SAN FRANCISCO
**PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

# CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination

## PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

| Project Address | | Block/Lot(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 68 Ventura Avenue | | 2817/012 | |
| Case No. | Permit No. | Plans Dated | |
| 2016-004294ENV | | 02/01/2016 | |
| ☑ Addition/ Alteration | ☐ Demolition (requires HRER if over 45 years old) | ☐ New Construction | ☐ Project Modification **(GO TO STEP 7)** |

Project description for Planning Department approval.

Vertical addition to an existing one-story single-family home. Interior remodel and renovation. Horizontal expansion at first floor. Facade alterations.

## STEP 1: EXEMPTION CLASS
**TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

| *Note: If neither class applies, an *Environmental Evaluation Application* is required.* | |
|---|---|
| ☑ | **Class 1 – Existing Facilities.** Interior and exterior alterations; additions under 10,000 sq. ft. |
| ☐ | **Class 3 – New Construction/ Conversion of Small Structures.** Up to three (3) new single-family residences or six (6) dwelling units in one building; commercial/office structures; utility extensions.; .; change of use under 10,000 sq. ft. if principally permitted or with a CU. Change of use under 10,000 sq. ft. if principally permitted or with a CU. |
| ☐ | **Class**___ |

## STEP 2: CEQA IMPACTS
**TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

| **If any box is checked below, an *Environmental Evaluation Application* is required.** | |
|---|---|
| ☐ | **Air Quality:** Would the project add new sensitive receptors (specifically, schools, day care facilities, hospitals, residential dwellings, and senior-care facilities) within an Air Pollution Exposure Zone? Does the project have the potential to emit substantial pollutant concentrations (e.g., backup diesel generators, heavy industry, diesel trucks)? *Exceptions: do not check box if the applicant presents documentation of enrollment in the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) Article 38 program and the project would not have the potential to emit substantial pollutant concentrations. (refer to EP _ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Air Pollutant Exposure Zone)* |
| ☐ | **Hazardous Materials:** If the project site is located on the Maher map or is suspected of containing hazardous materials (based on a previous use such as gas station, auto repair, dry cleaners, or heavy manufacturing, or a site with underground storage tanks): Would the project involve 50 cubic yards or more of soil disturbance - or a change of use from industrial to residential? If yes, this box must be checked and the project applicant must submit an Environmental Application with a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. *Exceptions: do not check box if the applicant presents documentation of enrollment in the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) Maher program, a DPH waiver from the* |

| | |
|---|---|
| | *Maher program, or other documentation from Environmental Planning staff that hazardous material effects would be less than significant (refer to EP_ArcMap > Maher layer).* |
| ☐ | **Transportation:** Does the project 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? |
| ☐ | **Archeological Resources:** Would the project result in soil disturbance/modification greater than two (2) feet below grade in an archeological sensitive area or eight (8) feet in a non-archeological sensitive area? *(refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Archeological Sensitive Area)* |
| ☐ | **Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment:** Does the project site involve a subdivision or lot line adjustment on a lot with a slope average of 20% or more? *(refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography)* |
| ☐ | **Slope = or > 20%:** Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? *(refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Topography)* **If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required.** |
| ☐ | **Seismic: Landslide Zone:** Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? *(refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones)* **If box is checked, a geotechnical report is required.** |
| ☐ | **Seismic: Liquefaction Zone:** Does the project involve any of the following: (1) square footage expansion greater than 1,000 sq. ft. outside of the existing building footprint, (2) excavation of 50 cubic yards or more of soil, (3) new construction? *(refer to EP_ArcMap > CEQA Catex Determination Layers > Seismic Hazard Zones)* **If box is checked, a geotechnical report will likely be required.** |
| **If no boxes are checked above, GO TO STEP 3. <u>If one or more boxes are checked above, an *Environmental Evaluation Application* is required, unless reviewed by an Environmental Planner.</u>** | |
| ☑ | **Project can proceed with categorical exemption review. The project does not trigger any of the CEQA impacts listed above.** |
| **Comments and Planner Signature (*optional*):** Erica Russell Digitally signed by Erica Russell DN: cn=Erica Russell, o=Environmental Planning, ou=City Planning, email=erica.russell@sfgov.org, c=US Date: 2016.10.04 14:35:52 -07'00' | |

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

| PROPERTY IS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING: *(refer to Parcel Information Map)* | |
|---|---|
| ☑ | **Category A:** Known Historical Resource. **GO TO STEP 5.** |
| ☐ | **Category B:** Potential Historical Resource (over 45 years of age). **GO TO STEP 4.** |
| ☐ | **Category C:** Not a Historical Resource or Not Age Eligible (under 45 years of age). **GO TO STEP 6.** |

## STEP 4: PROPOSED WORK CHECKLIST
**TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER**

| Check all that apply to the project. | |
|---|---|
| ☐ | 1. **Change of use and new construction.** Tenant improvements not included. |
| ☐ | 2. **Regular maintenance or repair** to correct or repair deterioration, decay, or damage to building. |
| ☐ | 3. **Window replacement** that meets the Department's *Window Replacement Standards.* Does not include storefront window alterations. |
| ☐ | 4. **Garage work.** A new opening that meets the *Guidelines for Adding Garages and Curb Cuts,* and/or replacement of a garage door in an existing opening that meets the Residential Design Guidelines. |
| ☐ | 5. **Deck, terrace construction, or fences** not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way. |
| ☐ | 6. **Mechanical equipment installation** that is not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way. |
| ☐ | 7. **Dormer installation** that meets the requirements for exemption from public notification under *Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 3: Dormer Windows.* |
| ☐ | 8. **Addition(s)** that are not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way for 150 feet in each direction; does not extend vertically beyond the floor level of the top story of the structure or is only a single story in height; does not have a footprint that is more than 50% larger than that of the original building; and does not cause the removal of architectural significant roofing features. |
| **Note: Project Planner must check box below before proceeding.** | |
| ☐ | Project is not listed. **GO TO STEP 5.** |
| ☐ | Project **does not conform** to the scopes of work. **GO TO STEP 5.** |
| ☐ | Project involves **four or more** work descriptions. **GO TO STEP 5.** |
| ☐ | Project involves **less than four** work descriptions. **GO TO STEP 6.** |

## STEP 5: CEQA IMPACTS – ADVANCED HISTORICAL REVIEW
**TO BE COMPLETED BY PRESERVATION PLANNER**

| Check all that apply to the project. | |
|---|---|
| ☐ | 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. |
| ☐ | 2. **Interior alterations to publicly accessible spaces.** |
| ☐ | 3. **Window replacement** of original/historic windows that are not "in-kind" but are consistent with existing historic character. |
| ☐ | 4. **Façade/storefront alterations** that do not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features. |
| ☐ | 5. **Raising the building** in a manner that does not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features. |
| ☐ | 6. **Restoration** based upon documented evidence of a building's historic condition, such as historic photographs, plans, physical evidence, or similar buildings. |
| ☐ | 7. **Addition(s)**, including mechanical equipment that are minimally visible from a public right-of-way and meet the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.* |
| ☐ | 8. **Other work consistent** with the *Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* (*specify or add comments*): |

| | |
|---|---|
| ☐ | 9. **Other work** that would not materially impair a historic district (specify or add comments):<br><br>*(Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator)* _____ |
| ☐ | 10. **Reclassification of property status.** *(Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator)*<br>☐ Reclassify to Category A ☐ Reclassify to Category C<br>a. Per HRER dated: _____ *(attach HRER)*<br>b. Other *(specify)*: |
| **Note: If ANY box in STEP 5 above is checked, a Preservation Planner MUST check one box below.** | |
| ☑ | **Further environmental review required.** Based on the information provided, the project requires an *Environmental Evaluation Application* to be submitted. **GO TO STEP 6.** |
| ☐ | **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*):**<br>Determination of Project's Impact to Historic Resource (HR Part 2) required. | |
| **Preservation Planner Signature:** Elizabeth Gordon Jonckheer Digitally signed by Elizabeth Gordon Jonckheer DN: dc=org, dc=sfgov, dc=cityplanning, ou=CityPlanning, ou=Current Planning, cn=Elizabeth Gordon Jonckheer, email=Elizabeth.Gordon-Jonckheer@sfgov.org Date: 2016.12.09 14:51:06 -08'00' | |

## STEP 6: CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DETERMINATION
### TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

| | |
|---|---|
| ☑ | **Further environmental review required.** Proposed project does not meet scopes of work in either *(check all that apply)*:<br>☐ Step 2 – CEQA Impacts<br>☑ Step 5 – Advanced Historical Review HR Part 2 required.<br>**STOP! Must file an *Environmental Evaluation Application.*** |
| ☐ | **No further environmental review is required. The project is categorically exempt under CEQA.** |

**Planner Name:** Elizabeth Jonckheer

**Signature:**

Elizabeth Gordon Jonckheer

Digitally signed by Elizabeth Gordon Jonckheer
DN: dc=org, dc=sfgov, dc=cityplanning, ou=CityPlanning, ou=Current Planning, cn=Elizabeth Gordon Jonckheer, email=Elizabeth.Gordon-Jonckheer@sfgov.org
Date: 2016.12.09 14:52:02 -08'00'

**Project Approval Action:**

Building Permit

If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project.

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: | |
|---|---|
| ☐ | Result in expansion of the building envelope, as defined in the Planning Code; |
| ☐ | Result in the change of use that would require public notice under Planning Code Sections 311 or 312; |
| ☐ | Result in demolition as defined under Planning Code Section 317 or 19005(f)? |
| ☐ | 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

| ☐ | 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

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

Reception:
**415.558.6378**

Fax:
**415.558.6409**

Planning
Information:
**415.558.6377**

| | |
|---|---|
| *Date* | November 3, 2016 |
| *Case No.:* | **2016-004294ENV** |
| *Project Address:* | **68 Ventura Avenue** |
| *Zoning:* | RH-1 (D) (Residential – House, One-Family-Detached)<br>40-X Height and Bulk District |
| *Block/Lot:* | 2817/012 |
| *Date of Review:* | November 3, 2016 (Part I) |
| *Staff Contact:* | Elizabeth Gordon Jonckheer (Preservation Planner)<br>(415) 575-8728<br>elizabeth.gordon-jonckheer@sfgov.org |

## PART I: HISTORIC RESOURCE EVALUATION

### Buildings and Property Description

68 Ventura Avenue is located on the south side of Ventura Avenue between Linares and Castenada Avenues in the Forest Hill neighborhood of San Francisco. 68 Ventura Avenue is located on a fan-shaped lot measuring approximately 33 feet at the front, 49 feet at the rear, and 100 feet in length, within a RH-1(D) (Residential, House, One-Family-Detached) Zoning District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District. The building is setback approximately 13 feet from the back of sidewalk on an upward sloping lot.

According to the Supplemental Historic Resource Determination prepared by prepared by Jeffrey Wood Architects (dated April 14, 2016), and information found in the Planning Department files, the date of construction for 68 Ventura Avenue varies. The Assessor's Office shows the date of construction as 1923. Spring Valley Water Tap records note an application for service dated May 31, 1923. There was a retap on February 2, 1926 indicating that the actual date of construction may have occurred later, however. San Francisco Building Department records show a new construction permit issued June 24, 1927. The subject property first appears on the 1928 Sanborn Map, with the same footprint as it has now. The property contains a two-story, rectangular plan, single-family residence designed in a vernacular style with Mediterranean Revival influences. The builder and/or architect for the property are unknown. The primary façade has a garage door in the left bay and a small window in the right bay. The second story has a paired wood sash window with rope twisted balustrades in the left bay and a three-part wood sash window divided by rope twisted balustrades in the right bay. The windows are slighted recessed from the façade and have swing-out wood windows. A section of red clay tiles caps the wall/roof junction over the windows. The entrance is reached via concrete steps to a landing with an arched, recessed opening with a wood glazed door. The only permitted alteration was made in 1984 for an interior remodel and replacement of broken windows in the kitchen.

The property was first held by Newell-Murdoch Realty and purchased by William H. Rilen in 1915. In 1920 John Rosenfield & Sons Realty sold the property to George E. Grant who appears to have worked in their realty office. Grant sold the property to F.E. Knox Jr. on April 7, 1924 who promptly sold it to August J. Lang, of Lang Realty, the same day. In September of 1925 the property was purchased by Lilla Miller Lomax who resided at the property. Lomax sold the property to Cynthia Grossman in 1927 who then sold it to L.E. Maguire in 1936. Lomax, Grossman and Maguire had unknown occupations. Hjalmar W. and Grace L. Jorgensen purchased the property in 1937. Mr. Jorgensen was a salesman at Lang Realty; Ms. Jorgensen resided at the property until 1984. George and Kay Kartsiovkas owned the property from 1984 until 1988 and sold it to Tsao Huei-Ling in 2002. The present owner, John Pfeifer, purchased the property in 2003.

## Pre-Existing Historic Rating / Survey

The subject property is not included on any historic resource surveys or listed on any local, state or national registries. The building 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

*Forest Hill*[1]

68 Ventura Avenue was built in the secluded Forest Hill residential neighborhood which is located southwest of the geographical center of San Francisco. Forest Hill is located in the West of Twin Peaks area across from Laguna Honda Hospital, in a hilly site roughly bounded by Laguna Honda Boulevard, Vasquez Avenue, Kensington Way, Taraval Street, and 12th Avenue. Dewey Boulevard bisects the tract and is relatively flat, but to the west the streets are steep with sharp turns. East of Dewey, the streets are nearly flat until they run up against the promontory known as Edgehill. However, the majority of Forest Hill is laid out in a curvilinear street and block arrangement that responds to the hilly topography. This arrangement distinguishes it from the grid in the surrounding neighborhoods to the north and west.

Forest Hill was developed on part of the holdings of the Adolph Sutro, whose heirs sold the land to the Residential Development Company (RDC) in 1910. RDC soon sold the tract to the Newell-Murdoch Realty Company. Construction began in 1912 in Forest Hill (north of Dewey Boulevard) and building began on Forest Hill Extension (south of Dewey Boulevard) on May 8, 1913. The land for Forest Hill was owned by the Newell-Murdoch Company. Newell-Murdoch actively advertised the creation and early sales of Forest Hill, claiming that they would incorporate the best features found in the residence parks in Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Boston, and New York, as well as artistic features from England and the Riviera. The Newell-Murdoch Realty Company was a partnership of Robert C. Newell and William C.

[1] Discussion of the Forest Hill neighborhood is excerpted from the draft Historic Context Statement, Gardens in the City: San Francisco Residence Parks, 1906-1940, dated May 1, 2016.

Murdoch. Robert C. Newell (1878–1963) was born in Iowa and moved to California in the 1890s, settling in Piedmont. Newel entered the real estate business in 1909 to develop the Thousand Oaks neighborhood in Oakland. He rose to serve as president of the San Francisco Real Estate board before leaving the real estate business in 1921. He moved into brokerage and insurance, serving as a director and vice president of the Title Insurance and Guaranty. William C. Murdoch, Jr. (1884–1968) served as a cashier in the Western National Bank before entering real estate with Newell. In 1921, Murdoch also left real estate to join in a stock brokerage business with Newell to form Newell, Murdoch, Railey & Company.

Hoping to capitalize on their successful residential development of Thousand Oaks, Newell-Murdock hired the same architect, Mark Daniels, to design the new community of Forest Hill. Daniels had recently completed the master plan for Sea Cliff and Bel-Air in Beverly Hills. Rather than attempting to grid the streets over the hilly terrain, Daniels opted to allow the streets to wind naturally around the land's contours, using retaining walls as necessary. Daniels acknowledged that the winding streets were misleading to visitors, but countered that the residents had no objections. Two arteries were provided (Pacheco and Magellan), with winding secondary streets adding a picturesque effect with the benefit of slowing traffic. Bernard Maybeck designed three houses within Forest Hill as well as the Forest Hill clubhouse during the 1910s. However, by March 1919, the residents of Forest Hill proved so dissatisfied with Newell-Murdoch's oversight of the tract that they took over the management of streets, sewers, and lighting from the company. The following year, the Lang Realty Company bought out the disengaging Newell-Murdoch Company and began planning, financing, and constructing new houses in Forest Hill. Lang Realty Company was a prolific, family-run development firm active in the Bay Area from 1915 through the 1950s. Throughout the 1920s, Lang Realty used Forest Hill to highlight their work, and opened a "San Francisco Model House" in the tract to showcase design features.

Lang Realty was founded by August J. Lang (1865–1955) in 1915. He came to San Francisco in 1878, and opened a butcher shop and brewery before establishing a real-estate firm. A. J. Lang, Jr. joined the business in 1919, and worked in Forest Hill, the Parkside District, and later Marin County, until his death in 1946. Several members of the Lang family had previous experience in the building industry, working as managers and salesmen at major construction and sales firms, including F. Nelson and Sons, and Oscar Heyman and Brothers. In the early 1920s, the firm was in the business of real estate, insurance, and home building, promoting itself as exclusive sales agents for Forest Hill, Claremont Court, and Balboa Terrace. Marketed as "Real Estate, Insurance, and Home Builders," in the mid-1920s, during a peak period of construction, Lang Realty consisted of August Lang, sons August, Jr., William, and Rudolph Lang, and hired in-house architects, including W. E. Hughson and Harold G. Stoner, who designed whimsical houses in a range of Period Revival styles. In 1927, Stoner designed a Flemish cottage that became one of four model homes commissioned and opened for tours "under the auspices of the [San Francisco] Chronicle." Other homes were designed by individually commissioned architects in a variety of revival styles including Italian Renaissance Revival, French Renaissance Revival, Colonial Revival, Tudor Revival, Spanish-Colonial Revival, Moorish Revival, and Roman Beaux-Arts Revival. Morrow and Morrow designed what many consider to be the first Modern (International) Style house in San Francisco in 1933 at 171 San Marcos Avenue. During the 1920s and early 1930s, the Lang Realty Company

constructed and sold several of the remaining lots within the Forest Hill neighborhood. By 1937, operation of the firm passed to August Lang's three sons August, Rudolph, and William (who was president of the San Francisco Board of Realtors).

Forest Hill is a historic district eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 1 (Events) and Criterion 3 (Architecture) at the local level as an early middle class community in San Francisco, as an example of the distinctive characteristics of a type and period, and as an area that possesses high artistic values (see draft Historic Context Statement, Gardens in the City: San Francisco Residence Parks, 1906-1940, dated May 1, 2016.) Specifically, this eligible historic district is notable for the high concentration of early twentieth-century residences that were designed mostly in Revival architectural styles. The period of significance ranges from 1912 (earliest date of construction) to 1939 (latest date of construction related to Lang Realty Company).

The immediate area of the subject property along Ventura Avenue is varied in character and consists largely of one- and two story detached single-family residences constructed in the 1920s and 1930s. The immediate block has several single-family residences constructed in the 1920s. The surrounding area features a mix of period revival architectural styles, including Spanish Colonial Revival, Mediterranean Revival, Tudor Revival, and Modern.

## 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.*

Based on the California Register significance criteria, Department staff finds that the subject property at 68 Ventura Avenue is not individually-eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources, but is eligible as a contributing resource to the Forest Hill Historic District. The Forest Hill Historic District is eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 1 (Events) and Criterion 3 (Architecture) at the local level as an early middle class community in San Francisco, as an example of the distinctive characteristics of a type and period, and as an area that possesses high artistic values. Specifically, as noted above, this eligible historic district is notable for the high concentration of early twentieth-century residences that were designed mostly in Revival architectural styles, including Italian Renaissance Revival, French Renaissance Revival, Colonial Revival, Tudor Revival, Spanish-Colonial Revival, Moorish Revival, and Roman Beaux-Arts Revival. The period of significance ranges from 1912 (earliest date of construction) to 1939 (latest date of construction related to Lang Realty Company).

To assist in the evaluation of the subject building, the project architect (Jeffrey Wood Architects) prepared a Supplemental Information Form for Historic Resource Evaluation (dated April 14, 2016).

Based on the following criteria, the subject property eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources as a contributing resource to an eligible historic district:

| 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: | ☐ Yes ☒ No | Criterion 1 - Event: | ☒ Yes ☐ No |
| Criterion 2 - Persons: | ☐ Yes ☒ No | Criterion 2 - Persons: | ☐ Yes ☒ No |
| Criterion 3 - Architecture: | ☐ Yes ☒ No | Criterion 3 - Architecture: | ☒ Yes ☐ No |
| Criterion 4 - Info. Potential: | ☐ Yes ☒ No | Criterion 4 - Info. Potential: | ☐ Yes ☒ No |
| Period of Significance: | | Period of Significance: 1912 to 1939<br>☒ Contributor ☐ Non-Contributor | |

**Criterion 1: Property 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.**

Although the date of construction for 68 Ventura Avenue is not certain, and the builder and/or architect of the property are unknown, the building contains the same footprint as first appears on the 1928 Sanborn Map, without major alterations. Moreover, the two-story, rectangular plan, single-family residence is designed in a vernacular style with Mediterranean Revival influences within the period of significance and era of development for the Forest Hill Historic District, and possesses many of the features of the Historic District. As noted above, often, residences within neighborhood were designed in a hybrid approach and combined different features from each of the Revival architectural styles. While the subject property may not be a strong or outstanding contributor, it nevertheless contributes to the District.

Based upon the submitted Supplemental Historic Resource Determination and Planning Department records, 68 Ventura Avenue and is eligible for inclusion in the California Register as a contributor to a historic district under Criterion 1 (Events).

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

As indicated previously, the property was first held by Newell-Murdoch Realty and purchased by William H. Rilen in 1915. In 1920 John Rosenfield & Sons Realty sold the property to George E. Grant

who appears to have worked in their realty office. Grant sold the property to F.E. Knox Jr. on April 7, 1924 who promptly sold it to August J. Lang, of Lang Realty, the same day. In September of 1925 the property was purchased by Lilla Miller Lomax who resided at the property. Lomax sold the property to Cynthia Grossman in 1927 who then sold it to L.E. Maguire in 1936. Lomax, Grossman and Maguire had unknown occupations. Hjalmar W. and Grace L. Jorgensen purchased the property in 1937. Mr. Jorgensen was a salesman at Lang Realty; Ms. Jorgensen resided at the property until 1984. George and Kay Kartsiovkas owned the property from 1984 until 1988 and sold it to Tsao Huei-Ling in 2002. The present owner, John Pfeifer, purchased the property in 2003.

Although,August J. Lang, of Lang Realty held the property between 1924-1925, occupancy records do not show that he lived there. None of the other individuals appear to be historically significant at the local, state or national level.

Based on the submitted report and Planning Department records, no persons of known historical significance appear to have been associated with the subject building; therefore, 68 Ventura Avenue is not eligible for listing in California Register under Criterion 2 (Persons) either individually or as part of a historic district.

**Criterion 3: Property 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.**

68 Ventura Avenue is a two-story, rectangular plan, single-family residence is designed in a vernacular style with Mediterranean Revival influences. As noted above, the subject property first appears on the 1928 Sanborn Map, with the same footprint as it has now. The property contains a two-story, rectangular plan, single-family residence designed in a vernacular style with Mediterranean Revival influences. The primary façade has a garage door in the left bay and a small window in the right bay. The second story has a paired wood window with rope twisted balustrades in the left bay and a three-part wood window divided by rope twisted balustrades in the right bay. The windows are slighted recessed from the façade and have swing-out wood windows. A section of red clay tiles caps the wall/roof junction over the windows. The entrance is reached via concrete steps to a landing with an arched, recessed opening with a wood glazed door. The only permitted alteration was made in 1984 for an interior remodel and replacement of broken windows in the kitchen.

Overall, the subject property is not particularly distinguished for its architectural style; however, as part of a collection of residences, the subject property does contribute to the overall feeling and style of the surrounding eligible historic district.

68 Ventura Avenue is located within the Forest Hills neighborhood, which is an eligible historic district, originally developed by the real estate developers, Newell-Murdoch, and noted landscape architect, Mark Daniels. Daniels is credited with several other developments in California including Sea Cliff, St. Francis Wood, St. Mary's Park, Crocker-Amazon, in San Francisco; the 17-Mile Drive in Pebble Beach; the

Thousand Oaks development in Berkeley; and Bel-Air in Los Angeles. The Forest Hill Historic District is significant for the collection of single-family residences, which embody the distinctive characteristics of a type and period and also express high artistic values. The residences located in the Forest Hill Historic District were designed to evoke specific picturesque imagery. Often, the residences were designed in a hybrid approach and combined different features from each of these architectural styles. Common architectural styles within this neighborhood included: Italian Renaissance Revival, French Renaissance Revival, Colonial Revival, Tudor Revival, Spanish-Colonial Revival, Moorish Revival, and Roman Beaux-Arts Revival.

Based on the submitted report and Planning Department records, 68 Ventura Avenue is not individually eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 3 (Architecture), but is eligible for inclusion in the California Register as a contributing resource to an eligible historic district. Again, while the subject property may not be a strong or outstanding contributor, as a Mediterranean Revival single-family residence, it nevertheless contributes to the architectural and historic character of the Forest Hill Historic District.

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

Criterion 4 is typically associated with archaeological resources. Based upon a review of information in the Departments records, the subject building is not significant under Criterion 4 since this significance criterion typically applies to rare construction types when involving the built environment and the subject building is not an example of a rare construction type.

**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:** | ☒ Retains | ☐ Lacks | **Setting:** | ☒ Retains | ☐ Lacks |
| **Association:** | ☒ Retains | ☐ Lacks | **Feeling:** | ☒ Retains | ☐ Lacks |
| **Design:** | ☒ Retains | ☐ Lacks | **Materials:** | ☒ Retains | ☐ Lacks |
| **Workmanship:** | ☒ Retains | ☐ Lacks | | | |

68 Ventura Avenue retains historic integrity and has had limited exterior alterations. Since its initial construction as a single-family residence, few documented alterations have occurred to the subject property. The documented alterations in 1984 include: an interior kitchen remodel (replace sheetrock, a door and installation of new cabinets) and replacement of broken windows in the kitchen.

**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.*

The character-defining features of the subject property include:

- Form and massing;
- Stucco exterior;
- Two and three-part, swing-out, wood sash windows divided by rope twisted balustrades;
- Red clay tile roof; and
- Main entryway with an arched, recessed opening.

The character-defining features of the eligible historic include, but are not limited to:

- Single-family residence on large lots;
- One- or two-story form and massing;
- Front and side setbacks (landscaped);
- Stucco, brick or wood cladding;
- Multi-lite, wood-sash windows;
- Plaster or wood ornamentation
- Raised/open entryways;
- Articulated roof form; and
- Architectural features that contribute to the district's "picturesque" character.

**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 Date: 11-28-16

Tina Tam, *Senior Preservation Planner*



Main façade.



Oblique view