



SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

File 110277 Sup Campos
RECEIVED Ac
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2011 JUN -7 AM 9:35
BY af

June 6, 2011

Ms. Angela Calvillo, Clerk
Honorable Supervisor David Campos
Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Re: Transmittal of Planning Case Number CASE NO. 2011.0295T to
the Board of Supervisors File No. 11-0277: Historic Sign
Ordinance

Recommendation: Approval with Modifications

Dear Ms. Calvillo and Supervisor Campos,

On June 2, 2011, the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission")
conducted a duly noticed public hearings at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider
the proposed Ordinance. At the hearing, the Commission voted 6-0 to recommend
approval with modifications.

Supervisor Campos, please advise the City Attorney at your earliest convenience if you
wish to incorporate any changes recommended by the Commission.

Attached is the resolution which provides more detail about the Commission's action. If
you have any questions or require further information please do not hesitate to contact
me.

Sincerely,

Aaron Starr
Legislative Affairs

Cc: City Attorneys: Judy Boyajian and Cheryl Adams

Attachments (one copy of the following):
Planning Commission Resolution No. 18376



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Planning Commission Resolution No. 18376

HEARING DATE JUNE 2, 2011

Project Name: Amendments relating to the authorization of historic signs
Case Number: 2011.0295T [Board File No. 11-0277]
Initiated by: Supervisor Campos/ Introduced February 8, 2011
Staff Contact: Aaron Starr, Legislative Affairs
aaron.starr@sfgov.org, 415-558-6362
Reviewed by: AnMarie Rodgers, Manager Legislative Affairs
anmarie.rodgers@sfgov.org, 415-558-6395
Recommendation: Recommend Approval with Modifications

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

RECOMMENDING THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPT A PROPOSED ORDINANCE THAT WOULD AMEND PLANNING CODE SECTION 608.14 REGARDING THE AUTHORIZATION OF HISTORIC SIGNS; ADOPTING FINDINGS, INCLUDING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS, PLANNING CODE SECTION 302 FINDINGS, AND FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AND PLANNING CODE SECTION 101.1.

WHEREAS, on February 8, 2011, Supervisors Campos introduced a proposed Ordinance under Board of Supervisors (hereinafter "Board") File Number 11-0277, which would amend Sections 608.14 of the Planning Code regarding the authorization of historic signs;

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider the proposed Ordinance on June 2, 2011; and,

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

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

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

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has reviewed the proposed Ordinance; and

MOVED, that the Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Board of Supervisors **approve with modifications** the proposed ordinance. Specifically, the Commission recommends the following modifications:

1. Change the name of signs covered under this Code section from 'Historic Sign' to more appropriate word that does not imply that signs covered under this section of the Planning Code are designated as Historic Resources.
2. Remove the last sentence from the **Referral to Historic Preservation Commission** section, which says: "However, the Department may refer the application to that Commission for an advisory opinion" from the proposed legislation
3. Modify the proposed legislation to allow three-dimensional Commemorative Signs to be relocated to new locations with Conditional Use authorization. Also stipulate that if a general advertising sign is eligible to be relocated under Section 611(c), this section of the code can not be used to relocate the sign.
4. Specify in the proposed ordinance that designation under this section of the Planning Code does not by itself protect signs from being obscured or removed by future development projects, particularly when those projects advance the goals and policies in the City's General Plan.
5. Required conditional use authorization to remove a sign designated under this ordinance.

FINDINGS

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

1. The proposed Ordinance will help preserve the cultural and visual identity of City neighborhoods.
2. The word "historic," when used in the City Planning Code, should be reserved for buildings or objects that have been determined City Landmarks or historic resources under CEQA.
3. The Historic Preservation Commission is the City's expert panel that provides advice on historic resources. Signs authorized under Section 608.14 are not being designated as historic resources; therefore these applications should not be sent to the Historic Preservation Commission for an advisory opinion.
4. Certain signs are cultural artifacts that have value, which transcend their location. Allowing these signs to be moved to new locations with Conditional Use authorization will help preserve these artifacts.
5. Authorization under this section of the Planning Code should not by itself protect a sign from being obscured or removed by future development, such as low-income housing or other projects that advance the goals and policies of the City's General Plan.

6. **General Plan Compliance.** The proposed Ordinance and the Commission's recommended modifications are consistent with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan:

I. URBAN DESIGN ELEMENT

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.

By allowing signs that contribute to the visual character of a City neighborhood to be preserved, the proposed amendments will help to promote the preservation of features within City neighborhoods that provide continuity with past developments.

8. **Planning Code Section 101 Findings.** The proposed amendments to the Planning Code are consistent with the eight Priority Policies set forth in Section 101.1(b) of the Planning Code in that:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;

The proposed amendments will not have a negative impact on neighborhood serving retail uses and will not impact opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of neighborhood-serving retail.

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

The proposed amendments will help preserve existing neighborhood character by allowing signs that contribute to the visual character of a City neighborhood to be maintained and preserved. The amendments will not impact existing housing.

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

The proposed amendments will have no adverse effect on the City's supply of affordable housing.

4. That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

The proposed amendments will not result in commuter traffic impeding MUNI transit service or overburdening the streets or neighborhood parking.

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

The proposed amendments would not cause displacement of the industrial or service sectors due to office development, and future opportunities for resident employment or ownership in these sectors would not be impaired.

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;
The proposed ordinance will allow signs that contribute to the visual character of a City neighborhood to be repaired and retrofitted, improving the City's preparedness against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.

7. That the landmarks and historic buildings be preserved;

Landmarks and historic buildings would not be negatively impacted by the proposed amendments.

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development;

The City's parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas would be unaffected by the proposed amendments. Any sign that is proposed for preservation or relocation would need to receive Conditional Use authorization, at which point impacts on sunlight access, to public or private property, would be reviewed.

8. **Planning Code Section 302 Findings.** The Planning Commission finds from the facts presented that the public necessity, convenience and general welfare require the proposed amendments to the Planning Code as set forth in Section 302.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Commission hereby recommends that the Board ADOPT the proposed Ordinance as described in this Resolution and in the proposed Ordinance with the modification outlined above.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Commission at its meeting on June 2, 2011.

Linda D. Avery
Commission Secretary

AYES: Commissioners Olague, Fong, Miguel, Moore, Sugaya, Borden

NOES: none

ABSENT: Commissioner Antonini

ADOPTED: none