

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184
Fax No. (415) 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

Date: February 14, 2024
To: Planning Department/Planning Commission
From: John Carroll, Assistant Clerk, Land Use and Transportation Committee
Subject: Board of Supervisors Legislation Referral - File No. 240070
Planning Code - Exceptions and Extensions for Existing Uses

- California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Determination
Ordinance / Resolution
Ballot Measure
Amendment to the Planning Code, including the following Findings:
Amendment to the Administrative Code, involving Land Use/Planning
General Plan Referral for Non-Planning Code Amendments
Historic Preservation Commission

Please send the Planning Department/Commission recommendation/determination to John Carroll at john.carroll@sfgov.org.



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

## CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination

### PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

<b>Project Address</b>		<b>Block/Lot(s)</b>
420-422 Precita Avenue		5526054
<b>Case No.</b>		<b>Permit No.</b>
2018-016540ENV		201812067573
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Addition/ Alteration</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Demolition (requires HRE for Category B Building)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>New Construction</b>
<p><b>Project description for Planning Department approval.</b></p> <p>Th existing property consists of two buildings with three residential units. The proposed project pertains to the building fronting Precita Ave (420-422 Precita Ave). The project scope includes the addition &amp; renovation to an existing three story two unit residential building. Proposed work: 1) Enlarge existing 3rd floor, relocate kitchen from 2nd to 3rd floor. 2) Add 3rd floor mezzanine/vertical addition. 3) Add new two story addition at existing single story side structure. 4) Convert existing rear second floor roof to a third floor deck. 5) Add new exterior stair from 2nd floor deck to 3rd floor. The proposed project will create an approximately 3267 square foot, two unit building (420-422 Precita) with no work to the rear cottage.</p>		

### STEP 1: EXEMPTION CLASS

<b>The project has been determined to be categorically exempt under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Class 1 - Existing Facilities.</b> Interior and exterior alterations; additions under 10,000 sq. ft.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Class 3 - New Construction.</b> 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 type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Class 32 - In-Fill Development.</b> 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><b>FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING USE ONLY</b></p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Class ____</b>

## STEP 2: CEQA IMPACTS

### TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Air Quality:</b> 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 &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Air Pollution Exposure Zone)</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Hazardous Materials:</b> 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?</p> <p><i>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 &gt; Maher layer).</i></p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Transportation:</b> Does the project involve a child care facility or school with 30 or more students, or a location 1,500 sq. ft. or greater? 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><b>Archeological Resources:</b> 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? If yes, archeo review is required (refer to EP_ArcMap &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Archeological Sensitive Area)</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment:</b> 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 &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Topography). If yes, Environmental Planning must issue the exemption.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Slope = or &gt; 25%:</b> Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 500 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 &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Topography) <b>If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required and Environmental Planning must issue the exemption.</b></p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Seismic: Landslide Zone:</b> Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 500 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 &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Seismic Hazard Zones) <b>If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required and Environmental Planning must issue the exemption.</b></p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Seismic: Liquefaction Zone:</b> Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 500 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 &gt; CEQA Catex Determination Layers &gt; Seismic Hazard Zones) <b>If box is checked, a geotechnical report will likely be required and Environmental Planning must issue the exemption.</b></p>
<p><b>Comments and Planner Signature (optional):</b> Laura Lynch</p>	

**STEP 3: PROPERTY STATUS - HISTORIC RESOURCE**  
**TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

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

**STEP 4: PROPOSED WORK CHECKLIST**  
**TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

<b>Check all that apply to the project.</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	1. <b>Change of use and new construction.</b> Tenant improvements not included.
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. <b>Regular maintenance or repair</b> to correct or repair deterioration, decay, or damage to building.
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. <b>Window replacement</b> that meets the Department's <i>Window Replacement Standards</i> . Does not include storefront window alterations.
<input type="checkbox"/>	4. <b>Garage work.</b> A new opening that meets the <i>Guidelines for Adding Garages and Curb Cuts</i> , and/or replacement of a garage door in an existing opening that meets the Residential Design Guidelines.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5. <b>Deck, terrace construction, or fences</b> not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
<input type="checkbox"/>	6. <b>Mechanical equipment installation</b> that is not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
<input type="checkbox"/>	7. <b>Dormer installation</b> that meets the requirements for exemption from public notification under <i>Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 3: Dormer Windows</i> .
<input type="checkbox"/>	8. <b>Addition(s)</b> 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.
<b>Note: Project Planner must check box below before proceeding.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project is not listed. <b>GO TO STEP 5.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project <b>does not conform</b> to the scopes of work. <b>GO TO STEP 5.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project involves <b>four or more</b> work descriptions. <b>GO TO STEP 5.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project involves <b>less than four</b> work descriptions. <b>GO TO STEP 6.</b>

**STEP 5: CEQA IMPACTS - ADVANCED HISTORICAL REVIEW**  
**TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7. <b>Addition(s)</b> , 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. <b>Other work consistent</b> with the <i>Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties</i> (specify or add comments):  vertical and horizontal additions minimally visible and treated so as to be compatible with the existing historic resource, new roof deck at rear
<input type="checkbox"/>	9. <b>Other work</b> that would not materially impair a historic district (specify or add comments):  (Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10. <b>Reclassification of property status.</b> (Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation <input type="checkbox"/> Reclassify to Category A <input type="checkbox"/> Reclassify to Category C a. Per HRER or PTR dated 07/01/2019 (attach HRER or PTR) b. Other (specify):
<b>Note: If ANY box in STEP 5 above is checked, a Preservation Planner MUST sign below.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Project can proceed with categorical exemption review.</b> The project has been reviewed by the Preservation Planner and can proceed with categorical exemption review. <b>GO TO STEP 6.</b>
<b>Comments (optional):</b>	
<b>Preservation Planner Signature:</b> Monica Giacomucci	

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>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.</b>	
	<b>Project Approval Action:</b> Building Permit	<b>Signature:</b> Monica Giacomucci
	If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project.	07/01/2019
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 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)
420-422 Precita Avenue		5526/054
Case No.	Previous Building Permit No.	New Building Permit No.
2018-016540PRJ	201812067573	
Plans Dated	Previous Approval Action	New Approval Action
	Building Permit	
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?
<b>If at least one of the above boxes is checked, further environmental review is required.</b>	

### 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. In accordance with Chapter 31, Sec 31.08j of the San Francisco Administrative Code, an appeal of this determination can be filed within 10 days of posting of this determination.	
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**

<b>Preservation Team Meeting Date:</b>		<b>Date of Form Completion</b>	5/14/2019
--	--	--------------------------------	-----------

PROJECT INFORMATION:		
Planner:	Address:	
Monica Giacomucci	420 Precita Avenue	
Block/Lot:	Cross Streets:	
5526/055, 056, 057	Alabama and Harrison Streets	
CEQA Category:	Art. 10/11:	BPA/Case No.:
A	N/A	2018-016540ENV

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

<b>DATE OF PLANS UNDER REVIEW:</b>	3/5/2019
------------------------------------	----------

PROJECT ISSUES:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the subject Property an eligible historic resource?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	If so, are the proposed changes a significant impact?
Additional Notes:	
Submitted: Supplemental Information for Historic Resource Determination prepared by Mark Hulbert, Preservation Architecture (dated December 4, 2018)	
Include project description here	

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:	1880 to 1912	
		<input checked="" type="radio"/> Contributor <input type="radio"/> Non-Contributor		

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

PRESERVATION TEAM COMMENTS:
<p>Based on review of plans prepared by David Thompson dated March 5, 2019, Planning staff finds that the proposed project will not materially impair the identified Bernal Heights North Historic District, nor will the project cause a significant impact to the historic resource. The subject property is improved with a Western False Front Italianate wood-frame, two-story, two-unit residential building to the north which is a contributor to the Bernal Heights North Historic District. A wood-frame, one-story residential cottage at the rear of the property has been identified as non-contributing.</p> <p>Overall, the proposed project complies with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and is compatible with the Bernal Heights North Historic District such that there will be no impact or potential impact to the historic district. Some of the main components of the project as it relates to the historic district include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Architecture - The proposed vertical addition will maintain a plain, simple vernacular appearance similar to that of the existing building.</li> <li>2) Volume - The proposed project will maintain an emphasis on volume rather than ornament by not including the application of referential decorative elements.</li> <li>3) Materials - The proposed new cladding material will be painted wood clapboarding consistent with the existing cladding on the building.</li> <li>4) Fenestration - The proposed fenestration is consistent with window types and sizes present on the existing building and within the historic district.</li> <li>5) Roof form - The roof form of the historic structure will remain flat and the roof form of the proposed penthouse vertical addition will also be flat, which is consistent with the roof form of the existing building and with other buildings within the historic district.</li> </ol>

Signature of a Senior Preservation Planner / Preservation Coordinator:	Date:
<b>Allison K. Vanderslice</b> Digitally signed by Allison K. Vanderslice Date: 2019.07.01 11:06:38 -06'00'	



Continuation Sheet  
Preservation Team Review Form  
420-422 Precita Avenue

According to information accessed in Department files and photographs provided by the project sponsor, the rear building appears to have been heavily altered over time and lacks historic and architectural integrity such that it would qualify for listing on the California Register, either individually or as part of a district.

In contrast, the front building has seen relatively few alterations. Known permitted alterations to the front building include installation of asbestos shingle siding at the front elevation (1948); replacement of wood stairs at the front and rear (1961 and 1992); construction of a horizontal addition, rear porch, and rear deck (1993); and construction of a vertical addition (1996). The front elevation windows have also been replaced, but likely in-kind according to historic photographs. The front stair appears to have changed to a dogleg orientation from its original straight alignment.

Based on the California Register significance criteria, Department staff finds that the subject property at 420-422 Precita Avenue is individually eligible for inclusion in the California Register under Criterion 1 and 3 as a distinctive example of a type and period.

Character-defining features of the front building at 420-422 Precita include:

- Wood channel drop siding
- Bracketed wood cornice with paneled frieze
- Center gabled parapet
- Raised, recessed paneled entry accessed by wood stair
- Solid-panel wood door with wood single-lite transom window
- Wood double-hung 2-over-2 sash windows
- Moulded window and door casings with paired decorative brackets and hoods

The property is located in the California Register-Eligible Bernal Heights North Historic District, which was identified through a previous Historic Resource Evaluation. The subject property has not been evaluated relative to this historic district, which was found eligible under Criterion 1 for its significance as an early residential development in the then-rural Bernal Heights neighborhood and under Criterion 3 as a rare surviving collection of small-scale, late-Victorian and Edwardian-era residential properties. The period of significance for the Eligible Bernal Heights North Historic District is circa 1880 to 1912. The subject property was constructed before 1886, retains significant architectural integrity, and represents an early Victorian residence in the Bernal Heights neighborhood.

None of the owners or occupants of the front or rear buildings have been identified as important to history (Criterion 2). Based upon a review of information in the Department's records, the front and rear buildings are not significant under Criterion 4, since this criterion typically applies to rare construction types when involving the built environment. The subject buildings do not exemplify a rare construction type. Assessment of archeological sensitivity is undertaken through the Department's Preliminary Archeological Review process and is outside the scope of this review.

Continuation Sheet  
Preservation Team Review Form  
420-422 Precita Avenue

The subject property was not included in the 1998 survey of the Area of Potential Effects of the Bernal Gateway project, nor was it mentioned in the Bernal Dwellings Historic Context Statement.

Staff finds that due to its date of construction and architectural integrity, the front building at the subject property is contributory within the Eligible Bernal Heights North Historic District.



Alabama & Precita, 1937. View West, 36-Line #744 on Alabama at Precita. Subject property is at the left.  
*Photographer Unknown (Courtesy of a Private Collector; accessed via Open SF History)*



# 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**

<b>Preservation Team Meeting Date:</b>		<b>Date of Form Completion</b>	2/19/2019
--	--	--------------------------------	-----------

PROJECT INFORMATION:		
Planner:	Address:	
Monica Giacomucci	420 Precita Avenue	
Block/Lot:	Cross Streets:	
5526/055, 056, 057	Alabama and Harrison Streets	
CEQA Category:	Art. 10/11:	BPA/Case No.:
A	N/A	2018-016540ENV

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

<b>DATE OF PLANS UNDER REVIEW:</b>	11/16/2018
------------------------------------	------------

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:	
Submitted: Supplemental Information for Historic Resource Determination prepared by Mark Hulbert, Preservation Architecture (dated December 4, 2018)	

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:	<input type="text" value="1880 to 1912"/>	
		<input type="radio"/> Contributor <input type="radio"/> Non-Contributor		

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

PRESERVATION TEAM COMMENTS:
<p>According to the Supplemental Application for Historic Resource Determination, the subject property is improved with a Western False Front Italianate wood-frame, two-story, two-unit residential building to the north ("front building") and a wood-frame, one-story residential cottage to the south ("rear building"), totaling three residential units. No work is planned for the rear building under the above permit application.</p> <p>The exact date of construction for the front building is unknown; however, the front building appears as a two-flat building in the 1886 Sanborn Map on a large lot also containing a one-story store and two outbuildings. Precita Park (originally called Bernal Park) was completed in 1894, so the subject property predates a surge in residential development related to the park and neighborhood-serving streetcar lines. The earliest known occupant, Thomas H. Marks, resided at the property as early as 1898 based on City Directory research. Marks was California-born miner who lived and worked in Eureka, Nevada before relocating to San Francisco. Charles B. Blumberg, a hat cleaner, purchased the property in 1905 resided there with his wife, Martha, until approximately 1915. By this time, the one-story commercial building and several outbuildings had been removed from the subject lot, leaving just the front building and a small one-story rear structure. The property was addressed as 420-420 1/2 Precita Avenue.</p> <p>Ludwig Thuswald, a baker, and his wife Marie purchased the property in 1915, but do not appear to have resided there. The Thuswalds sold the subject property to wholesale butcher Luigi (or Louis) Del Debbio and his wife Maria Pasquina in 1924, and the Del Debbio family resided at 420-420 1/2 Precita Avenue through 1945. Luigi was employed by the P. Micheletti Meat Co. at the Embarcadero, while his sons Angelo, Ernest, and Lawrence served in the United States Armed Forces. Alphonse Del Debbio owned an automobile garage at 1336 Grove Street in the Western Addition. After the Del Debbio family sold the property, the longest-term owners were Michael and Nazera Hider, who maintained ownership of 420-422 Precita from 1948 through 1984. Michael Hider co-owned Hider's Market, a neighborhood-serving grocery store in the Excelsior.</p> <p>The property has been altered over time. Several outbuilding were constructed and demolished without the benefit of permits through at least the 1950s. As such, the date of construction for the rear building is not known. A smaller structure appears in the rear building's current location in the 1914 Sanborn Map. By 1950, that structure had expanded to the approximate footprint of the existing rear building.</p> <p>(continued)</p>

Signature of a Senior Preservation Planner / Preservation Coordinator:	Date: