

2015-006744ENV



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION APPLICATION COVER MEMO - PUBLIC PROJECTS ONLY

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.

Please attach this memo along with all necessary materials to the Environmental Evaluation Application.

950 Golden Gate Ave.

Project Address and/or Title:	Margaret Hayward/James Lang Field-1016 Laguna Street	
Project Approval Action:	RPD Commission-date TBD	
Will the approval action be taken at a noticed public hearing? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES* <input type="checkbox"/> NO		
* If YES is checked, please see below.		

IF APPROVAL ACTION IS TAKEN AT A NOTICED PUBLIC HEARING, INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING CALENDAR LANGUAGE:

End of Calendar: CEQA Appeal Rights under Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code If the Commission approves an action identified by an exemption or negative declaration as the Approval Action (as defined in S.F. Administrative Code Chapter 31, as amended, Board of Supervisors Ordinance Number 161-13), then the CEQA decision prepared in support of that Approval Action is thereafter subject to appeal within the time frame specified in S.F. Administrative Code Section 31.16. Typically, an appeal must be filed within 30 calendar days of the Approval Action. For information on filing an appeal under Chapter 31, contact the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors at City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102, or call (415) 554-5184. If the Department's Environmental Review Officer has deemed a project to be exempt from further environmental review, an exemption determination has been prepared and can be obtained on-line at <http://sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=3447>. Under CEQA, in a later court challenge, a litigant may be limited to raising only those issues previously raised at a hearing on the project or in written correspondence delivered to the Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, Planning Department or other City board, commission or department at, or prior to, such hearing, or as part of the appeal hearing process on the CEQA decision.

Individual calendar items: This proposed action is the Approval Action as defined by S.F. Administrative Code Chapter 31.

THE FOLLOWING MATERIALS ARE INCLUDED:

- 2 sets of plans (11x17)
- Project description
- Photos of proposed work areas/project site
- Necessary background reports (specified in EEA)
- MTA only: Synchro data for lane reductions and traffic calming projects



SAN FRANCISCO

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

CEQA Categorical Exemption Determination

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Address		Block/Lot(s)	
950 Golden Gate Ave. (RPD Margaret S Hayward Playground & James P Lang Fields)		0759/001	
Case No.	Permit No.	Plans Dated	
2015-006744ENV		1/31/17	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addition/ Alteration	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Demolition (requires HRER if over 45 years old)	<input type="checkbox"/> New Construction	<input type="checkbox"/> Project Modification (GO TO STEP 7)
Project description for Planning Department approval.			
Demolition, renovation and/or consolidation of park structures, including buildings, storage, and restrooms. Improved park access. Replacement of sports courts and fields, children's play area, and related amenities. Lot line adjustment: expand Dept. of Emergency Management (DEM) property to the south and reduce DEM property to the east resulting in a net increase of park land of approx. 7,733 sq. ft.			

STEP 1: EXEMPTION CLASS

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

Note: If neither class applies, an Environmental Evaluation Application is required.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Class 1 – Existing Facilities. Interior and exterior alterations; additions under 10,000 sq. ft.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Class 4(b) 4(b) - landscaping of parks.

STEP 2: CEQA IMPACTS

TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

If any box is checked below, an Environmental Evaluation Application is required.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality: Would the project add new sensitive receptors (specifically, schools, day care facilities, hospitals, residential dwellings, and senior-care facilities) within an Air Pollution Exposure Zone? Does the project have the potential to emit substantial pollutant concentrations (e.g., backup diesel generators, heavy industry, diesel trucks)? <i>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)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	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. <i>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</i>

	<i>Maher program, or other documentation from Environmental Planning staff that hazardous material effects would be less than significant (refer to EP_ArcMap > Maher layer).</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Transportation: Does the project create six (6) or more net new parking spaces or residential units? Does the project have the potential to adversely affect transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle safety (hazards) or the adequacy of nearby transit, pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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)
<input type="checkbox"/>	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)
<input type="checkbox"/>	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.
<input type="checkbox"/>	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.
<input type="checkbox"/>	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.
<p>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></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project can proceed with categorical exemption review. The project does not trigger any of the CEQA impacts listed above.</p>	
<p>Comments and Planner Signature (optional): Jean Poling Digitally signed by Jean Poling Date: 2017.07.19 11:50:49 -07'00'</p> <p>No archeological effects.</p>	

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

PROPERTY IS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING: (refer to Parcel Information Map)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Category A: Known Historical Resource. GO TO STEP 5.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Category B: Potential Historical Resource (over 45 years of age). GO TO STEP 4.
<input type="checkbox"/>	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.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	1. Change of use and new construction. Tenant improvements not included.
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Regular maintenance or repair to correct or repair deterioration, decay, or damage to building.
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Window replacement that meets the Department's <i>Window Replacement Standards</i> . Does not include storefront window alterations.
<input type="checkbox"/>	4. Garage work. A new opening that meets the <i>Guidelines for Adding Garages and Curb Cuts</i> , and/or replacement of a garage door in an existing opening that meets the Residential Design Guidelines.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5. Deck, terrace construction, or fences not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
<input type="checkbox"/>	6. Mechanical equipment installation that is not visible from any immediately adjacent public right-of-way.
<input type="checkbox"/>	7. Dormer installation that meets the requirements for exemption from public notification under <i>Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 3: Dormer Windows</i> .
<input type="checkbox"/>	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.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Project is not listed. GO TO STEP 5 .
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project does not conform to the scopes of work. GO TO STEP 5 .
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project involves four or more work descriptions. GO TO STEP 5 .
<input type="checkbox"/>	Project involves less than four work descriptions. GO TO STEP 6 .

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

Check all that apply to the project.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	1. Project involves a known historical resource (CEQA Category A) as determined by Step 3 and conforms entirely to proposed work checklist in Step 4.
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Interior alterations to publicly accessible spaces .
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Window replacement of original/historic windows that are not "in-kind" but are consistent with existing historic character.
<input type="checkbox"/>	4. Façade/storefront alterations that do not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5. Raising the building in a manner that does not remove, alter, or obscure character-defining features.
<input type="checkbox"/>	6. Restoration based upon documented evidence of a building's historic condition, such as historic photographs, plans, physical evidence, or similar buildings.
<input type="checkbox"/>	7. Addition(s) , including mechanical equipment that are minimally visible from a public right-of-way and meet the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation</i> .
<input type="checkbox"/>	8. Other work consistent with the <i>Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties</i> (specify or add comments):

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9. Other work that would not materially impair a historic district (specify or add comments): <i>(Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator) <i>tina tam</i></i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	10. Reclassification of property status. (Requires approval by Senior Preservation Planner/Preservation Coordinator) <input type="checkbox"/> Reclassify to Category A <input type="checkbox"/> Reclassify to Category C a. Per HRER dated: _____ (attach HRER) b. Other (specify): _____
<p>Note: If ANY box in STEP 5 above is checked, a Preservation Planner MUST check one box below.</p>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Further environmental review required. Based on the information provided, the project requires an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i> to be submitted. GO TO STEP 6.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project can proceed with categorical exemption review. The project has been reviewed by the Preservation Planner and can proceed with categorical exemption review. GO TO STEP 6.
<p>Comments (optional): See ARG's memo dated June 21, 2017 regarding the contributing features for the Midcentury Recreation Historic District. The Department concluded demolition of the JP Lang Field Bleachers will not result in a significant adverse impact to the District. A thorough analysis regarding all of the pending changes to the District contributors is outlined in the HRER for the Tennis Complex (2015-005479ENV).</p>	
<p>Preservation Planner Signature: <i>tina tam</i></p>	

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	Further environmental review required. Proposed project does not meet scopes of work in either (check all that apply): <input type="checkbox"/> Step 2 – CEQA Impacts <input type="checkbox"/> Step 5 – Advanced Historical Review STOP! Must file an <i>Environmental Evaluation Application</i>.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No further environmental review is required. The project is categorically exempt under CEQA.
<p>Planner Name: Tina Tam</p> <p>Project Approval Action:</p> <p>Building Permit</p> <p>If Discretionary Review before the Planning Commission is requested, the Discretionary Review hearing is the Approval Action for the project.</p>	<p>Signature: <i>tina tam</i></p> <p>  Digitally signed by tina tam DN: dc=org, dc=sfgov, dc=cityplanning, ou=CityPlanning, ou=Current Planning, cn=tina tam, email=tina.tam@sfgov.org Date: 2017.08.01 11:07:35 -07'00' </p>
<p>Once signed or stamped and dated, this document constitutes a categorical exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines and Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code.</p> <p>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.</p>	

STEP 7: MODIFICATION OF A CEQA EXEMPT PROJECT TO BE COMPLETED BY PROJECT PLANNER

In accordance with Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, when a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exempt project changes after the Approval Action and requires a subsequent approval, the Environmental Review Officer (or his or her designee) must determine whether the proposed change constitutes a substantial modification of that project. This checklist shall be used to determine whether the proposed changes to the approved project would constitute a "substantial modification" and, therefore, be subject to additional environmental review pursuant to CEQA.

PROPERTY INFORMATION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Address (If different than front page)		Block/Lot(s) (If different than front page)
Case No.	Previous Building Permit No.	New Building Permit No.
Plans Dated	Previous Approval Action	New Approval Action
Modified Project Description:		

DETERMINATION IF PROJECT CONSTITUTES SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

Compared to the approved project, would the modified project:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Result in expansion of the building envelope, as defined in the Planning Code;
<input type="checkbox"/>	Result in the change of use that would require public notice under Planning Code Sections 311 or 312;
<input type="checkbox"/>	Result in demolition as defined under Planning Code Section 317 or 19005(f)?
<input type="checkbox"/>	Is any information being presented that was not known and could not have been known at the time of the original determination, that shows the originally approved project may no longer qualify for the exemption?
If at least one of the above boxes is checked, further environmental review is required. CONTINUE FORM	

DETERMINATION OF NO SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION

<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposed modification would not result in any of the above changes.
If this box is checked, the proposed modifications are categorically exempt under CEQA, in accordance with prior project approval and no additional environmental review is required. This determination shall be posted on the Planning Department website and office and mailed to the applicant, City approving entities, and anyone requesting written notice.	
Planner Name:	Signature or Stamp:



Memorandum

To: Jacob Gilchrist

San Francisco Recreation and Park Department
City and County of San Francisco
30 Van Ness Avenue, Third Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Project: J. P. Lang Field Bleachers – Impacts Assessment Memorandum

Project No.: 17141

Date: 21 June 2017

Via: Email

From: Sarah Hahn, Architectural Historian

Re: Historical Assessment

1. INTRODUCTION

Architectural Resources Group (ARG) has prepared this Impacts Assessment Memorandum for the James P. Lang Field Bleachers at Margaret Hayward Park in San Francisco. The bleachers were evaluated by Garavaglia Architecture in 2012 and found not to qualify for individual listing as a historic resource. Since that time, the primary bleacher structure at Turk and Octavia Streets has been identified as a contributor to the potential Midcentury Recreation Bond Historic District, which qualifies it as a historic resource under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The secondary set of bleachers at Gough Street and Golden Gate Avenue were constructed at the same time and will be assessed in conjunction with the primary bleacher structure. Both sets of bleachers are proposed for demolition. The San Francisco Planning Department has requested an impacts assessment as part of the environmental review process for the proposed demolitions.

1.1 Physical Description

The James P. Lang Field bleacher structures and softball diamonds occupy the city block bounded by Turk Street (north), Gough Street (east), Golden Gate Avenue (south), and Octavia Street (west). There are two softball fields on the lot, each with a set of bleachers. The playing fields are in between the bleacher structures, which are set at the northwest and southeast corners of the block. The following physical description is excerpted from the “James P. Lang Field Bleachers Draft Historic Resource Evaluation” completed by Garavaglia Architecture in April 2012.

The bleacher structure at the northwest corner (Bleachers No.1) is the principal facility for the field and contains restroom facilities, storage rooms, and office spaces. This reinforced concrete building is comprised of the outdoor seating area with wood bleachers, a three-sided viewing area facing the softball field, and the enclosed core of the facility. The interior restrooms and

storage areas are set under the bleachers, and accessed at the ground level at either end of the seating area. On the upper level, the office suite, which overlooks the field, is accessed via an entry door facing Turk Street. A frame of glass blocks originally surrounded this entry door, however the lower surround has been infilled and only a portion of the blocks remain around the top of the door. Though most wall surfaces are painted concrete, a stone veneer finish is seen on selected wall surfaces at the Turk Street pedestrian entry area. Two decorative steel gates, one at either side of the office entrance, secure entrance to the bleachers from this area. Bleachers No. 2, at the southeast corner is a simple reinforced concrete base structure with wood bleacher seats. Low ramps provide access from the street to the seating area at both the north and south ends. Painted steel deck panels enclose the back of the bleacher structure.¹



Figure 1. Aerial view James P. Lang Field (Google Aerial View, 2017, amended by ARG)

¹ Garavaglia Architecture, "James P. Lang Field Bleachers Draft Historic Resource Evaluation" (12 April 2012), 2.

1.2 Current Historic Status

In 2012, Garavaglia Architecture prepared a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) for the subject property and found it to be ineligible for individual listing as a historic resource under any criterion. Since that time, research has identified a discontiguous historic district of properties associated with the Recreation and Park Department's mid-century expansion of recreational facilities. The Midcentury Recreation Bond Historic District includes several building types including pools, clubhouses, recreation centers, and miscellaneous structures including a collection of playfield bleachers. The bleachers at James P. Lang field were constructed in 1956 and have been identified as contributing elements to the historic district.

2. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 Midcentury Recreation Bond Historic District

The San Francisco Recreation and Park Department (SFRPD) vastly improved San Francisco's park and recreation system in the decades immediately following World War II by constructing new recreational facilities throughout the city. Recreational bond measures passed in 1947 and 1955 funded the construction of playgrounds, clubhouses, pools, sports fields, recreation centers, and other recreational facilities.² Improvements also included the purchase of new recreational sites, installation of irrigation systems and other infrastructure, and modifications to existing facilities. This expansion effort was SFRPD's response to the dramatic increase in population and subsequent demand for recreational facilities that occurred following World War II. Shifting attitudes toward the necessity of parks in the urban landscape and an increase in leisure time also influenced park development in the post-war period.

Bond-funded recreational improvements commenced in the late 1940s and were completed in the early 1960s. Though some of the efforts funded by the bonds were less visible (irrigation systems, utility improvements), several new buildings were constructed as part of the expansion, a significant concentration of which share an aesthetic that reflects the Modern era in which they were constructed. The Midcentury Modern style – the most common Modern style of architecture built in San Francisco from 1945-1965 – was commonly applied to residential design, but was also frequently found in commercial, religious, institutional, office, and recreational property types during that period.³

In general, key characteristics of Modern buildings include the absence of historical ornament, and the use of new technologies, materials, and methods of construction. Midcentury Modern design features include cantilevered roofs and overhangs, angled asymmetry, the use of bright or contrasting colors, projecting vertical elements, brick or stone accents, projecting eaves, canted windows, stucco siding, large expanses of windows, flat or shed roof forms, stacked roman brick veneer, and sometimes, vertical wood

² Annual Report of the San Francisco Recreation Commission, 1948-1949, 9, accessed March 10, 2015, <https://archive.org/details/annualreportofsa1949sanf>; see also Declarations of Candidacy and Propositions for the General Municipal Election (November 4, 1947), 51, accessed March 10, 2015, http://sfpl.org/pdf/main/gic/elections/November4_1947.pdf.

³ Mary Brown, "San Francisco Modern Architecture and Landscape Design Historic Context Statement" (January 2011), 121.

siding.⁴ Midcentury Modern design also reflected the emerging trend toward indoor-outdoor living, and key features associated with this component of the style included overhanging or projecting trellises, atriums, and integrated planters⁵

Previous historic evaluations of buildings constructed as part of SFRPD's post-war recreational expansion have identified, but not fully defined, a potential discontiguous historic district. The National Park Service (NPS) defines a district as "a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development." A discontiguous district is defined as a grouping of significant properties separated by non-significant areas.⁶ The potential Midcentury Recreation Bond Historic District includes a series of clubhouses, pools, recreation centers, and other built resources that are associated with the pattern of recreational expansion initiated by SFRPD following World War II, and that share an aesthetic that reflects the Modern era in which they were constructed.

The table below lists all identified buildings and structures constructed by SFRPD as part of the municipal bond-funded expansion of recreational facilities throughout San Francisco. The projects are listed by building type, and alterations or demolitions have been noted. The San Francisco Recreation and Park Department has provided information on future proposed alterations to the listed properties, and contributing/non-contributors to the potential Midcentury Recreation Bond Historic District are identified.

Table 1. Midcentury Recreation Bond-Funded Buildings and Structures

Recreation Building or Structure	Location	Bond Measure Date	Built	Extant?	Proposed Alterations	Contributor/Non-Contributor
Playgrounds/Recreational Areas with Clubhouses						
Aptos Clubhouse	Aptos & Ocean Ave	1947	1950	Demolished		N/C
Argonne Clubhouse	18th Ave	1947	1952	Demolished or significantly altered		N/C
Cayuga Clubhouse	301 Naglee Ave	1947	1951	Demolished		N/C
Corona Heights Clubhouse	Roosevelt Way and State		1949	Demolished		N/C

⁴ Ibid, 2, 70, 121.

⁵ Ibid, 70, 122.

⁶ National Park Service Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation, http://www.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb15/nrb15_4.htm (accessed June 2017).

Recreation Building or Structure	Location	Bond Measure Date	Built	Extant?	Proposed Alterations	Contributor/Non-Contributor
Golden Gate Park Tennis Clubhouse	GGP	1955	1960	Extant, minimally altered	Demo planned	C
Grattan Clubhouse	1180 Stanyan St	1947	1949	Extant, few alterations, if any	No alterations currently planned	C
Hayes Valley Clubhouse		1947	1959	Demolished		N/C
Helen Wills Clubhouse		1955	1961	Demolished. Park fully renovated in 2005.		N/C
Herz (McClaren) Park Clubhouse	Hahn & Visitacion		c.1965	Extant, minimally altered	No alterations currently planned	C
Laurel Hill Clubhouse	Collins St. and Euclid Ave.	1947	Unknown	Extant, minimally altered	No alterations currently planned	C
Longfellow Clubhouse (Alice Chalmers Playground)	670 Brunswick St	1947	c.1952	Extant, partially altered	No alterations currently planned	C
Merced Heights (formerly Byxbee) Clubhouse	Byxbee & Shields St	1947	1949	Extant, minimally altered	No alterations currently planned	C
Miley (Cow Hollow) Clubhouse	Baker & Filbert St	1947	1950	Extant, minimally altered	No alterations currently planned	C
Miraloma Clubhouse	Omar & Sequoia Way	1947	1950	Extant, few alterations, if any	No alterations currently planned	C
Murphy (John P.) Clubhouse	1960 9th Ave	1947	1949	Extant, partially altered	No alterations currently planned	C

Recreation Building or Structure	Location	Bond Measure Date	Built	Extant?	Proposed Alterations	Contributor/Non-Contributor
Presidio Heights Clubhouse	Clay St (btwn. Laurel and Walnut)		1950	Extant, minimally altered	No alterations currently planned	C
Richmond Clubhouse	18th Ave & Lake	1947	1950	Extant, few alterations, if any	No alterations currently planned	C
Silver Terrace Clubhouse	Silver Ave. near Bayshore Blvd.	1947	1951	Extant, minimally altered?	No alterations currently planned	C
South Sunset Clubhouse	40th Ave & Vicente St	1947	1949	Extant, minimally altered	No alterations currently planned	C
Visitacion Valley Clubhouse	Cora and Leland Sts	1947	1950	Demolished or significantly altered		N/C
Wawona Clubhouse (Pine Lake Park)	20th Ave & Wawona	1947	1948	Extant, minimally altered	No alterations currently planned	C
West Portal Clubhouse	Ulloa and Lenox Way	1947	1950	Demolished or significantly altered		N/C
Pools						
Balboa Park Pool	Havelock Street and San Jose Ave	1947	1958	Extant, minimally altered	Renovation planned - complete 2017 CEQA review – exemption status (alteration compliant with the Standards, no significant Impact)	C
Coffman Pool	McClaren Park, Playground	1955	1958	Significantly altered 2008		N/C

Recreation Building or Structure	Location	Bond Measure Date	Built	Extant?	Proposed Alterations	Contributor/Non-Contributor
Garfield Square Pool	26th & Harrison St	1947	1957	Extant, minimally altered	Major capital improvement planned: retaining the pool shell, installing new windows, entryway, roof etc. Currently under CEQA Review - set for compliance with Secretary's Standards	C
Hamilton Playground Pool	Geary & Steiner St	1947	1955	Building retains original massing and structural elements, but was extensively altered as part of recent \$17 million improvement project		N/C
Larsen pool	2695 19th Ave	1955	1958	Replaced with new pool building in 2008		N/C
North Beach Pool		1947	1956	Renovated in 2005		N/C
Rossi Pool	600 Arguello Blvd	1947	1957		Full renovation planned	C

Recreation Building or Structure	Location	Bond Measure Date	Built	Extant?	Proposed Alterations	Contributor/Non-Contributor
Recreation Centers						
Burnett Rec Center (now Joseph Lee Rec Center)	1520-1598 Oakdale Ave	1947	1950-51	Yes, but appears significantly altered; lacks integrity		N/C
Chinese Recreation Center (now Betty Ong Rec Center)		1947	1951	Playground and rec center fully renovated in 2012 with new construction, \$21 million rec center		N/C
Eureka Valley Recreation Center and Playground	100 Collingwood St	1947	1957-58 (finalized)	Playground and field renovated in 2006: 20,050 square foot addition and full interior remodel; only a small portion of original building retained		N/C
Ocean View Recreation Center (now Minnie & Lovie Ward Recreational Center)	Capitol Avenue & Montana St	1947	1949	Demolished & replaced with new rec center facility		N/C
Potrero Hill Recreation Center	801 Arkansas St	1947		Intact, few alterations	No alterations currently planned	C
St. Mary's Rec Center	Murray & Justin Dr	1947		Intact, few alterations if any	No alterations currently planned	C

Recreation Building or Structure	Location	Bond Measure Date	Built	Extant?	Proposed Alterations	Contributor/Non-Contributor
Sunset Rec Center	2201 Lawton St	1947		Fully renovated in 2012, lacks integrity		N/C
Upper Noe Valley Recreation Center	295 Day St	1947	1957	\$11 million renovation in 2008. Diminished integrity overall, but main gym building appears to retain some integrity of design, mid-century design		C
Other Recreation Bond Improvements/Special Projects (Buildings/Structures)						
Balboa Park Soccer Stadium Bleachers (Boxer Stadium)	Havelock Street and San Jose Avenue	1955	1956	Intact, few alterations if any	No alterations currently planned	C
Corona Heights Junior Museum (now Randall Museum)	745 Treat Ave	1947	1951	Little notable alteration from available photos	Interior alterations planned, but no exterior alterations	C
Funston Bleachers (at Moscone Rec Center Park)	Bay Street and Laguna Street	1955	c.1958	Intact, few alterations if any	No alterations currently planned	C

Recreation Building or Structure	Location	Bond Measure Date	Built	Extant?	Proposed Alterations	Contributor/Non-Contributor
Golden Gate Park Handball Courts	GGP	1954		Intact, few alterations if any	No alterations currently planned	C
James D. Phelan Beach Recreation Building	China Beach	1947	1954	Intact, few alterations if any	No alterations currently planned	C
Lake Merced Sports Center (Harding Boathouse)	1 Harding Rd	1955	1959	\$3.2 million renovation completed 2014 – primarily interior. Diminished integrity, but original form, massing, fenestration patterns, location of balcony, etc. appear intact		C
(James P. Lang Field) Bleachers and entry pavilion, Margaret Hayward Park		1947	1956	Intact, few alterations if any	Demo planned	C
Recreational Arts Building	50 Scott St	1947	1957	Yes, but recently renovated and lacks integrity to original construction		N/C

Recreation Building or Structure	Location	Bond Measure Date	Built	Extant?	Proposed Alterations	Contributor/Non-Contributor
Silver Terrace Playground Concrete Bleachers		1955	c.1958	Intact, few alterations if any	No alterations currently planned	C

The period of significance for this potential California Register-eligible discontiguous historic district is 1947 to 1961, spanning the years from the date when the first bond measure passed to the date when the final bond measure project was completed.

2.2 James P. Lang Field Bleachers

The historical background information presented below has been excerpted and adapted from the “James P. Lang Field Bleachers Draft Historic Resource Evaluation” completed by Garavaglia Architecture in April 2012. The bleacher facilities and associated softball fields are located in Margaret S. Hayward Park.

In July 1918, the Playground Commission designated “that portion of Jefferson Square recently transferred from the Park Board for play purposes [as] ‘The Margaret S. Hayward Playground’ in memory of Margaret S. Hayward of the Playground Commission.” As previously noted, the playground was first divided into two sections, with the Girls’ Playground on the west half of the park, and the Boys’ Playground to the east. The original designer of the playground facilities at this site is unknown.

The Girls’ Playground originally had a field house, tennis and basketball courts, and play structures. These features were concentrated primarily on the west side of the block, with an open playfield occupying much of the southeast portion of the block. [The] modular building that now occupies the northeast corner of the block was erected in 1991, and the 911 Emergency Communications Center fronting on Turk Street was completed in 1999. After the 911 Emergency was completed, the basketball courts remained permanently at the southeast corner of the block.

The Boys’ Playground also had a small field house, basketball and tennis courts, though much of this block remained undeveloped into the 1930s. Wooden bleachers were installed in the location of the current bleacher structure at Turk and Octavia by the late 1930s, and this area is shown as a baseball field on Recreation Department drawings by 1940. The Boys’ Playground was entirely reconfigured for use as softball fields in the 1950s, and the earlier basketball and tennis courts, wooden bleachers, and field house were demolished at that time. The configuration established in the late 1950s remains essentially intact today.

Preparations for conversion of the Margaret Hayward Boys’ Playground into a softball facility began in the early 1950s, as part of the 1947 bond measure. The Recreation and Park

Commission hired architect Charles F. Strothoff to design the facilities in 1952, and the final working drawings were approved in 1954. Construction began the following year and is estimated to have been completed by 1956.

The softball field facilities were named for James P. Lang in 1977. Lang began his career as a playground director in 1928 and served as General Manager of the Recreation and Parks Department from 1963 to 1969. Before his work as General Manager, he had served as Recreation Superintendent for the Parks Department since 1958. Lang was also one of the first Presidents of the American Softball Association.

No alteration drawings were found for bleacher facilities except for a lighting renovation in 1981. Observed alterations include the removal and infill of the lower portions of the original glass block door surround at the Turk Street office entrance, and the installation of metal security grates over most, if not all, window openings.⁷

3. CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES

A character-defining feature is an aspect of a historic resource's design, construction, or detailing that is representative of the building's function, type, or architectural style. Generally, character-defining features include specific building systems, architectural ornament, construction details, massing, materials, craftsmanship, site characteristics, and landscaping within the period of significance. In order for an important historic resource to retain its significance, its character-defining features must be retained to the greatest extent possible.

3.1 Midcentury Recreation Bond Historic District

The character-defining features below are common to those buildings and structures constructed as part of the mid-century expansion of recreational facilities within the city that were funded by the 1947 and 1955 bond-measures. The significance of each district contributor is reflected in its function as a component of the city's recreational network, and in the Modern design elements that combine to visually distinguish these buildings from previous eras of construction within the park system. The general character-defining features of the Midcentury Modern style include:

- Absence of historical ornament
- Use of modern materials and construction techniques
- Angled asymmetry
- Cantilevered roofs and overhangs
- Flat or shed roof forms with projecting eave overhangs
- Use of bright or contrasting colors
- Projecting vertical elements
- Brick or stone accents
- Canted windows
- Large expanses of windows
- Stucco siding or vertical wood siding
- Stacked roman brick veneer

⁷ Garavaglia Architecture, "James P. Lang Field Bleachers Draft Historic Resource Evaluation" (12 April 2012), 13-16

- Overhanging or projecting trellises
- Integrated planters (brick, stone, or concrete)

The clubhouses constructed as part of SFRPD's mid-century expansion were built to support various recreational uses within the park system including children's playgrounds, baseball and softball fields, basketball courts, and tennis courts. These buildings typically consisted of a large, central common room flanked by restrooms, kitchens, office spaces, and storage areas. They are all one-story buildings with simple massing and are primarily asymmetrical in plan. Their design features include several elements from the list above, as well as masonry (usually brick) fireplace surrounds, large picture windows facing play areas, metal casement windows, projecting trellises, and prominent brick chimneys.

The extant pool buildings also include several elements of the Midcentury Modern style listed above and typically house the main pool area, shower and locker rooms, first aid and staff areas, offices and ticketing spaces, mechanical rooms, and storage areas. Design features include angled asymmetry, shed roof forms, large expanses of windows, brightly-colored tiling in the locker and restrooms, and exposed structural components.

Two of the remaining recreation centers (Potrero Hill and St. Mary's) share a similar Quonset-hut form, and feature basketball courts, activity rooms, restroom and locker rooms, and community areas. These also feature simple form and massing, use of modern materials, flat roof forms with overhanging eaves, and stacked brick chimneys. The Upper Noe Recreation Center has undergone significant alteration, but the main gym building still exhibits a distinctive angular design that is evocative of the Midcentury Modern style.

The other Recreation Bond Historic District contributors consist of a variety of use and construction types. They range from utilitarian concrete bleacher structures and handball courts, to the Randall Museum and the James D. Phelan Beach Recreation Building, both with simple modern design features.

Though none of these buildings is an individually significant example of the Midcentury Modern style, together they maintain an association with the Recreation and Park Department's mid-century expansion, and display a range of design characteristics that link them to the principal architectural style common to their period of construction.

4. EVALUATIVE FRAMEWORK

4.1 The California Register of Historical Resources

The California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) is the authoritative guide to the State's significant historical and archaeological resources. It serves to identify, evaluate, register, and protect California's historical resources. The California Register program encourages public recognition and protection of resources of architectural, historical, archaeological, and cultural significance; identifies historical resources for state and local planning purposes; determines eligibility for historic preservation grant funding; and affords certain protections under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). All resources listed on or formally determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (National

Register) are automatically listed on the CRHR. In addition, properties designated under municipal or county ordinances are eligible for listing in the California Register.

The California Register criteria are modeled on the National Register criteria. An historical resource must be significant at the local, state, or national level under one or more of the following criteria:

1. It is associated with events or patterns of 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.
2. It is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history.
3. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values.
4. It has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, state or the nation.

Second, for a property to qualify as a historic resource, it must also retain “historic integrity of those features necessary to convey its significance.”⁸ While a property’s significance relates to its role within a specific historic context, its integrity refers to “a property’s physical features and how they relate to its significance.”⁹ To determine if a property retains the physical characteristics corresponding to its historic context, the National Register identifies seven aspects of integrity:

Location is the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred.

Setting is the physical environment of a historic property.

Design is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.

Materials are the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property.

Workmanship is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory.

Feeling is a property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.

Association is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.¹⁰

⁸ National Park Service Bulletin 15: *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, http://www.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb15/nrb15_4.htm (accessed June 2015).

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid.

Since integrity is based on a property's significance within a specific historic context, an evaluation of a property's integrity can only occur after historic significance has been established.¹¹

4.2 The California Environmental Quality Act and Historic Resources

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) was originally enacted in 1970 in order to inform, identify, prevent, and disclose to decision makers and the general public the effects a project may have on the environment. Historical resources are included in the comprehensive definition of the environment under CEQA.

For the purposes of CEQA (Guidelines Section 15064.5), the term "historical resources" shall include the following:

1. A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code Section 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et.seq.).
2. A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.
3. Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California, may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets the criteria for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852).

When a proposed project may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, CEQA requires a city or county to carefully consider the possible impacts before proceeding (Public Resources Code Section 21084.1). CEQA equates a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource with a significant effect on the environment (Section 21084.1). The Act explicitly prohibits the use of a categorical exemption within the CEQA Guidelines for projects that may cause such a change (Section 21084).

¹¹ Ibid.

CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(b) defines a “substantial adverse change” in the significance of a historical resource as “physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired.” Further, that the significance of a historical resource is “materially impaired” when a project:

- “demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; or
- “demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources... or its identification in an historical resources survey..., unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or
- “demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA.” (Guidelines Section 15064.5(b))

5. IMPACTS ANALYSIS

This section provides an analysis of the proposed demolition of the James P. Lang Field Bleachers, which contribute to the Midcentury Recreation Bond Historic District. As discussed above, substantial adverse change is defined by CEQA as “physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired.”¹² The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a project “demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance” and that justify or account for its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in, the California Register.¹³

5.1 Demolition Impacts Analysis

As presented in Section 2, research identified 28 extant contributors to the Midcentury Recreation Bond Historic District. Contributors include a variety of recreational support facilities represented by buildings and structures that vary significantly in size, scale, use, and architectural detailing. The use and building types represented within the district include clubhouses serving recreational areas, pools, recreation centers, and concrete stadium seating structures associated with ball fields (soccer, softball, baseball). The district also includes buildings that serve more specific uses including a natural history museum, a lake recreation sporting center, and a beach recreation building.

Of the contributing buildings and structures, some are more distinctive representations of the Midcentury Modern style than others. In *National Register Bulletin #15*, the National Park Service notes that a “district can comprise both features that lack individual distinction and individually distinctive features that serve

¹² CEQA Guidelines subsection 15064.5(b).

¹³ Ibid.

as focal points.¹⁴ The Midcentury Recreation Bond Historic District has both distinctive contributors that are more prominent examples of the Modern style, and contributors that are more modest examples of the style. The more distinctive or focal point buildings, exhibit a higher number of character-defining features of the Midcentury Modern style than their counterparts, are more expressive of the style, and show fewer alterations.

CEQA Guidelines state that the significance of a historical resource is “materially impaired” when a project: “demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources.”¹⁵ The demolition of the James P. Lang Field bleachers would not remove a distinctive district contributor. Though Bleacher No. 1 displays some characteristics of the Midcentury Modern style including stone accent walls and projecting eave overhangs, the bleacher complex is largely utilitarian and is not a strong example of the style within the district. Bleacher No. 2 is devoid of any stylistic features and purely utilitarian in design. Removal of the bleachers at James P. Lang Field would not materially impair the significance of the Midcentury Recreation Bond Historic District by removing elements that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources. As such, the proposed demolition would not constitute an adverse effect on a historic resource.

Within the miscellaneous grouping of “Other Recreation Bond Improvements” demolition of the J.P. Lang Softball Field bleachers would reduce the number of contributors from 8 to 7 out of a total of 9, which would leave 78% of contributors in this category. Though removal will result in a slight decrease of integrity within this category, most of the contributors will remain intact. Bleacher structures and other miscellaneous contributors built during the mid-century recreational expansion will continue to be represented within the district.

5.2 Cumulative Impacts Analysis

CEQA defines cumulative impacts as follows:

‘Cumulative impacts’ refers to two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts. The individual effects may be changes resulting from a single project or a number of separate projects. The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time.¹⁶

¹⁴ National Park Service, *National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* https://www.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb15/nrb15_4.htm#district (accessed 10 April 2017).

¹⁵ CEQA Guidelines subsection 15064.5(b).

¹⁶ CEQA Guidelines, Article 20, subsection 15355.

The most common cumulative impact issue is the systematic demolition or significant alteration of a historic resource. In the case of this review, this would mean future alteration or demolition to contributors within the Midcentury Recreation Bond Historic District.

Documentation of the Historic District found that 46 buildings and structures were constructed as part of San Francisco's mid-century recreational expansion. Of these, 18 have been demolished or significantly altered over time, leaving 28 district contributors or 61% of the district intact. In addition to demolition of the James P. Lang Field Bleachers, the Recreation and Parks Department has current plans to demolish the Golden Gate Park Tennis Clubhouse and to renovate the Rossi Pool building. With the proposed demolitions of Golden Gate Park Tennis Clubhouse and the J.P. Lang Softball Field bleachers, 26 district contributors would remain intact (57% of the original district).

Though the demolition of these buildings does not constitute a significant impact to the district, the loss of contributors is nearing the 50% mark. Future demolition or significant alteration of contributing features would further diminish the district's integrity and could constitute a significant adverse effect to the district. Note that because the district is discontiguous, and the contributors are spatially discrete, the visual impacts of losing a single contributor may be less significant overall than in a visually contiguous historic district. However, Planning for alterations to district contributors that are compliant with the Secretary's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties will help minimize or avoid adverse effects on the historic district in the future. Implementation of the Documentation Improvement Measure outlined below may help offset the loss of integrity to the district by providing an increased level of documentation for the contributor.

6. IMPROVEMENT MEASURES

Documentation

Prior to the issuance of demolition or site permits, the project sponsor shall undertake Historic American Building Survey (HABS) documentation of the J.P. Lang Field Bleachers and surrounding context. The project sponsor shall retain a professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Architectural History, as set forth by the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (36 CFR, Part 61), to prepare written and photographic documentation. The documentation package should be coordinated the Planning Department Historic Preservation Staff and consist of the following:

- **HABS-Level Photographs:** Either HABS standard large format or digital photography shall be used, and all digital photography shall be conducted according to the latest National Park Service Standards. The photography shall be undertaken by a qualified professional with demonstrated experience in HABS photography. Photograph views for the dataset shall include (a) contextual views, including views of the existing bleachers and playfields; (b) views of each elevation of the bleachers; and (c) detail views of character-defining features, where applicable. All views shall be referenced on a photographic key map. If available, the original plans for the bleachers/playfield building should also be reproduced and included in the dataset.

- HABS Historical Report: A written historical narrative and report, per HABS Historical Report Guidelines.

The project sponsor should transmit this documentation, in both printed and electronic form, to the History Room of the San Francisco Public Library, San Francisco Architectural Heritage, and the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Information Resource System.

7. CONCLUSION

This analysis finds that the proposed demolition of the existing James. P. Lang Field bleachers, contributing elements of the discontiguous Midcentury Recreation Bond Historic District, will not constitute a significant impact to the overall district.

Though the removal of these features do not constitute a significant impact to the Midcentury Modern Recreation Bond Historic District, the cumulative effects of these changes on the integrity of the district could be reduced by implementing the documentation improvement measure outlined above.