SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Executive Summary

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Hearing Date:	November 7, 2007
Case No.:	**2007.1229A**
Project Address:	**Preservation Element of the San Francisco General Plan**
Staff Contact:	Rachel Force – (415) 558-6418 rachel.force@sfgov.org

BACKGROUND

The San Francisco General Plan currently contains no Preservation Element. Numerous drafts of this Element have been produced, beginning around 1987, but none have been adopted. Although this document stands on the shoulders of previous versions, dating back 20 years, it contains new information, Objectives and Policies throughout. It is informed by the American Planning Association publication "Preparing a Historic Preservation Plan" by White and Roddewig (1994). The California State Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) endorses the components of a preservation plan outlined in the White and Roddewig publication, and OHP recommends that every Certified Local Government have a preservation element in its General Plan.

ADOPTION PROCESS AND IMPLEMENTATION

At the hearing on November 7, 2007, the Planning Department seeks comments from the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board (Landmarks Board) and members of the public in order to produce a final draft Preservation Element (Element) to bring before the Landmarks Board for endorsement. Comments should be received in advance of the endorsement hearing in order to be incorporated. Following endorsement by the Landmarks Board, the Element would be brought before the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors for adoption, projected at early Spring, 2008.

The document presented at the hearing contains several pages of background information, as well as brief implementation measures for each Policy. However, the final Preservation Element that would be officially adopted and incorporated into the General Plan will contain only a brief introduction and the complete Objectives and Policies section. A separate implementation plan is being formulated to include specific tasks and actions, responsible agencies, and status for each Policy. As a schedule-oriented document, the implementation plan may be updated, and will be reviewed by the Landmarks Board on an annual basis. The initial implementation plan will come before the Landmarks Board along with the revised Preservation Element at the endorsement hearing.

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Historic Preservation Element

Historic preservation is a strategy for conserving significant elements of the built environment in order to maintain a tangible physical connection to the past. Much of San Francisco's character, enjoyed by residents and visitors alike, depends on the retention of its rich historical building fabric. In practical terms, maintaining and rehabilitating older buildings and neighborhoods can mean savings in energy, time, money, and materials; preservation is an inherently sustainable strategy. The City's commitment to historic preservation is codified generally in Section 101.1 of the Planning Code; this preamble is composed of eight Priority Policies, including Policy 7: *That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved*.

The purpose of the Preservation Element of the San Francisco General Plan is to outline a comprehensive set of objectives and policies for the preservation and enhancement of San Francisco's historic resources, which include buildings, districts, sites, and landscapes that are historically and/or archaeologically significant. Following a summary of background information, the Objectives and Policies are listed, addressing the following topic areas:

Identification and Evaluation of Historic Resources.

Protection of Historic Resources.

Ensure that Changes Respect Historical Character.

Integration of Preservation with the Planning Process.

Provide Preservation Incentives and Guidance.

Provide Public Information and Education.

Promotion of Sustainability.

Development of Emergency Preparedness and Response Plans

A helpful Glossary of Terms is located in the appendix, and additional information on a wide range of topics related to preservation in San Francisco can be found in the Planning Department's Preservation Bulletin series numbered 1 through 21, available online (http://www.sfgov.org/site/planning_index.asp?id=24996) or at the Planning Information Center.

BACKGROUND *DRAFT*

Overview of the History and Development of San Francisco

The character of San Francisco's built environment has been influenced over time by a number of factors, including significant historical events, cultural influences, technological advances, significant individuals, and evolving trends in urban design and architecture. Any discussion of San Francisco's development, however, must begin with an understanding of the city's dramatic topography. At the tip of a peninsula, with the Pacific Ocean to the west merging through the Golden Gate into the San Francisco Bay on the east, the city occupies roughly 47-square miles. It is distinguished by hills offering a myriad of views of the Ocean, the Bay, and the city skyline. The cultural landscape that emerged here during the 19th and 20th centuries resulted in the alteration of the original physical landscape, as coves and marshes along the Bay were filled in, and hills and dunes were leveled. Located at an important natural harbor, maritime commerce played a vital role in the development of San Francisco. In turn, the economic and commercial importance of the port was balanced by the city's relative geographic isolation by land; until the 1930s and the construction of the iconic Golden Gate and Bay Bridges, the only direct approach to San Francisco from points north and east was by boat or ferry. These natural features played a key role in the development of today's San Francisco.

Extant buildings in San Francisco date to as early as the late 18th Century, corresponding to the arrival of Spanish missionaries and military personnel in 1776. Archeological remains of the settlements of indigenous peoples date back much further, to at least 5,000 years ago. Indigenous peoples living in the area when the Spanish arrived were subjected to brutal treatment, including displacement from their traditional homelands, conversion that was often forced, and virtual enslavement on the missions; although they had no control over the subsequent development of their lands, descendents of those who survived this period continue to live in the area.

The government of Spain first established a military outpost, or *Presidio*, at the northern end of the peninsula near the mouth of the Golden Gate. At the same time, Catholic missionaries established the sixth in a chain of 21 California missions near what is now 16th Street and Dolores Street, today called Mission Dolores. Beginning in 1821 with Mexico's independence from Spain, the area became a territory of the Mexican government. By 1835 the civilian port settlement, the Pueblo of Yerba Buena, had been established in the area of California and Montgomery Streets, initially supported by the export of California hides and tallow and the import of goods from the eastern United States and Europe.

Two development patterns were established in these early years. In 1839, the pueblo's first survey platted the area around Portsmouth Square in what is known as the 50 Vara Survey. The survey established a rectangular grid of blocks, each composed of six square lots. Each lot was 50 Mexican varas on a side (a vara being 33 inches), separated

by streets 25 varas wide. Later surveys repeated this pattern from San Francisco Bay to Market Street, and from Sansome Street to Presidio Avenue. In 1847, Market Street was laid out at an angle to the earlier streets, running from the center of the shoreline of Yerba Buena Cove (approximately at the intersection of present-day Battery and Market Streets) toward Twin Peaks, with much of its route along an old path to Mission Dolores. Soon thereafter, the area south of Market was surveyed with streets parallel to Market Street, again in blocks containing six lots. This time, lots were quadrupled in size, becoming the 100 Vara Survey. These unconventional lot sizes, platted over 150 years ago, are apparent today as extra-long blocks south of Market Street.

In 1847, during the Mexican-American War that began the year before, the name Yerba Buena was officially changed to San Francisco. When the war ended and the United States officially assumed control of the territory in 1848, the population had reached about 400, including traders from the eastern United States and other countries. That soon changed, however, with the discovery of gold on the American River in the Sierra Nevada foothills that same year. San Francisco was the closest harbor to the strike, and by 1849 the city was growing exponentially as people flooded in, primarily by sea, bound for gold country. Exact population numbers in 1850 aren't known due to six major fires that swept through San Francisco between late 1849 and June of 1851, destroying records and most of the city's early structures. However, by 1852 the population stood at approximately 34,776, and the character of the place had entirely changed from four years before; it was a city.

With an increasing population came new construction to support housing, commerce and industry. The port was the natural location of trade in goods and services, and so commercial structures were concentrated in that area, where the Financial District is located today. Related industrial activities were housed near the port as well, primarily in the South of Market area, with rail spurs providing connections to move materials and goods to and from warehouses and manufacturing plants. Locations for housing were generally linked to transportation corridors, which developed from the original trails linking the three earliest Spanish/Mexican settlements to a regimented street grid system. Streetcars provided a means for people to live further away from the commercial and industrial core, beyond what was within walking distance. These vehicles were rudimentary at first, appearing in the form of horse-drawn cars on tracks in the late 1850s and early 1860s. A significant innovation soon followed with Andrew Hallidie's invention of the cable car in 1873, providing the means to conquer hills and thereby opening more areas to residential development. Electrification of the lines began gradually in the 1890s and accelerated after 1906, although cable lines continued to be used along the steeper hills. By the late 19th century, streetcar lines ran on nearly every major street, extending earlier housing patterns further westward.

At 5:12 a.m. on April 18th, 1906, a massive earthquake with a moment wave magnitude of approximately 7.9 struck San Francisco, and became one of the most significant events

in the city's history. Streets and streetcar lines buckled, water pipes and gas pipes broke, houses were knocked off their foundations, and masonry buildings collapsed. But the worst was yet to come. The damage to gas lines and brick chimneys soon produced fires, and the extreme heat of the fires along with damaged water mains made firefighting extraordinarily difficult. The city's residential buildings, most of which were made of wood, served as kindling for the great inferno. Firefighters, augmented by troops from the Presidio, tried to create fire blocks by dynamiting buildings, but sometimes succeeded only in creating new fires. For three days the fire blazed, and some 28,000 buildings that housed an estimated 250,000 people were destroyed -- almost every structure east of Van Ness Avenue and north of Duboce Street. Research has concluded that 3,000 or more people perished, and the majority of the entire population of San Francisco was left homeless by the disaster. Businesses were destroyed, and the city's financial system was in ruins.

Rebuilding began immediately. New construction included both reconstruction on previously developed lots and expansion onto formerly vacant lots. New architectural styles emerged, both to address safety concerns more effectively and as a reflection of changing trends in design. In response to earlier fires, the use of brick and other fireproof construction materials had been required within specified commercial zones, and those zones were extended after 1906. Residential construction after 1906 favored flat roof construction with a tar and gravel surface that was more fire resistant than a traditional pitched shingle roof. Victorian asymmetry and ornament lost favor to the more orderly and restrained Classical revival styles. This stylistic shift was perhaps best embodied by the completion in 1915 of the Beaux Arts-style City Hall, and the structures erected on filled land in the Marina District for the Panama Pacific International Exposition that same year, all classically styled buildings that marked the symbolic end of the reconstruction of San Francisco.

The building boom that began after the 1906 earthquake and fire continued nearly unabated through the 1920s. Much of the city had taken the physical shape that prevails today by the time of the Great Depression in the 1930s, during which new construction slowed dramatically. Despite the economic downturn, the Depression years provided the city with some of its finest public works projects. Major structures such as the Bay Bridge, the Transbay Terminal, Coit Tower, Rincon Annex, Aquatic Park, the Cow Palace, and numerous firehouses, libraries, police stations, and schools were constructed with the aid of Federal funds. The Golden Gate Bridge itself did not receive federal funds, but federal funds helped to construct the approaches. During the first half of the 1940s, World War II preempted all construction projects except work that supported military efforts.

Until the 20th century, architecture in San Francisco tended to utilize contemporary styles popular in the East, though on a somewhat delayed timeline. Greek Revival flourished in the 1850s and 1860s, Italianate in the 1870s, Stick Eastlake in the 1880s, Queen Anne in

the 1890s, and Classical or Colonial Revival in the early 20th century. There were also a smaller number of homes built in the Gothic Revival, First Bay Area Tradition (also called Western Stick), and Craftsman styles. In the 1910s and 1920s, styles with origins in California were popularized, such as Mission, Spanish Colonial, and Mediterranean Revival. Art Deco was used beginning in the late 1920s, most often on commercial rather than residential buildings, as was the related Streamline Moderne style that emerged in the postwar era. International Modernism also appeared as early as the 1930s in San Francisco in the form of dramatic hillside residential buildings by architects such as Richard Neutra. The 1950s brought the concept of "urban renewal" to San Francisco, resulting in the loss of many historic resources and a surge of new construction, often in the International style vernacular, in areas including Yerba Buena, the Western Addition, Golden Gateway, Diamond Heights, and parts of the Bayshore District. Brutalist styles and Postmodernism followed, and the Bay Area's Tech Boom of the late 1990s and early 2000s resulted in further development pressure and new construction in emerging 21st century styles.

San Francisco's built environment today displays a tremendous variety of architectural periods and styles that reflect the city's layered historical development. This brief history provides a very limited overview of the historical context of the city, and development of a comprehensive Historical Context Statement for San Francisco is a policy of this Element. Such a Context document is a vital tool for historic preservation planning, and work on it will begin in 2007. Endorsed context statements for specific areas of the city, such as the South of Market and Inner Mission North, are also available from the Planning Department. For further information also see Preservation Bulletin No. 18: *Architectural Periods and Styles in San Francisco*, available online or at the Planning Information Center.

Historic Preservation in San Francisco

San Francisco lost a significant amount of historical resources in the period after World War II. During the economic boom that followed the war, and through the 1980s, new development resulted in the loss of many recognized historic buildings, including the Montgomery Block, Fox Theater, Alaska Commercial Building, Fitzhugh Building, and the City of Paris Department Store. Older office and industrial structures were demolished to accommodate modern office towers as the City's economy grew and shifted to the service and professional sectors. Urban renewal projects cleared large areas of older residential buildings in the Western Addition and South of Market. In addition, many older buildings were demolished as a result of highway projects.

Concern over demolition of older buildings and disruption of neighborhood fabric helped lead to the "freeway revolt" of the 1950s that halted a number of proposed freeway construction projects in San Francisco. By the early 1960s, it became clear to San

Franciscans that the City's architectural heritage was being eroded through demolition, careless alteration, unsympathetic additions, and new construction that was out of scale with existing neighborhoods. In 1963, at the inspiration of local architectural historians, the Junior League undertook an architectural and historic survey of San Francisco that resulted in the book, *Here Today, San Francisco's Architectural Heritage*. In organizing the *Here Today* survey, criteria suggested by the National Trust for Historic Preservation were used. These criteria included (1) age, (2) a fine example of a particular style, (3) a work of a notable architect or builder, (4) the site of an historic event, and (5) a building associated with a famous person. In 1968, the Board of Supervisors adopted *Here Today* as the City's first historic resources survey.

The Planning Department's 1966 study "The Preservation of Landmarks in San Francisco" outlined goals for city legislation to protect architectural and historic resources. In 1967, the Board of Supervisors adopted a landmarks ordinance, Article 10 of the Planning Code, and a nine-member Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board (Landmarks Board) was appointed. In 1985 the Downtown Plan was adopted as part of the General Plan. Article 11 of the Planning Code implements the preservation policies created for that Plan. Finally, the General Plan's introduction incorporates a 1986 voter-approved initiative that added Section 101.1 to the Planning Code. This preamble to the Planning Code includes eight Priority Policies, including the policy "that landmarks and historic buildings be preserved."

In 1995, San Francisco became a Certified Local Government (CLG). CLG requirements include appointing a qualified Landmarks Board, maintaining a system for the comprehensive survey and inventory of historical resources, and enforcement of the local preservation ordinances. Meeting those requirements, the Planning Department employs a Preservation Coordinator to oversee all Historic Preservation activity, in addition to a Preservation Team dedicated to historic resources survey, and Preservation Technical Specialists on each Neighborhood Planning Quadrant Team who review proposed projects that impact potential or known historic resources.

San Francisco residents and community organizations have a long-standing commitment to historic preservation as one of the important contributors to the quality of life in San Francisco. Their work has made preservation a central value of residents and government alike, and has shaped San Francisco's planning and preservation policies.

Historic Resources Survey Program

The foundation of any historic preservation program is an understanding of the number, location and significance of historical resources, which might include buildings, districts, objects, sites and/or landscapes. This understanding is achieved through the historic resource survey process, in which properties are systematically documented and

evaluated in order to determine whether or not they are historically significant, either individually or as part of a grouping. Surveys are an important tool for Planners, generating data that can inform long-range planning efforts and that assists in review of building permit applications under the California Environmental Quality Act and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. In addition to identifying important individual historic resources and potential historic districts, a survey can to lead to the development of neighborhood-specific design guidelines that promote certain established characteristics. As more historic resources are identified through surveys, more property owners can potentially benefit by qualifying for tax credits and other incentives such as the use of the State Historical Building Code. Identification of both historic and non-historic resources serves the public, property owners, government officials, and those who do business in San Francisco by making environmental review and regulation more transparent.

Historic resource surveys have been accomplished in different portions of the city over the past four decades, notably in 1968 and 1976, resulting in information gathered on approximately 18,000 properties. Since the year 2000, the Planning Department has been actively engaged in survey work through the Citywide Survey Program. The focus of the program is on neighborhoods that are undergoing long-range planning efforts through the creation of Area Plans, such as Market and Octavia, Central Waterfront, Eastern Neighborhoods, Balboa Park, and Japantown. In addition, the Planning Department has been engaged in historic resources surveys of the Central Waterfront and Inner Mission since 2000, and conducts surveys in neighborhoods outside of Area Plan study areas as resources become available.

The survey program applies a context-based methodology endorsed by the State Office of Historic Preservation and National Register Bulletin #24 *Guidelines for Local Surveys: A Basis for Preservation Planning*. This methodology emphasizes the need for broad contextual knowledge in order to inform evaluation and identification of individual historic resources and districts. An Historic Context Statement for San Francisco, prepared by a staff Historian starting in 2007, provides this contextual basis to guide the survey program.

Relationship to Land-Use in Planning

Historic Preservation plays an integral role in land use planning in San Francisco as one of the eight Priority Policies of the City and through environmental review under CEQA. Although preservation solutions cannot always be found, they must be considered when projects are undertaken that will adversely impact either known or potential historic resources. As a result, the Planning Department reviews projects that could impact such resources, applying the nationally accepted Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties in order to determine appropriate alterations that may occur.

Since 1985, Area Plans of the General Plan have identified important historic buildings that should be preserved, conserved, or adaptively reused both individually and in groups. They include the Downtown Plan (1985), Rincon Hill Plan (1985), the Chinatown Plan (1987), the Van Ness Avenue Plan (1988), the South of Market Plan (1990), and the South Bayshore Plan (1995). Older Area Plans also include important preservation policies, including the Civic Center Plan (1974), the Central Waterfront Plan (1990 with 1998 amendments) and the Northeastern Waterfront Plan (1990 with 1998 amendments). Area Plans are currently being drafted with preservation policies including the Market and Octavia Plan, Eastern Neighborhoods Plans, and the Balboa Park Plan.

Historic preservation is also included in San Francisco's Urban Design Element, which contains general principles about the physical form of the city that have guided subsequent General Plan policy and implementation. One of these principles is "Conservation of resources which provide a sense of nature, continuity with the past and freedom from overcrowding." Policies include "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." The Urban Design Element observes "as the city grows, the keeping of that which is old and irreplaceable may be as much a measure of human achievement as the building of the new. Certainly, the old should not be replaced unless what is new is better."

This Preservation Element will further strengthen the relationship of historic preservation to land use planning within the framework of the General Plan, and inform the review of individual projects through the entitlement process.

Legal Basis

Federal Context. In the United States, the concept of preserving a community's architectural past emerged during the decades preceding the Civil War and focused on colonial buildings and other structures connected with important figures in American history. Public concern over the possible loss of historic sites and buildings of importance to the nation's heritage prompted Congress to adopt the Antiquities Act of 1906, offering protection to prehistoric and historic sites located on federal properties. The Historic Sites Act of 1935 established a national policy of preserving historic resources of national significance and created the National Historic Landmark Program. This legislation empowered the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the National Park Service, to use the Historic American Buildings Survey to survey, document, evaluate, acquire, and preserve archaeological and historic sites.

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 established a number of programs that deal with historic preservation at the federal and state levels. The National Register of Historic Places, maintained by the Secretary of the Interior, was created as a federal planning tool and contains a list of national, state, and local

"districts, sites, buildings, structures and objects significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering and culture." In addition, the NHPA created the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and independent federal agency that serves as the primary federal policy advisor to the President and Congress; recommends administrative and legislative improvements for protecting our nation's heritage; advocates full consideration of historic values in federal decision-making; and reviews federal programs and policies to promote effectiveness, coordination, and consistency with national preservation policies. The NHPA also established the review process known as Section 106, in which federal undertakings must be assessed for potential impact on historic resources.

Both the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970 similarly require consideration of a project's effects on historical, architectural, and archaeological resources as part of the environmental review process. In 1983, the Secretary of the Interior released Preservation Planning Standards and Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties that are used nationwide and under CEQA to guide appropriate preservation strategies.

State Context. The State of California maintains preservation programs through the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) within the California Department of Parks and Recreation. This office is administered by the State Historic Preservation Officer and overseen by the State Historical Resources Commission, whose members are appointed by the Governor. The office maintains the California Register of Historical Resources, which lists properties designated by federal, state and local authorities.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) is the foundation of environmental policy and law in the state of California, and encourages the protection of all aspects of the environment, including historical resources. Under CEQA, state and local governmental agencies must consider the impact proposed projects have on historic resources. State agencies are further regulated under Public Resources Code Section 5024 and Governor's Executive Order W-26-92, both of which address preservation requirements for state-owned or controlled historic resources.

State law requires that each city and county adopt a general plan containing the following seven components or "elements": land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open-space, noise, and safety (Government Code Sections 65300 et seq.). Although a preservation element is not required under state law, the OHP recommends that every Certified Local Government (such as San Francisco) include a preservation element in its General Plan.

Regulation in San Francisco. The legal framework for Historic Preservation in San Francisco was established in 1967 with the adoption of Article 10 of the Planning Code. The ordinance provides for the designation of local landmarks and historic districts,

which are listed in the appendices to Article 10. Among other protections, Article 10 allows the City to delay the demolition of individually designated landmark buildings for a period of up to one year to allow consideration of alternatives that could preserve the structure.

Article 10 also created the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board (Landmarks Board), a nine-member body, appointed by the Mayor, which serves as an advisory board to the Planning Commission and the Planning Department. The Landmarks Board makes recommendations to the Planning Commission and the Planning Department regarding designation of individual Landmarks and historic districts, as well as building permit applications that involve construction, alteration or demolition of individual Landmarks and resources located within historic districts. A review for appropriateness is required for exterior alterations to these properties, and for interior alterations of designated interiors. The Landmarks Board may also review and comment on projects affecting historic resources that are subject to environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), or projects subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

In 1985, Article 11 of the Planning Code was created as an outgrowth of the Downtown Plan. The Plan, in turn, was informed by a historic resources survey of downtown completed by the non-profit group San Francisco Architectural Heritage, the results of which were documented in the book *Splendid Survivors*, published in 1979. The Downtown Plan surveyed and classified all downtown buildings. It recognized 539 important buildings in the downtown zoning districts. Of those, 350 are designated "Significant," and their loss would constitute an irreplaceable loss to the quality and character of the downtown. It also established six Conservation Districts, and all of these resources are codified under Article 11.

One of the Downtown Plan's innovations is a system of Transfer of Development Rights, which permits owners of significant and contributory buildings to transfer unused development potential away from preserved buildings to other sites within the downtown zoning districts. Since 1985, other American cities have incorporated many of the innovative planning tools adopted in the Downtown Area Plan and Article 11, such as the Transfer of Development Rights strategy, to preserve and protect significant historic resources.

The General Plan's introduction incorporates a 1986 voter-approved initiative that added Section 101.1 to the Planning Code. This preamble to the Planning Code is composed of eight Priority Policies, including Policy 7: *That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved*. In addition to the regulation of historic resources proscribed through the Planning Code, the Planning Department follows guidelines for the implementation of CEQA presented in Preservation Bulletin No. 16 *CEQA and Historical Resources*, available online and at the Planning Information Center.

Incentives

Preservation incentives are intended to encourage property owners to repair, restore, or rehabilitate historic resources in lieu of demolition. While San Francisco offers local preservation incentive programs, there are other incentives offered through federal and state agencies. These include federal tax credits for rehabilitation of qualified historical resources, property tax abatement programs, alternative building codes, and tax deductions for preservation easements. Preservation incentives can result in tangible benefits to property owners. Policies encouraging the promotion and use of incentive programs are found Objective 6 of this Element, and those wishing further information about specific incentive programs should refer to San Francisco Preservation Bulletin No. 6: *Preservation Incentives*, available online or at the Planning Information Center.

OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION*DRAFT*

IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

OBJECTIVE 1*DRAFT*
MAINTAIN AN INVENTORY OF HISTORIC RESOURCES EVALUATED AS SIGNIFICANT TO SAN FRANCISCO'S BUILT ENVIRONMENT.

The foundation of any historic preservation program is an understanding of the number, location and significance of historical resources, which might include buildings, districts, objects, sites and/or landscapes. This understanding is achieved through the historic resource survey process, in which properties are systematically documented and evaluated in order to determine whether or not they are historically significant, either individually or as part of a grouping. Surveys are an important tool for Planners, generating data that can inform long-range planning efforts and that assists in review of building permit applications under the California Environmental Quality Act and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. In addition to identifying important individual historic resources and potential historic districts, a survey can to lead to the development of neighborhood-specific design guidelines that promote certain established characteristics. As more historic resources are identified through surveys, more property owners can potentially benefit by qualifying for tax credits and other incentives such as the use of the State Historical Building Code. Identification of both historic and non-historic resources serves the public, property owners, government officials, and those who do business in San Francisco by making environmental review and regulation more transparent.

Policy 1.1*DRAFT*
Undertake a citywide survey and evaluation of privately and publicly owned structures and sites forty-five years old or older, and conduct periodic updates of the survey.

A citywide survey requires an extensive commitment of resources. One approach to completing survey work is to integrate it with land use planning as the City undertakes Area Plans, Redevelopment Plans, Community and Neighborhood Plans, and participates in federal projects which result in historic surveys. The Planning Department Survey Program uses State of California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523-series forms to document historic resources, following the California Office of Historic Preservation's *Instructions for Recording Historical Resources*, and the methodology of National Register Bulletin # 24: *Technical information on comprehensive planning, survey of cultural resources, and registration in the National Register of Historic Places*.

Completed surveys should be periodically reviewed to identify historic resources that were previously determined to be less than forty-five years of age. Ultimately, there should be a complete survey of all citywide historic resources that is continually updated, used to guide land use decisions, and available to the public.

Implementation: The Planning Department will continue to conduct context-based historic resource surveys throughout the City, working cooperatively with other agencies such as the Redevelopment Agency and Port of San Francisco to coordinate survey efforts.

Policy 1.2*DRAFT*
Prepare a citywide historic context statement to inform an overall understanding of San Francisco's built environment.
The nationally accepted Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Preservation Planning emphasizes that "the development of historic contexts is the foundation for decisions about identification, evaluation, registration and treatment of historic properties." To date there is no "Context Statement" for the City and County of San Francisco. Such a document, as produced by other localities, serves as the basis for all historic surveys that are done. For example, it would provide the general history of the City so that planners, consultants and others could save time by referencing it or quoting portions of it as boilerplate. In addition, it would identify eras in the development of San Francisco, so that a planner or researcher could match the date of a building to a period of development and place it firmly within the context of city history. Thematic context statements would establish a framework by which property types could be understood contextually. Geographic context statements would offer short statements about the historical growth and development of distinct neighborhoods. Again, this would simplify the work of researchers and planners who could put building type, date, and location into a clear context, accepted by the City as accurate. The importance and usefulness of such a document cannot be overstated.

Implementation: In Fiscal Year 2007-2008 a Planner III Historian will begin to write the citywide historic context statement and maintain current research on thematic and geographical contexts throughout the city.

Policy 1.3*DRAFT*
Collect and evaluate information about areas with concentrations of historical resources that share physical qualities and/or historical context.
Through context-based historic resource survey, groupings of buildings can be identified as historic districts. This kind of survey provides an understanding of the overall history and development of an area, its characteristic architecture, or the importance of a historical theme, and can show clearly that particular properties have significance as a group because of their association with that history, architecture, or

theme. Even properties that are not historically significant individually may still be considered contributory to the overall significance of a historic district, and therefore be identified as historic resources. Once historic districts have been identified, designation and preservation strategies can be contemplated. An understanding of the character of a historic district will inform evaluation of what is appropriate and compatible change within that district.

Implementation: The Planning Department will continue to utilize context-based historic resource surveys to identify areas with concentrations of historic resources as historic districts.

Policy 1.4*DRAFT*
Encourage private developers and property owners to assist in the identification of historic resources.

Identification of historic resources is beneficial to private developers and property owners of potential historic resources, so that they may take advantage of incentives, streamline the regulatory process, and have early and meaningful knowledge to guide decision-making. Various laws and policies, such as CEQA and Section 101.1 of the Planning Code, regulate the consideration and protection of historic resources. In order to make the process of regulation as transparent as possible, it is helpful to identify historic resources ahead of proposed development. Owners of designated historic resources may also be eligible for a variety of incentives, including tax credits and the use of alternate building codes. Developers and private property owners should therefore be encouraged to take the lead on historic resource identification that affects them. In particular, post-secondary educational and medical institutions that are required under Section 304.5 of the Planning Code to complete Institutional Master Plans should be encouraged to include historic resource identification as part of that documentation.

Implementation: The Planning Department will include a recommendation in Institutional Master Plan guidelines that historic resources be identified.

Policy 1.5*DRAFT*
Recognize historic resources of exceptional importance that are less than fifty years old.

San Francisco contains excellent examples of architecture built in the recent past. Some buildings under fifty years old are already recognized. For example, the 1959 Crown Zellerbach Building (One Bush Street) is a designated City Landmark. Others were not recognized when surveys were undertaken in the past, or were not considered as potentially significant because of their age. Nonetheless, they may be important within the context of the City's built environment, because of significant associations with

important events, or as integral parts of an historic district. Their value should be assessed and recognized.

Implementation: The Planning Department will identify, through survey and historic context statements, properties less than fifty years old that are found to have exceptional significance.

PROTECTION OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

OBJECTIVE 2*DRAFT*
PROTECT AND PRESERVE HISTORIC RESOURCES.

Historically significant buildings and other features are important to San Francisco's quality of life. They contribute to neighborhood identity and the overall character and urban design of the City and make San Francisco attractive to residents, visitors, and new businesses. Historic properties should be protected to prevent their loss to the City, and to assure that they remain as resources for future generations.

Historic resources are affected by public and private decision-makers, by businesses and community groups, and by preservation organizations. All of these interested groups should be encouraged to participate in the planning and regulatory process of historic preservation.

Policy 2.1*DRAFT*
Protect individually designated buildings and other historic resources.

Historic resources are protected at the federal, state and local levels. Section 101.1 of the San Francisco Planning Code lists priority policies that are part of the San Francisco General Plan, including Policy 7: *That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved*. Laws and regulations seek to protect historic resources by controlling alterations, demolitions, or changes that could destroy or impair character-defining features. These laws, such as California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), do not always require outright preservation of the resource. They are intended to establish mechanisms to ensure that the integrity of the resource is not compromised, and that alternatives to demolition are considered. Regulation varies depending on the type of resource, its ownership, its jurisdiction, and what type of threat it faces. San Francisco regulates landmarks designated in Article 10 of the Planning Code, and downtown buildings designated in Article 11 of the Planning Code. Other resources are listed on the National Register or on the California Register, or are eligible for listing on those registers.

The City, using its regulatory and planning powers, should place a high value on these resources. Protection of individually designated historic resources should also be

accomplished through comprehensive planning and coordination with other land use laws. Preservation ordinances alone are often insufficient to protect historic resources unless integrated with General Plan objectives and policies for land use, transportation, and housing.

Implementation: The Planning Department's Preservation Staff will continue to evaluate the impacts of proposed projects on historic resources per Section 101.1 consistency with the General Plan, and substantial adverse impacts will continue to be evaluated using Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs).

Policy 2.2*DRAFT*
Protect groupings of historic resources that are formally listed as historic or conservation districts.

Designated Historic Districts and Conservation Districts have significant cultural, social, economic or political history, as well as significant architectural attributes, and were developed during a distinct period of time. Some districts include unique urban design features such as street patterns, squares, bridges, open space, street furniture, signs, and water features. When viewed as an ensemble, these features contribute greatly to the character of the neighborhood and to the overall quality, form, and pattern of San Francisco. Local and National Register districts in San Francisco include nationally significant areas such as Civic Center and the Presidio National Park, early commercial centers such as Jackson Square, warehouse districts such as the Northeast Waterfront and South End, and residential areas such as Telegraph Hill and Alamo Square.

The standards for review of building permits for local Historic Districts and Conservation Districts are contained within the Planning Code's Article 10 and Article 11. All designated historic districts, whether on local, state, or national registers, are also regulated under CEQA and Section 101.1 of the Planning Code. Development within those districts should be consistent with the character of the district. In addition, land use and zoning incentives should be considered to protect and revitalize such districts. Standards for review reflecting the unique characteristics of each historic or conservation district should be included in the designating ordinance for each district.

Implementation: Preservation Staff at the Planning Department will continue to evaluate proposed projects within historic and conservation districts according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and per Section 101.1 consistency with the General Plan.

Policy 2.3 ***DRAFT***
Protect resources that, based on professional evaluation, appear eligible for formal designation individually or as part of a grouping.
Not all historic resources have been identified or designated. Some properties may look humble architecturally, but research could show them to have significant associations with important people or events. Under CEQA, a property that is identified as eligible for the National Register, California Register, or for local listing, is an historic resource – regardless of whether it is officially designated. In order to avoid inappropriate treatment of these potential historic resources, guidelines must be followed that can help to identify them. The Citywide Historic Resources Survey Program is also working to inventory such resources. Once identified, these properties are given the same consideration as designated resources and their preservation is supported under Section 101.1 of the Planning Code.

Implementation: Preservation Staff at the Planning Department will continue to follow the guidelines set forth in Preservation Bulletin No. 16: "CEQA Review Procedures for Historic Resources," which establishes categories of buildings that could be potential historic resources, due to their age, the type of work proposed, and whether the property was previously evaluated by a survey.

Policy 2.4 ***DRAFT***
Protect historic resources that are less than fifty years old.
A challenge of recognizing historic resources that are less than fifty years old is to understand what treatments are appropriate for those properties. Modern materials, styles, and property types are frequently not as widely appreciated or studied as older materials and styles. For example, many people may feel uncomfortable applying the moniker "historic" to an International style building from the late 1950s or early 1960s. It can therefore be difficult to explain that lack of ornamentation and metal-frame windows can be character-defining features of that style, and should not be altered. In order to protect these resources, planners and the public must be educated about significant architecture and events from the recent past.

Implementation: Planners, both Preservation Staff and others, will be trained and educated about significant architecture of the recent past, including appropriate design and materials considerations. As more information comes to light about important aspects of this time period, training will remain current.

Policy 2.5 ***DRAFT***
Support efforts to pursue formal designation of properties determined eligible for listing as City Landmarks or City Historic Districts under Article 10 of the Planning Code.
The Landmarks Board, Planning Commission, Art Commission, and Board of Supervisors, as well as owners of properties to be designated, may initiate Landmark designation under Article 10 of the Planning Code. Historic resources eligible for local listing under Article 10 are identified in a number of ways; by the public, through historic resource surveys, and through the environmental review and entitlement process. Official designation of those identified resources should be encouraged. Designation serves to more widely and publicly recognize important historic resources in San Francisco. Owners of some designated properties are also eligible for a variety of financial incentives such as Mills Act property tax reduction. Landmark designation applications should be submitted to the Planning Department following guidelines set forth in Preservation Bulletin No. 5: *Landmark and Historic District Designation Procedures*.

Implementation: The Planning Department will processes Landmark designation reports submitted to the Department, per the procedures outlined in Preservation Bulletin No. 5, providing support and direction to members of the public seeking to designate.

Policy 2.6 ***DRAFT***
Encourage the rehabilitation and adaptive use of historic buildings and other historical resources as an alternative to demolition.
Whenever possible, historic resources should be conserved, rehabilitated or adaptively reused. Significant, character-defining architectural features and elements should be retained and incorporated into the new use, where feasible. Over time, many buildings outlive the functions for which they were originally designed, and they become vacant or underused. Adaptive reuse proposals can result in new functions for historic buildings, and may benefit property owners if tax incentives are available. Such treatment options may also avoid an adverse impact to the property, and could therefore negate the need for an Environmental Impact Report.

Implementation: Preservation Staff will continue to evaluate proposed rehabilitation and adaptive use projects to determine whether they meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. If so, a project may be exempt from environmental review, and in addition be eligible for various tax incentives.

POLICY 2.7*DRAFT*
Use enforcement powers to prevent demolition by neglect.
Owners have a responsibility to maintain their properties, and historic resources are particularly vulnerable to deterioration due to their age. Lack of maintenance and neglect can result in effective demolition of a historic resource. The Department of Building Inspection, in enforcing the Building Code, should require that vacant buildings be safely stabilized to prevent deterioration. Periodic inspections should ensure minimum maintenance and repair to maintain safety and to protect the resource for future use. Incentives and financial assistance in the form of façade improvements and other programs should be made available to those without the means to perform adequate maintenance. The City may need to take a proactive role in protecting threatened resources through a combination of enforcement, penalties, and financial assistance.

Implementation: The Planning Department will coordinate with the Department of Building Inspection to establish a tracking system to record code violations and deteriorating conditions of historic resources for prompt enforcement action.

Policy 2.8 *DRAFT*
Demonstrate leadership through the preservation, rehabilitation and adaptive use of publicly owned historic resources.
The City and County of San Francisco is the largest owner of officially designated landmarks in the City. Other historic resources are located within public rights-of-way and on property owned by the City. City agencies should consider the value of these resources when contemplating changes to them. Advice and guidance by the Landmarks Board should be sought in the identification and maintenance of publicly owned historic resources. Planning Department preservation staff are also available to consult on such projects.

Implementation: This Preservation Element, as part of the City's General Plan, will convey the importance of incorporating preservation across all City departments and agencies, and will insure that future actions are consistent with the principals set forth in the Element. Preservation staff will perform outreach to alert other departments and agencies about the Element.

Policy 2.9 *DRAFT*
Foster inter-agency communication and collaboration on projects with historic preservation aspects or impacts.
Due to jurisdictional boundaries, many historic resources within San Francisco city limits are not subject to Planning Code legislation. These resources may be owned, or under the jurisdiction of, entities such as the Redevelopment Agency or Unified School District. Although such properties may be regulated under Federal and/or State

preservation laws, it is important for Planning Department preservation staff members to maintain ties with appropriate contacts at such agencies and entities in order to further General Plan policies supporting historic preservation. Preservation staff are available for consultation on projects outside of their jurisdiction that effect historic resources, and can provide valuable expertise to counterparts at other agencies.

Implementation: Planning Department preservation staff will continue to assist with historic resources survey scoping as requested by outside agencies. Preservation staff will also work to develop lines of communication between the Planning Department and other entities.

Policy 2.10 ***DRAFT***
Recognize and protect non-architectural historic resources.
Historic preservation is concerned with many types of resources besides architectural examples. These may include, but are not limited to, landscapes, street furniture, and engineering structures. Such resources can establish a context for architecturally and historically significant buildings, districts, and sites. Others are historically significant in their own right, such as the Path of Gold Light Standards along Market Street, collectively recognized as City Landmark No. 200. By their nature these types of resources often blend into the background of the urban environment, and care should be taken to insure that they are recognized and preserved as part of the historic cultural landscape of San Francisco.

Implementation: The Planning Department will identify non-architectural historic resources through survey and environmental evaluation procedures, and will work with the Department of Public Works to ensure the protection of landscape elements recognized as historic resources.

Policy 2.11 ***DRAFT***
Collect, archive, maintain, and protect documents and artifacts that are important to the historical understanding of San Francisco's built environment.
Documents, letters, and ordinary artifacts of daily use can contribute to an accurate understanding of San Francisco's past. These cultural resources, whenever feasible, should be collected, properly documented, and preserved. Repositories for these materials should be identified so that researchers may access them. The San Francisco Public Library generally serves as the repository for the City's historical records. However, other institutions such as the California Historical Society also contain related information.

Implementation: Information pertaining to the history of San Francisco's built environment is also included in the Planning Department's files, and the Department will upload scanned documents and other information to an online historic resource database beginning in Fiscal Year 2007-2008.

OBJECTIVE 3 ***DRAFT***
PRESERVE ARCHEOLOGICAL RESOURCES WITHIN SAN FRANCISCO AS A UNIQUE, IRREPLACEABLE RECORD OF THE PAST

San Francisco has the oldest and most complex archeological record of any major urban area in California. It's archeological legacy is also a fragile, finite and non-renewable resource that through the course of the 21st century will perish at an accelerating speed due to the city's expanding built and infrastructural environment. San Francisco's historical archeological record dates to 1776 and its prehistoric record dates to more than 5,000 years before the present. The archeological record is the only surviving remains of some peoples (for example, prehistoric peoples and historically marginalized peoples) and of some historical phenomena (for example, a Gold Rush period encampment). Even when a parallel documentary record exists, the archeological record may preserve a less filtered and biased view of the past. Since the media, methodologies, and theoretical frameworks through which documentary history and archeology have access to the past are so different, the contribution of archeology to the history and prehistory of San Francisco provides a special and sometimes the only voice of the past to the present.

The preferred preservation strategy for an archeological site is the avoidance of activities that may potentially adversely affect the resource. In San Francisco preservation of archeological resources by avoidance is often not feasible. Where avoidance is not possible, archeological sites should be preserved through appropriate archeological treatment including data recovery, analysis, written interpretation, recordation, and curation of the archeological data that has significant research value.

Policy 3.1 ***DRAFT***
Develop and maintain an archeological GIS (Geographic Information System) of known and expected archeological resources and of their associated documentation.

The use of informational technologies that can collect, correlate, and spatially represent archeological site data and their associated documentation has a well-demonstrated potential to improve current methods of identification and evaluation of known or potential archeological sites. Through proper planning, an archeological GIS project is an optimal archeological resource management tool to assemble and correlate a large database of site-specific archeological information linked to geographical locations that can be presented spatially on a map. These data may be used to develop predictive or analytic models to identify vertical (sedimentary) and horizontal (historical ecological) contexts of prehistoric sites or the thematic and historical relationships among historical archeological sites. The City's development of an archeological GIS also enhances the pool of available site information by providing a platform for data-sharing with other

cultural resource management agencies, such as the Northwest Information Center, State Office of Historic Preservation, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, and the California Department of Transportation. Development of a web-based interface would permit access to select archeological information from the archeological GIS, filtered on a need-to-know basis, to public agencies and the archeological community.

Implementation: The Planning Department will support through staffing and informational technology the continuing development of the archeological GIS project to include additional archeological property type layers, such as, buried Gold Rush period ships/storeships, submerged shipwrecks, Gold Rush period archeological resources, 19th century cemeteries, and Spanish-Mexican period resources.

Policy 3.2 ***DRAFT***
Ensure preservation or appropriate treatment of inadvertently discovered archeological resources.
State environmental law requires public agencies to identify and evaluate for listing to the California Register of Historical Resources any archeological resource that may be affected by private or public actions over which the agency has discretionary approval (CEQA § 21083.2; 15128.4). State law further requires that the public agency determine if a potentially impacted archeological resource may be an historical resource, which may require a professional assessment of the presence or absence, integrity, and potential research value of the archeological resource (CEQA § 15128.4(c)(1)(2)). However, even with use of the most rigorous archeological techniques, there may be a residual possibility that a significant archeological resource could be inadvertently impacted by project activities.

Implementation: The Planning Department will work to amend the Planning Code to require that in the event of the accidental discovery of an archeological resource the following protocols will be carried out: immediate professional archeological identification and evaluation, work stoppage within the area of potential impact, and contingency funding of any requisite mitigation, as required by State Law (Public Resources Code. § 15064.5 (f))

Policy 3.3 ***DRAFT***
All Indigenous archeological sites in San Francisco shall be treated as having prima facie significant archeological value.
Archeological sites associated with prehistoric and historic period Indigenous peoples are of significant informational value in understanding the prehistory and history of the San Francisco Bay Area. However, Indigenous sites are finite in number, rapidly diminishing, and non-renewable. San Francisco is archeologically unique in the Bay Area in having a number of intact prehistoric shellmounds that have been preserved under sand dunes. Even re-deposited or disturbed prehistoric deposits may have

significant informational value if they contain material that is dateable, sourceable, or that can be typologically associated with primary prehistoric deposits. Irrespective of its scientific integrity, an Indigenous archeological site may have significance as a traditional cultural property when associated with the cultural values or practices of living Native Americans, such as the Ohlones (Costanoans) or members of other tribelets, such as the Wappo and Coastal Miwok and Southern Pomo, who were present in San Francisco during and after the Mission period.

Implementation: The Planning Department will inform the development community, environmental consultants, archeologists, and cultural resource managers in other public agencies that for purposes of CEQA and Section 106 identification, evaluation, and treatment the City and County of San Francisco presumes that Indigenous archeological deposits/features are presumed to be of significant scientific and/or cultural value, in the absence of convincing demonstration to the contrary.

Policy 3.4 ***DRAFT***
Create archeological preservation districts to preserve multiple-feature archeological resources that are prehistorically, historically, or thematically interrelated.
Determination of the appropriate level of analysis and interpretation of an archeological resource requires that the resource be understood within the broader context of other archeological resources to which it is historically, functionally, culturally, technologically, or thematically related. Historically inter-connected archeological sites may be geographically contiguous or discontiguous. Archeological features or deposits may be mis-interpreted and mis-evaluated in the absence of a contextual approach that examines discrete archeological resources at an appropriate geographical, historical, and typological level of analysis. As an important cultural resource management tool, an archeological preservation district can ensure that discrete archeological resources within the district are understood and evaluated within their appropriate context.

Implementation: The Planning Department shall initiate a project with a graduate archeology student to prepare an archeological resource management plan of the area that geographically centered on Mission Dolores (1775-1850) that shall provide the basis for an archeological district to be codified in Article 10.

ENSURE THAT CHANGES RESPECT HISTORICAL CHARACTER

OBJECTIVE 4*DRAFT*
ENSURE THAT CHANGES IN SAN FRANCISCO'S BUILT ENVIRONMENT RESPECT THE HISTORICAL CHARACTER AND HERITAGE OF THE CITY.
Historic resources are often focal points of urban context and design, and contribute greatly to San Francisco's diverse neighborhoods, scale, and city pattern. Alterations,

additions to, and replacement of, older buildings are processes by which a city grows and changes. Some changes can enhance the essential architectural and historical features of a building. Others, however, are not appropriate. Alterations and additions to a landmark or contributory building in an historic district should be compatible with the building's original design qualities. New construction infill within an historic district should also be compatible with the character of the district.

The policies under this objective encourage rehabilitation and adaptive reuse. They adopt the nationally recognized Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. For non-designated historic resources, surveys and evaluations should be conducted to avoid inappropriate alterations or demolition.

POLICY 4.1*DRAFT*
Apply the nationally established Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties for all projects that affect known or potential historic resources.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties provides guidelines for determining appropriate strategies to use when a project has the potential to impact historic resources. The strategies include Preservation, Restoration, Rehabilitation, and Reconstruction. Generally speaking, the Standards require protection of character-defining materials and features so that the integrity of a given resource will be retained. The Secretary of the Interior is responsible for establishing and implementing the Standards for all properties under the Department of the Interior's authority, as well as advising federal agencies on the preservation of historic resources listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The Standards contain language related to the treatment of various materials, construction types, sizes and occupancy, and to the exterior and interior of the property. In San Francisco the Standards are applied during environmental evaluation of known or potential historic resources in order to determine whether the project causes a significant impact that would trigger an EIR, and to guide Department recommendations about preferable treatments. The Standards have been adopted by landmark commissions and planning commissions throughout the country.

Implementation: The Planning Department will continue to apply the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties to projects affecting potential and known historic resources under CEQA. In order to codify this practice, the Planning Department will work to amend Article 10 of the Planning Code.

POLICY 4.2*DRAFT*
Apply the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties for infill construction in known or potential Historic Districts or Conservation Districts to assure compatibility with the character of the districts.
The Standards shall also be applied in City review of proposed infill construction within known or potential conservation or historic districts. These districts generally represent the cultural, social economic or political history of an area, and the physical attributes of a distinct historical period. Often, a limited number of architectural styles and types of structures are represented. Infill construction in historic districts should be compatible with the existing setting and built environment, but should avoid creating new buildings that look old – also called false historicism.

Implementation: The Planning Department will continue to apply the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties to projects affecting potential and known historic districts. In order to codify this practice, the Planning Department will work to amend Article 10 of the Planning Code.

INTEGRATION OF PRESERVATION WITH THE PLANNING PROCESS

OBJECTIVE 5*DRAFT*
INCORPORATE PRESERVATION GOALS INTO THE LAND USE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS.
Local regulation and public actions influence, positively or negatively, the preservation of older buildings. All City agencies should consider the impact on historic preservation of the development and enforcement of land use, building code, fire code, environmental evaluation, and other regulations.

POLICY 5.1*DRAFT*
Maintain a qualified governing body to oversee City preservation actions.
Article 10 of the Planning Code establishes the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board as the governing body responsible for advising the Planning Commission and Planning Department on issues such as Landmark designation and alterations to Landmarks. As a Certified Local Government, the City of San Francisco is also required to maintain a qualified Landmarks Board. Members of the Landmarks Board, appointed by the Mayor, are specialists in areas of preservation such as architectural history, history, and historic architecture. New appointees to the Landmarks Board should be qualified specialists in fields related to historic preservation, and vacant positions on the nine-member Board should be filled in a timely manner to support efficient governance.

Implementation: The Planning Department will continue to recommend that the Mayor appoint qualified persons to each of the nine Landmarks Board member positions, filling positions as they

become vacant. The Planning Department will also meet with stakeholders and policymakers to consider amending Article 10 so that the Landmarks Board would be converted to a Commission with authority beyond an advisory capacity.

POLICY 5.2*DRAFT*
Maintain a City staff of qualified preservation professionals.
Preservation staff at the Planning Department are responsible for review of projects impacting historic resources. These staff members may also, among other tasks, review historic designation reports; conduct and organize historic resources surveys; and provide guidance to other agencies, city departments, and policymakers in matters related to historic preservation. It is essential that the Planning Department staff persons who are qualified by education and/or experience to perform such duties. The nationally accepted Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Historic Preservation are therefore used to establish minimum qualifications for these positions.

Implementation: The Planning Department will continue to staff Preservation Technical Specialist positions, and a Preservation Coordinator position, with persons meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in the area of Architectural History, History, or Historic Architecture.

POLICY 5.3*DRAFT*
During the planning process, evaluate the significance of resources that have the potential to be designated individually or as part of a grouping, per the guidelines set forth in Preservation Bulletin No. 16 *CEQA Review Procedures for Historic Resources*.
The Planning Department's environmental review guidelines are structured to recognize that many historic resources have never been designated. This allows qualified staff members to identify historic resources through the planning process. When resources are identified in this way, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties can be applied to determine appropriate strategies for the specific project.

Implementation: Preservation Staff will determine whether a property is a historic resource under CEQA and follow the review guidelines set forth in Bulletin No. 16.

POLICY 5.4*DRAFT*
Ensure that historic resource surveys are an integral component of long-range planning and Area Plan efforts.
In order to inform planning policies and zoning changes, a baseline of information about existing conditions is needed, including the identification of individual historic resources and districts. A historic resource survey of the area undergoing long-range

planning efforts will generate information about the historic context of the area, and identify historic resources. Planning policies can then be formulated that take into account the presence of historic resources. The Planning Department is committed to institutionalizing historic resources surveys as a critical component of each newly initiated planning process, and to incorporating survey information into plan policies.

Implementation: The Planning Department will continue to implement the citywide survey program and will add survey areas to the program as new long-range planning effort arise.

POLICY 5.5*DRAFT*
Include Historic Preservation Policies in all Area Plans.
Just as it is important for this Preservation Element to be included in the General Plan, it is essential that specific historic preservation policies be called out in all Area Plans. Generally, preservation policies should be a separate section or chapter of an Area Plan, in order to highlight their equal footing with other plan policies.

Implementation: All Area Plans will be developed to include the treatment of historic resources, including historic preservation policies, and shall have associated historic resource surveys.

Policy 5.6 ***DRAFT***
Consider information about historic resources, as well as the objectives and policies of this Element, in the development of zoning regulations and other regulatory policies.
This Preservation Element is supported by regulations in the Planning Code, such as Section 101.1 and Articles 10 and 11. Further updates to the Planning Code should review proposed zoning changes with consideration to the goals of historic preservation. The Planning Code and other City laws should be updated as needed to reflect changes in preservation policies.

Implementation: Planning staff will consider potential impacts to historic resources when contemplating zoning regulations and other regulatory policies, and will work to update Codes as needed. Regulations that encourage or support preservation will further support this policy.

Policy 5.7*DRAFT*
Periodically review historic preservation procedures and guidelines related to CEQA, Section 106, and Articles 10 and 11, and update as needed.
As interpretations of regulations evolve and laws are updated, published guidelines and procedures related to them must also be updated. The Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board and other political bodies may also recommend changes in procedures related to historic preservation. In the case of the Planning Code, revisions to Articles 10

and 11, or to other sections, could additionally result in codification of these procedures. The City's Preservation Bulletin series and Zoning Administrator Bulletins provide the public with updated information about preservation guidelines.

Implementation: Planning staff will continue to review and update the Preservation Bulletin series to insure its consistency with current interpretations and law. An update to Bulletin 16: CEQA Review Procedures for Historic Resources, is currently underway.

PROVIDE PRESERVATION INCENTIVES AND GUIDANCE

OBJECTIVE 6*DRAFT*
ENCOURAGE HISTORIC PRESERVATION THROUGH INCENTIVE PROGRAMS.

Incentives for historic preservation range from financial support to relief from certain code requirements. Economics plays an important role in decision-making about the use of historic buildings, and these incentives can make preservation, restoration, and rehabilitation options financially feasible. It is possible that more historic resources could be preserved and receive appropriate treatments if property owners were made aware of all the incentives available to them.

POLICY 6.1*DRAFT*
Encourage the use of grants, loans, tax mechanisms, or other funding sources for the preservation of historic resources.

A variety of financial benefits are available to support the preservation of certain types of historic resources. These include federal tax credits, loans, and grants. One of the most substantial incentives available in San Francisco is a 10-year property tax reduction through California's Mills Act. The use of such tax incentives and funding sources should be encouraged through simplified and streamlined review procedures, and by broadening the types of historic resources eligible to use them.

Implementation: The Planning Department will work with the Assessor-Recorder's office to streamline Mills Act contract procedures and maximize benefits for property owners.

POLICY 6.2*DRAFT*
Educate San Francisco's decision makers, business leaders, neighborhood groups, and residents about the economic benefits of historic preservation.

The public and policy makers should be made aware of the variety of economic incentives that support historic preservation. It is vital that developers be knowledgeable about these programs before a project is substantially underway, so that the preservation option can be considered from the beginning. Once a hefty investment

is made in a project, it is difficult to change course even if there are economic incentives for doing so. In addition to tax incentives, other economic benefits of historic designation and preservation may include increased property value. This information, and details about available tax abatement and credit programs, should be more widely publicized.

Implementation: Planning staff will create a website that will provide information about preservation incentives.

Policy 6.3 ***DRAFT***
Promote public awareness of the State Historic Building Code.
The State Historic Building Code (SHBC) seeks to protect California's heritage by recognizing the unique construction problems inherent in historic buildings and providing an alternative to the regular Building Code. Requests to use the SHBC are made with the Department of Building Inspection (DBI), and Planning staff frequently collaborate with DBI in order to determine the eligibility of specific properties to utilize it. The SHBC permits alternate design approaches that can minimize adverse visual impacts while still providing for health and safety. It can be used to find creative solutions to protect archaic materials and methods of construction that might not otherwise be permitted under the standard Code. Property owners seeking to rehabilitate historic buildings may also be able to realize cost savings when rehabilitating an historic structure by using the SHBC.

Implementation: Planning staff will create a website that will provide information about preservation incentives, including the SHBC.

PROVIDE PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION

OBJECTIVE 7*DRAFT*
FOSTER PUBLIC AWARENESS AND APPRECIATION OF SAN FRANCISCO'S HISTORIC RESOURCES.
An historic preservation program is most effective when it has broad community support. This objective seeks to promote awareness among San Franciscans that the preservation of the built environment is directly linked to the City's quality of life and its special identity, and that it can contribute to our culture and to our economy. The policies under this objective seek to promote, encourage, and educate the public about rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of historic resources. Preservation outreach can take the form of lectures, plaque and marker programs, tours, special events, websites, and publications. City staff, Landmarks Board members, and non-profit preservation organizations should continue to play a major role in achieving this objective.

POLICY 7.1*DRAFT*
Promote awareness among the public, including visitors, about historic resources in San Francisco.
Residents and visitors alike can benefit from awareness about the presence of historic resources. As heritage tourism continues to be popular, and residents show a desire to learn about the history of San Francisco, it would be helpful if historic sites and landmarks were well identified to passers-by with plaques or other signage. Signs have recently been erected to mark the boundaries of local historic districts, drawing attention to those areas.

Technical information relating to preservation in San Francisco is currently available through the City's Preservation Bulletin series, available online. Additional information can be disseminated through a website.

Implementation: Planning staff will create a website that will address historic preservation and survey efforts. The Planning Department will work with other agencies to implement a plaque and signage program.

POLICY 7.2*DRAFT*
Encourage public participation in identification of potential historic resources.
The public can play a very important role in identifying historic resources. Neighbors, long-time San Francisco residents, and local historians, may be privy to information not widely known about buildings or other resources that would qualify them as historically significant. Such participation is very helpful for planning and environmental decision-making, and is highly encouraged.

Implementation: The Planning Department will continue to encourage the public to submit information about potential Landmarks using Preservation Bulletin No. 19: Potential San Francisco Landmarks Evaluation Form.

POLICY 7.3*DRAFT*
Encourage activities that foster awareness and appreciation of historic events and resources.
Commemoration of historic events and resources serves to educate the public about the history of San Francisco. The recent 100-year anniversary of the 1906 Earthquake and Fire brought much media and public attention to history of the City. Other activities, such as walking tours, are interactive and can help make history come alive.

Implementation: Planning staff will work on a website that will address historic preservation and survey efforts. The Planning Department will work with other agencies to implement a plaque and signage program.

PROMOTION OF SUSTAINABILITY

OBJECTIVE 8*DRAFT*
PROMOTE THE PRINCIPLES OF SUSTAINABILITY FOR THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT THROUGH THE INHERENTLY "GREEN" STRATEGY OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION.

Environmental sustainability and preservation of historic resources are complementary. Historic resources were shaped by humankind's response to the environment. It is not just nostalgia that draws people to historic buildings. Much of what is valued about these structures is their response to the climate, natural setting, and locally available building materials; their usefulness as models for new buildings adds to their value. Older buildings are nonrenewable resources. Creatively reusing historic buildings is a form of recycling. The sensitive and effective management, preservation and maintenance of historic resources recognize that.

Policy 8.1*DRAFT*
Encourage sustainability of historic resources consistent with the goals and objectives of the Sustainability Plan for the City and County of San Francisco.

Ongoing commitment to historic resource conservation saves, recycles, rehabilitates and reuses valuable materials.

San Francisco has adopted a *Sustainability Plan* that addresses environmental topics including energy, hazardous materials, water, human health, parks, open spaces, streetscapes, and transportation. It is the policy of San Francisco to promote resource conservation, rehabilitation of the built environment, and adaptive reuse of historical resources using an environmentally sensitive "green building standards" approach to development. The components of green building standards include resource-efficient design principles both in rehabilitation and deconstruction projects, the appropriate selection of materials, space allocation within buildings and sites for recycling, and low-waste landscaping techniques. The salvage and reuse of construction and demolition materials that are structurally sound as part of new construction and rehabilitation projects promotes the principles of green building standards.

Implementation: The City will mandate green building strategies, and historic preservation will be considered one strategy.

DEVELOPMENT OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE PLANS

OBJECTIVE 9*DRAFT*
PREPARE HISTORIC RESOURCES FOR NATURAL OR OTHER DISASTERS AND DEVELOP EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE PLANS THAT CONSIDER THESE RESOURCES.

The development of an emergency preparedness plan for historic resources requires commitment and innovative decision-making by San Francisco's leaders to protect, rehabilitate, and seismically retrofit historic resources before and after a natural disaster. In addition, a coordinated effort among the Office of Emergency Services, Department of Building Inspection, Fire Department, and Planning Department is necessary to develop a response plan specifically tailored to the protection of historic resources.

POLICY 9.1*DRAFT*
Preserve, consistent with life safety considerations, the architectural character of buildings and structures important to the unique visual image of San Francisco, and increase the likelihood that architecturally and historically valuable structures will survive future earthquakes.

Older buildings are among those most vulnerable to destruction or heavy damage from a large earthquake. They may not have the more recent engineering features that make buildings more resistant to ground shaking, and many of them are located in areas near the Bay and the historic Bay inlets that were among the earliest parts of the City to be settled, and have the softest soil. The part of the City most vulnerable to fire, the dense downtown area, also contains many historic structures. A major earthquake could result in an irreplaceable loss of the historic fabric of San Francisco. The City needs to achieve the related goals of increasing life safety and preserving these buildings for future generations by increasing their ability to withstand earthquake forces.

When new programs are being considered to abate hazards posed by existing buildings and structures, the likely impacts of those programs on historic buildings must be thoroughly investigated. The resulting programs should encourage the retrofit of historic buildings in ways that preserve their architectural design character while increasing life safety. When development concessions, transfers of development rights or City funds are granted to promote preservation of historic buildings, there should be reasonable measures taken to increase the building's chances of surviving future earthquakes.

Implementation: The Planning Department will coordinate with the Department of Building Inspection to develop disaster preparation plans that address the protection of historic resources.

POLICY 9.2*DRAFT*
Ensure that historic resources are protected in the aftermath of a disaster.
Preservation of the City's historic resources is an immediate concern when damage is being assessed. The older construction techniques of historic buildings make them more vulnerable to damage, and if the damage is noted without recognition of the resources' historic value, the building can be at risk of further damage or demolition.

Accurate information about heritage resources is fundamental to ensuring resources are not lost. Complete survey information ensures that resource documentation of relevant buildings exists, and this information can be mapped and used by assessors in the tagging of buildings post-disaster. The City should therefore continue its ongoing survey efforts. While that survey is underway, the City should make use of existing survey information, including privately developed property reviews, by consolidating this data in one place so that it is available should such a disaster occur.

Post-disaster assessment should include an analysis of the extent of the damage to historic areas and resources. In a typical assessment scenario, assessors will attach a green tag if a building is structurally sound, a yellow tag where repairs are needed, and a red tag if the structure is uninhabitable. In order to ensure sufficient protection for historic resources post-disaster, this system should be amended to include separate placards that identify the building as an historic resource. Without such identification, the buildings are at risk: for example, one such unidentified resource in New Orleans, tagged as unsafe, but not scheduled for demolition, was used to demonstrate demolition equipment by unknowledgeable staff, and eventually collapsed.

Implementation: The Planning Department will coordinate with the Department of Building Inspection to develop disaster preparation plans that address the protection of historic resources.

Appendix

PRESERVATION ELEMENT GLOSSARY

[to be added soon]