HERITAGE PREPARING NOVEMBER LECTURES


Among Mr. Cox's architectural projects are additions to a number of historic buildings, including the Folger Shakespeare Library, the Winterthur Museum, and the Corcoran Gallery of Art, all in Washington. He has also designed long-range plans for the National Academy of Sciences, Mount Vernon College and IBM.

Contextual new design presents the architect in San Francisco a range of challenges, from single residence infill construction to the design of an entirely new neighborhood, like Mission Bay. The more than three hundred-acre project site, between Townsend, Mariposa, Seventh Street and the Bay, offers a "blank slate" within the larger context of San Francisco's built environment.

Professor Moudon has taught at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the University of California, Berkeley and in Latin America. She is the author of Built for Change, a study of planning in San Francisco, and has written numerous articles on urban design and planning. She has served as a consultant for a number of projects in Baltimore, Toronto, and in the state of Washington.

Our final lecture, tentatively slated for Monday, November 18, will feature a guest panel that will discuss the practical issues involved in achieving good design in residential contexts.

All lectures take place at 1700 Franklin Street at 7:30 PM. Admission is $10.00 per lecture for members of San Francisco Heritage and $12.00 to the public. Series tickets are available for $25.00, Heritage members; $30.00 for non-members.

Members will receive a mailer on the event and should return the coupon to reserve their tickets for the lectures. The general public may reserve by calling Rick Propas at Heritage, (415) 441-3000.

Notice — This year's Holiday Open House, originally announced for December 1, has been rescheduled for Sunday, December 8 (See calendar notice on the back page).
ARCHITECTURAL FRAGMENTS

Since the removal of the Embarcadero Freeway, San Franciscans have had their first unobstructed view of the Ferry Building's west elevation in thirty-five years. Darius Aidalas has been photo-documenting the freeway's demolition, and a selection of his "before and after" shots, featuring the renowned landmark, is currently on display in the first-floor lobby of the Ferry Building's World Trade Center. The title of the exhibit, which runs into December, is "The Death of the Embarcadero Freeway."

On November 18 and 19, the National Park Service is sponsoring a second conference on the Seismic Retrofit of Historic Buildings. The first occurred in 1984. Heritage is among the co-sponsors of the program, which will take place at the recently retrofitted Palace Hotel in San Francisco. The conference is directed particularly to building officials, contractors, building owners and managers, architects, engineers, preservationists and material manufacturers. Registration is $150 and includes lunch on both days and a conference workbook. Interested parties should contact David W. Look at (415) 744-3988.

Treasures: Splendid Survivors of the Golden Gate International Exposition is a recent publication that tells the story of California's last world's fair and current efforts to restore its legacy, the Pacific Unity sculptures and the Pacific Basin fountain, as part of a public garden on Treasure Island. To obtain the sixteen-page book send $7 to GGIE Research Associates, P.O. Box 7314, Landscape Sta., Berkeley, CA 94707-9991. Proceeds benefit the Treasure Island Treasures Restoration Fund.

Recent visitors to the Haas-Lilienthal House have noted the addition of four large Kentia palms to the ballroom, where guests to the House are received for Wednesday and Sunday house tours. We would like to thank Korotkin Associates, who provide Comprehensive Environmental Planting for homes and businesses. They have donated the palms along with maintenance for a period of three years. Special Tour Docent Heidi Stocker, who heads marketing for Korotkin, arranged for the gift. Thanks to her and to Sharon Korotkin. They can be reached at (415) 621-7173.
On August 26, upon the recommendation of the Landmarks Board and the Planning Commission, the Board of Supervisors passed and sent to the Mayor an ordinance to designate the Bush Street – Cottage Row Historic District.

The landmark case report cites the district's "remarkably intact group of...Italianate and Stick residential buildings," which reflect speculative development of the block between 1870 and about 1885. Attorney John H. Smyth undertook the first construction on the site, erecting three duplexes on Webster Street, in 1870; only one, 1717-19, remains.

Four years later, The Real Estate Associates (TREA) purchased and subdivided the portion of the block west of what is now Cottage Row. TREA was a major developer of mass market housing in the Western Addition, as well as Pacific Heights and the Mission, in the 1870s. The row of six flat-front Italianate residences on Bush and two bay-front Italianates on Sutter survive from the TREA development within the historic district, all dating from 1875.

Business and civic leader Colonel Charles J. Taylor built the four buildings at 2101-2107 Bush Street, in 1874, and purchased a strip of property that ran through the block from Bush to Sutter. There he constructed six two-story frame residences, in 1882. The gabled ends of these modest Stick Style houses front on the walkway that Taylor called Cottage Row.

The district also includes a Stick Style cottage built behind 2117 Bush, about 1885, and 1735-37 Webster Street. The Newsom Brothers designed the latter, built in 1885, at 773 Turk Street. The Redevelopment Agency moved it to its present site several years ago.

The designation became official when the Mayor signed the ordinance. The district, however, will not come immediately under the purview of the Landmarks Board, because it lies in the Western Addition Redevelopment Project Area. The Redevelopment Agency's jurisdiction continues until 1994. The Agency and the Landmarks Board have entered into an interim agreement whereby the Landmarks Board shall review the design of proposed exterior alterations and new construction within the district.
for a twenty-seven story tower planned for the northeast corner of Howard and Beale, now a parking lot. The project also entails a “poetry-sculpture garden” on the west flank of the tower and the rehab of the Marine Electric Building at 342-56 Howard.

Architect Emil Johndesigned the three-story unreinforced masonry structure at Fremont and Howard (1907) for the Marine Electric Company, purveyor of marine and industrial wiring. Brick pilasters divide the pressed red brick façade into seven bays of “Chicago windows” (four-over-four panes double-hung flanking six-over-six double hung) on Howard and two on Fremont.

The exterior retains a high degree of integrity, even in the original storefront, where iron pillars mark the shop and clerestory windows and a square iron column stands at the diagonal corner entry to the building. Its spare ornamentation is of Renaissance/Classical Revival inspiration. Heritage gave the Marine Electric Building a B-rating in its South-of-Market survey, and the Downtown Plan lists it as a Category III (contributory) structure.

The project sponsor proposes to retain the structure and rehabilitate it for new uses. Plans call for removal of the existing fire escape on the south elevation and replacement with a new one on the north, where new windows will be added. The rehab will entail a seismic retrofit designed in such a way that bracing will not show at any of the windows.

Heritage informed the Planning Commission that it found the proposed treatment of both the Marine Electric Building and the California Farmer Building acceptable. On September 19, the Planning Commission voted to approve the Bechtel project.

---

**ST. ROSE DEMOLITION UNDER WAY**

*The Dominican Sisters have commenced demolition of the St. Rose Academy building at Pine and Pierce Streets. The photograph shows the work in progress on September 30. Heritage wishes to acknowledge the help received from members, neighbors of St. Rose, alumnae of the Academy and other friends of preservation in the effort to save the structure. We thank them for their financial contributions to defray the costs of the struggle and for their letters on behalf of the building’s retention.*

**Heritage thanks the following corporations and individuals for their generous support of the 1991 Soirée.**

- Ghirardelli Square Associates
- 343 Sansome/Gerald D. Hines Interests
- Circe Gallery, Ghirardelli Square
- Jaymont (USA) Inc.
- Tobin & Tobin
- Murphy, Weir & Butler
- Pacific Gas & Electric Company
- Wurster, Bernardi & Emmons
- Bank of San Francisco
- Catellus Development Corporation
- Coblenz, Cahen, McCabe & Breyer
- Flood Partners
- Heller & Leake, Architects
- Jacobs, Spotswood, Ryken & Winnie
- Pettit & Martin
- Plant Construction
- General Atlantic
- The Lurie Company
- Schell Construction
- Stubbs, Collenette & Associates
- Wilsey Bennett Foundation

The following restaurants at Ghirardelli Square provided dining at the Soirée.

- Compadres Mexican Bar & Grill
- Gaylord India
- Ghirardelli Chocolate Manufactory
- McCormick & Kuleto’s
- The Magic Pan
- The Mandarin
- Oritalia
- Paprikas Fono
- Vicolo Pizzeria
UNREINFORCED MASONRY BUILDINGS IN SAN FRANCISCO

During 1992, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors will consider the recommendation of a city task force on unreinforced masonry buildings (UMBs) to require virtually all private owners of "UMBs" to strengthen their buildings structurally or demolish them, at their own expense. The City has targeted slightly more than 2,000 structures. Together these buildings contain over 36 million square feet of floor space. They provide 22,000 housing units, the majority of which are among the city's most affordable; house 4,500 businesses that provide 46,000 jobs; and include the sanctuaries of many long-established San Francisco churches. The alternatives under consideration propose engineering solutions with enormous potential social, economic, political and aesthetic implications.

Historical Background

Unreinforced masonry structures—first adobe and then brick and stone—existed in California from the earliest days of European settlement. The frequency and destructiveness of fires which plagued cities and towns throughout Northern California encouraged brick construction. Although masonry buildings existed in San Francisco as early as 1848, following the city's fourth major fire, in 1850, about twenty brick and stone structures were built in an effort to design buildings that would withstand future conflagrations.

In 1851, fire destroyed an estimated 1,500 to 2,000 buildings but proved the fire-resistant properties of masonry structures and gave impetus to their construction. By 1869, contemporary accounts estimated the city had a total of more than four thousand brick buildings. While San Francisco saw its first reinforced concrete structure in 1884, its first metal frame building in 1889 and its first steel frame in 1891, brick continued to be widely used.

Beginning in 1853, the City defined areas of the business section within which it prohibited new wood frame construction. The original "Fire Limits" were Union, Powell, Post, Second and Folsom Streets. By the turn of the century, they had expanded to include the waterfront, a larger area south of Market and Market Street west to Gough and Valencia. Although nineteenth century enforcement appears to have been inconsistent and subject to political influences, these "Fire Limits" explain the geographic concentrations of existing UMBs.

Construction of unreinforced brick buildings dropped dramatically after 1933. While available information does not permit assessment of the role of other possible causes, such as depression or war shortages, the destructive 1933 Long Beach earthquake played a major role in changing perceptions of the desirability UMB construction.

San Francisco's UMBs Today

In 1987, the City's Bureau of Building Inspection and the Seismic Investigation and Hazards Survey Advisory Committee completed an inventory of unreinforced masonry buildings. The study defines UMBs to be structures which have exterior load bearing walls of brick, concrete block or similar materials which were built or received permit rights prior to 1948 and which have not received specific types of steel or other reinforcement in ensuing years. Building code changes which San Francisco adopted in 1948 included "seismic design provisions" for all new buildings, effectively ending the construction of UMBs.

The inventory identified approximately 2,200 structures, the vast majority of which are brick. After excluding structures containing one to four residential units and those owned by governmental agencies, and with other adjustments, 2,007 remained targeted for proposed new laws.

The inventory shows that of all existing UMBs, 123 were built before 1906. Concentrations occur in the Jackson Square area and at the foot of Brannan Street.
San Francisco UMB Data:
2,007 structures
36 million square feet
22,000 units housing 27,000 people
20.6 million square feet of office-commercial-industrial space
4,500 businesses employing 46,000 people
48 institutional buildings, including 27 churches

Street. Pre-1906 UMBs on the list include some Ghirardelli Square buildings, the
Oriental Warehouse, Old St. Mary's and St. Mark's Lutheran Church. Others, such
as the Embassy Theatre on Market Street, the former Scottish Rite Temple on
Geary near Fillmore and St. Rose Academy, are on the list but have been or are
scheduled to be demolished.

Generally, the largest concentrations of the 1,884 UMBs built since 1906 which
survive occur in the North of Market/Tenderloin/Givic Center area, Chinatown
and the Bush Street corridor. A large number also exist south of Market, although
they are distributed over a larger area. More than half of the post-1906 UMBs
today date from the first five years of reconstruction following the earthquake
and fire.

The studies of San Francisco UMBs have found great variation in both the
physical characteristics of the building types and the activities they contain.
Privately owned UMBs include multi-story apartment-with-retail buildings, purely
residential and exclusively office buildings, structures containing
a combination of retail and office uses, single-story
neighborhood auto repair and/or garage facilities, theatres,
hotels—both residential and tourist, warehouse buildings,
churches and schools.

Diverse
UMBs house varied
activities

No single feature of use, building type or overall size
appears to be predominant. Of the 2,007 targeted buildings,
1,171 are classified as being in commercial/office/residential use, 780 are residential
and forty-eight serve institutional, principally church, school or hospital-related uses.

Residential buildings contain nearly 22,000 housing units and are home to an
estimated 27,000 people. Of these, approximately 11,000 are apartments and
10,300 are residential hotel rooms occupied by permanent residents. Together
they represent approximately 7 percent of all housing units in San Francisco and
a much higher proportion of the city's affordable housing. For example, these
residential hotel units represent 48 percent of all such units in San Francisco.

Commercial, office and industrial buildings contain 20,600,000 square feet.
Although not all of this space is office related, its magnitude is illustrated by the
fact that under the current city rules for office construction, it would require
construction at the maximum allowable level each year for the next twenty-two
years to replace this much space.

Unreinforced masonry buildings provide space for an estimated 4,500
businesses. Sampling by Recht Hausrath & Associates suggested that a large percentage
of these are defined as "retail," but that others include a wide range of
efforts, such as advertising, graphic and engraving services, medical offices,
photo finishing, entertainment and social services, dry cleaners, laundries,
apparel manufacturing and printing. While the specific goods and services of
businesses located in UMBs vary widely, the sample confirmed that typically
these businesses are small and independently operated.

Enterprises located in these UMBs provide an estimated 46,000 jobs. The
largest, by category, is related to commercial activity (estimated 43 percent),
followed by office (estimated at 29 percent). Industrial and warehouse-related
represent an estimated 16 percent.

Of the forty-eight UMBs classed as "institutional," twenty-seven house
churches. Over 9,000 people are members of these churches, most of which have
occupied their buildings for over seventy years. Ten additional structures are
school buildings, the vast majority private elementary schools, which provide for
nearly 3,000 students. Institutional buildings vary in size and type, like San
Francisco's UMBs in general, but are predominantly designed to allow gatherings
of large numbers of people.
Senate Bill 547

In 1986, California enacted legislation requiring all cities and counties in California “in Seismic Zone 4” to identify unreinforced masonry buildings in their jurisdiction and to develop a plan for these structures.

The only required component of these plans was the notification of UMB owners that their building “is considered to be of a general type of structure that historically has exhibited little resistance to earthquake motion.” However, the law provided that plans could also include provisions to strengthen buildings, to reduce intensity of use, and to demolish buildings, as well as to allow tax incentives, low cost loans or other incentives for building owners. Senate Bill 547 exempted warehouses, structures containing less than six dwelling units or qualifying “historical properties” from its provisions.

The law required local building departments to complete identification of UMBs and propose a plan by January 1, 1990, and to report their findings to the local legislative body, as well as the State. At that time, nearly 50 percent of affected jurisdictions had complied. Their plans ranged from posting notices on buildings of the potential risks, to imposing mandatory upgrades which are expected to lead to extensive demolitions.

San Francisco's Response

Following the completion of its inventory of all UMBs, City staff specified and then attempted to evaluate three different levels of possible mandatory structural upgrade. Public documents have presented these alternatives in ascending order of the extensiveness of work required and therefore of cost to property owners. According to engineers, none can guarantee that damage to UMBs will not occur in an earthquake. There remains controversy in the engineering community on the merits of one approach over another. The first alternative significantly reduces risk of injury. The second and third alternatives accomplish progressively smaller reductions in risk but at progressively and dramatically higher costs

Out of Plane Wall Strengthening (also referred to as Alternative C or Alternative D). Requirements under this scenario would mandate anchoring all floors and roofs to masonry walls as well as other work intended to eliminate risks that walls could collapse perpendicular to their length (“out-of-plane”). Most often such work involves only the exterior walls, although this prescription would apply to interior masonry walls in larger buildings, as well. In addition, this alternative would require strengthening the upper-story walls of multi-story buildings, if the ratio of their height to their area exceeded a standard set by formula.

According to the City’s engineering consultants, Rutherford & Chikene, “Although some wall anchors may exist from the original construction of the building, or subsequent remodels, virtually all UMBs will require supplementary wall anchorage work.” They estimate that this level of upgrade would require a minimum of four weeks of construction work for even the smallest buildings, if vacant. Occupied buildings would require substantially increased time.

Uniform Code for Building Conservation (UCBC) Appendix I (Proposed) (Also known as Alternative D or Alternative 2). This level of structural strengthening has been referred to as the Los Angeles Approach. One alternative available under Los Angeles' building law and now the UCBC for existing buildings, it is based upon the work of a team of Southern California engineers who conducted innovative tests of older building materials and construction technologies for resistance to earthquake forces.

How to become involved

- Coalition for Seismic Safety (property owners & commercial tenants) 461 Bryant St., San Francisco, CA 94107 (415) 543-9171 or 979-8370
- Tenants' Coalition for Seismic Safety (residential tenants) c/o Asian Law Caucus Contact: Gen Fujioka 468 Bush St., 3rd floor San Francisco, CA 94108 (415) 391-1655
- David Prowler, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer City Hall, Room 289 San Francisco, CA 94102 (415) 554-7940
- The Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage 2007 Franklin St. San Francisco, CA 94109 (415) 441-3000
The tests, funded by the National Science Foundation, resulted in an approach known as the ABK methodology. This method uses a different approach in analyzing the ability of wood floors and roofs to withstand motion from that of traditional engineering. The ABK research found many UMBs require less additional structural work to reduce safety risks. In part this is because tests indicate that wood interior walls add their own strength to buildings.

Vacant buildings undergoing this level of upgrade would require an estimated six to thirty weeks of construction time, depending upon size and individual characteristics. Work on occupied commercial and residential buildings may require twice as much time.

San Francisco Building Code Section 104(f) (Also known as Alternative E or Alternative 3). Section 104(f) of the present San Francisco Building Code requires existing buildings to be rebuilt to meet the same seismic resistance rules in effect for new buildings in 1973. This requirement applies when, in the opinion of the Building Department, proposed repair or remodel work on an existing building meets any one of five tests, including that proposed alterations affect two-thirds of the floors or that structural alterations affect 30 percent of the building area. This alternative would apply Section 104(f) rules to all UMBs irrespective of whether new construction work was proposed.

In addition to the work required under the “Out of Plane Wall Strengthening,” this approach would require strengthening of all roofs and floors. New foundations would frequently be necessary. Storefronts with little or no solid walls would require strengthening, such as diagonal steel braces provide. In general, steel and concrete components would be necessary.

Small, simple projects in vacant buildings require an average of eight weeks (estimated), and larger projects, twenty-four to thirty-two weeks, if the structure is vacant. Occupied commercial and residential buildings are expected to require twice the time.

The City of San Francisco, using engineering and economic consultants, has undertaken a substantial effort to develop estimates of construction time and average cost per square foot for each of the alternatives. These estimates have served as assumptions to evaluate the impacts of each alternative and to speculate upon the magnitude of dislocation and demolition which will result if mandatory requirements are enacted. A city task force of department heads has recommended mandatory structural work reflecting Alternatives 1 and 2 for privately owned UMBs, and city government has essentially completed the procedural requirements necessary to bring the proposal to a vote by the Board of Supervisors.

Persons familiar with recent construction costs have voiced strong disagreement with the estimates of construction costs, saying they are dramatically low. Disagreement also exists within the engineering community over the alternatives. Others have expressed concern that the City has not fully identified the impacts of the alternatives nor adequately understood the scope of mandated construction work and its impact on housing, small business and low and fixed income San Franciscans.

— Mark Ryser

In a future publication, Heritage will attempt to illuminate the technical issues and controversies and to examine more closely the enormous potential impacts of San Francisco's proposals to address the seismic issue of unreinforced masonry buildings.

© Copyright 1991 The Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage
The Beginningsof a New National Historic Preservation Program, 1957 to 1969
James A. Glass
AASLH, Nashville, 1991

On October 15, we celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of President Lyndon B. Johnson's signing of Public Law 89-655, the National Historic Preservation Act. By signing the act, Johnson acknowledged what preservationists had long argued to be a responsibility of the Federal government, to protect historic properties whether they be in public or private hands. James A. Glass has produced a short book entitled The Beginnings of a New National Historic Preservation Program, 1957 to 1969, which chronicles the origins, enactment and immediate consequences of Public Law 89-655.

This small (sixty-three-page) volume provides a useful history of federal preservation efforts from the Antiquities Act of 1906, designed to protect Civil War monuments, through the New Deal's Historic Sites Act of 1935, which expanded the responsibility of the government to protect sites outside national parks. But, Glass argues, historic preservation was not an issue for the national government until the passage of the Federal-Aid Highway Act in 1957. That act, which mandated urban renewal by bulldozer, threatened historic properties across the nation and galvanized preservationists to seek federal assistance in their efforts to protect sites of both local and national significance.

Although Glass provides a useful account of the origins of what he calls "new" preservation, based on historic and architectural significance rather than the shrine mentality that had characterized earlier efforts, at this point his discussion of the origins of the National Historic Preservation Act bogs down. Rather than tracing the events and forces that shaped the act on a broader level, Glass focuses on the bureaucratic politics and the inside players that shaped the Preservation Act.

As one who has researched and written on Federal bureaucracies, this reader found Glass' account of Capitol Hill and National Park Service politics to be of some interest. But, as Glass acknowledges, much of the force for preservation came from outside Washington, and as I read his account I found myself asking what was going on outside the beltway. In only a few instances, and toward the end of the book, does Glass answer these questions, and even then he focuses on the actions of the state historic preservation offices more than the grass-roots movement.

Despite these problems, Glass' is a useful book. Apart from providing a good capsule history of historic preservation in the United States, it helps to explain the relationship between locally based preservation, the backbone of the movement, and the uneven efforts of the federal government to assist those who seek to preserve the historic fabric of the nation. As such, it is worth reading.

— Frederic L. Propas

continued on page 10

AT TWENTY
HERITAGE
LOOKS AHEAD

A s Heritage marks its twentieth year, the organization seeks to expand its presence in the community. To do this, we will continue to cultivate an enlarged constituency which reflects the diversity of San Francisco. We will also increase our efforts to educate and inform public officials and decision makers of the values of preservation.

The issue of housing, particularly affordable housing, will remain a primary one in San Francisco for the foreseeable future. The implication of this is that Heritage will have to continue to focus much of its advocacy efforts in the city's residential neighborhoods, where the pressing need for housing in recent years has resulted in demolition of valuable—and sound—architectural resources.

Experience has shown, notably in the downtown area, that the best conservation strategy is to survey architectural resources. Heritage will, therefore, work to extend its Inner Richmond survey into other residential neighborhoods.

A number of on-going issues will occupy Heritage in the coming years. These include planning for the preservation and compatible reuse of the more than three hundred historic buildings in the Presidio.

Heritage remains committed to ensuring long-overdue protection for San Francisco's Chinatown, where unsympathetic changes, particularly to store-fronts, continue to eat away at the historic character of this unique neighborhood. Related to this is the larger issue of unreinforced masonry buildings. San Francisco is under State mandate to provide a program that addresses seismic issues affecting these structures (See this issue of the Newsletter), and Heritage must work
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Heritage looks ahead
continued from page 9
to keep conservation in the forefront as the City responds to this issue.

Finally, Heritage will concern itself with the quality of contextual new design. Recognizing that a healthy and economically viable city must make room for change, we should speak out more forcefully on the design of infill and replacement construction to ensure compatibility with the architectural character of San Francisco’s streetscapes and neighborhoods without promoting slavish imitation or imposing undue constraints on architects’ creativity.

Since Heritage accepted its first easement in 1974, its program has become the largest in the West. Heritage holds preservation easements on a variety of both commercial and residential properties in San Francisco, such as 1020 Broadway (illustrated above). Owners of architecturally or historically significant properties who wish to ensure their preservation in perpetuity may donate an easement to Heritage. An easement may extend to the interior as well. The easement binds successive owners to preserve the exterior appearance and to seek Heritage’s approval of any proposed alterations. Owners of National Register Properties who make easement donations qualify for tax benefits.

Michael Steingräber
Office 415 921-5555
1892 Union Street
San Francisco, CA 94123

Call for a complimentary opinion of value

HIGHLIGHTS OF HERITAGE’S FIRST TWENTY YEARS

1971 A group of concerned San Franciscans establishes The Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage.
1972 Lilienthal heirs donate the Haas-Lilienthal House to Heritage.
1974 Heritage accepts its first preservation easement.
1974-1980 The struggle to save the Fitzhugh and the City of Paris focuses preservation efforts on downtown San Francisco.
1977 Heritage launches Preservation Loan Program.
1977-78 Heritage completes its downtown survey
1979 Publication of Splendid Survivors, results of downtown survey.
1981-83 Heritage extends survey into South of Market, Chinatown, Van Ness Corridor, Civic Center, Nob Hill, the Waterfront.
1982 Heritage inaugurates Heritage Hikes program for San Francisco school children.
1983 Planning Department completes Downtown Plan; Board of Supervisors adopts it in 1985, after two years of lobbying by Heritage.
1985 Heritage helps to save Jesse Street Hotel.
1986 Heritage wins protection for the Old Wells Fargo Building at 85 2nd Street.
1988 Heritage obtains agreement from Mayor’s Office of Housing to address preservation issue in early planning for housing projects.
1988 Inner Richmond Survey begins, extending Heritage’s inventory into residential neighborhoods.
1989 When Loma Prieta Earthquake strikes, Heritage plays significant role in preventing unnecessary demolitions.
1991 Heritage receives a Governor’s Preservation Award.
The historic Haas-Lilienthal House, a property of The Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage, is available for rental for private or corporate events. The House can accommodate up to 150 guests. Please call 441-3011 for more information.

Please patronize our advertisers. When you do, thank them for supporting the San Francisco Heritage Newsletter.

William Stout
architectural books
Current catalog available $2.50
Out-of-print and rare book catalog $2.50
William Stout Architectural Books
884 Montgomery Street
San Francisco, CA 94133
415 391.6757
415 989.2341 (fax)

NOTICE
This issue of the San Francisco Heritage Newsletter was mailed on October 21, 1991.
If you receive delivery later than three weeks after that date, please notify your carrier.
CONTINUING HERITAGE EVENTS
Sundays 11 am to 4:15
Wednesdays 12 noon to 3:15
Haas-Lilienthal House Tours $4
Free to Heritage members & guests
Sundays 12:30 pm
Pacific Heights Walking Tour $3
Free to Heritage members & guests

For information concerning all Heritage events, call (415) 441-3004

OCTOBER

October 19, noon-5 pm
Heritage's Western Pacific Heights House Tour Call (415) 441-3000

October 16-20 San Francisco National Preservation Conference
Call 1-800-YES-NTHP

October 20, 1-5 pm
Victorian Alliance Hayes Valley House Tour Call (415) 824-3907

Through October 31
AIA/SF Gallery, 130 Sutter Street Exhibit "Women's Work: Architecture and Design." Call (415) 362-7397

Through November 26

November 4, 14, 18
Heritage Fall Lectures (See page 1) Call (415) 441-3000

November 2 & 16, 10:30 am
Los Gatos Heritage Walks
Call (408) 395-7375, 867-0922 or (415) 922-1063

November 14-February 2
San Francisco Museum of Modern Art In the Spirit of Modernism. Exhibition features contemporary Bay Area architects. Call (415) 866-8800

November 18-19, 8 am-5 pm
Conference "The Seismic Retrofit of Historic Buildings" at the Palace Hotel Call (415) 744-3988 for information

DECEMBER

Throughout the holiday season
For a complete listing of holiday activities, send $1 and a stamped, self-addressed envelope to Bay Area Historic House Museums, 22701 Main Street, Hayward, CA 94541

The Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage
2007 Franklin Street
San Francisco, CA 94109

Nonprofit Organization
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
San Francisco, CA
 Permit No. 10581

JOIN SAN FRANCISCO HERITAGE!
Please enter my membership in the following category:

☐ $35 Individual
☐ $50 Family
☐ $100 Supporting
☐ $250 Contributing
☐ $500 Sustaining
☐ $20 Seniors/Students

Name

Address

City, state, zipcode

Phone

Please make checks payable to:
San Francisco Heritage
2007 Franklin St.
San Francisco, CA 94109

Contributions are tax deductible.