| 1        | [Adopting findings related to disapproving the categorical exemption issued for 2462 27 <sup>th</sup>  |
|----------|--|
| 2        | Avenue.]   |
| 3        | Matica adopting findings related to discourse in a the determination by the Discourse                  |
| 4        | Motion adopting findings related to disapproving the determination by the Planning                     |
|          | Department that the 2462 27 <sup>th</sup> Avenue project is categorically exempt from                  |
| 5        | environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act.                                   |
| 6        |  |
| 7        | The Planning Department determined that a proposal to add a third-floor and rear                       |
| 8        | extension to a single family home at 2462 27th Avenue (the "Project") was categorically                |
| 9        | exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") on or around November 27,                |
| 10       | 2006 (the "determination"). By letter to the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors dated May 15,           |
| 11<br>12 | 2007, Stephen M. Williams filed an appeal of the determination to the Board of Supervisors,            |
| 13       | which the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors received on or around May 15, 2007.                        |
| 14       | On June 26, 2007, this Board held a duly noticed public hearing to consider the appeal                 |
| 15       | of the determination and following the public hearing disapproved the determination of the             |
| 16       | Planning Department that the Project is categorically exempt from CEQA.                                |
| 17       | In reviewing the appeal of the categorical exemption determination, this Board                         |
| 18       | reviewed and considered the written record before the Board and all of the public comments             |
| 19       | made in support of and opposed to the appeal. Following the conclusion of the public                   |
| 20       | hearing, the Board disapproved the Planning Department's categorical exemption                         |
| 21       | determination for 2462 27 <sup>th</sup> Avenue based on the written record before the Board as well as |
| 22       | all of the testimony at the public hearing in support of and opposed to the appeal. Said Motion        |
| 23       | and written record is in the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors File No. 070696 and is                  |
| 24       | incorporated herein as though set forth in its entirety.   |

25

| In regard to said decision, this Board made certain findings specifying the basis for its                 |
|---|
| decision to disapprove the Planning Department's approval of the determination for 2462 27 <sup>th</sup>  |
| Avenue based on the whole record before the Board including the written record in File No.                |
| 070694, which is hereby declared to be a part of this motion as if set forth fully herein; the            |
| written submissions to and official written records of the Planning Department determination              |
| related to the 2462 27 <sup>th</sup> Avenue project; the official written and oral testimony at and audio |
| and video records of the public hearing in support of and opposed to the appeal and                       |
| deliberation of the oral and written testimony at the public hearing before the Board of                  |
| Supervisors by all parties and the public in support of and opposed to the appeal of the                  |
| categorical exemption.  |

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT MOVED, That the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco finds that questions have been raised by the public testimony and records before it as to whether the project qualifies for a categorical exemption under CEQA Guidelines Section 15301 (Class 1) because the project may cause a substantial adverse change to the significance of a historical resource and, therefore, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15300.2 (f) not qualify for a categorical exemption.

FURTHER MOVED, That the Board of Supervisors finds that the evidence presented to it raises questions about whether the building proposed to be altered by the project may contribute to a historic district consisting of a series of intact 1920's houses on the east side of the 27<sup>th</sup> Avenue block in which the project is located and that a historic resource context statement for the Parkside District that would assist in resolving whether the project may contribute to a historic district has not yet been prepared.

FURTHER MOVED, That if the series of 1920's houses on the east side of 27<sup>th</sup>

Avenue, of which this building forms a part are found to be of historic significance, the alteration proposed to the building would need to be re-evaluated to determine whether the

| 1  | project as proposed may result in a significant adverse impact to an historic resource or       |
|----|---|
| 2  | historic resources.   |
| 3  | FURTHER MOVED, That the Board of Supervisors directs the Planning Department, in                |
| 4  | light of the questions that remain about whether the project may affect an historic resource or |
| 5  | historic resources as set forth above in these findings and the whole record, to review the     |
| 6  | questions identified in these findings and other information in the whole record that raise     |
| 7  | concerns about the possibility that the project may have a significant environmental effect,    |
| 8  | and at the conclusion of that review, undertake such additional environmental review as is      |
| 9  | required and appropriate under the California Environmental Quality Act.                        |
| 10 |   |
| 11 |   |
| 12 |   |
| 13 |   |
| 14 |   |
| 15 |   |
| 16 |   |
| 17 |   |
| 18 |   |
| 19 |   |
| 20 |   |
| 21 |   |
| 22 |   |
| 23 |   |
| 24 |   |
| 25 |   |