



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

## Historic Resource Evaluation Response

*Date* March 8, 2018  
*Case No.:* **2016-012545ENV**  
*Project Address:* **4840 Mission Street**  
*Zoning:* Excelsior Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District  
Residential, House – One Family (RH-1) Zoning District  
40-X Height and Bulk District  
*Block/Lot:* 6959/019, 025, 026, 031  
*Date of Review:* March 8, 2018 (Parts 1 and 2)  
*Staff Contact:* Elizabeth White (Environmental Planner)  
(415) 575-6813  
[elizabeth.white@sfgov.org](mailto:elizabeth.white@sfgov.org)  
Jørgen G. Cleemann (Preservation Planner)  
(415) 575-8763  
[jorgen.cleemann@sfgov.org](mailto:jorgen.cleemann@sfgov.org)

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

Reception:  
**415.558.6378**

Fax:  
**415.558.6409**

Planning  
Information:  
**415.558.6377**

### PART I: HISTORIC RESOURCE EVALUATION

#### Buildings and Property Description

The subject property at 4840 Mission Street, known as the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral home, contains three adjacent through-lots extending between Mission Street and Alemany Boulevard in the Outer Mission neighborhood of San Francisco. Along Mission Street, the closest intersections are with Onondaga Avenue to the north and with France Avenue to the south. The property is located within the Excelsior Outer Mission Neighborhood Commercial District, an RH-1 (Residential, House, One Family) Zoning District, and a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

The only building on the subject property is a funeral parlor located on the northernmost of the three adjacent lots.<sup>1</sup> This building occupies the east half of its lot and fronts onto Mission Street. The west half of this lot and the entirety of the two adjacent lots to the south contain a continuous surface parking and vehicle maneuvering area associated with the funeral parlor. Although the lots extend back to Alemany Boulevard, access from this direction is blocked by a chain-link fence.

The subject building at 4840 Mission Street was built in two main phases. The initial section was constructed in 1926 to the designs of architect John A. Porporato. As originally built, it was a two-story Spanish Colonial Revival-style building with stucco cladding, a tile roof, and a

---

<sup>1</sup> In addition to the three adjacent lots referenced above, the project that precipitated this review also includes a fourth adjacent lot to the south (6959/031), which contains a supermarket and parking area constructed in 1980. Because the built elements on this fourth lot are less than forty-five years old and are not related functionally to the age-eligible building at 4840 Mission Street, they are not evaluated for potential historic significance in the current report.

symmetrical front (Mission Street) façade featuring a central entry portico and five vertical bays of arched windows. To the rear, the building stepped down to a single story and then stepped up again to a single story over a raised basement. The second phase of construction occurred in 1959. It was designed by architect Otto G. Hintermann, engineered by Hyman Rosenthal, and constructed by the DeMartini Brothers contracting firm. In this renovation, the building was extended to the south and east with a two-story addition and was given a new façade designed in a Midcentury Modern style. The building's current appearance dates largely to this 1959 renovation.

Above a base of Roman brick veneer, the primary east (Mission Street) façade is clad in square porcelain enamel panels set in a stack bond pattern. A projecting wood belt course runs across this façade, separating the first and the second stories. At the first story, the east façade contains seven masonry openings, which are grouped toward the north end of the façade. The third opening from the north contains a recessed building entry consisting of a marble stair leading to a pair of hollow metal doors. Each of the remaining six openings contains an eight pane aluminum window with a two-pane hopper sash at the bottom, a four-pane awning sash at the center, and two fixed lights at the top. The second-story windows, framed by a projecting porcelain enamel-clad border, are identical to the first-story windows except in the location over the building entry, where they take the form of a pair of smaller, narrow, four-pane windows. A neon sign projects from above the wood belt course in between the first and second windows from the south. With the windows grouped toward the north end of the façade, the south end of the east façade consists largely of a blank section of wall, on which building signage ("Valente Marini Perata & Co. Funeral Directors") has been painted. At the extreme south end of the eastern façade, there is another pair of hollow metal doors leading to a one-story vestibule that runs along the south façade (see below). The projecting wooden beltcourse passes over these doors and extends beyond the corner of the building, where it forms part of a canopy that spans a driveway and is supported at the opposite end by a brick wall.

The secondary south façade, which fronts onto a driveway that connects to the parking area, features a one-story vestibule consisting of a brick base, large fixed aluminum-frame windows, and a flat roof. At the right (east) end of the façade, this vestibule features a projecting canopy (see above). At the center, the vestibule features a porte-cochère. Toward the left (west) end, the vestibule steps down with the slope of the lot. Behind the one-story vestibule, the second story of the south façade features two groups of ribbon windows framed by projecting borders and glazed with opaque glass block. At the right (east) end of the façade, a short section of the primary façade's porcelain enamel cladding turns the corner and features painted wall signage. Otherwise, the south façade features only utilitarian features such as louvers and drain pipes.

The tertiary west (rear) façade clearly displays both of the subject building's two major phases of construction. At the left (north) end, the 1926 design is legible in the arched wooden windows and the tile roof parapet, while the right (south) end features the aluminum windows used in the 1959 renovation. The south end also features a neon building sign. The tertiary north façade, which fronts onto a narrow alley, dates mostly to the original 1926 design, featuring a porte-cochère, arched wood windows, wood entry doors, and stucco scored to resemble ashlar masonry. Elements of the north façade that were altered in the 1959 renovation include the

addition and removal of windows and the application of a short section of the modernist cladding that wraps around the corner from the primary façade.

Site features on the subject property include the parking lot, a concrete wall separating the parking lot from the driveway running along the south side of the building, masonry walls separating the parking lot from the sidewalk, and a neon sign installed on top of a post in the parking area.

In addition to the two major phases of construction, major exterior alterations to the subject building include the construction of the neon sign currently located in the parking lot (1937), the installation of the neon sign on the west façade (1961), and the replacement of the wall separating the parking lot from the sidewalk (1977). Various window replacements have occurred on the tertiary facades at unknown dates.

### **Pre-Existing Historic Rating / Survey**

The subject property is considered a "Category B" property (Properties Requiring Further Consultation and Review) for the purposes of the Planning Department's California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review procedures due to its age (constructed in 1926, extensively renovated in 1959). It is not listed on any local, state, or national registries. In the draft Excelsior Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District Historic Resource Survey (Historic Resource Survey), the Planning Department identified the subject building as one of thirty-two buildings in the Neighborhood Commercial District that "are of unusually expressive design, appear to retain a high level of physical integrity, and/or are of a rare property type," and therefore require follow-up evaluation to determine their individual significance and integrity. Referring specifically to the subject building, the survey states that "this building is an outstanding example of its type and period [Midcentury Modern] and it appears to have significant associations with the Italian-American community and [is] a significant Italian-American owned enterprise ... It should be considered for landmark designation under Article 10 of the Planning Code." In a separate section addressing follow-up work necessary to identify historic districts within the Neighborhood Commercial District, the survey states that "[a] larger cluster for prioritization could include all of the individually-identified Midcentury Modern buildings from c. 1935 to c. 1965." Such a cluster would include the subject building. Aside from the Historic Resource Survey, the subject property is not included on any other historic resource surveys.

### **Neighborhood Context and Description**

In the vicinity of the subject building, Mission Street serves as the border between two different officially recognized neighborhoods: to the west, encompassing the subject building, is the Outer Mission neighborhood; to the east is the Excelsior neighborhood. Approximately three blocks to the south, Mission Street also divides the Outer Mission and Crocker Amazon neighborhoods. In addition to—and in some ways eclipsing—its role as a border, however, Mission Street between Interstate 280 to the north and the San Francisco-San Mateo county line to the south forms a continuous commercial corridor that runs through a residential area composed mostly of single-



family homes.<sup>2</sup> For zoning purposes, the Planning Department has identified this corridor as the Excelsior Outer Mission Street Neighborhood Commercial District (NCD). Notable commercial streets that intersect with Mission Street in this area and extend the boundaries of the NCD include Ocean and Geneva Avenues.

Mission Street is one of San Francisco's oldest roadways. Within the confines of the NCD, Mission Street follows the path of El Camino Real, the historic route that connected the missions and presidios of the Spanish colony of Alta California in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. During this period, the subsequent Mexican period (1821-1846), and the early American period, the area surrounding the subject property was mainly agricultural, initially supporting large ranches and later smaller produce farms. The first major spur to neighborhood development was the construction in the 1860s of the San Francisco and San Jose Railroad, which ran to the west of the subject site, following a course similar to that of Interstate 280 today. Anticipating future growth, real estate speculators and homestead associations bought large tracts of land next to this rail line and subdivided them into lots. One such developer was H.S. Brown, who in 1863 bought a large tract on the west side of Mission Street that included the site of the subject property. A tract on the opposite side of Mission Street was purchased and platted by the Excelsior Homestead Association in 1869. In 1894 the Market Street Railway extended its electric streetcar line to the intersection of Mission Street and China (now Excelsior) Avenue. Another rail line—the Ocean Shore Electric Railway, running along the path of the future Alemany Boulevard—was completed by 1908. The 1906 earthquake and the resultant demand for housing provided another spur to the area's growth. The establishment of Balboa Park (1908) and McLaren Park (1927) further enhanced the area's desirability as a residential neighborhood.

In spite of these various stimuli, as late as 1920 the west side of Mission Street remained sparsely developed with vegetable farms, open fields, and a few scattered rows of houses. Mission Street itself contained long stretches of undeveloped land between houses and commercial establishments. To the east of Mission Street, on the other hand, more intensive residential development had started to fill the blocks out with long rows of houses designed in vernacular and Spanish Colonial Revival Styles. The area's remaining open spaces dwindled and contracted as residential and commercial development continued through the mid twentieth century. Toward the end of this period, changing architectural tastes resulted in the construction of a cluster of Midcentury Modern commercial buildings on and around Mission Street.

The Outer Mission and Excelsior neighborhoods have historically hosted a large Italian American population. In fact, the Italian presence pre-dates the area's development into residential neighborhoods and extends back to the late nineteenth century, when the surrounding lands were divided into vegetable farms cultivated by Italian immigrants. Into the 1960s, the Italian-American population maintained and reinforced its identity in the area through the creation of numerous businesses and institutions with a distinctly Italian-American identity. When this population started to relocate to the suburbs in the 1970s, residents of Latino and Filipino

---

<sup>2</sup> Mission Street continues as a commercial corridor after it crosses into San Mateo County. The scope of this review is limited to properties and neighborhoods located within the City and County of San Francisco.

heritage moved in. Reflecting this demographic shift, new businesses opened and existing institutions accommodated their practices to serve the needs of this new population.

Known historic resources close to the subject property include the following:

- 35-45 Onondaga Avenue (aka Alemany Emergency Hospital and Health Center), San Francisco City Landmark No. 272, designated 2016. These two buildings were determined to be significant under National Register of Historic Places Criteria A (events) and C (architecture). Built in 1933, these are the last buildings constructed as part of San Francisco's emergency hospital system. Designed by master architect Charles H. Sawyer, they embody the distinctive characteristics of Spanish Baroque and Spanish Colonial Revival style architecture. Additionally, their interiors contain two significant frescoes painted in 1934 by the noted artist Bernard Zakheim.
- 1000 Cayuga Avenue (aka Balboa High School), San Francisco City Landmark No. 205, designated 1995. Balboa High School was built in phases between 1927 and 1931. It was designed in a Spanish Colonial Revival style by an assortment of architects that included John Reid, Jr., Samuel Lightner Hyman, A. Appelton Associates, Bakewell and Weihe Architects Associates. The designation case report states that the school "represents San Francisco's 'golden age' of school construction ... and is the most prominent and visible school building extant in the southern quadrant of the city."

## CEQA Historical Resource(s) Evaluation

### Step A: Significance

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

Individual	Historic District/Context
Property is individually eligible for inclusion in a California Register under one or more of the following Criteria:	Property is eligible for inclusion in a California Register Historic District/Context under one or more of the following Criteria:
Criterion 1 - Event: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Criterion 1 - Event: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Criterion 2 - Persons: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Criterion 2 - Persons: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Criterion 3 - Architecture: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Criterion 3 - Architecture: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Criterion 4 - Info. Potential: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Criterion 4 - Info. Potential: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Period of Significance: 1959	Period of Significance: <input type="checkbox"/> Contributor <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Contributor

To assist in the evaluation of the properties associated with the proposed project, the Project Sponsor has submitted a consultant report:

- Architectural Resources Group, 4840 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA, *Historic Resource Evaluation – Part 1* (January 2017) (ARG Part 1 report)

Below is a brief evaluation of the subject building's historical significance per the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) eligibility criteria. This summary is based upon the Architectural Resources Group (ARG) Part 1 report, which finds that the subject building is eligible for individual listing in the CRHR under Criterion 3. Staff concurs with the findings of this report and refers the reader to it for a more thorough evaluation of individual significance. Planning staff also finds that the subject building is not located in an eligible historic district.

**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.**

To be eligible under the event Criterion, the building cannot merely be associated with historic events or trends but must have a specific association to be considered significant. Staff concurs with ARG that the subject building is not eligible for inclusion on the California Register individually or as a contributor to a potential historic district under Criterion 1.

4840 Mission Street was constructed in 1926 and assumed its current appearance largely as the result of a major expansion and renovation in 1959. Although the Valente, Marini, Perata & Co. funeral parlor is associated with San Francisco's historic Italian-American community, it is neither the oldest nor the longest continuously operating Italian-American business in San Francisco.<sup>3</sup> By the time the funeral parlor was constructed in its current location in 1926, the Outer Mission/Excelsior area was long established as a prominent Italian-American neighborhood supporting numerous Italian-American enterprises and institutions, such as Corpus Christi Church (original building constructed in 1898). Furthermore, the building's current appearance essentially dates to 1959, which further distances it from the Italian American community's historic roots. Therefore the subject building does not possess the specific associations with the development of the Italian American community—both throughout San Francisco and more specifically within the Excelsior/Outer Mission neighborhood—necessary to support a finding of individual significance under Criterion 1.

As noted, the Excelsior/Outer Mission neighborhood does have historical associations with the Italian-American community. However, the neighborhood has undergone dramatic demographic changes that have reduced the size of the Italian-American community relative to other groups. Although several institutions with clear ties to the Italian-American community do remain in the neighborhood (e.g., the Sons of Italy Hall & Cultural Center, 5051 Mission St.; the Italian-American Social Club, 21-25 Russia St.), they are too geographically dispersed to cohere into a historic district eligible under Criterion 1.

---

<sup>3</sup> Older continuously operating Italian-American businesses in San Francisco include Ghirardelli Chocolate Company (established 1852) and Fior d'Italia restaurant (established 1886).



Therefore the subject building does not appear eligible for listing in the CRHR either individually or as a contributor to a potential historic district under Criterion 1.

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

Planning staff concurs with ARG's report that the subject building does not appear eligible for listing in the CRHR under Criterion 2. Although founding partner Frank Marini was a prominent philanthropist and community leader, he died seven years before the subject building assumed its current appearance in 1959.<sup>4</sup> Records show that none of the other owners and operators of the funeral parlor was important in our local, regional, or national past. Therefore, 4840 Mission Street is not eligible under Criterion 2.

**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.**

Planning Staff concurs with ARG's conclusion that the subject building at 4840 Mission Street is eligible for individual listing in the CRHR under Criterion 3 as an outstanding intact example of a large-scale Midcentury Modern commercial building in San Francisco. Planning staff also finds that the subject building is not located in a CRHR-eligible historic district.

As noted in the HRE, the *San Francisco Modern Architecture and Landscape Design 1935-1970 Historic Context Statement* provides the following guidance for evaluating the individual significance under Criterion 3 of Midcentury Modern commercial properties:

In order to meet local and state registration requirements under Criterion 3 (architecture) as an individual resource, a commercial property would need to retain many of its character-defining features. Storefronts, even more so than residential or other commercial buildings, are subject to continuous alterations in order to appear up-to-date and as such there are relatively few storefronts that retain the full expression of Midcentury Modern style.<sup>5</sup>

According to this evaluative framework, the subject building appears eligible for individual listing in the CRHR under Criterion 3 due to its full expression of Midcentury Modern design, which remains essentially unaltered since the time of its construction in 1959. Intact features of the subject building that embody the Midcentury Modern style include its "flat roof, porcelain enamel panels forming a geometric grid across the façade, roman brick veneer water table, aluminum sash windows and doors, clean lines, and minimal exterior detailing largely limited to the sweeping belt course across the east façade and the projecting boxes enframing windows at the second story."<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Frank Marini is the namesake of Marini Plaza, a small park adjacent to Washington Square Park in the North Beach neighborhood. A bust of Marini was installed in the Plaza in 1954.

<sup>5</sup> 193-194.

<sup>6</sup> ARG Part 1 Report, 27.

The finding of individual eligibility under Criterion 3 derives from the subject building's full embodiment of the Midcentury Modern style, and not from its status as the work of Otto G. Hintermann, who is not a recognized master architect. This finding also does not relate to the subject building's original design by architect John A. Porporato in the Spanish Colonial Revival style. Porporato is not a recognized master architect and the majority of the subject building's exterior features dating to this original phase of construction have been removed.

The Planning Department conducted additional analysis to determine if the subject building contributes to a potential historic district. The specific direction of the initial district analysis was suggested by one of the recommendations in the Neighborhood Commercial District (NCD) Historic Resource Survey, which states that "[a] larger cluster for [prioritized district analysis] could include all of the individually-identified Midcentury Modern buildings from c. 1935 to c. 1965."<sup>7</sup>

In examining this cluster, Planning staff finds that the Midcentury Modern buildings identified in the survey are too geographically dispersed to form a coherent historic district. This remains true even if one incorporates some of the less distinguished Midcentury Modern buildings on and around Mission Street that were not identified in the survey. Between the Midcentury Modern buildings, Mission Street in this area contains long stretches of commercial frontage that have been constructed in a wide range of architectural styles over a protracted period of time and display varying degrees of integrity.

In addition to the district analysis recommended by the Historic Resource Survey, Planning staff conducted additional analysis to determine if the area contains a district comprising a wider range of architectural styles. After examining a number of different permutations—a district comprising all representatives of the area's modern styles (Art Deco, Streamline Moderne, Midcentury Modern, New Formalist), a district comprising all of the architecturally distinct buildings identified in the NCD Historic Resource Survey (the modern buildings plus those designed in such styles as Beaux Arts, Renaissance Revival, Storybook, Mission Revival, etc.)—staff finds that no historic district eligible under Criterion 3 exists in the area. Under the evaluative framework that focuses on modern architecture, the architecturally notable buildings remain too widely dispersed to support the identification of a historic district. This issue persists under the more inclusive framework that takes in buildings of all historically significant architectural styles, with the added consideration that any such district would be too broadly defined to clearly represent any coherent architectural theme.

In conclusion, the subject building is eligible for individual listing in the CRHR under Criterion 3, but is not located in an eligible historic district.

**Criterion 4: Property yields, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.<sup>8</sup>**

---

<sup>7</sup> 31.

<sup>8</sup> Assessment of archeological sensitivity is undertaken through the Department's Preliminary Archeological Review process.



Based upon a review of information in the Departments records, the subject property is not significant under Criterion 4 since this significance criterion typically applies to rare construction types when involving the built environment. The subject property 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  
**Association:** ☒ Retains ☐ Lacks  
**Design:** ☒ Retains ☐ Lacks  
**Workmanship:** ☒ Retains ☐ Lacks

**Setting:** ☒ Retains ☐ Lacks  
**Feeling:** ☒ Retains ☐ Lacks  
**Materials:** ☒ Retains ☐ Lacks

4840 Mission Street retains a high degree of integrity, having undergone no major alterations since the 1959 renovation and expansion that resulted in the building's current appearance. Overall, 4840 Mission Street conveys its significance as a historic resource that is individually eligible for listing in the CRHR under Criterion 3 due to its full expression of the Midcentury Modern architectural style.

### 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 the following:


- Box form and overall massing
- Two-story height
- Horizontal orientation
- Orientation toward Mission Street and lack of setback from the sidewalk
- Flat roof with varying heights and parapet walls
- Combination brick and reinforced concrete construction
- Large square porcelain enamel panels and brick veneer cladding
- Fenestration dating to the 1959 remodel, including aluminum sash and glass block windows
- Projecting boxes enframing windows
- Aluminum frame glazed doors

- Signage, including attached, projecting, and freestanding neon signs and painted signs
- Wood-clad belt course and awning on the east façade
- Porte-cochere on the south facade
- Enclosed walkway along the south façade
- Low tapered wall separating the driveway from the parking lot
- Landscaped beds along the east façade and the tapered wall

#### 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: PRINCIPAL PRESERVATION PLANNER REVIEW

Signature:  Date: 3/8/18  
M. Pilar LaValley, Acting Principal Preservation Planner

#### PART II: PROJECT EVALUATION

Proposed Project ☒ Demolition ☐ Alteration

Per Drawings Dated: 02/07/2018

##### Project Description

The proposal is to demolish the existing historic resource, the adjacent non-historic supermarket building, and the buildings' affiliated parking lots and construct, in two phases, two new mixed-use buildings totaling approximately 715,800 gsf in size. The two new buildings would range from 69 to 85 feet in height (79 to 89 feet including rooftop appurtenances) and would include 428 dwelling units (comprising 175 below-market-rate units and 253 market-rate units), a replacement grocery store, a health center, other ground-floor retail and neighborhood services, and below-grade parking.

##### Project Evaluation

*If the property has been determined to be a historical resource in Part I, please check whether the proposed project would materially impair the resource and identify any modifications to the proposed project that may reduce or avoid impacts.*

**Subject Property/Historic Resource:**

- ☐ The project will not cause a significant adverse impact to the historic resource as proposed.
- ☒ The project will cause a significant adverse impact to the historic resource as proposed.

**California Register-eligible Historic District or Context:**

- ☐ The project will not cause a significant adverse impact to a California Register-eligible historic district or context as proposed.
- ☐ The project will cause a significant adverse impact to a California Register-eligible historic district or context as proposed.

**Project Impacts**

Demolition

The proposed project will have a significant impact on the individually eligible historic resource at 4840 Mission Street, which will be demolished. Demolition would remove all character-defining features of the individually eligible building and would materially impair its ability convey its historic significance.

New Construction

Staff finds that the construction of the proposed Project would not affect offsite historic resources, including the City Landmarks at 35-45 Onondaga Avenue and 1000 Cayuga Avenue, and the buildings individually identified in the NCD Historic Resource Survey. Although the design and scale of the project will not be compatible in massing or details with nearby historic resources, the physical separation between new construction and such resources reduces the potential for direct or indirect impacts. The proposed project may alter the setting of some of these nearby individual buildings. However, the overall integrity of these resources will not be affected by the project.

**PART II: PRINCIPAL PRESERVATION PLANNER REVIEW**

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

M. Pilar LaValley, Acting Principal Preservation Planner

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

3/8/18

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





Figure 1. 4840 Mission Street. Screenshot of 2017 Google Streetview.