SUMMER PROGRAMS PLANNED

This summer Heritage will offer members and friends a broad selection of events ranging from our usual walks to a bay cruise and a bike tour.

The summer program begins at 10 am on June 2, with a walking tour of Chinatown that Heritage guides will lead every Saturday through September 29. The tour meets outside the Commodore Stockton Schoolyard at 950 Clay Street. Presidio walks will set out from the flagpole in the Main Parade Ground at 10 am on Saturdays June 9 & 23, July 7 & 21, August 4 & 18 and September 1, 15 & 29.

Our first special event, on June 23, is a Saturday Brunch Bay Cruise on board Hornblower Yachts. This offers a good opportunity to gain a new perspective on the Bay Area. You will enjoy Hornblower's fine food while Heritage Guides offer a spirited narration on the history and development of the Bay Area. Members enjoy preference for the limited space on the tour, and if you haven't already returned your reservation form be sure to do so. This event is bound to be popular and may sell out quickly.

A month later, we begin our "Summer in the City" program, which consists of two walks that will feature interiors and a bicycle ride south of Market. First, we explore the Presidio,
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NEIGHBORHOOD ACTIVISTS GET RESULTS

This year's theme of National Preservation Week, May 14-19, reminds us that "Keeping America's Heritage Alive" is everyone's concern. Heritage and the Landmarks Board cannot carry the struggle to preserve San Francisco's legacy alone. Fortunately, the city's strong tradition of citizen involvement and neighborhood activism often fills the gaps. Here are two recent stories as examples and encouragement to all San Franciscans that citizen initiative can make a difference.

In February of last year, when Mrs. Min Cherney died, her neighbors and friends wondered what would happen to her charming cottage at 126 27th Avenue. They discovered that real estate speculators had purchased it in 1985 with the provision that Mrs. Cherney retain a lifetime lease. Now the new owners planned to demolish it as soon as they could. The neighbors were appalled.

Six neighbors met one evening and decided to give the developers a good fight. Each one in the group gave one hundred dollars to a war chest and agreed to divide up the tasks the effort would require. The campaign to save Mrs. Cherney's house had begun.

Bev Klein learned from the Planning Department that the new owners received a variance in 1986, allowing them to divide the lot, and nothing anyone could do would stop development of the site. For the concerned neighbors, this news merely increased the challenge.

On another front, Julie Ray commissioned local historian William Kostura to research the cottage's

continued on page 11
San Francisco Heritage's recent efforts to conserve the 1931 Zig-Zag Moderne service station at Larkin and Pacific brought us face to face with some important philosophical questions concerning issues which the preservation movement has never fully resolved.

There is no question that retention of the entire structure on its site, fully visible in its original configuration as a free-standing building and used for activities which do not destroy its authentic materials or original design, is the ideal solution to this and most architectural conservation situations. Far less apparent, however, is what alternative solutions are appropriate if this ideal is not possible.

When the proposal to redevelop 1501 Pacific was presented, not only did Heritage have insufficient support to gain the necessary Planning Commission votes to defeat the project, we also failed to gain retention on the site and incorporation of the station into the proposed new structure. The Planning Commission, instead, offered conservation advocates the opportunity to find a new site and use for the station and, if successful, to receive a mandatory contribution from the owner of the old site to cover a portion of the costs. Thus were we confronted with the most significant of the several philosophical issues which arose in this project. When and under what circumstances does moving of an historic structure from its traditional location still serve the goals and purposes of historic preservation?

Not too many years ago, those who were committed to making conservation of historic and architecturally significant buildings part of public decision making and private development calculations won so few concessions that the opportunity to relocate structures was frequently considered a victory and, while not the most desirable outcome, nonetheless an acceptable means to retain a valued structure. Most often those relocations were to a newly constituted “park” or other area especially set aside to receive relocated significant buildings. Frequently the work necessitated by the physical requirements of the relocation and the application of current building codes triggered by the move resulted in substantial loss of authentic materials and features of the structure.

Gradually, the results of these relocations came to be perceived among a growing number of preservation advocates as robbing the structures of their essential character. Simultaneously, the preservation movement slowly gained credibility and strength in local communities, and together these factors led to a loss of support for relocating historic buildings. New criteria for National Register status reflected this perspective by generally disqualifying relocated buildings.

Are there, nonetheless, individual situations in which the relocation of a valued structure is justifiable if demolition is the only other available alternative? In the 19th and early 20th centuries, when our society was in some way more frugal with consumption of its resources, buildings were more frequently moved. San Francisco has examples, like the old Commercial High School, the Gough Street Octagon House and others, that have now stood on their relocation sites for so long that this once-new location has taken on its own significance as the context for the historic structure.

In deciding that the concept of relocation of the Larkin/Pacific station was preferable to demolition, Heritage was convinced that, at a minimum, any new site must be urban and located in San Francisco and that the structure’s new use be practical. Park or highly land-
THE WILLIAMS BUILDING

One of the very few remaining historic buildings in the Yerba Buena Center urban renewal area is the eight-story Williams Building, built in 1907. Well-known local architect Clinton Day designed the steel, brick and terra cotta structure for the southeast corner of Third and Mission, once a prime corner in downtown San Francisco.

In 1984, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, the owner of the building, entered into an agreement with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, a federal agency which reviews projects seeking federal funds for their impact on historically and architecturally significant buildings. Under this agreement, the Agency was to ensure preservation of the building and its rehabilitation to standards established by the Secretary of the Interior.

Since last November, the Agency staff has suggested that the Williams Building may have to be demolished, based on the evaluation of earthquake damage by the Agency’s private structural engineer. Shapiro, Okino, Hom & Associates expressed concern that, in the event of another strong earthquake, falling masonry might harm persons on the street.

Despite years of negotiations, the Redevelopment Agency has been unable to reach an agreement with Olympia & York for completion of Yerba Buena, including the rehab of the Williams Building. The Agency believes another five years may pass before work would begin. This length of time before a full seismic upgrading of the building could begin has led to renewed statements that the building will have to be demolished.

Specialists employed by Federal Emergency Management Administration and the State Office of Historic Preservation dispute the Agency’s assessment. Heritage is closely following the matter and has facilitated an assessment by a second structural engineer.
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scaped locations would distort the truth about the building’s traditional purpose and use. The station found a new site and developer south of Market, in an urban and automobile-oriented environment. Some of its authentic fabric was lost in the relocation as it had to be cut down in height to travel on city streets, requiring new “legs” to be created. The precise siting and design for the newly situated structure still have to be worked out, and not all questions have been answered.

Heritage decided that relocation was better than demolition, but whether this was the “correct” answer to the situation can never be known with complete certainty. The passage of time will determine whether our perspective in 1990 was sound. I would be very interested to hear members’ and readers’ thoughts. Given the circumstances, should the station have been moved? Is too much authenticity and significance lost in a relocation across town? We will attempt to share responses in the next issue of the Newsletter.

—Mark Ryser
An historic Excelsior District house nearly fell victim to demolition recently. The owner had plans to tear down the building at 699 Paris Street and split the fifty-foot-wide lot for the construction of two new single-family homes. The building committee and the history committee of the Neighbors of the Excelsior took up the issue. According to the group’s president, Carol Taylor, they wanted to preserve the house both because of its architectural value and as a reminder of the district’s history.

The house sits on the corner of Italy Avenue and Paris Street, just down the hill from McLaren Park. Its residential type and relatively open site, looming from the crest of a hillock, recall the agrarian character of early settlement in this neighborhood. Infill construction has isolated many such houses and small cottages on blocks of more recent residences.

Neighbors of the Excelsior filed for a discretionary review of the demolition permit, and the Landmarks Board, which looked into the case at the request of Heritage, recommended retention of the house. At an April hearing, the Planning Commission decided that the old building would be saved.

The neighbors and the owner worked out a compromise that will allow subdivision of the property along the rear of the lot for the construction of one new house. The compromise solution will also save the open space on one side of the historic building. The owner has agreed to address another concern of the neighborhood group by designing the new building to respond to the old in general form and surface materials.

The four-part sixteen-unit structure at 130-144 Langton Street, rated “C double plus” in Heritage’s survey, is a good example of post-1906 residential development on the secondary streets of South of Market. Built in 1907, the two-story wood frame building, with deeply projecting second story bay windows, sustained fire damage in February 1989. As a result, the owners have sought demolition.

Donald McDonald is the architect of a new residential project proposed for the site. He is a San Francisco architect with a reputation for designing spatially and financially economical single-family residential projects in the Bay Region. San Francisco Heritage and the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board are working with Mr. McDonald to seek retention of the structure and its rehabilitation for residential use.

The building of the Golden Gate Commandry of the Knights Templar, now home to the Macedonian Baptist Church, is an object of concern among conservation advocates. Immediately after the October earthquake, city inspectors “yellow-tagged” the building, allowing only limited entry. However, Heritage is not aware of any assessment of the nature and full extent of damage.

The local firm of O’Brien and Werner designed the handsome Tudor (Jacobean) Revival brick structure, which was constructed in 1906. It sits on a stone basement, and extensive terra cotta ornament articulates the two broad bays which frame the crenelated entrance tower. The 1976 City Planning Department survey gave the building a “4”, its second highest rating. This means the Planning Department regards preservation of this building to be of highest importance. Heritage concurs and will continue to monitor the situation.
"LIVE-WORK" BRINGS NEW LIFE TO OLD SPACES

In the post-World War II era, traditional industrial districts such as New York’s South of Houston Street (SoHo) and San Francisco’s South of Market (SOMA) witnessed a gradual decline of activity. Handsome brick and timber, reinforced concrete and corrugated iron clad frame structures stood as eulogies of America’s industrial heritage.

Appreciation of the surviving structures slowly developed, and many citizens were unwilling to relegate these districts to the ravages of urban renewal. Architects and historians interested themselves in industrial design and, in alliance with city planners, sought to adapt these buildings to new uses. The precedent of Ghirardelli Square, Faneuil Hall in Boston and a few other notable projects suggested a new aesthetic that proved to be extremely popular.

At the same time, rising rents were forcing artists out of urban centers. Several municipalities sought legislation that would enliven industrial areas and provide affordable housing and studio spaces for artists. In the mid-1960s, New York amended its Multiple Dwelling Law to facilitate conversion of industrial and commercial buildings for live/work occupancy appears in several projects recently completed or under construction. In every case, the project sponsor and their architects sought to retain the industrial character of the exterior of their structures. While the specific interior design of each project varied, typically, the schemes sought to preserve the maximum amount of light and unobstructed space. Conversions also display a characteristic respect for the physical quality of the structural members, which range from heavy timber elements to concrete columns, and wood or concrete floor and ceiling materials.

Minnesota Lofts is located near Potrero Hill, at 601 Minnesota Street. The two-story corrugated iron clad frame structure was built in 1929 by the California Canneries Co., and by about 1945, housed Thompson Aircraft Tire Factory. In 1986, Roxanne Mankin acquired the building, which the City had cited for forty-seven code violations and condemned. With experience garnered from the conversion of five buildings in Phoenix, Mankin rehabilitated the 40,000 square foot building. She inserted thirty-five units into the existing floors. Her architect divided the spaces according to the module established by the 12.5’ on-center timber supports. Ceiling heights vary from fourteen to nineteen feet. The original industrial sash remains, but aluminum sliders were installed where new windows had to be cut.

Mankin admits she would replicate the industrial sash if she had it to do over.

Lofts/601 Fourth Street occupies a 1915 commercial/industrial reinforced concrete building, which the well-known San Francisco architect Charles Peter Weeks designed for John Bollman and Co., a division of Liggett & Meyers. The three story-on-basement structure is articulated by Continued on page 14
Heritage wishes to thank the following corporations and individuals for their generous underwriting support of the 1990 Soirée.
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Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe
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AMB Investments • Broadacre Pacific Company/Wm. Anderson Barnes • Eastdl Realty Incorporated • Grubb & Ellis Company • Jones, Lang & Wootten • The Lurie Company • Macy's California • Stan and Christine Mattison • OU Interests • Pelli Development • Pillsbury, Madison & Sutro • Sedway & Associates • Sedway Cooke Associates • Stolte Inc. • Tiffany & Co. • Wilsey Bennett Foundation

Mr. and Mrs., Charles D. Field • Lisa Lindelet • William M. Roth • Mr. and Mrs. William Tooley

Sue Bransten • James F. Crafts, Jr. • Pauline S. Goldsmith • Amanda Hamilton • A.T. Le • Luke Morley • Francesca Peck • Paul H. Waszink • Mr. and Mrs. Robert Young
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SOIREE SCORES BIG HIT

With over 650 guests in attendance and exceptional underwriting support, the 1990 Soirée was a most successful fundraising gala for Heritage. The evening was designed to be a true celebration of the 1924 San Francisco Landmark Old Federal Reserve Bank Building.

As guests arrived they were invited to tour the beautifully restored second floor reception and board rooms. They viewed models and portfolios provided by STUDIOS Architecture, the design firm responsible for both the restoration of the historic executive offices and the bold, yet respectful, design of the remaining space to meet the needs of Orrick, Herrington and Sutcliffe, the building tenant.

On the main floor, swagged black velvet curtains provided a dramatic and stately entrance to the main banking hall. Spectacular floral arrangements filled the space and delighted the guests. Numerous buffets and bars provided them with many dining choices.

The Earl Heckscher orchestra played a variety of dance music while vocal performances by the Encore.

Soirée Scene at 400 Sansome Street

Theater Ensemble offered guests the chance to hear selections from the Sondheim show Marry Me A Little. As usual at our Soirées, the gaming tables proved to be very popular.

One of the more delightful features of the evening was the laser show projected onto the upper walls and ceiling of the grand space, accenting the classical interior with 21st Century technology.

Stewart Morton greets Marron
Kendrick and Katherine Lewis
YOU DON'T HAVE TO DESTROY A BUILDING IN ORDER TO SAVE IT!

If you own an historic or an architecturally valuable building in San Francisco, you may be able to bring it "up to code" and retain historic elements, with the help of the State Historical Building Code (SHBC).

WHAT IS THE STATE HISTORICAL BUILDING CODE?

Recognizing that strict interpretation of existing building codes often destroys important features of older buildings, the California Legislature created an advisory board to prepare a code with the flexibility to preserve the integrity of historic buildings. The resulting State Historical Building Code went into effect in 1979, for use at the discretion of enforcing agencies. Since July 1, 1985, the Code has been mandatory for all agencies and jurisdictions in California, when dealing with qualified historic buildings.

WHAT BUILDINGS QUALIFY FOR USE OF THE SHBC?

The State Historical Building Code applies to "any structure, collection of structures, and their associated sites deemed of importance to the history, architecture, or culture of an area, by an appropriate local or state governmental jurisdiction." In San Francisco, at present, the Code applies to approximately seventeen thousand structures. This number includes designated State and City Landmarks, properties on the National Register of Historic Places, buildings in existing and proposed historic districts, those listed in the Downtown Plan and area plans of the San Francisco Master Plan, buildings in the 1968 Here Today survey and buildings which the Department of City Planning rated in its 1976 city-wide survey.

WHAT IS THE CODE'S INTENT?

The intent of the State Historical Building Code is slightly different from that of the Uniform Building Code (UBC), which generally governs new construction throughout the country. The intent of the UBC is the protection of life and property, in that order. Codes have also served to achieve other socially desirable goals, such as energy efficiency or accessibility for handicapped citizens. Uniform codes have achieved this by prescribing certain ways of constructing new buildings so that walls are fire-resistant, for example, and properly insulated, or requiring doorways wide enough for wheelchairs to pass through.

While the first priority of the SHBC remains the safety of building occupants, its second priority is preserving the historical and architectural features of the building. Alteration of a structure in preparation for a change of use for that structure typically must comply with the UBC. However, if compliance with the UBC would result in destruction or loss of historic fabric, the SHBC offers an alternative.

WHAT IS THE BASIS OF THE SHBC?

The State Historical Building Code is performance based rather than prescriptive. A prescriptive code gives builders fairly exact instructions. "Every corridor serving an occupant load of 10 or more shall be not less
than 44 inches in width," for instance; or, "The top of handrails shall be placed not less than 34 inches nor more than 38 inches above the nosing of treads." Such specifications may seem arbitrary, but, in fact, they represent standards derived from experience of many situations over many years. They eliminate endless discussion about how wide is wide enough for a new corridor.

The State Historical Building Code is performance based in that it allows the substitution of alternative means to achieve the intent of the prescriptive provisions of the uniform code. The equivalent performance of these alternative means must be demonstrable. Use of the SHBC does not compromise life safety.

**HOW DOES THE SHBC ENSURE BOTH SAFETY AND PRESERVATION?**

Construction materials and methods of construction are obvious ways in which modern and historic buildings differ. Very few adobe buildings, for example, are constructed today. Mortise and tenon joints are rarely used to join structural members, and wood lath has fallen out of favor with modern plasterers. Compliance with the UBC would require replacing such historic materials with modern materials. The State Historical Building Code, however, permits repairs to existing structures using these older materials, often in combination with modern materials or construction methods, where that will result in preserving the authenticity of the historic structure.

The SHBC recognizes that some materials and methods of construction have "stood the test of time" in an historic structure and proven their claim to continued use in the building's restoration or renovation.

According to the code, "Any method or material that is (or is similar to) the historic fabric of a structure that may have been dropped from present codes, was a known type of construction in the past, has served a useful purpose in the structure, and was a part of the historical structure... may be used or re-used in the structure."

Archaic materials (that is, older materials no longer in general use) have often posed problems for engineers assessing the structural strength of a building for seismic resistance or its resistance to the spread of fire. Modern construction materials are rated for their structural and fire resistant properties as tested under laboratory conditions. The standardized production of many modern materials makes this testing highly predictive of how materials, when used in actual construction, will perform in a real-life emergency. A wall constructed of 2x4 studs covered with 5/8" gypsum board on both sides will have properties very similar to those of any other similarly constructed wall.

Many historic materials never underwent such testing, and while they may perform as well as modern materials, there has been no rating to which building officials can refer. As a result, engineers can find it difficult to know the shear value (resistance to the lateral forces of an earthquake) or fire-resistance of a wall built a hundred years ago.

The SHBC assigns shear values to some archaic materials and permits their use in combination with modern code materials, on a case by case basis, to achieve desired seismic resistance. In addition, the Structural Engineering Association of California has tested archaic materials and publishes a "blue book" which assigns shear values to those materials. Using this information, engineers may devise creative solutions to building safety problems that will allow preservation...
Conversion of the powerhouse at the former Southern Pacific Hospital complex to rental housing presented some challenging problems. To preserve the historic appearance of this entry, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards required that the floor of the second level, added to the building, must not come up to the window. The UBC required a fire exit from this level. The architects devised a guardrail for the interior, in the form of a grate, that can be manually lowered into place, to bridge the gap between the floor and the exterior wall to allow easy exit through the windows above the entry. This is the kind of creative solution to safety problems the SHBC seeks to facilitate.

of existing historic fabric.

At the El Cortez Hotel in San Diego, the building's concrete molded frame does not meet today's seismic codes. Adding shear walls, which the UBC requires, would have taken up too much space in the already small guest rooms. Structural engineers determined that the existing columns carried the vertical loads and were strong enough to resist 22% of the lateral loads required by the UBC. Therefore, they needed only to supplement the existing load bearing capability, reducing the minimum column size from about three feet to twelve or fourteen inches and reducing the cost of renovation significantly.

In the matter of fire safety, the SHBC requires buildings which do not conform to prevailing codes to install an automatic fire extinguishing system and an approved automatic fire alarm system. Non-conforming interior wall and ceiling finish, such as lincrusta, may be resurfaced with an approved fire-resistant paint. An exterior sprinkler system under the roof line, with at least one sprinkler head per wall opening, may substitute for fire-resistant exterior wall construction.

OTHER FEATURES OF THE SHBC

Historic buildings must comply with current code provisions for disabled access, unless that would destroy the historical fabric or historical aspects of the structure. In that case, local building departments may authorize alternative standards or methods "to assure reasonably equivalent access and use." The SHBC provides a set of specific guidelines to devise alternative access solutions that may be individually tailored to the building or site.

The State Historical Building Code exempts historic buildings from compliance with California Energy Conservation Standards. This allows retention of existing glazing or wall systems, for example, where addition of insulation would cause disruption of finishes or structural assemblies.

In general, the code also permits existing heating, ventilating, air conditioning, plumbing and electrical systems to remain in use where, in the opinion of the enforcing agency, they do not "constitute a safety hazard."
At the Hotel La Rose, in Santa Rosa, corridor walls of thin lath and plaster and wood wainscoting did not conform with UBC requirement that such walls must resist the spread of fire for at least one hour. The SHBC permitted retention of the historic corridor walls by backing the original materials with one-hour fire-rated gypsum, applied between the studs from the guest room side. Two layers of fire-rated gypsum on the guest room wall, sprinklers in the corridor and fire-retardant paint on the wainscoting completed the fire-rated assembly.

HOW CAN YOU USE THE SHBC?

First, you need to find out if your building is among the, currently, seventeen thousand in San Francisco which qualify for use of the State Historical Building Code. You can do so at the Zoning Counter of the Department of City Planning. You may also seek assistance from the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board and The Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage.

Once you have established that the SHBC applies to your building, you or your representative (your architect or structural engineer) must request approval to use the State Historical Building Code from the Bureau of Building Inspection. With a check for $108 to cover the fee, submit two sets of drawings and a full statement of the conditions to which the code would apply. The Bureau will require sufficient evidence or proof to substantiate all claims you make concerning those conditions and the appropriateness of the specific design solution, as governed by the SHBC. They may seek an opinion or ruling from the SHBC Board, before making a decision.

Remember, the State Historical Building Code is mandatory for all qualified historic structures. Although the Bureau of Building Inspection does enjoy some latitude in the SHBC's interpretation, it does not have the option to use it or not. If you believe your effort to use the code is overruled without good cause, appeal the case to the SHBC Board, which is the final arbiter of its application.

—L.B., R.M. & D.A.

WHERE TO GET ASSISTANCE

To obtain a copy of the State Historical Building Code send $6 to:

SHBC Board

a/o Office of the State Architect

400 P Street, 5th Floor

Sacramento, CA 95814

(916) 445-7627

To consult a copy of the SHBC or apply to use the code go to:

Bureau of Building Inspection

450 McAllister Street, Room 103

558-6133

To find out if your building qualifies for use of the SHBC call or go to:

Zoning Counter

Department of City Planning

450 McAllister Street, 5th Floor

558-6377

Or contact:

Landmarks Board

Department of City Planning

450 McAllister Street, 4th Floor

558-6345

San Francisco Heritage

2007 Franklin Street

411 3000

To obtain a copy of the structural engineer's "Blue Book," send $48 to:

SEAOC

2550 Beverly Blvd.

Los Angeles, CA 90057

(213) 385-4424

The SHBC allowed exemption from the UBC handrail specifications in this restoration at Old Oakland, ensuring preservation of the stairway's graceful proportions and decorative newel post.
Activists
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origins. It proved to be one of the earlier homes in the middle Richmond, built in 1907. Best of all, Kostura discovered that the 1976 Planning Department survey rated the house as architecturally significant. This fact greatly enhanced the case for preservation.

Jill Hallinan learned her way around the planning arena, and by the time the neighbors received notices of application for demolition and new construction permits, they were well prepared. They met again and decided on a plan of action. They would seek landmark designation of the house, with the aid of then-president of the Landmarks Board Jean Kortum, and request Planning Commission review of the permits. To increase their clout, they rang doorbells, collected signatures and asked neighborhood organizations for support.

The preservation advocates, now grown in numbers and experience, testified at four Landmarks Board hearings on behalf of Mrs. Cherney's house. On July 19th, the Board voted to recommend landmark designation to the Planning Commission.

The group blanketed the neighborhood with leaflets to announce the impending Planning Commission hearing and held a community meeting to explain the process. When the Commission met, on September 7th, thirty-five neighbors turned up to show their support for the preservation of 126 27th Avenue. Although the Commission rejected the Landmarks Board's recommendation, it voted to deny the demolition and new construction permits.

This partial victory did not satisfy the neighbors. They turned to Heritage, and in the days immediately following the October 17 earthquake, with the power still out at Heritage's offices, Executive Director Mark Ryser hand wrote the letter that appealed the matter to the Board of Supervisors.

On November 6, the Supervisors, after hearing testimony from the neighbors, Heritage and the Landmarks Board, voted ten-to-one to designate Mrs. Cherney's house a landmark. The mayor signed the ordinance soon after.

The story does not end here. The owners of 126 27th Avenue appealed the Planning Commission's denial of the demolition permit. On April 18, the Board of Permit Appeals heard the case and voted to deny the appeal.

Jill Hallinan, Bev Klein, Julie Ray and their neighbors saved a bit of neighborhood history. They maintain their vigilance, now, to make sure this landmark, which sits vacant, does not fall victim to vandalism or landlord neglect. Preservation is a full-time job.

In 1984, David K. Finn hosted a meeting of neighbors that marked the birth of the Buena Vista North Association. Recent development had made residents and property owners aware of the fragile nature of the neighborhood's architectural character. The group decided to solicit support for an historic district, hoping that the regulations which ensure compatible new construction and sensitive alterations to existing buildings in historic districts would help conserve the area's architectural legacy.

About half of the some three hundred sixty-seven structures within the proposed district's boundaries—Divisadero, Masonic, Oak and Haight, date from 1880-90, when the growing attraction of Golden Gate Park and opening of the Haight Street cable car line encouraged residential development west of Divisadero Street. Most of the rest date from the period 1900-1930. All of San Francisco's historic styles from the district's fifty-year period of significance are represented, but the preponderance of the stock is Classical Revival, Queen Anne and Stick.

The Association's newsletter and informational meetings generated wide support for the historic district concept. Dues and two very successful house tours (one of which Heritage helped to sponsor) provided the means to hire historian Anne Bloom-
ARCHITECTURAL FRAGMENTS

Transit buffs and preservation advocates equally share a concern for the condition of City Landmark #105, at the southeast corner of Turk and Fillmore Streets. Shored because of the 1989 earthquake, this 1896 electrical substation served first the Market Street Railway Company and then the Muni, until 1978. Charles A. Smallwood, historian of the Market Street Railway, described the building as a veritable “cathedral of electricity,” which once housed six sets of 1500 kw generators. The City recently transferred stewardship from the Muni to the Arts Commission, which is currently exploring reuses for the structure that will entail its rehabilitation and preservation.

The San Francisco chapter of the American Institute of Architects offers a mediation service called **Advisory Design Review**. Arnold Lerner, chapter Secretary and former Director of Architectural Services at Heritage, initiated the program, which aims to provide an objective and neutral forum for neighbors and developers to settle disputes over new construction or alteration projects that come under the Residential Conservation Interim Controls. For information on the service and how it works, call 362-7397.

Preservationist and hotelier **Joel Daily** died of AIDS, in San Francisco, February 23. In 1977, he and his late partner Tony Kramedas purchased the residence at 943 South Van Ness Avenue, built in 1872 for the John English family. They carefully restored the twenty-room house, which had suffered disfiguring modernization over the years, to its original Victorian Era character, furnished it in period style and operated it as The Inn San Francisco.

Two important San Francisco Landmarks appeared in the news recently in quake-related items. On March 13, H.J. Degenkolb Associates, Engineers, announced they had received the contract to perform a seismic evaluation of the **Ferry Building**. “We are exploring ways to improve its future performance while preserving its historic appearance and fabric,” said Loring A. Wyllie, the firm’s principal in charge of the analysis. On April 10, the American Conservatory Theater announced the selection of the firm of Esherick, Homsey, Dodge and Davis to restore the interior of the **Geary Theater**. It suffered severe damage when a lighting grid pulled away from the proscenium during the October earthquake.

In preparation for the building-by-building survey, architect Paul Finwall instructed his neighbors how to identify and evaluate architectural styles. Taking part in the survey were other BVN Association members Timothy Beaver, Timothy Sockett, Kim Desteiguer, Yvonne Sigueiros, Marge Yasueda, Dennis Wolframski, Patricia Madigan, and David Hunter. Scott Miller completed the data entry work, and several neighbors, including Kathy LaForce and Bob Emery, photodocumented the district.

In December, the Landmarks Board voted to recommend approval of the district to the Planning Commission, which will hear the issue sometime this year. If approved, Buena Vista North will become the city’s eighth historic district and another tribute to citizen preservation advocacy. ■

—Jill Hallinan wrote up the 27th Ave. story. Paul Finwall and Janet Nedeau contributed to the BVN account.

---

**TEAM**

**Paul Finwall** and **Janet Nedeau** contributed to the **BVN A**ccount.
New Architecture
San Francisco
James Shay, AIA
Chronicle Books
San Francisco, 1989

In this remarkably fluid period of architectural discourse, the concept of place-defining architecture is one of a few values upon which many contemporary practitioners can agree. The architectural response to the physical drama of the Bay Region has forcibly created an identifiable regional building tradition. As such, it is not surprising that the thirty-five prominent local practitioners interviewed by James Shay in New Architecture San Francisco consistently articulate their reaction to the existing built and native context of the region.

The interview format of the volume is one which has previously met with success in such publications as Cook and Klotz’s Conversations With Architects (1973) and Barbara Lee Diamonstein’s American Architecture Now (1980). As New York Times architecture critic Paul Goldberger noted in his introduction to Diamonstein’s volume, these published works restore “to us some sense of the significance of verbal communication in the making of architecture.”

The intellectual content of Shay’s interviews is impressive. The architects, many of whom have written and taught architecture, tend to express theoretical positions, and when they discuss the making of buildings, it is in terms of process rather than, as Sally Woodbridge notes in her introduction to this book, the “nuts and bolts of getting it built.” She observes that Fisher-Friedman (architects of Golden Gateway Commons) are a notable exception to this rule.

“Contextualism” is among the leading topics the architects discuss in these interviews. Shay defines it as “a popular approach within post-modernism architecture that calls for designing individual buildings and groups of buildings so that they are woven visually into their surroundings.” Contextualism implies a design process which includes the study of prevailing building types and their siting, relationships between buildings, choice of materials and forms. The interpretation of these elements can range from Backen Arrigoni and Ross’ Macondry Terrace Condominiums on Russian Hill, where they merged the Mediterranean and Craftsman images within a courtyard plan, to Kotas and Panaleoni’s California Street Apartments, where peculiarities of scale found in the work of Ernest Coxhead and other turn-of-the-century contemporaries are set within a building envelope that is respectful of its bay-windowed neighbors.

The literate and perceptive tone that pervades this volume is set by Sally Woodbridge’s introduction. Conscious that this handsome book may attract a general as well as professional audience, she gently reminds the reader of the practical world from which these theoretical positions emerge. Christopher Irion’s color photographs beautifully reveal the projects discussed. While the architectural drawings included are handsome works, additional drawings—specifically floor plans and cross-sections—would greatly increase the readability of the works.

—Lauren Weiss Bricker

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

Call for a complimentary opinion of value
Live/Work continued from page 5

Tuscan pilasters which define wide bays originally glazed with steel industrial sash windows. Unfortunately, weather erosion necessitated the replacement of the windows with anodized aluminum frames, although still in the multi-paned configuration.

Rick Holliday of McKenzie, Rose & Holliday Development, Inc. is sponsoring the project. His architect is David Baker. Holliday's intention is to develop ninety loft condominiums planned as live/work space for small, start-up entrepreneurs. Ceiling heights range from fourteen to sixteen feet, with lofts averaging 1,400 square feet per unit. With the exception of the existing floor levels, the interior of the structure will be virtually new and includes seismic bracing, new light courts, ventilation shaft and the utilities to serve live/work spaces.

A third project, is nearing completion at 520 Hampshire Street, a 1930 reinforced structure originally built by Sunset Scavenger Corporation. The sponsor of this project is David Allen, whose family has been associated with notable suburban developments in San Francisco (Sea Cliff) and Marin County (Belvedere).

Allen is working with Michael Sands of the architectural firm Russ Watson & Associates. Their project entails the creation of office space to house the Bay Guardian on the ground floor. Twelve live/work units will be inserted within the upper two floors and an additional partial fourth floor. A restaurant will replace the former "Sunset Bar" located at the northeast corner of the property.

Many conversions are in progress or planned in the city. With the SOMA Plan committed to "preserve the architectural character and identity of commercial/industrial buildings," as well as live/work space, San Franciscans can expect to see many more, particularly in this interesting and quickly changing part of the city.

—L.W.B. & D.A.
ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES AT WORK

Architectural Services has begun work on several new projects through the Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG) of the Mayor's Office of Housing, which funds repairs on housing for low-income people. The clients include individual families and non-profit organizations which sponsor group living facilities or "board and care" homes for people with various disabilities.

One of these projects is 1900 Pierce Street, an unusual corner Victorian, built for Mr. John I. Sabin of the Pacific Bell Telephone Company and now owned by the Association for Retarded Citizens. The Association plans to use the building as housing for mentally retarded residents who are making the transition to independent living in their own apartments.

An exterior photograph and an extensive description of the interiors of this house appeared in Artistic Homes of California (1888). This material, reorganized and reprinted in 1987 as Victorian Classics of San Francisco, makes it easy to document the changes the house has undergone. For example, a modern kitchen has replaced the original library next to the dining room. The original kitchen was in the basement, along with the laundry, wine room, and servants' bedrooms.

While the decorative glass shown in some of the windows has disappeared, the coffered ceiling and wall paneling in the entry hall and several lovely corner fireplaces are intact, as is most of the original woodwork.

Work on the building will include modifications to comply with handicapped access requirements, creation of separate apartments at basement and attic levels, and repairs to earthquake-damaged plaster. Exterior painting and window repairs are also planned.

NEW DOCENTS GRADUATE

The Haas-Lilienthal House Docent, Heritage Hikes and Walks Guides Class of 1990 graduated on the evening of March 29, with a tasting of the historic wines of northern California.

Members of the class included Diane Alfinito, James and Mary Armstrong, Elizabeth Charlson, Brenda Cory, Carice Flanagan, Marc Hyman, Carlton Johnson, Ryoko Kobayashi MacColl, Sara Purcell, Dori Ryken, Arlene Siprelle, Mark Smith, Lauren Weiss, Pat Wilke, and Robert Yeargin.

A number of these people will serve as docents and guides for both regular House tours and Pacific Heights Walks, and several will help lead summer walks and tours. Congratulations to all!

Thanks to Fred McMillin, who presented the wine tasting and to Connie Hammerman, a long-time docent and guide, who arranged the program.

It is not too early to express your interest in becoming a Heritage guide or docent in 1991. For further information contact Education Coordinator Rick Propas at 441-3000.

Summer programs

continued from page 1

which will make the transition to a national park between 1990 and 1995. Join us to learn about some of the three hundred and fifty-five architecturally or historically significant buildings and the preservation challenge they represent.

In August, we go south of Market, a diverse area which was the city's first silk stocking district and later home to industry and warehouses. Virtually every aspect of the city's history has flourished here at some time, and remnants of all exist today. Pump up your bicycle tires (or rent a bike) and join us to explore a part of the city that continues to change.

Our final summer walk features interiors of the Inner Richmond, where Heritage is surveying architectural resources. Our walk focuses on the area between Park Presidio and Arguello, the Presidio Wall and Clement, including Presidio Terrace. This area offers a wide range of architecture, from the vernacular to custom design and from small cottages to grand homes and apartment houses.

Send in your "Summer in the City" reservation form now. Look, too, for the special package of all three "Summer in the City" programs. A number of members have found that the package makes a wonderful gift and is a good way to introduce friends to Heritage.

ADDENDA

The earthquake feature in the last issue of the Newsletter failed to name Tower Architects as associated with Patrick McGrew Associates in the rehab and retrofit of 20 California St.

The same issue stated that the Department of City Planning supported a senior housing project in the 1600 block of Pine Street which calls for the demolition of five architecturally important buildings. DCP has advised Heritage that while they do support the project, they do not support the demolition of the those buildings, at this time.
CONTINUING HERITAGE EVENTS

Sundays 11 am to 4:15
Haas-Lilienthal House Tours

Wednesdays 12 noon to 3:15
Pacific Heights Walking Tour

Sundays 12:30 pm
Haas-Lilienthal House Tours

Sundays 12:30 pm
Pacific Heights Walking Tour

Saturdays June 2-September 29
Chinatown Walking Tour 10 am
Meets at 950 Clay Street

Saturdays June 9, 23 July 7, 21
August 4, 18 September 1, 15, 29
Presidio Walking Tour 10 am
Meets at Main Parade Ground
Call 441-3004

JUNE

June 23 11 am
Heritage Architectural Bay Cruise
Call 441-3000

June 8-10
Art Deco Weekend by the Bay
Art Deco Society of California
Call 552-DECO

June 14-August 26
Exhibition: Visionary San Francisco
Museum of Modern Art
Call 863-8800

Throughout the year
Cameron-Stanford House, Oakland
Tours Wednesdays 11-4
Sundays 1-5 Call 836-1976

Through the fall
Dunsmuir House, Oakland
Tours every Sunday
Call 562-7588

Through July 13
Exhibit: Art by Architects
AIA/SF Gallery
Call 362-7397

JULY

July 28 10 am
Heritage Presidio Interiors Tour
Call 441-3000

July 19-September 16
Exhibition: The Art Museums of Louis I. Kahn
Museum of Modern Art
Call 863-8800

July 21-August 26
Neighborhood Walking Tours
Oakland Heritage Alliance
Call 763-9218

AUGUST

August 26 10 am
Heritage South of Market Bike Tour
Call 441-3000

SEPTEMBER

September 16 10 am
Heritage Interiors of the Inner Richmond Tour
Call 441-3000

JOIN HERITAGE!

YES I would like to become a member of HERITAGE. Enclosed is my check in the amount of:

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

Name

Address

City, state, zipcode

Phone

Please make checks payable to:
HERITAGE
2007 Franklin Street
San Francisco, CA 94109

Contributions are tax deductible.

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

HERITAGE
2007 Franklin Street
San Francisco, CA 94109