figure 43: 1900 insurance map by the Sanborn Map Co. Yellow shading roughly delineates subject parcel and orange shading delineates 3620 Buchanan Street.

Source: San Francisco Public Library. Edited by Page & Turnbull.

V. PROJECT SITE HISTORY

SITE DEVELOPMENT

Industrial Use (1893-1958)

As shown on the 1869 U.S. Coast Survey map, the vicinity of the future building at 3620 Buchanan Street consisted of marshes and sand dunes on the U.S. Reserve (Fort Mason), with Black Point a short distance northeast. Rare for property in the Marina, the subject parcel was not one of the many filled in by suction dredges, and thus to its benefit later on did not significantly suffer from the 1906 Earthquake and Fire. By 1893, the subject parcel became the site of San Francisco Gas Light Company's North Beach Station as discussed in the previous historic context. Located on the parcel was the complex's brick administration building, Landmark No. 58, originally used as an office with a large room for two meters and an apartment for the plant manager on the second floor. Landmark No. 58 remained as such until 1906, whereupon PG&E used it as record storage for the remainder of their ownership (Figure 44).




Figure 44: 1951 photograph of Landmark No. 58, then known as the PG&E administration building.
Source: *A Place of Light and Power* (page 18); PG&E.

In regards to the future garden house (also called garden cottage; garden shop; Greenhouse) at 3620 Buchanan Street, the 1893 and 1899 Sanborn maps show a one-story hose cart shed and a one-story horse shed at the site of the subject building. These sheds were removed by 1913 and the area remained vacant for 45 years. In regards to the future garden, it appears as though landscaping was an early component to the property, prior to Merryvale Antiques. The 1899 Sanborn map labels the grounds surrounding Landmark No. 58 as "Lawn & Garden." The Abbreviated HSR, however, disputes the landmark designation's claim: "The handsomely-landscaped and spacious areas between the buildings in the original complex were ideal for refugees following the 1906 Earthquake and Fire as photographs of the period show."¹⁶ The Abbreviated HSR states, "A search of the local photographic archives has failed to turn up any evidence of this report. In fact, the opposite appears to be true based upon photos that show considerable devastation surrounding the building."¹⁷

¹⁶ Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board, "Merryvale Antiques (Formerly San Francisco Gas Light Company)."

¹⁷ McGrew, "The San Francisco Gas Light Company: Abbreviated Historic Structure Report," 4.

Commercial Use (1958-present)

A Place of Light and Power continues beyond the history of the San Francisco Gas Light Company and North Beach Station with additional narrative of the site's development, and is thus excerpted throughout this section.

Changing taste posed perhaps the greatest threat to the building's [Landmark No. 58] survival in the first half of the twentieth century. During that time, Victorian-era structures such as the administration building fell so far out of fashion that many regarded their demolition as acts of civic beautification. Herb Caen described the building as "that gorgeously hideous old reel brick gas house on Buchanan Street" when he informed his readers on June 2, 1958 that Dent and Margaret Macdonough had purchased it from PG&E for \$100,000. The couple intended to convert it into a high-end antique store and "brickabrakery", Caen said.

The Macdonoughs figured large in the Bay Area's *ancien regime*, for Dent Macdonough was the great nephew of Silver King William O'Brien, one of James Fair's partners in the Big Bonanza. As one of the city's leading coal merchants, his grandfather Joseph may well have supplied the North Beach Station with the anthracite it used to make gas.

The sensitive restoration and adaptation of the building, as well as the design of the garden house, is often attributed to the prestigious architectural firm of Wurster, Bernardi, and Emmons and the garden itself to Thomas Church. WB&E had done other work for the Macdonoughs and designed the showcase Marina Safeway at about the same time, but office records show that the collaboration was stillborn when a freshly poured concrete floor cracked and pulled away from the walls. Angered by what they considered shoddy workmanship, the Macdonoughs terminated the work and hired architect Clifford Conly to complete the project, including the design of a wooden garden house [subject building at 3620 Buchanan Street] for which they had earlier received an estimate from WB & E. Jean Wolff executed the garden.

The Macdonoughs called their new business Merryvale, a name by which the building is still known to many San Franciscans. It became famous for the many charitable and social events hosted by the Macdonoughs until Dent's death in 1974. In that year, the city officially designated the structure Landmark Number 58.¹⁸

Not mentioned in *A Place of Light and Power*, are the iron gates and fence surrounding Landmark No. 58 that had been salvaged from the San Francisco Public Library and installed as a part of the 1958 renovation (**Figure 45**).¹⁹ The six-foot tall brick walls around the garden were also installed in 1958, and are visible in the 1990 Sanborn map. Also during the 1958 renovation, Landmark No. 58's structure was stabilized by GFDS Engineers.²⁰

¹⁸ Brechin, *A Place of Light and Power*, 20-21.

¹⁹ McGrew, "The San Francisco Gas Light Company: Abbreviated Historic Structure Report," 5.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 2.



Figure 45: 1969 photograph of Landmark No. 58, then known as Merryvale Antiques. Source: San Francisco Public Library Historical Photograph Collection (AAC-4810).

Clifford Conly designed the garden house in 1958 for Merryvale Antiques to display and sell garden decorations and plants as the main building, Landmark No. 58, was already filled with art and antiques.²¹ The 1973 landmark designation explains, “the owners added an equally impressive garden shop to the south which is directly accessible from the main building.”²² The garden executed by Jean Wolff in 1958 improved the bland landscape seen in the 1938 aerial photograph. In an interview, Wolff explains the assistance Conly, not Thomas Church, gave with the garden design:

But the nice break that I had was that the architect Clifford Conally [Conly] was asked at that time to build the garden house. As I'd been doing some work for Clifford previously, he was very helpful in laying out the garden and giving me ideas and stiffening my spine, at a time when I felt very insecure. He built the charming little garden house, where I was, and he planned all the beds, and all the irregularities in the garden which made lovely little display areas. It was most conducive to the arranging of plants and accessories.²³

Wolff proceeded to work at Merryvale Antiques for the next 13 years where she managed the garden and nursery. The Macdonoughs gave Wolff full rein and by the end of her time there, she had a fulltime gardener, a fulltime delivery boy for the shop and the nursery, and four women who helped her. Wolff taught herself the topiary style, and thus the garden offered a “great feature of topiary.”²⁴

²¹ “The Greenhouse,” Tusker Corporation, accessed May 6, 2016, <http://www.tuskercorp.com/thegreenhouse>.

²² Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board, “Merryvale Antiques (Formerly San Francisco Gas Light Company).”

²³ Jean Wolff interview conducted by Suzanne B. Riess, “Merryvale,” *Thomas D. Church, Landscape Architect, Volume I*, Regional Oral History Office, The Bancroft Library (Berkeley: University of California, 1975-1978) 260.

²⁴ Jean Wolff interview, “Merryvale,” *Thomas D. Church, Landscape Architect, Volume I*, 259-260.

By the early 1960s, Merryvale Antiques had become an institution in the Bay Area, known for its location in Landmark No. 58, its “elegant display” of antiques, and its role in high society events, including house tours, fundraisers, interior decorating exhibitions, garden parties, receptions, and an assortment of social functions.²⁵ The garden was also used as the host setting for a reception honoring the French Ambassador to the U.S., who visited San Francisco in 1966.²⁶

Merryvale Antiques continued to operate at the property until 1980, when it was sold to the Pacific Union Land Company. *A Place of Light and Power* resumes:

Margaret Macdonough sold [though not directly because she died in December 1979] the building to the three founders of the Pacific Union Realty Company in 1983 [1980] for over two million dollars. As an aggressive new entry into the San Francisco real estate community, Pacific Union sought a strong identity in the city and found it in the picturesque old building. Bill Harlan, Peter Stocker, and John Montgomery took a great liking to Merryvale, converting the large room in the rear from an open display area to office space for real estate brokers, while reserving the front of the building for offices for the company's senior executives. They made the building an integral part of all their marketing efforts, using its distinctive profile as their corporate logo and decorating it with ribbons and lights during the Christmas season.²⁷

The garden house was renovated for offices in the 1980s under the ownership of Pacific Union.²⁸ Possibly because of these alterations, the 1998 Abbreviated HSR disagrees with the 1973 landmark designation's positive judgement of the garden house and found, “this small structure has undergone several alterations, and does not recall earlier historic structures.”²⁹

A Place of Light and Power resumes:

It [Landmark No. 58] remained an essential part of the Pacific Union corporate image and life into the early 1990s when a series of events changed the company's commitment to the structure. Peter Stocker was tragically killed in a helicopter crash, and Bill Harlan found himself spending more time at his Napa Valley winery and the company-owned Meadowood Resort. In addition, as the South of Market neighborhood became hot property in the 1990s, the Marina District seemed out of the way for an aggressive real estate company. As the gas company had once moved west to serve a growing district, Pacific Union decided to move east a century later for much the same reason. The two partners and Peter Stocker's widow reluctantly put their signature building on the market in the late 1990s.

From his office across Buchanan Street, Roger Walther, a real estate developer himself, had long admired the Gas Light building. A long-time friend of the Pacific Union principals, Walther was one of the first to learn when the building came on the market. After a brief period of negotiation, he purchased it in March, 1998. When John Montgomery handed the building over to his friend, he said, “Our stewardship has lasted fifteen years and we pass this treasured historic symbol of old San Francisco on to you for your stewardship.”

²⁵ “Behind the Shop Counter,” *San Francisco Chronicle* (July 31, 1960) 4S.

²⁶ “The Chatter Box: Diplomatic Visit from the French,” *San Francisco Chronicle* (August 29, 1966).

²⁷ Brechin, *A Place of Light and Power*, 21-24.

²⁸ “The Greenhouse,” Tusker Corporation, accessed May 6, 2016, <http://www.tuskercorp.com/thegreenhouse>.

²⁹ McGrew, “The San Francisco Gas Light Company: Abbreviated Historic Structure Report,” 5.

Mr. Walther took his responsibility seriously, committing his Tusker Corporation to bringing the building up to seismic and disability codes, while fully restoring it to the prominence and quality with which it was built. The seismic bracing of the building's interior required the addition of a second floor in the rear room which once housed the meters. In addition, the building's roof was carefully strapped to the brick walls with steel, and each floor was further secured by driving eighteen-inch bolts directly into the walls and securing them with epoxy. Every window was removed and the original glass saved while wood frames were strengthened with epoxy resins. The garden [patio garden] was renovated to complement the building's architecture by using brick paving and mature planting. A full-service kitchen and catering facilities will permit the kind of community events for which the Macdonoughs once made Merryvale famous.

Unlike J.B. Crockett, Roger Walther is quite happy to give credit to all those who assisted him in this exemplary restoration. Architects Sady Hayashida and Patrick McGrew collaborated on the project. Author of a book on San Francisco's landmarks and former president of the Landmark Advisory Board, McGrew worked closely with Mr. Walther on the historic details of the building. Walther chose as his general contractor Stephen Plath, a board member of the Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage who specializes in historic restoration and adaptive reuse. Magrane Associates had the responsibility for landscape design and used Frank & Grossman to do the brickwork, planting, and full execution of their garden plans.

By the time the landmark restoration was completed in October, 2000, the office building of the San Francisco Gas Light Company had stood on the same site for 107 years. Once the headquarters for what J. B. Crockett boasted was the world's most modern gas plant, the brick structure is now fully equipped with twenty-first century electronic technology, while at the same time preserving the craftsmanship of the nineteenth century. It is Roger Walther's hope that as it once served San Franciscans of the past, helping to grow the city around it, the building will serve those of the present and be a place of gathering, discussion, and community service.³⁰

As mentioned in *A Place of Light and Power*, in 2000, Landmark No. 58 underwent extensive rehabilitation and renovation, as did the garden, though the garden house does not appear to have been as significantly modified during this time. Written before the work, the 1998 Abbreviated HSR describes the landscaping as "elaborate formal gardens," which may have changed further from Wolff's garden.³¹ However, Peter Scott of Tusker Corporation recalled that when they purchased the site in 1998, the "previous garden had very little hard-scape or infrastructure" including "a few scraggly little trees and some bushes. It was more like a vacant lot."³² The thorough renovation of the garden spaces throughout the property in 2000 involved expanding the brick walls to connect the garden to Landmark No. 58 and installing the brick paving, new plantings, and new circulation patterns (**Figure 46**). This surely changed what remained of Wolff's garden.

³⁰ Brechin, *A Place of Light and Power*, 21-25.

³¹ McGrew, "The San Francisco Gas Light Company: Abbreviated Historic Structure Report," 5.

³² Peter Scott, email to Maggie Smith, May 17, 2016.




Figure 46: ca. 2000 photograph of patio garden after the 2000 renovation.
Source: *A Place of Light and Power* (page 26); Anne Lawrence.

Currently, Tusker Corporation occupies the west portion of Landmark No. 58. PG&E has returned to the building, leasing the east portion along with Paragon Real Estate Group. Their entrance is at 1593 (1595) North Point Street.³³ 3620 Buchanan Street is occupied by a small interior and furniture design firm. The patio garden is a shared space, used for charitable and social events.³⁴

3620 BUCHANAN STREET ARCHITECT / LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT

Clifford Conly, Jr., Architect

Clifford Conly, Jr. was born in 1913 “of a well-to-do San Francisco family.”³⁵ He went to the University of California, Berkeley, and apprenticed in the office of Farr and Ward. Conly designed the interior of the Town and Country Club, which led to a successful career in residential and landscape design. His residential projects include 1059 Vallejo Street for Barbara McAndrews (1954) and 1715 Taylor Street for Phyllis and Bruce Dohrman (1957).³⁶ Conly converted a reportedly nondescript building from the Victorian period into an “unusual modern dwelling” for Mrs. Vernon Smith – Wild on Telegraph Hill.³⁷ He also restored and furnished the interior of the Lyford House, “the oldest Victorian in Marin County.”³⁸ Conly appears to be best known for his association with

³³ “The Gas Light Building,” Tusker Corporation, accessed May 6, 2016, <http://www.tuskercorp.com/thegaslightbuilding>.

³⁴ Brechin, *A Place of Light and Power*, 26.

³⁵ McGrew, “The San Francisco Gas Light Company: Abbreviated Historic Structure Report,” 6.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Elise Mannel, “How Tour Will Cover Nearly 100 Years of San Francisco Architecture,” *San Francisco Chronicle*, April 3, 1949, page 3L.

³⁸ Margot Patterson Doss, “The Richardson Bay Sanctuary,” *S.F. Sunday Examiner & Chronicle, Sunday Punch*, April 2, 1978, page 6.

Cypress Grove, having bought the dilapidated property in 1952 and restored the cottages, as well as added a greenhouse and gardens. In 1970, he promised the property to Audubon Canyon Ranch, which made Cypress Grove a wildlife preserve and research center.³⁹ In 2002, Conly passed away at his home in Sonoma.⁴⁰

Jean Wolff

Jean Wolff (Mrs. George Wolff) was born in 1898 as Jean Ward. She was married to George Wolff, Sr. and had two sons by 1930. She was a “much-admired gardening teacher, whose own Telegraph Hill garden was designed by Thomas Church in 1951, whom she credits with ‘reawakening her interest in urban gardens.’”⁴¹ She and Church were friends early in his career and she occasionally helped him with his work, though she was never professionally trained as a landscape architect. Wolff was in charge of the nursery and garden house shop at Merryvale Antiques for 13 years.⁴² In Wolff’s later years, she worked as a garden consultant and traveled.⁴³

CONSTRUCTION CHRONOLOGY

The following provides a timeline of construction activity at the subject building at 3620 Buchanan Street as well as the landscaping. This timeline is based on building permit applications on file with the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection (see Appendix). Permits with a status of “Expired” were not included.

| Date Filed | Permit App. # | Owner | Architect/ Builder | Scope of Alterations |
|------------|---------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--|
| 10/23/1958 | 194622 | Dent W. Macdonough | Clifford Conly, Jr. | (Addressed as 3640 Buchanan Street) Footing to extend 12" above natural ground. Siding not to extend below top of footing. Vertical siding to be over 1" solid sheathing or horizontal blocking at 16" ctr |

There are additional modifications to 3620 Buchanan Street not mentioned in the building permit applications. As mentioned in Site Development, interior office renovations were completed to the subject building in the 1980s, and not included in the permit history. Alterations likely included the bathroom addition to the middle bay of the primary (south) façade.

Permit applications did not appear to mention the conversion of the site from industrial to commercial during the 1958 renovations. As mentioned in Site Development, the patio garden was completed in 1958 and renovated again in 2000, though permits are not listed for this work and there were likely modifications in between that period. The 2000 garden makeover involved extending the brick wall and installing the brick paving, new plantings, and new circulation patterns.

³⁹ Jim Doyle, “FOR THE BIRDS - Researcher John Kelly keeps an eye on herons, egrets on Tomales Bay preserve,” *The San Francisco Chronicle* (January 17, 2003) 1.

⁴⁰ “Conly, Clifford, Jr.,” *San Francisco Chronicle* (February 2, 2002) accessed April 30, 2016, <http://www.sfgate.com/news/article/ONLY-Clifford-Jr-2878960.php>.

⁴¹ McGrew, “The San Francisco Gas Light Company: Abbreviated Historic Structure Report.”

⁴² Jean Wolff interview, *Thomas D. Church, Landscape Architect, Volume I*, page 251.

⁴³ Virginia Westover, “Social Scene,” *San Francisco Chronicle* (March 15, 1972) 21.

OWNERSHIP AND OCCUPANT HISTORY

The following table provides a summary of the ownership history of 3620 Buchanan Street, compiled from historic contexts, sales records held at the San Francisco Assessor-Recorder's Office, and building permits.

| Dates | Owner(s) / Occupant(s) |
|----------------------------|--|
| 1884-1905 ⁴⁴ | San Francisco Gas Light Company; San Francisco Gas and Electric Company |
| 1905-1958 ⁴⁵ | Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) |
| 1958-1980 ⁴⁶ | Margaret & Dent Macdonough (Merryvale Antiques) |
| 1980-1998 ⁴⁷ | Pacific Union Land Company |
| 1998-Present ⁴⁸ | Roger Walther / Tusker Corporation (PG&E and Paragon Real Estate Group also currently occupy Landmark No. 58) |

Select Owner and Occupant Biographies

The following biographies have been researched for longer-term owners and occupants.

*Mr. & Mrs. Dent W. Macdonough*⁴⁹ | Owner: 1958-1980

Dent W. Macdonough was born on February 23, 1896 in New York. His father, Joseph Macdonough came to California during the Gold Rush and established an extensive fortune and presence in the Bay Area. The family transferred their business operations to New York, but continued to own property on both coasts and often spent different times of the year on alternating sides of the country. Dent married his first wife, Sarah Worthy and moved to the Macdonough family ranch, Ormondale, near Woodside, California where they had two daughters.⁵⁰ The marriage ultimately ended in divorce and Dent remarried in 1941 to Margaret Allen Bailie, who was born in San Bernardino in June 1902.

Utilizing one of the houses on the Ormondale Ranch, Margaret began operating an antique store and craft shop, which she named "Merryvale" and was able to stock with quality items the couple was able to access through the family's East Coast connections.⁵¹ In 1958, the Macdonoughs bought the former Gas Light Company property on Buchanan Street with the intention of restoring and reusing the property as a new and more accessible location for Merryvale. The Macdonoughs opened the Merryvale Antique store in the 1893 brick building that same year. During that time, they hired Jean Wolff to remodel the gardens on the property, as well as work in the garden department.⁵² The Macdonoughs continued to own and operate Merryvale until their deaths, Dent in June 1974 and Margaret in December 1979.⁵³

⁴⁴ Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board, "Merryvale Antiques (Formerly San Francisco Gas Light Company)."

⁴⁵ Ibid.; building permit.

⁴⁶ Sales records; building permits.

⁴⁷ Sales records; building permits; "History," Pacific Union Land Company, accessed May 5, 2016, <http://pulc.com/who-we-are/history.php>.

⁴⁸ Sales records; building permits; historic contexts.

⁴⁹ Ancestry.com, accessed May 10, 2016, <http://person.ancestry.com/tree/25686948/person/26214014495/facts>.

⁵⁰ California Voter Registrations, 1934-1936.

⁵¹ Jean Fay Webster, "Peninsula Diary – Ormondale Ranch and The Macdonough Clan," *San Francisco Chronicle* (October 18, 1953) 4P.

⁵² "Behind the Shop Counter," *San Francisco Chronicle*.

⁵³ California, Death Index, 1940-1997.

Merryvale Antiques | Occupant: 1958-1980

Merryvale Antiques occupied Landmark No. 58 and 3620 Buchanan Street between 1958 until 1980. It was founded in 1950 by Mrs. Margaret Macdonough, who quickly established the store as a premier retailer that specialized in 17th and 18th century English and French antiques and decorative arts. The first location occupied by Merryvale Antiques was in a remodeled house on the Macdonough family's Ormondale Ranch property in Woodside, located near Stanford University at 3249 Alpine Road.⁵⁴ Merryvale Antiques was known for its "choice plants" from its "distinctive nursery" and also known for its "lovely garden setting" where many afternoon teas and social functions were held. However, this semi-rural setting proved too isolated for business.⁵⁵ In 1958, the Macdonoughs purchased 3620 Buchanan Street in the Marina District of San Francisco to serve as their new store and, through the assistance of their garden specialist, Jean Wolff, began transforming the former PG&E property into a garden space.⁵⁶ Merryvale Antiques continued to operate at the property until 1980, when it was sold to the Pacific Union Land Company.

Pacific Union Land Company | Owner & Occupant: 1980-1998

The Pacific Union Land Company is a real estate sales and marketing company that was founded in 1975. Focusing initially on condominium properties, the company grew substantially over the following years with major projects throughout the Bay Area.⁵⁷ It has a family of companies, including real estate investors; developers, builders, and operators.⁵⁸ The company sought to establish a stronger presence in San Francisco and purchased Landmark No. 58 from the Macdonoughs as their new corporate headquarters. They continued to occupy and utilize the building as a corporate icon through the 1990s; however, the real estate landscape was shifting away from the Marina District towards South of Market. Following the development trends, Pacific Union put their signature property on the Market, which was sold in 1998 to Tusker Corporation.⁵⁹

Roger Walther / Tusker Corporation | Owner & Occupant: 1998-Present

Tusker Corporation is a prominent property management company that was founded in Greenwich, Connecticut in 1968. In the 1990s, the company sold off its properties on the East Coast and relocated to San Francisco to focus on the Bay Area.⁶⁰ Roger Walther, the CEO of the company, was acquainted with the principals of the Pacific Union Land Company and, upon learning of them selling Landmark No. 58, purchased the property.⁶¹ Tusker Corporation began an extensive rehabilitation of the property that involved seismic and accessibility upgrades, as well as the restoration of the façade. The garden and greenhouse courtyard were also re-landscaped in 2000, which coincided with the completion of the rehabilitation of Landmark No. 58. Tusker Corporation continues to own and occupy the building, while serving as stewards of this landmark property.

⁵⁴ Jean Fay Webster, "Peninsula Diary – Ormondale Ranch and The Macdonough Clan."

⁵⁵ "Merryvale Antiques" advertisement, *San Francisco Chronicle* (July 17, 1955) 8S.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ "History," Pacific Union Land Company, accessed May 12, 2016, <http://pulc.com/who-we-are/history.php>.

⁵⁸ "Home," Pacific Union Land Company, accessed May 12, 2016, <http://pulc.com/>.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ "Home," Tusker Corporation, accessed May 5, 2016, <http://www.tuskercorp.com/>.

⁶¹ Brechin, *A Place of Light and Power*, 24-25

VI. EVALUATION

CALIFORNIA REGISTER OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES

The California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) is an inventory of significant architectural, archaeological, and historical resources in the State of California. Resources can be listed in the California Register through a number of methods. State Historical Landmarks and National Register-listed properties are automatically listed in the California Register. Properties can also be nominated to the California Register by local governments, private organizations, or citizens. The evaluative criteria used by the California Register for determining eligibility are closely based on those developed by the National Park Service for the National Register of Historic Places.

In order for a property to be eligible for listing in the California Register, it must be found significant under one or more of the following criteria.

- *Criterion 1 (Events):* Resources that are 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.
- *Criterion 2 (Persons):* Resources that are associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history.
- *Criterion 3 (Architecture):* Resources that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic values.
- *Criterion 4 (Information Potential):* Resources or sites that have yielded or have the potential to yield information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California, or the nation.

The following section examines the eligibility of 3620 Buchanan Street for listing in the California Register, including any association with Landmark No. 58 and its setting:

Criterion 1 (Events)

3620 Buchanan Street is not significant under Criterion 1 (Events) as a property that is individually 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. The subject building was constructed in 1958 as a garden house and workshop to supplement Merryvale Antiques, a well-known art and antique store that had relocated from Menlo Park. The adjacent patio garden was also designed in 1958, though it was later renovated in 2000. Unlike Landmark No. 58, the subject building and its adjacent garden are not associated with the development of the San Francisco Gas Light Company or its North Beach Station. Merryvale Antiques, while a popular store and venue during its time occupying the property, did not majorly influence the Bay Area. The subject building also does not appear noteworthy or significant within the Marina neighborhood context. Therefore, 3620 Buchanan Street does not appear to be individually eligible for listing under Criterion 1, nor is it strongly associated with Landmark No. 58.

Criterion 2 (Persons)

3620 Buchanan Street is not individually significant under Criterion 2 (Persons) for an association with the lives of persons important to local, state, or national history. The subject building was initially used as a garden house and workshop, and then converted into offices. None of the various owners or occupants of the subject building had a large impact on San Francisco, California, or

United States history to the extent that the subject building, and/or garden, would be considered individually eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 2.

Criterion 3 (Architecture)

3620 Buchanan Street does not appear to be individually eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 3 (Architecture). The subject building is an altered, vernacular mixture of the Ranch and Neo-French architectural styles. Though the hipped roof alludes to and the low height is respectful of Landmark No. 58, the subject building is not a particularly noteworthy or remarkable design. Similarly, the original 1958 design of the garden does not appear to have been published or recognized as a significant landscape, and it has since been altered by the 2000 renovation.

To reaffirm, the subject building and garden were not designed by Wurster, Bernardi & Emmons and Thomas Church respectively. The subject building's architect, Clifford Conly, completed various residential and commercial buildings and renovations throughout the Bay Area, but does not appear to be a master architect. He is better known for his association with Cypress Grove and Audubon Canyon Ranch. The garden was initially executed by Jean Wolff, a gardener and teacher known for occasionally assisting Thomas Church. However, she did not have professional training, and is not a master landscape architect. Further, the garden was renovated in 2000 by Magrane Associates and Frank & Grossman. Not enough time has passed to determine the master landscape architect status of those employed on the project and the design has not been recognized as possessing high artistic value.

While the subject building and the garden as renovated in 2000 are compatible with Landmark No. 58, they replaced the earlier lawn and garden landscaping associated with Landmark No. 58's original construction. They have not gain significance in their own right and are not integral to Landmark No. 58's design. Conclusively, 3620 Buchanan Street and the adjacent garden do not appear to be individually eligible for listing under Criterion 3, nor are their designs strongly associated with Landmark No. 58.

Criterion 4 (Information Potential)

Evaluation of 3620 Buchanan Street under Criterion 4 (Information Potential) is beyond the scope of this report. This criterion is generally applied to sites that may provide archeological information.

INTEGRITY

In order to qualify for listing in any local, state, or national historic register, a property or landscape must possess significance under at least one evaluative criterion as described above and retain integrity. Integrity is defined by the California Office of Historic Preservation as "the authenticity of an historical resource's physical identity by the survival of certain characteristics that existing during the resource's period of significance," or more simply defined as "the ability of a property to convey its significance."⁶²

In order to evaluate whether 3620 Buchanan Street retains sufficient integrity to convey its historic significance, Page & Turnbull used established integrity standards outlined by the National Register Bulletin: "How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation." Seven variables, or aspects, that define integrity are used to evaluate a resource's integrity—location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. A property must stand up under most or all of these aspects in order to retain overall integrity. If a property does not retain integrity, it can no longer convey its significance and is therefore not eligible for listing in local, state, or national registers.

⁶² California Office of Historic Preservation, "Technical Assistance Series No. 7: How to Nominate a Resource to the California Register of Historical Resources" (Sacramento: California Office of State Publishing, 4 September 2001) 11.

The seven aspects that define integrity are defined as follows:

Location is the place where the historic property was constructed.

Design is the combination of elements that create the form, plans, space, structure and style of the property.

Setting addresses the physical environment of the historic property inclusive of the landscape and spatial relationships of the building(s).

Materials refer to the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern of configuration to form the historic property.

Workmanship is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history.

Feeling is the property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.

Association is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.

Location

3620 Buchanan Street retains integrity of location because the building and the adjacent garden do not appear to have been moved and are still situated on the original lot along the west side of Buchanan Street.

Design

3620 Buchanan Street retains integrity of design despite the renovations to the subject building converting it from a garden house to an office. The bathroom addition to the middle bay of the primary façade is the only visual detractor from what appears to be the original design and is not significant enough to affect negatively the building. The lattice on the north façade may have also been added, but is not a permanent fixture and is consistent with the garden aesthetic.

The patio garden does not appear to retain integrity due to its 2000 renovation, which installed the dominate brick paving.

Setting

3620 Buchanan Street retains integrity of setting. While area no longer looks like the remnants of an old industrial complex with a gasholder tank, gas stations on block corners, and open swaths of land from 1958, the building, garden, and surrounding Marina neighborhood have remained on flat terrain and have maintained the spatial relationships between the buildings and streets from the period of construction. Further, the building and garden are still tucked away amongst a mixed-use neighborhood.

Materials

3620 Buchanan Street retains integrity of materials. Though there were renovations to the subject building converting it from a garden house to an office, the what seem to be original cladding, windows, and doors remain.

The garden does not retain integrity of materials because of its 2000 renovation.

Workmanship

3620 Buchanan Street retains integrity of workmanship. The physical evidence of the craft and technology used in constructing the subject building are still evident because there have been few exterior alterations.

The garden does not retain integrity of workmanship because of its 2000 renovation.

Feeling

3620 Buchanan Street retains integrity of feeling. Despite further development of the surrounding area after the subject building and garden were constructed in 1958 and although the building was converted for re-use as an office, the building still feels like a garden house associated with a garden. The garden still feels very much like a garden.

Association

3620 Buchanan Street retains integrity of association. Though the subject building is no longer used as a garden house or workshop, and the building and garden are no longer associated with Merryvale Antiques, they are still associated with the commercial use of Landmark No. 58. The subject building is still visually connected to the adjacent garden. Further, the garden is still used as such, including as a gathering space for events.

Overall, although 3620 Buchanan Street does not meet any criteria for California Register listing, it does retain integrity. The garden, which also does not meet criteria for historic listing, was renovated in 2000 and does not retain integrity of its original design, materials, or workmanship.

LANDMARK NO. 58 CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES

The character-defining features of Landmark No. 58 located at 3636 Buchanan Street include:⁶³

- Red brick construction
- Rectangular form of two stories and an attic
- Queen Anne corner tower with conical roof (taller than the main roof)
- Hipped main roof, without projecting eaves, resting on a corbelled cornice
 - Brick chimney
- Fenestration
 - Reflects the interior division of the building into two elements
 1. The front, or westerly, one-third possessing windows indicating two floors with a heavy string course of brickwork at the upper floor level
 2. The back, or easterly, remaining two-thirds of the building, containing tall windows divided into panes with fanlights above, whose sill line is uniform with those on the lower floor at the front, but whose tops extend upward about three-quarters of the total wall height
 - Decorative, arched terra-cotta lintels divided into sections containing a patera
- Centered, arched main entrance resting on short brick pilasters framing a recessed doorway
 - Arch contains raised letters of the name of the original occupant of the building: S.F. GAS LIGHT Co”

⁶³ Based on the architectural description provided by the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board in the “Merryvale Antiques (Formerly San Francisco Gas Light Company)” Landmark No. 58 designation.

- Two story opening at the rear (east) façade with flat decorative terra-cotta lintel similar to those above the windows
- Two-story brick pilasters
- Open space surrounding the building, allowing the building to maintain dominance of the corner without being overshadowed by neighbors on either side

VII. CONCLUSION

Although compatible in scale with Landmark No. 58, 3620 Buchanan Street is not integral to the significance of the landmarked building, nor does it appear to qualify for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources as an individual resource. The building was designed in 1958 by Clifford Conly as a garden house and workshop for Merryvale Antiques, a business that occupied Landmark No. 58 after PG&E. Jean Wolff executed the adjacent garden also during that time, though the garden was fully renovated in 2000 and does not retain integrity from its original 1958 design. The designation of Landmark No. 58 emphasized the history and architecture of what once was the administration building for San Francisco Gas Light Company's North Beach Station.⁶⁴ Landmark No. 58 was not designated for its association with Merryvale Antiques, despite it being referenced as such. 3620 Buchanan Street may be relevant to Merryvale Antiques, but it is not historically or architecturally significant for an association with Landmark No. 58 and its setting.

The subject building and garden at 3620 Buchanan Street does not appear to be individually significant for association 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. It does not appear to be individually significant for an association with the lives of persons important to local, state, or national history. The building is a vernacular garden house with French decorative elements. It is unremarkable and the garden is not the original design. Clifford Conly is not a master architect and Jean Wolff is not a master landscape architect. The subject building and garden are therefore not individually significant for architecture. Therefore, 3620 Buchanan Street does not meet the criteria for individual listing in the California Register.

⁶⁴ Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board, "Merryvale Antiques (Formerly San Francisco Gas Light Company)."

VIII. REFERENCES CITED

PUBLISHED WORKS

- Bardell, Robert. "The Presidio Road." *The Argonaut*. Vol. 23, No.2. Winter 2012.
- Brechin, Gray. *A Place of Light and Power: The Restored S.F. Gas Light Co. Building, San Francisco Landmark No. 58*. San Francisco: Tapestries Publishing, 2000.
- California Office of Historic Preservation. "Technical Assistance Series No. 7: How to Nominate a Resource to the California Register of Historical Resources." Sacramento: California Office of State Publishing, September 4, 2001.
- Delehanty, Randolph Stephen. *San Francisco parks and playground, 1839 to 1990: The history of public good in one North American city (Volumes I and II)*. Harvard University Thesis. 1992.
- McGrew, Patrick. "The San Francisco Gas Light Company: Abbreviated Historic Structure Report." December 22, 1998.
- Richards, Rand. *Historic San Francisco: A Concise History and Guide*. San Francisco: Heritage House Publishers, 2001.
- San Francisco Planning Department. "Preservation Bulletin No. 9: Landmarks." San Francisco: January 2003.
- San Francisco Planning Department. "San Francisco Preservation Bulletin No. 16: City and County of San Francisco Planning Department CEQA Review Procedures for Historic Resources." San Francisco: October 2004.
- Staff of the National Register of Historic Places. "How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation." U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service. 2002. Accessed February 16, 2016. <http://www.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb15/>.
- VerPlanck, Christopher. "From Mud Flats to Marina: Building a San Francisco Neighborhood." *Heritage News*. Vol. XXXV, No.3. Summer 2007.
- VerPlanck, Christopher. "Marina District Development Takes Off." *Heritage News*. Vol. XXXV, No. 4. Fall 2007.
- Wolff, Jean interview conducted by Suzanne B. Riess. "Merryvale." *Thomas D. Church, Landscape Architect, Volume I*. Regional Oral History Office, The Bancroft Library. Berkeley: University of California, 1975-1978.

PUBLIC RECORDS

- Building Permit Applications. San Francisco Department of Building Inspection.
- California, Death Index. 1940-1997.
- California Voter Registrations. 1934-1936.
- Deeds and Sales Leases. San Francisco Assessor/Recorder's Office.
- Google Earth. 2016.
- Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board. "Merryvale Antiques (Formerly San Francisco Gas Light Company)." San Francisco Landmark No. 58 designation. 1973.
- Microsoft Bing Maps. 2016.
- Ryker, Harrison. "San Francisco Aerial Views." David Rumsey Historical Map Collection. 1938.

Sanborn Fire Insurance Company maps.
San Francisco City Directories.
San Francisco Property Information Map.
San Francisco Public Library Historical Photograph Collection.
San Francisco Public Library: San Francisco History Center.
San Francisco Public Library Vertical Files: "SF Districts: Marina."
United States Federal Census. www.Ancestry.com.

NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS

Building and Engineering News.
San Francisco Chronicle.
S.F. Sunday Examiner & Chronicle.

INTERNET SOURCES

"History." Pacific Union Land Company. Accessed May 12, 2016. <http://pulc.com/who-we-are/history.php>.
"Home." Pacific Union Land Company. Accessed May 12, 2016. <http://pulc.com/>.
"Home." Tusker Corporation. Accessed May 5, 2016. <http://www.tuskercorp.com/>.
"Mr. & Mrs. Dent W. Macdonough." Ancestry.com. Accessed May 10, 2016.
<http://person.ancestry.com/tree/25686948/person/26214014495/facts>.
"The Gas Light Building." Tusker Corporation. Accessed May 6, 2016.
<http://www.tuskercorp.com/thegaslightbuilding>.
"The Greenhouse." Tusker Corporation. Accessed May 6, 2016.
<http://www.tuskercorp.com/thegreenhouse>.

IX. APPENDIX

BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATIONS

Front and back pages of building permit applications currently on file with the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection:

Approved:

Zone Asv 100

CPG Backlog

Edward W. Wood
 Department of City Planning

Approved:

Approved:

W. H. ...
 Structural Dept. of Bureau of Building Inspection

Approved:

Director of Public Health

Approved:


He J. ...
 Bureau of Fire Prevention & Public Safety

Approved: Footing to extend 12" above natural ground. Siding not to extend below top of footing. Vertical siding to be over 1" solid sheathing or horizontal blocking with 16" cts. & 3/8" dia. & 1/2" dia. ...

130/15 S. ...
 Chief Engineer, Bureau of Building Inspection

ALL ENTRANCES, BOTH PEDESTRIAN AND VEHICULAR SHOULD MEET THE SIDEWALK GRADE. ALL RAISING TO BE INSIDE OF PROPERTY. ...

APPROVED: ALL INSULATING MATERIALS HAVE A CLEARANCE OF NOT LESS THAN TWO INCHES FROM ALL ELECTRICAL WIRES OR ...



Loc. No.

Assessor's Block No.

GRADE LINES AS SHOWN ON DRAWINGS ACCOMPANYING THIS APPLICATION ARE ASSUMED TO BE CORRECT. IF ACTUAL GRADE LINES ARE NOT THE SAME AS SHOWN REVISED DRAWINGS SHOWING CORRECT GRADE LINES, CUTS AND FILLS TOGETHER WITH COMPLETE DETAILS OF RETAINING WALLS AND WALL FOOTINGS REQUIRED MUST BE SUBMITTED TO THIS BUREAU FOR APPROVAL.

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT ALL CONDITIONS OR SPECIFICATIONS OF THE VARIOUS DEPARTMENTS OF THE CITY ENGINEER'S BUREAU OR DEPARTMENT NOTED ON THIS APPLICATION ARE HEREBY APPROVED AND GIVEN THE SAME AS FINAL AND COMPLETE AUTHORITY AND AGENT.

W. H. ...

BLDG. FORM

No. 2145

APPLICATION OF *W. H. ...*

FOR PERMIT TO ERECT

Signy Type & Structure Location 3540 Buchanan

Total Cost \$ 14,600

Filed October 23 1958

Approved:

APPROVED
 NOV 23 1958

W. H. ...
 Superintendent, Bureau of Building Inspection


Permit No. 194622

Issued 11/16/58

Certificate of Final Completion

Issued

OFFICIAL COPY



RECEIVED
DEPT. OF PUBLIC WORKS
1958 OCT 27 PM 3:01

Write in Ink—File Two Copies

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING INSPECTION
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS BLDG. FORM
CENTRAL PERMIT BUREAU

2

APPLICATION FOR BUILDING PERMIT
TYPE 5 BUILDING
BUILDING NOT TO BE OCCUPIED UNTIL CERTIFICATE OF
FINAL COMPLETION IS POSTED ON THE BUILDING
FOR NON-HAZARDOUS USE ONLY

October 23 1958

Application is hereby made to the Department of Public Works of the City and County of San Francisco for permission to build in accordance with the plans and specifications submitted herewith and according to the description and for the purpose hereinafter set forth:

(1) Location of Lot _____ Side of 3640 Buchanan Street
_____ of _____ Street

(2) Number of stories one (without) basement.

(3) Total cost 14,600.00 Height of building 16' No. of families none

(4) Use of building Garden house, workshop (5) Occupancy 78 1728-19-3
Building Code Classification

(6) Note: Sect. 105, S.F. Bldg. Code. Change in use. No change in use shall be made in the character of occupancy, or use of any building which would put the building to a different use, unless such building is made to comply with the requirements of this code for that use, and unless the Bureau of Building Inspection and the Bureau of Fire Prevention and Public Safety have been notified before such a change has been made.

(7) Note: Sec. 15155, State Housing Act. Any building or structure not erected for use as an apartment house, hotel, or dwelling, which is converted to or altered for such use, shall conform to all the provisions of this part affecting an apartment house, hotel, or dwelling, as the case may be.

(8) No portion of building or structure or scaffolding used during construction, to be closer than 6'0" to any wire containing more than 750 volts. See Sec. 385, California Penal Code.

(9) Size of lot, front 184 ft., rear 75 ft., depth of lot 50 (at new bldg) ft.

(10) Ground floor area of building 1500 sqm square ft.

(11) Any other building on lot Yes (Must be shown on Plot Plan if answer is Yes)
Yes or No

(12) Is building designed for any more stories No How many _____
Yes or No

(13) PLOT PLANS, FLOOR PLANS, DETAILS AND SPECIFICATIONS MUST BE SUBMITTED WITH APPLICATIONS IN DUPLICATE.

(14) Supervision of construction by Contractor Address _____

(15) General contractor H. D. Groe California License No. 76600
Address 2929 Harrison, San Francisco 10

(16) Architect Clifford Conly Jr. California Certificate No. _____
Address 10 Mattingham Place, San Francisco

(17) Engineer _____ California Certificate No. _____
Address _____

(18) I hereby certify and agree that if a permit is issued for the construction described in this application, all the provisions of the permit, and all the laws and ordinances applicable thereto will be complied with. I further agree to save San Francisco and its officials and employees harmless from all costs and damages which may accrue from use or occupancy of the sidewalk, street or sub-sidewalk space or from anything else in connection with the work included in the permit. The foregoing covenant shall be binding upon the owner of said property, the applicant, their heirs, successors and assignees.

(19) Owner Deot W. Macdonough

Address 3640 Buchanan Phone No. NA 6-1813
(For contact by Bureau)

By H. D. Groe Address 2929 Harrison St. S.F. 10
Owner's Authorized Agent to be Owner's Authorized Architect, Engineer or General Contractor.

ARCHITECTURE
PLANNING & RESEARCH
PRESERVATION TECHNOLOGY

www.page-turnbull.com

417 S. Hill Street, Suite 211
Los Angeles, California 90013
213.221.1200 / 213.221.1209 fax

2401 C Street, Suite B
Sacramento, California 95816
916.930.9903 / 916.930.9904 fax

417 Montgomery Street, 8th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94104
415.362.5154 / 415.362.5560 fax



Attachment C

August 15, 2018 Architectural Review Committee Meeting Notes



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

DATE: August 30, 2018
TO: Jody Knight, Reuben, Junius & Rose LLC
CC: Historic Preservation Commission
FROM: Stephanie Cisneros, Preservation Planner
(415) 575-9186
REVIEWED BY: Architectural Review Committee of the
Historic Preservation Commission
RE: Meeting Notes from Review and Comment at the
August 15, 2018 ARC-HPC Hearing for the
Project at 3620 Buchanan Street
2016-010079COA

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

At the request of the Planning Department, the design for the proposal to demolish an existing one-story garden house and a portion of an existing garden and construct a new, four-story, eight-unit residential building at 3620 Buchanan Street was brought to the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) on August 15, 2018. 3620 Buchanan Street is located on the parcel designated as City Landmark No. 58, Merryvale Antiques/San Francisco Gas Light Company (S.F. Gas Light Co.). At the ARC meeting, the Planning Department requested review and comment regarding conformance of the proposed design of the new construction with Article 10 and with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards*. Specifically, the Planning Department sought comments on the differentiation of materials on the horizontal components of the design and on the design of the primary entryway. Planning Department Preservation Staff has prepared a summary of the ARC comments from the meeting.

ARC COMMENTS

1. **General.** The Commissioners expressed concern that there was not sufficient information provided in the hearing packet for them to understand the history of the property and overall context of the proposed project in order to formally and accurately comment on the design of the proposed project. The information that they expressed was missing from the packet included the following:
 - o The overall history of the site and development of the garden house and garden as separate entities and in relation to the development of the S.F. Gas Light Company building. Specifically, the Page & Turnbull Historic Resource Evaluation report.

- Explanation of the context of the 1973 Landmark Designation Ordinance and how the designation ordinance can and should be legally interpreted.
- Commissioner Hyland commented that the landmark ordinance for the subject property was not sufficiently detailed, as landmark cases typically weren't at the time, and was not as detailed as it would be if done today. Therefore, analysis for both buildings should be completed. If analysis has been done, the ARC should determine if they agree with that finding.
- Information regarding the level of environmental review in progress and/or completed for the garden house and adjacent garden and the level of environmental review required for the proposed project in relation to the site as a landmark.
- Commissioner Hyland questioned whether CEQA analysis was conducted for the Garden House that analyzed and conclusively determined it was not an Historic Resource. If the Historic Resource Evaluation was focused on the main house being the Landmark, as opposed to the entire site, and didn't evaluate a potential second period of significance, he was concerned that the analysis may be wrong or lacking. He questioned whether there might be a second period of significance associated with the Merryvale Antiques shop.
- Commissioner Johnck stated that there should be a cultural landscape analysis of the site, with particular attention to the garden and relationship to the structures.

2. Scale and Proportion.

- Commissioner Hyland expressed concern that the height of the new construction was too tall in relation to the existing Merryvale Antiques/San Francisco Gas Light Company (S.F. Gas Light Co.) building and was also concerned that the new construction was an inappropriate addition to the site. He questioned the possibility of altering the existing one-story garden house to accommodate the program of the new construction.
- Commissioner Pearlman stated that the height of the proposed new construction was relatable to the surrounding context but did agree that the appropriateness of the new construction on the site was questionable.

3. Fenestration

- Commissioner Pearlman felt that overall, the fenestration of the proposed new construction was appropriate and liked the punched openings.

4. Materials.

- Commissioner Pearlman agreed with Staff's recommendation that the proposed brick at the horizontals should be articulated to better relate to the stringcourse of the Merryvale Antiques/San Francisco Gas Light Company (S.F. Gas Light Co.) building.

5. Architectural Details.

- Commissioner Hyland expressed concern about the amount of the existing brick garden wall that would be demolished as part of the proposed project. He stated that the wall was a community asset and there was insufficient information provided to understand how the wall would be altered.
- Commissioner Pearlman also expressed concern about the amount of the existing brick garden wall to be demolished and asked that this be re-examined to result in a reduction of the amount of the existing wall that would be removed. He stated that it might be a good idea to connect the garden to the street.
- Commissioner Pearlman agreed with Staff's recommendation regarding the primary entryway; that the entryway should be studied further to establish a stronger relationship to the formal entryways of the Merryvale Antiques/San Francisco Gas Light Company (S.F. Gas Light Co.) building. He suggested that a frame or border around the entryway of the new construction be studied as a means of accomplishing this recommendation.

Attachment D

Historic Preservation
Commission Motion No. 0360
(November 7, 2018 HPC
Hearing)



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Historic Preservation Commission Motion No. 0360

HEARING DATE: NOVEMBER 7, 2018

Case No.: 2016-010079COA
Project Address: 3620 Buchanan Street
Historic Landmark: No. 58 – Merryvale Antiques/S.F. Gas Light Co.
Zoning: NC-2 (Neighborhood Commercial, Small Scale)
40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 0459/003
Project Sponsor: Tusker Corporation, Property Owner
3636 Buchanan Street
San Francisco, CA 94123
Staff Contact: Stephanie Cisneros - (415) 575-9186
stephanie.cisneros@sfgov.org
Reviewed By: Tim Frye – (415) 575-6822
tim.frye@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 003 IN ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 0459, WITHIN AN NC-2 (NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL, SMALL SCALE) ZONING DISTRICT AND A 40-X HEIGHT AND BULK DISTRICT.

PREAMBLE

WHEREAS, on August 30, 2017, Tusker Corporation (Project Sponsor) filed an application with the San Francisco Planning Department (hereinafter "Department") for a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish a non-contributory one-story garden house and portion of an existing non-contributory garden patio and construct a new, four-story residential building on the same parcel as City Landmark No. 58 (Merryvale Antiques/S.F. Gas Light Co.) on Lot 003 in Assessor's Block 0459. The proposed project will result in a new, eight-unit, 13,279 square foot residential building that includes eight bicycle parking spaces and one accessible vehicle parking.

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 November 7, 2018, the Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing on the current project, Case No. 2016-010079COA ("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 October 8, 2018 on file in the docket for Case No. 2016-010079COA based on the following findings:

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

- *As part of the Site Permit submittal, the Project Sponsor shall provide material samples, including the examples of the materials for the proposed brick cladding for floors one through three and fiber cement panels for floor four, metal railing at the street level, and railing for balconies to ensure compatibility with the landmark site. These material samples shall demonstrate the range of color, texture and finish for the identified materials. Generally, the materials should feature a matte or painted finish, and be consistent with the building's overall historic character.*
- *As part of the Site Permit, the Project Sponsor shall provide the following details: window schedule detailing the materials and dimensions of the proposed new windows and corresponding window surrounds and providing elevations and sections; design of the metal railing at the street level and at the balconies; and design and dimensions of the entryway.*
- *The project sponsor shall complete a site visit with Department preservation staff prior to occupancy in order to verify compliance with the approved project description and conditions of approval.*

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 September 20, 1973.

- The project does not propose to change the existing use of the S.F. Gas Light Co. building on the property, which has undergone changes to its use since initial construction. As such, none of the landmark site's distinctive, character-defining materials, features, spaces or spatial relationships will be affected by the proposed project.

- Historically, the setting of Landmark No. 58 was made up of a larger complex of predominantly brick buildings, an oiler dock, a gasometer, and two storage tanks used by the S. F. Gas Light Co. and other surrounding industrial-oriented companies. At the time of the 1973 Landmark Designation, the industrially-based historic setting had been significantly altered to include two- to four-story, residential and mixed use buildings, which continues to be its current setting. The proposed project will not diminish the historic character of the landmark site.
- The project does not propose historicist or conjectural features that would give the false perception of historical development.
- There are no proposed changes to features of the property that have acquired significance in their own right.
- The new construction will not diminish or remove distinctive features, finishes and construction techniques and examples of craftsmanship of the landmark site. All work will be localized to the new development.
- The proposed project does not include replacement of deteriorated or missing historic features.
- The proposed project does not include chemical or physical treatments to historic materials.
- The proposed new construction will not destroy historic materials, features or spatial relationships that characterize the property. The proposed new construction will be differentiated from the old but will be compatible in terms of materials, features, size, scale and proportion. Brick cladding, punched fenestration and fenestration features will reference the features of the landmark building but will be completed in a differentiated manner such that the integrity of the landmark and its environment will be protected.
- The proposed new construction will occur on a portion of the landmark site that contains non-contributing features. If removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the landmark and its environment would be unimpaired.
- 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.

Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

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 7.

Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

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 3636 Buchanan 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 demolition of non-contributing features of a landmark site and construction of a new residential building that 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 landmark 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 ten units at the property are uninhabitable.

- 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 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 improved by the proposed work. The work will eliminate unsafe conditions at the site and all construction 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 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 **APPROVES** a Certificate of **Appropriateness** for the property located at Lot 003 in Assessor's Block 0459 for proposed work in conformance with the renderings and architectural sketches dated October 8, 2018 on file in the docket for Case No. 2016-010079COA.

APPEAL AND EFFECTIVE DATE OF MOTION: The Commission's decision on a Certificate of Appropriateness shall be final unless appealed within thirty (30) days. Any appeal shall be made to the Board of Appeals, unless the proposed project requires Board of Supervisors approval or is appealed to the Board of Supervisors as a conditional use, in which case any appeal shall be made to the Board of Supervisors (see Charter Section 4.135).

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 November 7, 2018.


Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES: Black, Johns, Pearlman, Wolfram

NAYS: Johnck, Matsuda, Hyland


ABSENT: None

ADOPTED: November 7, 2018

Attachment E

SF Heritage Letter

January 18, 2019



January 18, 2019

Jody Knight, Esq.
Reuben Junius & Rose, LLP
One Bush Street, Suite 600
San Francisco, CA 94104

Re: 3620 Buchanan Street

Dear Ms. Knight:

On behalf of San Francisco Heritage, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed infill project at 3620 Buchanan Street. Members of the project team presented to Heritage's Projects + Policy Committee at its meeting on November 30, 2018.

Heritage concurs with the conclusion of the Historic Preservation Commission, Planning Department, and Page & Turnbull that the period of significance for the City Landmark designation is from 1893 to 1958, terminating when PG&E ceased operations at 3620 Buchanan Street. As such, the Projects + Policy Committee agrees that the Garden Shop and landscape improvements – both added after 1958 – do not qualify as protected character-defining features, despite being located within the property boundaries identified in the original landmark designation ordinance.

All members of the Projects + Policy Committee were impressed by the attention to detail and sensitivity of the proposed infill design, including its varied fenestration, reduced massing, materials palette, degree of separation between the landmark building and new construction, and the setback at the corner of the new building to maximize views to the landmark building from the sidewalk.

Although we do not consider the landscape improvements to be character-defining features, Heritage believes that it will be important to maintain the permeability of the open space between the landmark building and the proposed new construction. We understand that the project sponsor also seeks to maintain the transparency of this space to the extent feasible while addressing security concerns. To this end, the sponsor has committed to consulting with Heritage on the design of any hedge, fence, or other barrier that may divide the open space between the buildings.

It seems likely that as units are purchased in the new building, there will be interest in creating a physical barrier between the two buildings. Providing sufficient open space

around the landmark building will be important to help maintain the integrity of the site. Heritage urges the project sponsor to consider donating a conservation easement now that will permanently protect the landmark building and its adjacent open space. I am happy to discuss easement options with you.

Thank you, again, for presenting to the Projects + Policy Committee. Please contact me directly at 415/441-3000 x15 or mbuhler@sfheritage.org should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mike Buhler". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Mike" and last name "Buhler" clearly distinguishable.

Mike Buhler
President & CEO

cc: Stephanie Cisneros, San Francisco Planning Department

Wong, Jocelyn (BOS)

From: Carroll, John (BOS)
Sent: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 6:48 PM
To: BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject: FW: File No. 190275 3620 Buchanan

Categories: 190275

For the 3620 Buchanan Street Appeal.

Thanks,
JEC

From: Calvillo, Angela (BOS)
Sent: Tuesday, April 02, 2019 6:29 PM
To: Carroll, John (BOS) <john.carroll@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: File No. 190275 3620 Buchanan

RE: Appeal of 2016-010079CUA 3620 Buchanan Street (Project) File No. 190275.

Thank you John.

From: Arnold Cohn [mailto:sfamc2@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 11:41 AM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Subject: File No. 190275 3620 Buchanan

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Angela Calvillo
Clerk, Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: Appeal of 2016-010079CUA 3620 Buchanan Street (Project) File No. 190275

Dear Ms Calvillo:

The entire area of Block 459 Lot 3 which includes 3620, 3636 and 3640 Buchanan, and 1595 North Point (the Project site) has been designated an important historic landmark by the Board of Supervisors in Ordinance No. 12-74 on January 4, 1974, known as Merryvale Antiques (Historical Landmark No. 58). The proposed 3620 Demolition and Construction Project (Project) violates the Planning Code in numerous ways, and the design ignores various Residential Design Guidelines. In addition, as the Project would have a substantial adverse effect on an historic resource (Landmark No. 58), it must be reviewed under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) before any City approvals can occur.

The Project's Historic Resource Evaluation prepared by Page and Turnbull dated May 20, 2016 (HRE) attempts to obfuscate the fact that the entire lot, which includes the Merryvale Antiques building, the courtyard, and the garden house, is designated as part of Historical Landmark No. 58. The various addresses assigned to the buildings located on the lot do not change the fact that the designation of Landmark No. 58 applies to the entirety of the location and boundaries of the Project site.

Furthermore, in Ordinance No. 12-74, "the equally impressive garden shop to the south, which is directly accessible from the main building," is referred to as part of the special character and special historical, architectural and aesthetic interest justifying the designation of Landmark No. 58. The garden shop is precisely the building which will be demolished as a result of the Project. The existing landscaped courtyard, which is also referred to as part of the "handsomely landscaped and spacious areas between the buildings" in Ordinance No. 12-74, will also be significantly diminished by approximately 25% to 33%, which will impact the spatial relationships between the Merryvale Antiques historic building and the proposed Project. A substantial adverse change in the significance of the historic resource includes any "physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired," See CEQA Guidelines 15064.5(b)(1). Considering the historic resources present, any partial or full demolition of any element of the Landmark No. 58, which includes the landscaped courtyard and the garden house, will be a significant impact under CEQA. The Planning Department should require the Project to undergo further environmental review, including the preparation of an initial study and a focused environmental impact report to address this issue.

Please stop the proposed 3620 Buchanan demolition construction project.

Sincerely,

Arnold Cohn
1550 Bay Unit B126
S.F., CA. 94123

Wong, Jocelyn (BOS)

From: BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Sent: Tuesday, April 2, 2019 8:12 AM
To: Olson, Charles; jknight@reubenlaw.com
Cc: GIVNER, JON (CAT); STACY, KATE (CAT); JENSEN, KRISTEN (CAT); Rahaim, John (CPC); Teague, Corey (CPC); Sanchez, Scott (CPC); Gibson, Lisa (CPC); Jain, Devyani (CPC); Navarrete, Joy (CPC); Lynch, Laura (CPC); Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC); Sider, Dan (CPC); Starr, Aaron (CPC); Cisneros, Stephanie (CPC); Rosenberg, Julie (BOA); Cantara, Gary (BOA); Longaway, Alec (BOA); BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject: HEARING NOTICE: Appeal of CEQA Exemption Determination - Proposed 3620 Buchanan Street Project - Appeal Hearing on April 16, 2019

Good morning,

The Office of the Clerk of the Board has scheduled a hearing for Special Order before the Board of Supervisors on **April 16, 2019, at 3:00 p.m.**, to hear the appeal of the determination of categorical exemption from environmental review under CEQA for the proposed project of 3620 Buchanan Street.

Please find the following link to the hearing notice for the matter.

[Public Hearing Notice - April 2, 2019](#)

I invite you to review the entire matter on our [Legislative Research Center](#) by following the links below:

[Board of Supervisors File No. 190275](#)

Best regards,

Jocelyn Wong

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
T: 415.554.7702 | F: 415.554.5163
jocelyn.wong@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco will hold a public hearing to consider the following appeal and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard:

Date: Tuesday, April 16, 2019

Time: 3:00 p.m.

Location: Legislative Chamber, City Hall, Room 250
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett, Place, San Francisco, CA 94102

Subject: File No. 190275. Hearing of persons interested in or objecting to the determination of exemption from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act issued as a Categorical Exemption by the Planning Department on November 7, 2018, for the proposed project at 3620 Buchanan Street, to demolish one of two existing structures on one shared parcel and construct a new four-story, eight-unit residential building with eight bicycle parking spaces and one accessible vehicle parking space. (District 2) (Appellant: Charles R. Olson of Lubin Olson & Niewiadomski LLP, on behalf 1598 Bay Condominium Association) (Filed March 4, 2019)

In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on this matter may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in this matter and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102. Information relating to this matter is available in the Office of the Clerk of the Board and agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, April 12, 2019.

Peggy Nevin
for Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

PROOF OF MAILING

Legislative File No. 190275

Description of Items: Hearing - Appeal of Determination of Exemption From Environmental Review - 3620 Buchanan Street - 85 Notices Mailed


I, Jocelyn Wong, an employee of the City and County of San Francisco mailed the above described document(s) by depositing the sealed items with the United States Postal Service (USPS) with the postage fully prepaid as follows:

Date: April 2, 2019

Time: 8:15 AM

USPS Location: Repro Pick-up Box in the Clerk of the Board's Office (Rm 244)

Mailbox/Mailslot Pick-Up Times (if applicable): N/A

Signature: 

Instructions: Upon completion, original must be filed in the above referenced file.

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

March 11, 2019

File Nos. 190275-190278

Planning Case Nos. 2016-010079ENV

Received from the Board of Supervisors Clerk's Office two checks, each in the amount of Six Hundred Seventeen Dollars (\$617), representing the filing fee paid by Lubin Olson & Niewiadomski LLP for the appeal of the Categorical Exemption under CEQA for the proposed 3620 Buchanan Street project:

Planning Department

By:

Tony Young
Print Name

[Signature] 3/13/19
Signature and Date

Wong, Jocelyn (BOS)

From: BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2019 1:32 PM
To: Olson, Charles; jknight@reubenlaw.com
Cc: GIVNER, JON (CAT); STACY, KATE (CAT); JENSEN, KRISTEN (CAT); Rahaim, John (CPC); Teague, Corey (CPC); Sanchez, Scott (CPC); Gibson, Lisa (CPC); Jain, Devyani (CPC); Navarrete, Joy (CPC); Lynch, Laura (CPC); Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC); Sider, Dan (CPC); Starr, Aaron (CPC); Cisneros, Stephanie (CPC); Rosenberg, Julie (BOA); Cantara, Gary (BOA); Longaway, Alec (BOA); BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject: Appeal of CEQA Exemption Determination - Proposed 3620 Buchanan Street Project - Appeal Hearing on April 16, 2019
Categories: 190275

Greetings,

The Office of the Clerk of the Board has scheduled an appeal hearing for Special Order before the Board of Supervisors on **April 16, 2019, at 3:00 p.m.** Please find linked below the letter of appeal filed for the proposed project at 3620 Buchanan Street, as well as direct links to the Planning Department's timely filing determination, and an informational letter from the Clerk of the Board.

[Appeal Letter - March 4, 2018](#)

[Planning Department Memo - March 7, 2018](#)

[Clerk of the Board Letter - March 11, 2019](#)

I invite you to review the entire matter on our [Legislative Research Center](#) by following the link below:

[Board of Supervisors File No. 190275](#)

Regards,

Jocelyn Wong

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

T: 415.554.7702 | F: 415.554.5163

jocelyn.wong@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Rm 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

March 11, 2019

Charles Olson
Lubin Olson & Niewiadomski LLP
The Transamerica Pyramid
600 Montgomery Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111

**Subject: File No. 190275 - Appeal of CEQA Categorical Exemption
Determination - Proposed Project at 3620 Buchanan Street**

Dear Mr. Olson:

The Office of the Clerk of the Board was in receipt of a memorandum dated March 7, 2019, from the Planning Department regarding their determination on the timely filing of appeal of the Categorical Exemption Determination issued by the Planning Department under CEQA for the proposed project at 3620 Buchanan Street.

The Planning Department has determined that the appeal was filed in a timely manner (copy attached).

Pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 31.16, a hearing date has been scheduled for **Tuesday, April 16, 2019, at 3:00 p.m.**, at the Board of Supervisors meeting to be held in City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Legislative Chamber, Room 250, San Francisco, CA 94102.

Please provide to the Clerk's Office by noon:

20 days prior to the hearing: names and addresses of interested parties to be notified of the hearing, in spreadsheet format; and

11 days prior to the hearing: any documentation which you may want available to the Board members prior to the hearing.


For the above, the Clerk's office requests one electronic file (sent to bos.legislation@sfgov.org) and two copies of the documentation for distribution.

Continues on Next Page

NOTE: If electronic versions of the documentation are not available, please submit 18 hard copies of the materials to the Clerk's Office for distribution. If you are unable to make the deadlines prescribed above, it is your responsibility to ensure that all parties receive copies of the materials.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Legislative Clerks Brent Jalipa at (415) 554-7712, Lisa Lew at (415) 554-7718, or Jocelyn Wong at (415) 554-7702.

Very truly yours,


Angela Galvillo
Clerk of the Board

cc Jon Gjyner, Deputy City Attorney
Kate Stacy, Deputy City Attorney
Kristen Jensen, Deputy City Attorney
John Rahaim, Planning Director
Corey Teague, Zoning Administrator, Planning Department
Scott Sanchez, Acting Deputy Zoning Administrator, Planning Department
Lisa Gibson, Environmental Review Officer, Planning Department
Devyani Jain, Deputy Environmental Review Officer, Planning Department
Joy Navarette, Environmental Planning, Planning Department
Laura Lynch, Environmental Planning, Planning Department
AnMarie Rodgers, Director of Citywide Planning, Planning Department
Dan Sider, Director of Executive Programs, Planning Department
Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs, Planning Department
Stephanie Cisneros, Staff Contact, Planning Department
Julie Rosenberg, Executive Director, Board of Appeals
Gary Cantara, Legal Assistant, Board of Appeals
Alec Longaway, Legal Process Clerk, Board of Appeals



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

DATE: March 7, 2019
TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
FROM: Lisa Gibson, Environmental Review Officer
RE: CEQA Appeal Timeliness Determination – 3620 Buchanan Street,
 Planning Department Case No. 2016-010079ENV

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

Reception:
 415.558.6378

Fax:
 415.558.6409

Planning
 Information:
 415.558.6377

On March 4, 2019, Charles R. Olson of Lubin Olson & Niewiadomski, LLP, on behalf of the 1598 Bay Condominium Association, filed an appeal with the Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the categorical exemption determination for the 3620 Buchanan Street project. As explained below, the appeal is timely.

| Date of Approval Action | 30 Days after Approval Action/ Appeal Deadline | First Business Day after Appeal Deadline | Date of Appeal Filing | Timely? |
|-------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|---------|
| January 31, 2019 | Saturday, March 2, 2019 | Monday, March 4, 2019 | Monday, March 4, 2019 | Yes |

Approval Action: On November 7, 2018, the planning department issued a CEQA categorical exemption determination for the 3620 Buchanan Street project. The categorical exemption determination identified the approval action for the project as the hearing before the planning commission. On January 31, 2019, the planning commission held a conditional use authorization hearing and approved the project at 3620 Buchanan Street (date of approval action).

Appeal Deadline: Section 31.16(a) and (e) of the San Francisco Administrative Code states that any person or entity may appeal an exemption determination to the Board of Supervisors during the time period beginning with the date of the exemption determination and ending 30 days after the date of the approval action. Thirty days after the approval action was March 2, 2019, which is a Saturday. The next date when the Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors was open was Monday, March 4, 2019 (appeal deadline).

Appeal Filing and Timeliness: The appellant filed the appeal of the exemption determination on Monday, March 4, 2019, prior to the appeal deadline. Therefore, the appeal is considered timely.

Wong, Jocelyn (BOS)

From: BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 3:17 PM
To: Rahaim, John (CPC)
Cc: GIVNER, JON (CAT); STACY, KATE (CAT); JENSEN, KRISTEN (CAT); Teague, Corey (CPC); Sanchez, Scott (CPC); Gibson, Lisa (CPC); Jain, Devyani (CPC); Navarrete, Joy (CPC); Lynch, Laura (CPC); Rodgers, AnMarie (CPC); Sider, Dan (CPC); Starr, Aaron (CPC); Cisneros, Stephanie (CPC); Rosenberg, Julie (BOA); Cantara, Gary (BOA); Longaway, Alec (BOA); BOS-Supervisors; BOS-Legislative Aides; Calvillo, Angela (BOS); Somera, Alisa (BOS); BOS Legislation, (BOS)
Subject: Appeal of CEQA Exemption Determination - Proposed Project at 3620 Buchanan Street - Timeliness Determination Request
Attachments: Appeal Ltr 030419.pdf; COB Ltr 030619.pdf
Categories: 190275

Good afternoon, Director Rahaim:

The Office of the Clerk of the Board is in receipt of an appeal of the CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination for the proposed project at 3620 Buchanan Street. The appeal was filed by Charles R. Olson of Lubin Olson & Niewiadomski LLP, on behalf of 1598 Bay Condominium Association, on March 4, 2019.

Please find the attached letter of appeal and timely filing determination request letter from the Clerk of the Board.

Kindly review for timely filing determination.

Best regards,

Jocelyn Wong

San Francisco Board of Supervisors

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244

San Francisco, CA 94102

T: 415.554.7702 | F: 415.554.5163

jocelyn.wong@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org


BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

March 6, 2019

To: John Rahaim
Planning Director

From:  Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Subject: **Appeal of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Determination of Categorical Exemption from Environmental Review - 3620 Buchanan Street**

An appeal of the CEQA Determination of Categorical Exemption from Environmental Review for the proposed project at 3620 Buchanan Street was filed with the Office of the Clerk of the Board on March 4, 2019, by Charles R. Olson of Lubin Olson & Niewiadomski LLP, on behalf 1598 Bay Condominium Association.

Pursuant to Administrative Code, Chapter 31.16, I am forwarding this appeal, with attached documents, to the Planning Department to determine if the appeal has been filed in a timely manner. The Planning Department's determination should be made within three (3) working days of receipt of this request.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Legislative Clerks Brent Jalipa at (415) 554-7712, Lisa Lew at (415) 554-7718, or Jocelyn Wong at (415) 554-7702.

c: Jon Givner, Deputy City Attorney
Kate Stacy, Deputy City Attorney
Kristen Jensen, Deputy City Attorney
Corey Teague, Zoning Administrator, Planning Department
Scott Sanchez, Acting Deputy Zoning Administrator, Planning Department
Lisa Gibson, Environmental Review Officer, Planning Department
Devyani Jain, Deputy Environmental Review Officer, Planning Department
Joy Navarette, Environmental Planning, Planning Department
Laura Lynch, Environmental Planning, Planning Department
AnMarie Rodgers, Director of Citywide Planning, Planning Department
Dan Sider, Director of Executive Programs, Planning Department
Aaron Starr, Manager of Legislative Affairs, Planning Department
Stephanie Cisneros, Staff Contact, Planning Department
Julie Rosenberg, Executive Director, Board of Appeals
Gary Cantara, Legal Assistant, Board of Appeals
Alec Longaway, Legal Process Clerk, Board of Appeals

Introduction Form

By a Member of the Board of Supervisors or Mayor

Time stamp
or meeting date

I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one):

- 1. For reference to Committee. (An Ordinance, Resolution, Motion or Charter Amendment).
- 2. Request for next printed agenda Without Reference to Committee.
- 3. Request for hearing on a subject matter at Committee.
- 4. Request for letter beginning : "Supervisor [] inquiries"
- 5. City Attorney Request.
- 6. Call File No. [] from Committee.
- 7. Budget Analyst request (attached written motion).
- 8. Substitute Legislation File No. []
- 9. Reactivate File No. []
- 10. Topic submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the BOS on []

Please check the appropriate boxes. The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following:

- Small Business Commission
- Youth Commission
- Ethics Commission
- Planning Commission
- Building Inspection Commission

Note: For the Imperative Agenda (a resolution not on the printed agenda), use the Imperative Form.

Sponsor(s):

Clerk of the Board

Subject:

Hearing - Appeal of Determination of Exemption From Environmental Review - 3620 Buchanan Street

The text is listed:

Hearing of persons interested in or objecting to the determination of exemption from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act issued as a Categorical Exemption by the Planning Department on November 7, 2018, for the proposed project at 3620 Buchanan Street, to demolish one of two existing structures on one shared parcel and construct a new four-story, eight-unit residential building with eight bicycle parking spaces and one accessible vehicle parking space. (District 2) (Appellant: Charles R. Olson of Lubin Olson & Niewiadomski LLP, on behalf 1598 Bay Condominium Association) (Filed March 4, 2019)

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor: 

For Clerk's Use Only