



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| Project Address | | Block/Lot(s) | |
| 1280 10th Ave. | | 1741/026 | |
| Case No. | Permit No. | Plans Dated | |
| 2013.1655E | | 12/12/13 | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addition/ Alteration | <input type="checkbox"/> Demolition (requires HRER if over 50 years old) | <input type="checkbox"/> New Construction | <input type="checkbox"/> Project Modification (GO TO STEP 7) |
| Project description for Planning Department approval. | | | |
| Interior remodel and facade renovation of existing 1-residential unit + 1 commercial unit building; reconfigure storefront and windows; new roof deck. | | | |

STEP 1: EXEMPTION CLASS

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

| | |
|--|--|
| Note: If neither class applies, an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i> is required. | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Class 1 – Existing Facilities. Interior and exterior alterations; additions under 10,000 sq. ft.; change of use if principally permitted or with a CU. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Class 3 – New Construction. Up to three (3) new single-family residences or six (6) dwelling units in one building; commercial/office structures; utility extensions. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Class__ |

STEP 2: CEQA IMPACTS

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

| | |
|---|---|
| If any box is checked below, an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i> is required. | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 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? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 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 hot spot? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Air Pollution Hot Spots) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Hazardous Materials: Any project site that 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 soil disturbance of any amount or a change of use from industrial to commercial/residential? If yes, should the applicant present documentation of a completed Maher Application that has been submitted to the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH), this box does not need to be checked, but such documentation must be appended to this form. In all other circumstances, this box must be checked and the project applicant must submit an Environmental Application with a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and/or file a Maher Application with DPH. (refer to EP_ArcMap > Maher layer.) |

| | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Soil Disturbance/Modification: 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) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Noise: Does the project include new noise-sensitive receptors (schools, day care facilities, hospitals, residential dwellings, and senior-care facilities) fronting roadways located in the noise mitigation area? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Noise Mitigation Area) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment: Does the project site involve a subdivision or on a lot with a slope average of 20% or more? (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Slope = or > 20%: Does the project involve excavation of 50 cubic yards of soil or more, square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft., shoring, underpinning, retaining wall work, or grading on a lot with a slope average of 20% or more? <i>Exceptions: do not check box for work performed on a previously developed portion of site, stairs, patio, deck, or fence work.</i> (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required and a Certificate or higher level CEQA document required |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Seismic: Landslide Zone: Does the project involve excavation of 50 cubic yards of soil or more, square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft., shoring, underpinning, retaining wall work, grading –including excavation and fill on a landslide zone – as identified in the San Francisco General Plan? <i>Exceptions: do not check box for work performed on a previously developed portion of the site, stairs, patio, deck, or fence work.</i> (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones) If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required and a Certificate or higher level CEQA document required |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Seismic: Liquefaction Zone: Does the project involve excavation of 50 cubic yards of soil or more, square footage expansion greater than 1000 sq ft, shoring, underpinning, retaining wall work, or grading on a lot in a liquefaction zone? <i>Exceptions: do not check box for work performed on a previously developed portion of the site, stairs, patio, deck, or fence work.</i> (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones) If box is checked, a geotechnical report will likely be required |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Serpentine Rock: Does the project involve any excavation on a property containing serpentine rock? <i>Exceptions: do not check box for stairs, patio, deck, retaining walls, or fence work.</i> (refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Serpentine) |
| If no boxes are checked above, GO TO STEP 3. If one or more boxes are checked above, an <u>Environmental Evaluation Application</u> is required. | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Project can proceed with categorical exemption review. The project does not trigger any of the CEQA impacts listed above. |
| Comments and Planner Signature (optional): Jean Poling | |

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

| | |
|--|--|
| PROPERTY IS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING: (refer to Parcel Information Map) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Category A: Known Historical Resource. GO TO STEP 5. |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Category B: Potential Historical Resource (over 50 years of age). GO TO STEP 4. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Category C: Not a Historical Resource or Not Age Eligible (under 50 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"/> | 3. Regular maintenance or repair to correct or repair deterioration, decay, or damage to building. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. Window replacement that meets the Department's <i>Window Replacement Standards</i> . Does not include storefront window alterations. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 5. 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. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 6. Deck, terrace construction, or fences not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 7. Mechanical equipment installation that is not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 8. Dormer installation that meets the requirements for exemption from public notification under <i>Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 3: Dormer Windows</i> . |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 9. 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 checked="" 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 PRESERVATION 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 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): |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 9. Reclassification of property status to Category C. (Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator) a. Per HRER dated: <u>1/7/14</u> (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: Jonathan G. Lammers 1/21/14

**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. | |
| | Planner Name: <u>Jonathan Lammers</u> | Signature or Stamp: <u>Jonathan G. Lammers 1/21/14</u> |
| | Project Approval Action: Select One <small>*If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project.</small> | |
| | 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. | |

**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) |
| | | |
| Case No. | Previous Building Permit No. | New Building Permit No. |
| | | |
| Plans Dated | Previous Approval Action | New Approval Action |
| | | |
| 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 CATEX FORM | |

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: | Signature or Stamp: |
| | |



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Historic Resource Evaluation Response

Date January 7, 2014
Case No.: 2013.1655E
Project Address: 1280 10th Avenue
Zoning: NCD (Inner Sunset Neighborhood Commercial)
40-X Height and Bulk District
Block/Lot: 1741/026
Date of Review: January 7, 2014 (Part I)
Staff Contact: Jonathan Lammers (Preservation Planner)
(415) 575-9093
jonathan.lammers@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

PART I: HISTORIC RESOURCE EVALUATION

Buildings and Property Description

The subject property, 1280 10th Avenue (also addressed historically as 840 - 858 Irving Street), is located on a rectangular-shaped lot measuring 32.5 feet by 100 feet on the northeast corner of Irving Street and 10th Avenue in the Inner Sunset neighborhood. The property is located within the Inner Sunset Neighborhood Commercial (NCD) zoning district and a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

The subject property consists of a one story, wood frame, commercial unit facing Irving Street, with a one-and-a-half story residential-over-garage unit at the northwest corner of the building facing 10th Avenue. The building is rectangular in plan, primarily clad with textured stucco and brick veneer, and capped by a flat roof. It was constructed in 1904 per the San Francisco Assessor, although Sanborn maps and city directories indicate the original construction date as circa 1906-1907.

The primary façade faces south onto Irving Street and features a center entry flanked by aluminum and plate glass windows. The lower portion of the façade is wrapped by a brick veneer, while the upper portion includes a fabric awning and is clad with painted plywood. The west façade of the commercial unit is clad with rough-textured stucco and the upper portion of the façade includes a narrow overhang—the likely result of a prior alteration. Spaced along the west façade are a series of narrow sliding aluminum windows with wood frames, as well as pedestrian entry screened by a metal security gate toward the north. The residential-over-garage portion of the building at the northwest corner includes a mix of pedestrian and vehicle entrances at the first story. Moving north to south, these include a garage with paneled wood door; a paneled wood pedestrian door crowned by a plaster shield ornament; a sliding flush wood door and what appears to be an additional infilled vehicle opening. Above the garage and sliding door are six double-hung aluminum windows arranged in two groups. A small portion of the north façade is visible in this area and is clad with rustic channel wood siding.

Known alterations to the exterior of the property as indicated by building permits and historic photos include the removal of a storefront partition and installation of new doors (1913); installation of a new cornice over the storefront with the plate glass windows raised approximately one foot (1937);

remodeling of the storefront—including the addition of brick veneer at the base of the primary façade with vertical wood siding above (circa 1957); and sealing off the side wall at the left garage (1977). Other apparent alterations as indicated by Sanborn maps include the addition of the residential unit (circa 1913), and the application of plywood over the vertical wood siding on the primary façade (unknown date).

Pre-Existing Historic Rating / Survey

The subject property has not been addressed by any prior historic resource surveys and is not listed on any local, state or national registries. The subject property is considered a “Category B” property (Properties Requiring Further Consultation and Review) for the purposes of the Planning Department’s California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review procedures due to its age.

Neighborhood Context and Description

1280 10th Avenue is located in San Francisco’s Inner Sunset neighborhood, an area roughly bounded by Lincoln Way on the north, Stanyan Way and Clarendon Avenue on the east, 19th Avenue on the west, and Quintara Street on the south. The vicinity of the subject block is mixed in character. Along 10th Avenue and Lincoln Way the block is almost exclusively residential and marked by single-family and multi-family dwellings. By contrast, Irving Street and 9th Avenue include commercial, residential, mixed use and light industrial properties. San Francisco Assessor’s data indicates that construction dates for buildings on the subject block range from 1904 to 1983, although most were constructed between 1904 and 1910. This is reflected in the mixed architecture of the building stock, which includes examples of Queen Anne, Classical Revival (Edwardian era), Mission Revival and Tudor Revival designs, as well as examples of midcentury infill. Several of the older properties in the neighborhood also show evidence of prior alterations, including window replacement and recladding—typically stucco or asbestos shingles over wood.

CEQA Historical Resource(s) Evaluation

Step A: Significance

Under CEQA section 21084.1, a property qualifies as a historic resource if it is “listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources.” The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources or not included in a local register of historical resources, shall not preclude a lead agency from determining whether the resource may qualify as a historical resource under CEQA.

| Individual | Historic District/Context |
|---|--|
| Property is individually eligible for inclusion in a California Register under one or more of the following Criteria: | Property is eligible for inclusion in a California Register Historic District/Context under one or more of the following Criteria: |
| Criterion 1 - Event: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | Criterion 1 - Event: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| Criterion 2 - Persons: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | Criterion 2 - Persons: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| Criterion 3 - Architecture: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | Criterion 3 - Architecture: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| Criterion 4 - Info. Potential: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | Criterion 4 - Info. Potential: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| Period of Significance: N/A | Period of Significance: N/A |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Contributor <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Contributor |

Based on the information provided in a historic resource evaluation prepared by Preservation Architecture (dated 10/10/2013), information found in the Planning Department files, and research conducted on the Inner Sunset neighborhood, Preservation staff finds that the subject building is not eligible for listing on the California Register, either individually or as a contributor to a potential historic district.

Criterion 1: It is 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.

In the years following the Gold Rush, much of the western half of San Francisco was known as the “Outside Lands,” a large undeveloped area encompassing all of what is today the Richmond and Sunset neighborhoods, as well as Golden Gate Park. The Inner Sunset area was first platted as a result of the Outside Lands Ordinances, enacted during the 1860s. The ordinances helped settle land ownership disputes and allowed for the subdivision of new city blocks. They also provided for the reservation of lands for public building sites, squares and parks—including Golden Gate Park, which was formally surveyed in 1870.

Initially, Golden Gate Park consisted of little more than scrub and sand dunes, and the surrounding area was used primarily for farming and raising livestock. As the park began to take shape, however, real estate speculators and streetcar companies lobbied for the introduction of mass transit, and franchises were subsequently granted for several cable car lines connecting the park to more developed areas of the city. These included the Market Street Railway’s Haight Street cable car line, which opened in 1883 with a route running out Market and Haight streets to a terminus at Stanyan Street. There, passengers could board the steam-powered Park and Ocean Railroad, which ran out Lincoln Way to Ocean Beach. This steam line was converted to electric trolley service in 1898 and renamed the Ferries, Park & Ocean line, providing service from the Ferry Building all the way to Ocean Beach. Another streetcar loop was installed around the same time, running out Carl Street and Irving Street to 9th Avenue before turning one block north to Golden Gate Park.

The introduction of mass transit touched off a sustained period of residential construction in the vicinity of the Golden Gate Park—first in what is today the Haight Ashbury neighborhood, and later in the Inner Sunset and Inner Richmond neighborhoods. Maps produced in 1899 by the Sanborn Map Company show that most blocks in the vicinity of the subject property were only five to twenty-five percent built out—and some remained wholly undeveloped. By contrast, maps produced in 1905 show that several blocks fronting Golden Gate Park were by then approximately seventy-five percent built out. The Inner Sunset neighborhood experienced another concentrated burst of development following the 1906 Earthquake and Fire, when many residents relocated to areas outside the burned districts.

Building activity in the Inner Sunset tapered off around World War I, but soared again during the 1920s as San Francisco and the rest of the country participated in a sustained building boom. In recognition of the neighborhood’s continued growth, the Sunset Tunnel was constructed in 1928 by the city-owned Municipal Railroad (MUNI) for the new N-Judah streetcar line. Designed to provide a faster connection between the Sunset neighborhood and downtown, completion of the N-Judah line touched off a wave of commercial development along its right-of-way, which originally ran out Irving Street to 9th Avenue, before turning south and running west along Judah Street. By the end of the 1920s, much of the Inner Sunset in proximity to Golden Gate Park was built out.

The subject block is first shown on the 1899 Sanborn map where it is depicted as approximately twenty-five percent built out, almost exclusively with single-family dwellings. By 1905, however, the block was approximately ninety-percent built out, with a concentration of residential properties along 10th Avenue, while 9th Avenue included several commercial and mixed use buildings—including two butchers' shops. The subject property is shown vacant on the published version of the 1905 Sanborn map. But a copy of the 1905 map in the San Francisco Public Library's collection includes a hand-drawn sketch dated 1908 which shows the subject property as occupied by a commercial building divided into three storefronts: two facing Irving Street and a smaller storefront facing 10th Avenue. According to the historic resource evaluation prepared by Preservation Architecture, the subject building was constructed circa 1906-1907 for Henry and Rudolph Marquard as a butcher shop. The third storefront fronting 10th Avenue was used as a barber's shop.

The rear portion of the building which includes the residential-over-garage unit is not shown in the sketch map from 1908. It was likely constructed as an addition circa 1913. That same year, building permits indicate that the storefront partition at the front of the building was removed to combine the two storefronts facing Irving Street. The newly-combined single storefront is shown on the 1915 Sanborn map—as is the rear addition, labeled as an "Auto Ho" or "auto house" (garage). Part of the rear addition also included a small area labeled as a stable. At this time the building appears to have been operating as a fruit market, and the stable may have been used to board a horse for making deliveries.

The building functioned as a grocers/fruit market through the 1930s, and was subsequently used as a restaurant and ice cream shop (1938-1950s), as an office (1950s-1970s) and again as a grocers (circa 1980-2012). The property is currently vacant.

Based on the information provided in the Supplemental Information Form for Historical Resource Determination and research performed by Planning Department staff, the subject property does not appear to be associated with any significant historic events such that it would be individually eligible for the California Register under Criterion 1. The building is tied to the first sustained wave of development in the Inner Sunset, which began around the turn of the century following the introduction of mass transit service. However, the building does not appear individually significant within that context. It also does not appear to relate to a potential historic district. While many of the surrounding buildings were also constructed around the turn of the century, there are numerous examples of midcentury infill and prior building alterations such that the area lacks cohesion.

It is therefore determined that the subject property is not eligible for listing in the California Register individually or as a contributor to a potential historic district under Criterion 1. However, this finding does not preclude the identification of other individual properties on the subject block as eligible for historic listing, or the identification of a potential historic district in the larger neighborhood.

Criterion 2: It is associated with the lives of persons important in our local, regional or national past.

According to the information provided in the historic resource evaluation prepared by Preservation Architecture, the earliest known owner of the property was Henry Marquard. He and his brother Rudolph both worked as butchers. Circa 1913 the property was sold to Nellie and William A. Rodgers, who also owned and operated a grocery nearby at 834 Irving Street. During this time the Rodgers appear to have leased the property to various tenants. Following the death of William Rodgers in 1934, the property continued to be owned by Nellie Rodgers. Nellie was born in 1877 as one of thirteen children of

Toribio Tanforan and Maria Valencia, both members of prominent and pioneering families in San Francisco. In addition to the subject property, Nellie for a time also owned the Tanforan Cottages at 214 and 220 Dolores Street (San Francisco Landmarks 67 and 68). Following Nellie's death in 1951, the property passed to her sister, Julia C. Bodkin. Other owners of the subject property have included the following:

- 1954-1958: Frank Dalporto (Sunset Market, 827 Irving) and Cesarino Dalporto; Alfred Lazzareschi (Sunset Market) and Elsie Lazzareschi.
- 1958-1976: Reuben Price (accountant) and Selma Price
- 1976-1977: James and Paula Lee (James Lee Realtors)
- 1977-1995: Han Sang and Hyon Suk Lee
- 1995-2013: Han Bong and Michelle M. Park

Considered as a whole, none of the persons named above appear to be important to local, state or national history. While Nellie Rodgers was born into prominent San Francisco family—and was the property's longest owner (circa 1913-1951), research does not indicate that her productive life was important to local or regional history. It is therefore determined that 1280 10th Avenue is not eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 2.

Criterion 3: It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values.

1280 10th Avenue was originally constructed circa 1906-1907 as a three unit commercial building. Circa 1913, the two storefronts facing Irving Street were combined into a single unit. Around the same time, a residential unit and garage were added at the rear of the property. Historic photos and building permits show that the building was remodeled in 1937, and again circa 1957. The latter alteration was influenced by midcentury architectural influences and resulted in the application of a brick veneer at the base of the primary façade, with vertical wood siding above.

The various alterations have compromised the building's original design such that it no longer conveys association with its early construction, nor with the 1937 storefront alteration. The circa 1957 alteration also does not appear significant in its own right. Considered as a whole, the subject building has lost much of its integrity of design, materials and workmanship and does not qualify for individual listing in the California Register under Criterion 3. 1280 10th Avenue also does not appear to contribute to any potential historic district. As discussed in this analysis, various infill projects and alterations to many buildings on the subject block have removed character-defining features and ornament. Overall, the subject block face lacks sufficient cohesion and integrity to qualify as a potential historic district.

It is therefore determined that 1280 10th Avenue is not eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 3, either individually or as a contributor to a potential historic district. However, this finding does not preclude determining other buildings on the subject block to be individually eligible for historic listing, nor does it preclude identifying a potential historic district in the larger neighborhood.

Criterion 4: It yields, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Based upon a review of information in the Departments records, the subject property is not significant under Criterion 4, which is typically associated with archaeological resources. The building is also unlikely to yield information important to history, such as evidence of unique building materials or

methods. It is therefore determined that 1280 10th Avenue is not eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 4.

Step B: Integrity

To be a resource for the purposes of CEQA, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the California Register of Historical Resources criteria, but it also must have integrity. Integrity is defined as "the authenticity of a property's historic identity, evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the property's period of significance." Historic integrity enables a property to illustrate significant aspects of its past. All seven qualities do not need to be present as long the overall sense of past time and place is evident.

The subject property has retained or lacks integrity from the period of significance noted in Step A:

- | | | | | | |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Location: | <input type="checkbox"/> Retains | <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks | Setting: | <input type="checkbox"/> Retains | <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks |
| Association: | <input type="checkbox"/> Retains | <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks | Feeling: | <input type="checkbox"/> Retains | <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks |
| Design: | <input type="checkbox"/> Retains | <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks | Materials: | <input type="checkbox"/> Retains | <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks |
| Workmanship: | <input type="checkbox"/> Retains | <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks | | | |

1280 10th Avenue is not significant under any of the California Register criteria discussed above. Therefore, an analysis of integrity is not warranted.

Step C: Character Defining Features

If the subject property has been determined to have significance and retains integrity, please list the character-defining features of the building(s) and/or property. A property must retain the essential physical features that enable it to convey its historic identity in order to avoid significant adverse impacts to the resource. These essential features are those that define both why a property is significant and when it was significant, and without which a property can no longer be identified as being associated with its significance.

1280 10th Avenue is not significant under any of the California Register criteria discussed above. Therefore, a discussion of character defining features is not warranted.

CEQA Historic Resource Determination

- Historical Resource Present
 - Individually-eligible Resource
 - Contributor to an eligible Historic District
 - Non-contributor to an eligible Historic District
- No Historical Resource Present

PART I: SENIOR PRESERVATION PLANNER REVIEW

Signature: Tina Tam
Tina Tam, Senior Preservation Planner

Date: 1-13-2014

cc: Virnaliza Byrd, Environmental Division/ Historic Resource Impact Review File



Primary and west facades of 1280 10th Avenue (Google Maps)



View of the residential unit at the northwest corner of 1280 10th Avenue (Bing Maps)



Satellite view east of 1280 10th Avenue (Google Maps)