In December 1989, Butterfield and Butterfield held the first of a two-part auction of the John Pflueger Collection of architectural drawings. The collection represented the career of San Francisco architect Timothy Pflueger (1892-1946) and included his own work and the work of firms with which he was associated. In the second part of the auction, held March 1, 1990, Heritage acquired fifteen drawings of Miller & Colmesnil, the architects with whom Pflueger did his apprenticeship.

The tradition of collecting architectural renderings extends back several centuries. As David Gebhard indicates in his introduction to the catalogue of the University of California/Santa Barbara collection, practising architects and scholars have sought them as source materials for their own work or as documents in the study of architectural history. Connoisseurs have regarded them primarily as works of art. The exhibition, Visionary San Francisco, recently at the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art (See Booknotes, page 7) indicates a level of interest today in architectural drawings both as historical documents and as works of art.

With the growing concern for historic architecture, in this century, preservationists and architectural historians have employed drawings as tools of the trade. Heritage receives many requests for assistance in locating original drawings from practitioners who are engaged in restoration work. Publication in 1988 of Waverly Lowell's guide to architectural records in the Bay Area (See Newsletter, February 1989) has proven a valuable resource in this quest. For the historian, plans of both unbuilt and realized projects give evidence of an architect's development, and drawings may be the only sources to document buildings that have been demolished.

San Francisco-born Timothy Pflueger, raised and schooled in the Mission, worked as an apprentice right out of high school at the architectural firm of Miller & Colmesnil. He joined in partnership with Miller after World War I. The Heritage Newsletter said of Pflueger (Winter, 1981), "His short career endowed the city with some of its finest landmarks and contributed continued on page 10

Miller & Colmesnil, Architects
Apartment Building/Residential Hotel for
Spencer C. & Samuel G. Buckbee
Southeast corner of Jones and Steveloe Streets
Entrance elevation and section
Undated drawing. Project not realized
COMMENTARY

Over the past several months, workers have reduced this building at the northeast corner of Van Ness Avenue and Sacramento Street to a truncated shell, in the process of converting it to housing. Only a portion of the reinforced concrete frame remains, stripped of architectural features. Why not simply demolish and replace the building? The answer, according to a source in the Planning Department, suggests that a project to “alter” and add to an ‘existing’ structure does not have to comply with rear yard and parking provisions, which the current building code requires of new construction.

The City's Van Ness Area Plan listed this former auto showroom, which has housed a variety of dealerships since construction in 1919, as a contributory building. The preservation component of the plan encourages “the retention and appropriate alteration of contributory structures.” The plan also calls for “flexibility and imagination” in the preservation and adaptive reuse of automotive structures, which predominate in the Van Ness corridor. It is difficult to understand how a project such as that at Sacramento and Van Ness fulfills these objectives.

This precedent is disturbing. The recently adopted South of Market Area Plan also provides for the development of housing and encourages the retention and adaptive reuse of the industrial, commercial and warehouse structures that characterize the area. What assurance does this give that planners will not approve demolition-through-alteration there, as well?

On Van Ness Avenue, the Planning Department responds that the retention of the structural core of the first three floors (See photo above) was all that could be negotiated. Yet at no point in the permit process did the Department notify Heritage or ask for assistance in obtaining concessions from the project sponsor which would better achieve the results called for in their own adopted plan. How will the Department handle the pending proposal to demolish two much more important structures within the Van Ness Plan area, in the 1600 block of Pine Street (See Newsletter, Winter 1990)?
The recent proposal to demolish the former Maimonides Hospital complex, now part of Mount Zion Hospital, has attracted the attention of architects and architectural historians around the world.

The architect of the complex was German-born Erich Mendelsohn, a seminal figure in expressionist architecture in the 1920s and a major contributor to the International Style. Mendelsohn fled Nazi Germany in 1933. After years in London, Israel and New York, he settled in San Francisco in 1945, where he maintained a practice until his death in 1953.

The Maimonides is Mendelsohn’s first project constructed in the United States and is one of only two of his designs realized in San Francisco. The complex includes a one-story pavilion joined to a highrise tower by a glass-enclosed passageway, which opens into a Thomas Church-designed garden courtyard. The building received wide publicity after its construction, and, in 1953, the New York Museum of Modern Art cited it as “among the most significant examples of modern architecture” built since World War II.

The proposal to demolish the Maimonides complex first surfaced last year (See Newsletter, Summer 1989), as part of the University of California/San Francisco’s long range plan for Mount Zion Hospital, whose integration with the university medical school took place this summer. Heritage took strong exception to the opinion of UCSF’s Environmental Impact Report that no architecturally or historically significant buildings existed at Mt. Zion and that the demolition of six or seven buildings at Mount Zion, including the Maimonides, “would not be considered a significant loss.”

Earlier this year, Heritage’s Board of Directors took a position opposing demolition of the Maimonides under any circumstances. Soon after, the San Francisco Chapter of the AIA endorsed a similar resolution. In meetings of the University regents, Heritage has been joined by the AIA, interested neighbors of Mt. Zion and numerous architects and historians in urging retention and adaptive reuse of the complex.

The university had taken the position that alterations to the tower, particularly the enclosure of the balconies on the south side, have seriously compromised the building’s integrity. However, those alterations are entirely reversible.

In response to the concern of preservationists, the University is exploring a plan to retain the Maimonides complex. In a public meeting with the Western Addition Neighborhood Association on August 2, the University presented a proposal for the retention and reuse of the Maimonides as a clinic and the construction of a highrise addition to the north, on Bush Street. The reaction of the “friends” of the Maimonides was inconclusive, because the design of the addition, which would house research facilities, is only schematic at this stage.

The City is currently considering the first application to demolish a Downtown Plan-rated building. The structure, a six-story, three-part vertical composition residential hotel at 620 Post Street, is a Category IV building, due to its status as a contributory building in the Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter Conservation District. Coincidentally, it is also a contributory building in the proposed Lower Nob Hill Hotel and Apartment National Register Historic District, which the State Historical Resources Commission is now considering.

Article 11 permits demolition of Downtown Plan-rated buildings if the Department of Public Works orders demolition to eliminate an imminent hazard or in the event the owner can demonstrate that the building has “no substantial remaining market value or reasonable use.” In conservation districts, structures may also be demolished if the design for a replacement structure has been approved. The Bureau of Building Inspection has determined that there is no imminent public hazard in the case of 620 Post Street, and the site owner has presented no plans for a replacement structure. Instead, he has attempted to argue that the cost of rehabilitating...
PRESERVATION NOTES

this unreinforced masonry structure, including seismic upgrading, would exceed its market value and has therefore applied for demolition under the procedures of Article 11. After considering the case, the Landmarks Board requested a discretionary review by the Planning Commission, on the grounds that the owner has not given sufficient evidence in support of his contention. At this time, interested parties are exploring the feasibility of a non-profit housing corporation purchasing and developing the building as a low income single-room occupancy hotel.

MALTING PLANT

ARMAX Corporation and its architects, Tanner Ledd Maytum Stacy, with Daniel Solomon & Associates, have presented a proposal for development of the former Bauer & Schweitzer Maling Company plant at 530-550 Chestnut Street. Brewers and maltsters have occupied this site since 1867. The present complex replaced a nearly identical plant which was destroyed right after completion in 1906. Built in 1908, this plant is the last remaining brewing and malting facility in North Beach and a reminder of the district's traditional mixed industrial-residential use. Its principal structures include a two-story reinforced concrete office/warehouse building on Chestnut Street, six seventy-foot steel silos, eight smaller silos and a one hundred-foot reinforced concrete tower on Francisco Street, where barley was unloaded from railroad cars for processing and storage. In 1981, the City designated only the tower structure a landmark.

The proposal, as reviewed by Heritage this spring, overcomes the challenge of transforming this interesting but difficult site into condominium housing, while retaining much of the historic structures in the complex. The scheme calls for demolition and replacement of the Chestnut Street building. The project will preserve the landmark tower structure on Francisco Street, as well as the six large silos. The overall treatment of the project will attempt to retain the basic industrial character of the site. While Heritage regrets the loss of portions of the structures, it commends the effort and, after having completed a detailed review and discussion with the sponsors, will support the project.

1808 PALOU STREET

Developers seeking buildable sites in San Francisco are turning to the city's southeast quadrant, where the prospect of opening up surplus Navy property at Hunters Point will soon cause land values to rise. Recently, Heritage received word of a proposal to demolish an Italianate-style residence in the Bayview district, at 1808 Palou Avenue. The building, owned by Southern Pacific Railroad until 1989, served as a residence for the foreman of track maintenance and repair gangs on the railroad for most of this century. The house is on land originally part of the Haley-O'Neill tract, whose development began in the 1860s. A neighborhood source attributes construction of the Palou Street house to Arthur McGuire, and the City Directory first lists McGuire at this location in 1868. However, the square-bay design would place the building no earlier than the 1870s. Water Department records indicate a tap into the water system in 1883, and Sanborn maps show no evidence of a well which might have served a house on the site before that date.

The developer of the site had proposed demolition of the house in order to make room for a five-lot subdivision at the northwest corner of Palou Avenue and Phelps Street. In response to strong objections from Heritage, which helped facilitate review by the Landmarks Board, the project sponsor now proposes to move the historic house to the northern end of the project site, on Phelps Street, where he would rehabilitate it as a single-family residence. The matter is unresolved at this time.

*UPDATE* On May 10, the mayor signed an ordinance designating the Spreckels property (See Newsletter, Summer 1989) a city landmark. The designation specifically includes the grounds, surrounding wall, garage and chauffeur's quarters, as well as the mansion.
SPOTLIGHT ON REHAB

FIRE-DAMAGED PROPERTIES RESTORED IN THE HAIGHT

On September 22, 1988, a raging pre-dawn fire broke out in a building under construction at the northwest corner of Haight and Cole Streets (See Newsletter, Winter 1988). The intense heat of the arson fire, which destroyed the intended home for a Thrifty Jr. drugstore, drove residents from nearby apartments moments before those buildings burst into flames. In all, a dozen structures suffered damage ranging from shattered windows and scorched and blistered paint to destruction of residential units in two Edwardian-era apartment houses across Cole Street from the Thrifty Jr. site.

Historian Chris Nelson (See Newsletter, April 1987) described the Haight as "an almost entirely intact turn-of-the-century streetcar suburb." The loss of contextually significant structures at a key intersection would seriously compromise the neighborhood character. Fortunately, the owners of the buildings at 540 Cole and 1692-98 Haight decided to preserve and restore them.

The two apartment houses occupy part of the 137.6-foot-square northeast corner of Haight and Cole, which originally belonged to the Baird Estate. Kentucky-born John H. Baird arrived in San Francisco on the famed Gold Rush ship Niantic, in 1849. He pursued a varied career in the growing city and acquired considerable real estate. By 1870, he owned nearly half the property in the Haight. He died in 1880. By the turn of the century, the Baird Estate had sold off much of the Haight properties for development.

Veronica Baird, the captain's widow, sold the land at Cole and Haight to William J. McKillop in 1907. He, in turn, subdivided and sold off the larger corner lot to W.F. Porter, who built 1692-98 Haight, a typical contractor-designed apartment house of the Edwardian era in San Francisco. McKillop, with his brothers Daniel and George, constructed 532 Cole St. in 1907, and working out of the carriage house at the rear, built a number of Haight district buildings, including 540 Cole, completed in 1911.

The Del Curto family has owned 540 Cole for some forty years. The fire destroyed the roof and façade at the top level of the four-story structure. When it was clear he could save the fire-damaged building, Rino Del Curto moved quickly to enlist contractor John Pasini and to secure the necessary permits. Darin Richards-Brown, a Heritage member who has worked on a number of renovations for Del Curto Properties, managed the project.

Pasini began reconstruction in November of 1988 and completely rebuilt the sections destroyed. Olsen Construction restored the original façade details, working from photos, memory and the example of similar buildings in the neighborhood. On lower floors and at the entry, workers scraped and repainted the scorched and water-damaged surfaces.

Fire and the fire fighters, who had to pursue the fire into the walls, destroyed the entire assembly of most of the windows in the front of the building. In order to keep costs down so that tenants could return to restored apartments at the same rent, Darin Richards-Brown opted for anodized aluminum frames. While not appropriate to this building, they are at least double-hung windows that retain the proportions of the original fenestration. At the rear, where frames only and not the whole assembly were damaged, Pasini installed wood frame replacement windows that he had to custom order.

Inside, wherever damage was limited to scorching or water and continued on page 8
CITY MOVES ON CONSERVATION IN THE SOUTH OF MARKET

This spring the City approved two measures which will have an important impact on preservation South of Market. On March 23, Mayor Agnos signed the ordinance designating the South End Historic District (See Newsletter; Spring 1989), extending protection to more than fifty commercial and warehouse structures dating from virtually every period of the city’s economic history. The City’s area plan “for the conservation and development” of South of Market, which the City has incorporated into its Master Plan, overlaps the historic district’s boundaries and designates an additional thirty-three significant buildings.

Contributory Buildings within the South End Historic District:
- 200 Brannan, 230 Brannan
- 274 Brannan, 275 Brannan
- 300 Brannan, 301 Brannan
- 329 Bryant, 333-353 Bryant
- 355-367 Bryant, 385 Bryant
- 52 Colin P. Kelly
- 1 Federal, 51 Federal, 60 Federal

Significant Buildings in the South of Market Area Plan:
- 475 Brannan
- 539 Bryant, 673 Bryant
- 1477-79 Emberly
- 1400 Folsom, 1477 Folsom
- 1489 Folsom
- 1275 Harrison, 1440 Harrison
- 7 Heron
- 1035 Howard, 1049 Howard
- 1097 Howard, 1126 Howard
- 1234 Howard, 1401 Howard
- 1415 Howard
- 1235 Mission
- 310 Townsend, 350 Townsend
- 410 Townsend
- 500 Fourth, 601 Fourth
- 106 Sixth, 182 Sixth
- 201 Sixth, 665 Sixth
- 335 Seventh
- 201 Ninth
- 165 Tenth, 465 Tenth
- 319 Eleventh, 333 Eleventh

512 First, 620-650 First
128 King
461 Second, 500 Second
512 Second, 522-6 Second
553 Second, 544 Second
555-59 Second, 563 Second
599 Second, 601 Second
625 Second, 634 Second
640 Second, 650 Second
670 Second, 678-680 Second
698 Second, 699 Second
1 South Park/570 Third
601 Third, 625-647 Third
630 Third, 660 Third
665 Third, 685 Third
64 Townsend, 101 Townsend
111 Townsend
115-131 Townsend
130 Townsend, 135 Townsend
136 Townsend, 139 Townsend
144 Townsend, 148 Townsend
156-164 Townsend
166 Townsend, 180 Townsend
200-202 Townsend

1275 Harrison Street

166 Townsend Street

300 Brannan Street
The Oriental Warehouse, at First and Brannan Streets, is a sentinel of San Francisco's past. Once the hub of vital activity on the waterfront, the massive brick building today stands isolated in an area undergoing rapid change. The Oriental Warehouse symbolizes San Francisco's onetime importance as a center of international trade and maritime activity. The building itself played a crucial role in that trade and was part of a complex which received the majority of Asian immigrants arriving in the West, from the 1860s to the early twentieth century. Nearly all passenger traffic to the Orient passed through this facility, as well.

Contemporary accounts portray the drama that centered on the site of the Oriental Warehouse. In 1872, the Alta California observed that the arrival of a ship there created "such a state of excitement and confusion as to suggest to the mind of the spectator the Tower of Babel..." Hackmen, boarding-house runners, touters of every denomination and a heterogeneous mass of seemingly self-interested humanity...crowd the gangways as soon as they are fixed, throwing cards, shouting names, hustling passengers and attacking baggage...

The New York-based Pacific Mail Steamship Company (PMSS) constructed the Oriental Warehouse in 1867, at a time when entrepreneurs in San Francisco were laying the foundations of an economic empire that drew riches through the port of San Francisco, to and from North and South America, the Pacific Islands and the Far East. PMSS was the principal carrier of that trade, and its San Francisco facilities handled millions of dollars worth of goods. The Oriental Warehouse is all that remains of the PMSS complex.

The Company got its start in New York when William H. Aspinwall successfully bid on a U.S. Government contract, in 1847, to provide postal service from the East to the West Coast. It appeared to be a risky venture, even with heavy government subsidies, that is, until the Gold Rush entered the picture.

When Pacific Mail's steamer, the California, stopped at Panama City, en route to inaugurate the Panama-California service, her crew found that word of the discovery of gold had preceded their arrival. A crowd of would-be prospectors demanded passage. On arrival in San Francisco on February 28, 1849, the California dropped anchor at the eastern lee of Telegraph Hill, and four hundred fifty passengers disembarked for the gold fields. She was the first steamer ever to arrive in this port. The steamers Oregon and Panama followed the California within the next four months, loaded with gold seekers. As a result of the Gold Rush, PMSS's regular mail service between Panama and San Francisco's Archite...
Francisco proved more profitable than the most extravagant expectations.

During the next twenty years, the explosive growth of California and the building of the transcontinental railroad (completed in 1869) encouraged the nation to look to the establishment of a regular steamship service across the Pacific to the Orient. In 1865, an act of Congress directed the Postmaster-General to call for bids on a ten-year contract to provide monthly mail service between San Francisco and China, with calls at the Hawaiian Islands and Japan. Pacific Mail submitted the only acceptable bid.

To accommodate the trans-Pacific service, PMSS built four new steamships: the Great Republic, Japan, China and America. Ashore, the Company, which had previously leased existing facilities, decided to construct its own new facilities in South Beach and leased land for this purpose from the State Board of Harbor Commissioners. The property, then at the water's edge, now lies between Brannan, Townsend, First and Colin P. Kelly (originally Japan) Streets. The new complex included a wharf at the end of First Street, the Oriental and the Occidental Warehouses, coal yards and rail facilities. In order to accomplish this major effort, according to Langley's San Francisco City Directory (1868) the Company "cut down hills, and fitted up swamps to such an extent that what had been the most useless portion of the city front has become the center of an extensive business."

In early 1868, the Pacific Mail Steamship Company's President described the new San Francisco facility in his annual report to the stockholders: "At San Francisco, the Company...have erected extensive and commodious wharves...at which the inward and outward steamers of the Panama and China Lines lie and discharge and receive cargo, without interfering one with the other. In connection with these wharves, and to meet the demands of the increasing freight traffic, particularly that to and from China, the Company have built three convenient warehouses [the Oriental Warehouse divided into thirds by fire walls] of ample capacity, and provided with the best protection against fire..."
The Oriental Warehouse, centrally placed between the First Street wharf sheds and the coal yards, physically dominated Pacific Mail's operations. Architectural historian Michael Corbett characterized the warehouse as "a state-of-the-art example of planning and construction...not a cheap building but...intended as a permanent, essential component in the business of a major international corporation." The high quality of its masonry and timber construction, as well as the fine exterior brick detail work, show that the Company spent lavishly on this important structure.

The brick exterior and fire walls of the Oriental Warehouse rest on substantial foundations. A September 1867 newspaper account reported that "they are of solid rock, deposited on the rocky bottom of the bay, and made still more firm by the earth and stone deposited around them, and...by the process of filling in from the adjacent hills." The fire walls divide the Warehouse into three bays, which run the length of the building. The interior structural system, comprised of heavy timber supports and tightly fitted floors derives from the principles of fire-resistant construction. Goods intended for short-term storage could be unloaded through the wharf sheds or directly from the ships to the ground floor, while hoists lifted goods for long-term storage into the open lofts of the upper floor.

From the beginning, the PMSS complex saw the transit of varied commodities that included flour, gold and silver bars and Mexican dollars, as well as oats, barley and wheat, quicksilver, liquor, beans, dried fish and various provisions for American and European residents in the Orient. Rice, tea and silk were the principal commodities that entered the facility from the Orient for distribution in the United States.

Thousands of immigrants from China and Japan arrived here on Pacific Mail steamers to play a vital part in building California. The South Beach facility served as a West Coast equivalent of Ellis Island from the 1860s until the construction of the immigration station on Angel Island, in 1910. Maritime historian John Kemble, writing in Side-Wheelers Across the Pacific (1942), describes the arrival of Chinese immigrants: "sometimes more than a thousand of them, came ashore by the gangway forward, carrying bedding, clothing, and all their possessions swung over their shoulders on bamboo poles." They were then lodged in the wooden sheds of Pacific Mail's First Street wharf, and eventually transported through the city to Chinatown, "sometimes attacked by white ruffians, particularly in periods of anti-Chinese agitation."

Although the Company thrived on the Pacific traffic, it began to feel the effects of competition by the 1880s. California historian John Hittell wrote in The Commerce and Industries of the Pacific Coast of North America (1882), that the Pacific Mail "has declined greatly in importance to our coast, since competition [from the] first railroad across the continent." In fact, in 1878, Collis P. Huntington, one of Central Pacific Railroad's "Big Four" and president of the Railroad, wrote his good friend Mark Hopkins, "The PMSS Co. is in trouble, and it would be a very good time to take it into camp if we had the right parties to work with. I think the whole concern could be controlled for a million and a half."

The Pacific Mail did come "into camp" shortly thereafter. In 1893, Huntington became president of the steamship company and remained in control until his death in 1900. At that point, the Southern Pacific Railroad, which had absorbed the Central Pacific in 1884, purchased controlling interest in PMSS and thereby acquired the Oriental Warehouse.

By 1907-10, construction of the seawall, begun in the
1870s in the vicinity of today's Fisherman's Wharf, reached the area of the Oriental Warehouse and, ironically, cut it off from the water that was its life-blood. The seawall construction entailed demolition of the old "Mail Dock" (the First Street wharf) and the addition of bay-fill, paved to create the new East Street (now the Embarcadero), separating the Oriental Warehouse from the new piers built further east.

The 1910s proved to be a transitional period for South Beach. In the area just west of the Oriental Warehouse, bounded by Colin P. Kelly, Brannan, Townsend and Second Streets, the South End Warehouses and Rosenberg's Dried Fruit Company replaced modest housing and a coal yard. Hooper's South End Grain Warehouse (1874) and the 1882 California Warehouse (taken over by the South End Warehouse Company) remained at the Townsend St. end of that block.

Southern Pacific continued the practice, begun when the Oriental Warehouse opened, of leasing it to a variety of operators. The first proprietors were the firm of Howard and Pool, whose sign is visible on the north wall, in a photograph from the 1880s. Other operators have included the Haslett Warehouse Company, at the turn of the century, and the De Pue Warehouse Company, from 1920 until about 1955. A "ghost" of the De Pue name appears on the building's east face. In the years that followed, the Oriental

1977, the City designated the Oriental Warehouse a landmark. In 1980, the SFRA adopted the Rincon Point-South Beach Plan, which proposed that the Oriental Warehouse—soon to be designated eligible for the National Register of Historic Places—play a vital role in the context of the new development. Documents accompanying the plan stated that the SFRA intended the warehouse to "include a combination of such uses as retail, commercial, day-care, recreation and service facilities."

During the next ten years, several development proposals involving the Oriental Warehouse surfaced, but none were actually undertaken. In 1990, the City of San Francisco created the South End Historic District and included the Oriental Warehouse, the district's "historically most important building," over the objections of the Redevelopment Agency. The ordinance designating the district extends recognition to other historic warehouses in the area. Despite this recognition, the future existence of the Oriental Warehouse remains in doubt.

—Jean Kortum, Lauren Weiss Bricker & Don Andreini

COPYRIGHT 1990 THE FOUNDATION FOR SAN FRANCISCO'S ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE
**Visionary San Francisco**
By Paolo Polledri, ed.

Since the advent of the City Beautiful movement toward the end of the 19th century, most American cities have been self-conscious of the way they have built. San Francisco has been among the cities most absorbed with its own development. The volume *Visionary San Francisco* is ostensibly the catalogue for the exhibit of the same name on view at the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art from June 14 to August 26. Not only does the book greatly enrich one's understanding of the exhibit, it stands well on its own. If you missed the exhibit, do not hesitate to purchase the catalogue, for it fully imparts the spirit and essence of the show.

The chief curator of Visionary San Francisco, Paolo Polledri, admits in his contribution to the volume that an exhibition on architecture and history is not the traditional domain of an art museum. In fact, the exhibit reflected the tension between the subject and the institution. Art galleries tend to present their material without much interpretation, believing that the pieces speak for themselves. Up to the 1970s, other museums followed this pattern. More recently, the pendulum has swung toward more interpretation and interaction between material and viewer. This trend has caught up with natural history, historical and children's museums but has not yet been taken on by art museums, and this difference in interpretive styles shows in the Visionary exhibit. Much of the material in this exhibition was presented without an attempt to create narrative continuity, in a manner more suited to art than to architecture. This type of installation reflects Polledri's belief that these visionary plans do speak for themselves.

The volume *Visionary San Francisco* answers the need for interpretive material. The volume is made up of seven very diverse essays on the city, and although they are interspersed, there are here two different groups of works: those which present the "objective" history of the city and those which can best be regarded as "memoirs" of the city. Gray Brechin, Daniel Gregory and Sally Woodbridge provide what Polledri calls the reality. The realists all deal with the question of a coherent vision for the city. Brechin notes the variety of contending visions that tried to shape the early city; Gregory argues that the city had a vision in the early twentieth century; and Woodbridge implies that after World War II that vision was lost to the quest for growth.

What Polledri characterizes as the dreamscape, however, is more metaphysical, reaching out to explain the soul of the city. The dreamers deal with the city as a human habitat or a state of mind. Joe Gores evokes the city's Hispanic character. While Richard Rodriguez discusses the gay aspects of the city, his essay really explains why San Francisco is a haven for "bohemian" lifestyles. William Gibson presents a futurist view of the...
ARCHITECTURAL FRAGMENTS

Sculptor Douglas Tilden's monument to the California Volunteers of the Spanish-American War (See Newsletter, Spring 1989), on Market Street at the head of Dolores Street, recently underwent cleaning at the hands of Genevieve Baird and Larry Rief. This team has previously restored the Mechanic’s and the Admission Day monuments, both also by Tilden, under the Arts Commission’s program to refurbish all the Market Street Monuments.

Preservationists will gather at Charleston, South Carolina, October 17-21, for the forty-fourth National Preservation Conference. The three hundred twenty-year-old city will host sessions on a variety of subjects, including preserving the nation’s diverse cultural resources, disaster preparedness and recovery, stewardship of historic properties, and preserving the landscape. For information, call the local office of the National Trust for Historic Preservation at (415) 956-0610, or the national office in Washington, D.C. at (202) 673-4089.

Sixty years after its official opening, the Shell Building, at Bush and Battery Streets, re-opened in a special dedication ceremony, July 26, 1990. This capped a $7 million restoration and modernization of George Kelham’s twenty-nine-story Art Deco tower, which JMB Properties began in February of 1989. Heller & Leake, Inc. prepared the program design; the contractors were Plant Builders, Inc. The Art Deco Society of California recently occupied offices in the building.

The Bureau of Building Inspection has begun publication of a bi-monthly newsletter in a pilot program to serve the citizens of San Francisco more effectively. According to Superintendent Lawrence L. Litchfield, the newsletter will "reach out to those we serve and keep them informed" of the bureau's rulings and programs, as well as pertinent state and local laws and ordinances.

Spotlight on Rebab
continued from page 5

smoke damage, Darin decided on retention and restoration of most detail work. Restoration of costly dark mahogany panels and wainscoting, however, would have overrun a budget which was geared to restoring housing at the existing rent levels. Workers, therefore, cleaned, repaired or replaced and painted over those surfaces. The grey marble facing in the entry was cleaned and remains in place.

Richards-Brown took the opportunity of the reconstruction to update kitchens and baths. However, tenants, who were able to reoccupy apartments by May 1, 1989, less than eight months after the fire, found the old familiar details in much of the building, including coved ceilings, picture rails, built-in bookcases and drawers flanking classically pilastered mantels, banisters and newel posts.

The larger structure on the corner, with frontage on both Cole and Haight, which housed the Haight-Ashbury Free Clinic, is still undergoing reconstruction of the interior. The exterior restoration appears complete. The windows are the only discordant element. The frames, like the replacements next door at 540 Cole, are anodized aluminum, but the configuration is not that of the double-hung wood-frame originals. Their jarring appearance, particularly when compared with the building’s neighbor, shows how inappropriate fenestration can throw off an otherwise carefully executed restoration.

—R.M. & D.A.

For Sale: Oriental rugs. One Serab camel-hair field, geometric; 100 years old, 3'7"x6'9", in perfect condition—$2350. One Turkish, camel-hair field, subtle floral; 50+ years old, 5'5"x8', very good condition—$1650. Jacqueline Bandel (415) 655-3119.
city, which, as compelling as it is, I hope never comes to pass.

For this reader, however, the most compelling essay in the volume is Mark Helprin’s. In an earlier work, A Winter’s Tale, Helprin has written convincingly about a metaphorical and metaphysical New York City. Now he brings his formidable analytical powers to bear on San Francisco to explain that the true vision for this city is exactly that—a function of light. He argues that here more than in even Paris and Rome, form should be dictated by “geography and the weather.” His essay should be required reading for anyone who would think to design even the smallest or remotest of structures for San Francisco.

Ultimately, Visionary San Francisco, the book and the show, are an enigma. In contrast to current planning assumptions in San Francisco, which give emphasis to neighborhood concerns, Polledri accepts Daniel Burnham’s dictum, “Make no small plans.” Polledri clearly argues that great minds know better what is good for cities than the people who live in them. The catalogue presents a more balanced view, although its material was not available to all museum-goers. While some may be confused or put off by the eclecticism of the catalogue, it offers a compelling set of visions of the city and is definitely worth reading, whether in conjunction with a viewing of the exhibit or not.

—Frederic L. Propas
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James E. Cane • Mr. & Mrs. Alfredo L. Capobianco • CarePlus • Elizabeth Charolson • Martin Checov • Chicago Title Company • Eula D. Chris
Carolyn A. Christopher • Ursula Clark • Yvonne Cocino • Robert Cole & Frank Garcia • Mr. & Mrs. William E. Coleman • William H. Collins
Mr. & Mrs. Nelson Combs • Terry Conway • Lin Y. Cooman • Linda Cordero • Brenda Cory • Lucinda Cox John F. Gullen • Nancy Curran
Mr. & Mrs. Mark Dalla Valle • William D. Davis • Mr. & Mrs. Porter Dickerman • Polly Dinkel
Glener Disrud • Jack Doty • Thad Doyka • Larry Duggin • David Dunaway • Mr. & Mrs. James Dwyce
Audrey Earl • Joseph L. Edel • Delia Ehrlich • Mr. & Mrs. Keith Emrick
Kenneth Epley • Betty Estelle
Melinda Ellis Evers • Erik B. Faaland
Eleanor L. Fabian • Ethel Fash • Anna Ferrell-Wachtel • Canice Flanagan
Diane Flyte • Mr. & Mrs. Ralph Foyer
Mr. & Mrs. James Fredrickson
Douglas J. Fritz • G. Michael Galvin
Rcb Gayle • James P. Geigenmuller
Mr. & Mrs. Michael Geise • Rhoda Gentry • Hans Gerson • Barbara Ghiselin • Ellen R. Gibson • Merrill Gillespie • Hal Glater • Nancy Golden • Julie Gonzalez • Mr. & Mrs. Stephen Goodman • Stephen M. Goodman • Mr. & Mrs. Henry J. Gorin • Russell Graham • Janet Griffin • Ernest A. Haeuslein • Alice A. Harrington • Lee Harrington • Andrea Hawkins • E. Marion Hazzard • Mr. & Mrs. Raymond Helman • Raymond P. Herrmann • Daniel A. Hernandez • Carol Lynne Horuchi • Sarah Howald • Marc Hyman • Harold M. Isbell • Marian H. Jakobovits • Dorothy Jakus • Mr. & Mrs. J.D. Jensen • Charles Jessen • Carlton Johnson • Deborah Joyce • Steve C. Juliano • Joni Kahn &

continued on next page

For Sale: Victorian carved oak mantel, beveled mirror, c. 1890; 60" x 107".
Call Ann, (415) 641-4219.

Special thanks to Chuck Wilcher, whose technical assistance helps to keep Heritage’s desktop publishing operation up and running.
Drawings
continued from page 1
greatly to its stock of public art. Among those works are 450 Sutter, the Pacific Telephone Building, the Stock Exchange, Roosevelt Middle School and the Castro Theater.

Heritage deliberately selected, not the glamorous drawings of Pflueger’s famous works, but those which reflect the characteristically high quality design for work-a-day buildings in San Francisco, which the firm of Miller & Colmesnil produced. This small lot of drawings reveals the classical tradition that was integral to Pflueger’s training.

Nearly all of Pflueger’s work was in the Bay Area. It is, therefore, particularly unfortunate that the collection has not remained intact. While the Museum of Modern Art bought many of the important drawings—some recently on display in the Visionary San Francisco show—the bulk of the collection has passed into various hands.

In one sense, marketing architectural drawings is helping to assure their preservation. On the other hand, market value largely determines what gets offered and therefore what may be preserved. Presentation drawings are most coveted and bring the highest prices, in part, no doubt, because buyers perceive them as having the highest individual artistic continued on next page

New members
continued from previous page

STAFF REVIEWS
HOUSING
DEMOLITIONS

For several years, the demolition review has been a regular component of Heritage's effort to conserve historically and architecturally significant buildings. This spring, we entered into an agreement to notify the Mayor's Office of Housing (MOH) of demolitions which affect existing housing resources.

Owners who want to demolish a building must apply for a city demolition permit. Heritage receives notice of all such permit applications in San Francisco.

The "demolition run" is a first step in the demolition review process. With demo applications in hand, Heritage staff members take to the road for a drive-by assessment of the endangered properties. The demo team visually evaluates each building's architectural significance, briefly assesses its physical condition, and photographs the structure.

After returning to the office, they collect further information from library sources on the properties deemed significant and summarize the information on a form along with the photograph of the building. This information may include date of construction, architect, original owner, and whether the building has been rated by Heritage or by the 1976 Department of City Planning survey.

Heritage will request a public hearing review by the Landmarks Board and the Planning Commission of any candidate for demolition which is significant. A building's significance may derive from, but is not limited to, its age or the importance of its architect. Its design may be of a type rare in San Francisco, or it may be a fine example of a typical San Francisco style. A building may also have contextual significance, meaning it is important to the streetscape or the larger neighborhood.

Many buildings slated for demolition, especially residences, are attractive buildings with period charm, which contribute to the character of their neighborhoods. However, they may not be individually significant enough to make the list of priority preservation candidates that Heritage has the resources to champion. In cases like these, we make an effort to alert neighborhood groups and other parties who may have the interest to pursue matters further.

When we encounter existing housing in our demolition review, we forward a copy of our evaluation form to MOH, to make them aware that housing—often low-income housing—may be lost. This may lead ultimately to alternative solutions which retain and reuse the structures, extending the useful life of buildings whose owners had written them off.

FALL LECTURES PLANNED

Heritage's Fall Lecture Series focuses this year on the Presidio. Gordon Chappell and Bud Halsey will present the history of this important post, and Lauren Bricker will discuss its architecture. The four part program will conclude with a discussion by a panel of distinguished experts who will consider future plans for the Presidio. The series begins in late October. Members will receive details in the mail soon. Non-members can obtain information by calling Rick Propas at 441-3000.

## Drawings

continued from previous page

worth. Among working drawings, elevations and details have greater individual appeal than floor plans. As a result, in the case of the Pflueger sales, few plan sheets were offered, even when the majority of a building's drawings were otherwise sold as a lot.

In the case of Pflueger's design for the Stock Exchange, the sale offered the drawings in more than one lot, thereby inviting the separation of materials which logically, in terms of the evolution of a design from its preliminary stages through the final concept, belong together.

More than the viewing of a building itself, the drawings, from the preliminary sketches to the presentation, elevations, floor plans and mechanicals, reveal an architect's fullest intent. As David Gebhard points out, the recovery of medieval drawings in the twentieth century has not only greatly increased our understanding of the Gothic cathedrals, even though they have stood for all to see and study for seven centuries.
CONTINUING HERITAGE EVENTS

Sundays 11 am to 4:15
Wednesdays 12 noon to 3:15
Haas-Lilienthal House Tours

Sundays 12:30 pm
Pacific Heights Walking Tour

For information concerning all Heritage events, call 441-3004

SEPTEMBER

Each Saturday in September 10 am
Heritage Chinatown Walking Tour
Meets at 950 Clay Street
Call 441-3004

September 1, 15, 29 10 am
Heritage Presidio Walking Tour
Meets at Main Parade Ground
Call 441-3004

September 8-9 1-6 pm
Tours of recently restored Willis Polk remodel of 1853 Atkinson House
Reservations call 441-8564

September 10 5:30-7:30
Heritage New Members Reception
Haas-Lilienthal House

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

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

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

Throughout the year
Palo Alto-Stanford Heritage
Walking tours of downtown
Wednesdays 11 am
Professorville Saturdays 10:30 am
Call 321-8667 or 324-3121

Through October 28
The Grand Tour of Italy in the Nineteenth Century
Museo ItaloAmericano
Call 673-2556 or 673-2200

OCTOBER

October 9 through November 27
SF/AIA - Museum of Modern Art
Lecture Series Call 392-4400

October 14 1-5 pm
Victorian Alliance Annual House Tour
Call 863-8036

October 20 11:30am - 3:30 pm
Hamlin School House Tour
Reservations 922-3964

Late October
Heritage Fall Lecture Series

NOVEMBER

November 2-3
California Preservation Foundation
Workshop on use of computers for preservation professionals and non-profits Call Elizabeth Morton 763-0972

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