

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

| Project Address | | Block/Lot(s) | |
|---|----------------------|--------------|--|
| Pier 40 - Java House | | 9900040H | |
| Case No. | | Permit No. | |
| 2019-006140ENV | | | |
| Addition/ Demolition (requires HRE for | | New | |
| Alteration | Category B Building) | Construction | |
| Project description for Planning Department approval. | | | |
| The project involves the interior remodeling and renovation of the Java House at Pier 40, on the Embarcadero at | | | |

the project involves the interior remodeling and renovation of the Java House at Pier 40, on the Embarcadero at the intersection of Townsend Street. It is a continuation of an existing use that has been in operation at the site since 1912.

STEP 1: EXEMPTION CLASS

| The project has been determined to be categorically exempt under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | Class 1 - Existing Facilities. Interior and exterior alterations; additions under 10,000 sq. ft. | | |
| | 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. | | |
| | 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: (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 5 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. FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING USE ONLY | | |
| | Class | | |

STEP 2: CEQA IMPACTS TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

| | 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.)? (<i>refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Air Pollution Exposure Zone</i>) |
|-----|--|
| | 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 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). |
| | Transportation: 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? |
| | 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? If yes, archeo review is required (<i>refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Archeological Sensitive Area</i>) |
| | 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? (<i>refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography</i>). If yes, Environmental Planning must issue the exemption. |
| | Slope = or > 25%: 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? (<i>refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography</i>) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required and Environmental Planning must issue the exemption. |
| | Seismic: Landslide Zone: 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 > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required and Environmental Planning must issue the exemption. |
| | Seismic: Liquefaction Zone: 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 > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones) If box is checked, a geotechnical report will likely be required and Environmental Planning must issue the exemption. |
| Com | ments and Planner Signature (optional): Laura Lynch |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

STEP 3: PROPERTY STATUS - HISTORIC RESOURCE

| TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER | S |
|------------------------------------|---|
|------------------------------------|---|

| 10 5 | | | |
|------|--|--|--|
| PROP | PROPERTY IS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING: (refer to Property Information Map) | | |
| | Category A: Known Historical Resource. GO TO STEP 5. | | |
| | Category B: Potential Historical Resource (over 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 4. | | |
| | 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. | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | 1. Change of use and new construction. Tenant improvements not included. | | |
| | 2. Regular maintenance or repair to correct or repair deterioration, decay, or damage to building. | | |
| | 3. Window replacement that meets the Department's <i>Window Replacement Standards</i> . Does not include storefront window alterations. | | |
| | 4. Garage work. 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. | | |
| | 5. Deck, terrace construction, or fences not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way. | | |
| | Mechanical equipment installation that is not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way. | | |
| | 7. Dormer installation that meets the requirements for exemption from public notification under <i>Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 3: Dormer Windows</i> . | | |
| | 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: | Note: Project Planner must check box below before proceeding. | | |
| | Project is not listed. GO TO STEP 5. | | |
| | Project does not conform to the scopes of work. GO TO STEP 5. | | |
| | Project involves four or more work descriptions. GO TO STEP 5. | | |
| | 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. Image: Project involves a known historical resource (CEQA Category A) as determined by Step 3 and conforms entirely to proposed work checklist in Step 4. Image: Project involves a known historical resource (CEQA Category A) as determined by Step 3 and conforms entirely to proposed work checklist in Step 4. Image: Project involves a known historical resource (CEQA Category A) as determined by Step 3 and conforms entirely to proposed work checklist in Step 4. Image: Project involves a known historical resource (CEQA Category A) as determined by Step 3 and conforms entirely to proposed work checklist in Step 4. Image: Project involves a known historical resource (CEQA Category A) as determined by Step 3 and conforms entirely to proposed work checklist in Step 4. Image: Project involves a known historical resource (CEQA Category A) as determined by Step 3 and conforms entirely to proposed work checklist in Step 4. Image: Project involves a known historical resource (CEQA Category A) as determined by Step 3 and conforms entirely to proposed work checklist in Step 4. Image: Project involves a known historic windows that are not "in-kind" but are consistent with existing historic character. Image: Project involves a known historic windows that are not "in-kind" but are consistent with existing historic character. Image: Project involves a manner that does not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features. Image: Project involves a manner that does not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features. Image: Project involves a manner that

| | 7. Addition(s), including mechanical and meet the Secretary of the Interior | | minimally visible from a public right-of-way ehabilitation. | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | 8. Other work consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic <i>Properties (specify or add comments)</i> : | | | | | |
| | 9. Other work that would not materia | | district (specify or add comments): | | | |
| | Interior alts not removing character-defining features. | | | | | |
| | (Requires approval by Senior Preserv | ation Planner/Pres | ervation Coordinator) | | | |
| | 10. Reclassification of property stat Planner/Preservation | u s . (Requires appr | oval by Senior Preservation | | | |
| | Reclassify to Category A | | Reclassify to Category C | | | |
| | a. Per HRER or PTR dated | 06/24/2019 | (attach HRER or PTR) | | | |
| | b. Other <i>(specify)</i> : | | | | | |
| | Note: If ANY box in STEP 5 | above is checked, | a Preservation Planner MUST sign below. | | | |
| | 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 (<i>optional</i>): | | | | | | |
| Preser | Preservation Planner Signature: Jorgen Cleemann | | | | | |
| | STEP 6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION | | | | | |

| No further environmental review is required. The project is There are no unusual circumstances that would result in a effect. | | |
|--|-----------------|--|
| Project Approval Action: | Signature: | |
| Building Permit | Jorgen Cleemann | |
| If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project. | 06/26/2019 | |
| Once signed or stamped and dated, this document constitutes a categorical exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines and Ch 31of the Administrative Code. In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, an appeal of an exemption determination can only 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 approv | | |

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 from | Block/Lot(s) (If different than front page) | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|--|
| Pier 40 - Java House | 9900/040H | | |
| Case No. | Previous Building Permit No. | New Building Permit No. | |
| 2019-006140PRJ | | | |
| Plans Dated | Previous Approval Action | New Approval Action | |
| | | | |
| Modified Project Description: | | | |

DETERMINATION IF PROJECT CONSTITUTES SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

| Deput in expension of the building equations as defined i | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | Result in expansion of the building envelope, as defined in the Planning Code; | | |
| Result in the change of use that would require public noti Sections 311 or 312; | ce under Planning Code | | |
| Result in demolition as defined under Planning Code Sec | tion 317 or 19005(f)? | | |
| Is any information being presented that was not known and at the time of the original determination, that shows the original 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

| | The proposed modification would not result in any of the above changes. | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| approva website with Ch | f 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 vebsite and office and mailed to the applicant, City approving entities, and anyone requesting written notice. In accordance vith 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. | | | |
| Plan | Planner Name: Date: | | | |
| | | | | |



Planner:

Block/Lot:

3620/102

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW FORM

Address:

Pier 40 - Java House

Cross Streets:

Embarcadero

Art. 10/11:

....

Date of Form Completion 6/24/2019

BPA/Case No.:

.

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

Reception: **415.558.6378**

Fax: 415.558.6409

Planning Information: **415.558.6377**

| A | | N/A | 2019-0 | 2019-006140ENV | |
|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| PURPOSE OF REVIEW: | | PROJECT DESCRI | PTION: | | |
| CEQA | ○ Article 10/11 | O Preliminary/PIC | Alteration | O Demo/New Construction | |

DATE OF PLANS UNDER REVIEW: June 12, 2019

Preservation Team Meeting Date:

PROJECT INFORMATION:

Jørgen G. Cleemann

CEQA Category:

 PROJECT ISSUES:

 Is the subject Property an eligible historic resource?

 If so, are the proposed changes a significant impact?

 Additional Notes:

 Submitted: Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation Compliance Analysis Memo, prepared by Page & Turnbull (dated 4/19/19), Project plans dated 6/12/19

 Proposal: Horizontal addition at the north facade, reroofing, window and door replacement/enlargement, addition of rooftop mechanical equipment, interior alterations.

PRESERVATION TEAM REVIEW: • A $\bigcirc B$ $\bigcirc C$ Category: Historic District/Context Individual Property is individually eligible for inclusion in a Property is in an eligible California Register California Register under one or more of the Historic District/Context under one or more of following Criteria: the following Criteria: Criterion 1 - Event: ○ Yes ● No Criterion 1 - Event: ● Yes ∩ No ○ Yes ● No Yes ONO Criterion 2 -Persons: Criterion 2 -Persons: ○ Yes ● No ● Yes ∩ No Criterion 3 - Architecture: Criterion 3 - Architecture: Criterion 4 - Info. Potential: ○ Yes ● No Criterion 4 - Info. Potential: ○ Yes ● No Period of Significance: Period of Significance: 1878-1946 Contributor Non-Contributor

| Complies with the Secretary's Standards/Art 10/Art 11: | Yes | ⊖ No | ⊖ N/A |
|---|-------|------|-------|
| CEQA Material Impairment to the individual historic resource: | ⊖ Yes | No | |
| CEQA Material Impairment to the historic district: | ⊖ Yes | No | |
| Requires Design Revisions: | ⊖ Yes | No | |
| Defer to Residential Design Team: | ⊖ Yes | No | |

PRESERVATION TEAM COMMENTS:

The subject building is a one-story, wood-frame, flat-roof restaurant building located near the landward end of Pier 40 in the South or Market neighborhood. The subject building has an irregular plan, horizontal and vertical wood siding, and a variety of different window types. The subject building was identified as contributor to the Port of Embarcadero Historic District ("the District"), which was listed on the National Register of Historic Places and the California Register of Historical Resources in 2006. The District's period of significance extends from 1876 to 1946. As a district contributor, the subject building is considered a historic resource for the purposes of CEQA review. It is not eligible for individual listing in either the National or California Registers.

According to credible new information presented in the Page & Turnbull Standards Analysis memo, the subject building was originally built around 1936 as a cigar store and expanded and converted into a restaurant around 1954. Therefore, the subject building's most extensive phase of construction and establishment as a restaurant did not occur until after the end of the District's period of significance in 1946. Nonetheless, as a vernacular wood-frame structure that was originally built to serve the needs of waterfront workers, the subject building retains sufficient integrity to continue to qualify as a contributor to the District. The subject building's character-defining features include the following:

- Siting immediately south of Pier 40, facing the Embarcadero

- One-story height
- Flat roof
- Mostly horizontal wood siding
- Plan shape that incorporates the volume of the original c.1936 cigar shop
- Publicly accessible interior commercial space

Preservation staff has determined that the proposed project conforms to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation ("the Standards") and therefore does not result in an impact to the District. The project conforms to the relevant Standards as follows:

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. (continued)

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

Allison K. Vanderslice Digitally signed by Allison K. Vanderslice Date: 2019.06.24 13:27:13 -07'00'

(Continued)

The subject building will continue to be a waterfront restaurant.

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.

None of the subject building's character-defining features will be removed or significantly altered. The addition on the north façade and the addition of rooftop mechanical equipment will not affect the building's one-story height and will not significantly obscure the character-defining wood siding.

Standard 3. Each property shall 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 architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.

The proposed new one-over-one wood-sash windows on the primary (west) façade and tripartite window configuration on the secondary south façade are compatible with the historic character of waterfront shed structures, which often featured a different type of fenestration than the large pier structures, which typically featured industrial steel sash.

Standard 4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

None of the post-1946 features, including all interior fixtures and finishes, has been identified as character-defining. Therefore, their removal and alteration will not result in an impact.

Standard 5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.

The subject building's character-defining wood siding, including all siding on the most visually prominent west façade, will be retained and restored.

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. The proposed addition on the north façade is modest in scale and slightly lower than the historic building. This height differential will retain the primacy of the historic building and will also indicate a later phase of construction. The fencing proposed for the outside dining area is simple and modest in size; it will not block visibility of the subject building or any of its character-defining features. The proposed rooftop mechanical equipment will be visible, but will not overwhelm the historic resource and is consistent with its historic and current use.

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.

The proposed north-façade addition, windows, fence, and other related items could be removed in the future without significantly affecting the form and integrity of the subject building or its environment.

Therefore the proposed project conforms to the Standards and will not result in an impact to historic resources.



Figure 1. Pier 40 Java House. Screenshot of 2017 Google Streetview.