The Office of Housing Adopts New Preservation Policy

The frequency of new projects supported by MOH to demolish architecturally significant structures has become increasingly intense. The Colombo Building and the old Transamerica Building, among others, have been targets of lengthy opposition and have only recently, a few months prior to the issuance of the demolition permit in July, been approved for demolition.

The "B" rated Colombo Building, left foreground, and the "A" rated old Transamerica Building on the right. Columbus Tower (also "A" rated) can be glimpsed in the background.

COLOMBO BUILDING DEMOLITION APPROVED

After four years of efforts to prevent the loss of the Colombo Building, Heritage reluctantly withdrew its appeal of the issuance of the demolition permit in July.

Together with the old Transamerica Building, the Colombo Building forms a traditional gateway at the foot of Columbus Avenue from the high-rise financial district to the low-rise, but intensely active, North Beach-China-town districts. Merrit and James Reid, considered in their day among the most important architects in San Francisco, designed the building, built in 1913 and originally called the Ausonia, for Elise A. Drexler. Mrs. Drexler was the widow of Louis P. Drexler, entrepreneur and real estate developer with interests throughout California. The Reid Brothers left a legacy of significant structures that includes the Call Building at 74 New Montgomery, the Fairmont Hotel, the First Congregational Church at Post and Mason, the former Hale Brothers Department Store (901 Montgomery), and the Music
Heritage Adopts Long-Range Plan

New design versus historic structures? Property ownership by Heritage? These are just two of the questions which have been debated by the Heritage Board and staff during the last 15 months as Heritage sought to develop a long-range plan to guide the organization’s activities for the next several years.

In addition to Board and staff discussion, input came from questionnaires sent to a sampling of Heritage members and from volunteers and experts. Members of the Board also conducted interviews with representatives from the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, SPUR, architects, architectural historians, and developers to get a perspective on Heritage’s effectiveness.

The interviews confirmed that Heritage fills a real need in San Francisco. Consequently, the mission statement of the long-range plan affirms the organization’s traditional mission:

"to develop and maintain a public appreciation and understanding of the cultural, aesthetic and economic value of San Francisco’s architecturally and historically significant structures and districts; and to be an effective force in motivating public and private action to preserve and protect these resources."

The biggest challenge to Heritage is to continue to provide all the services and advocacy the community has come to expect from the organization. The goals of the long-range plan, adopted by the Board at the May meeting, establish an ambitious agenda. The organization is committed to be active concurrently in Advocacy, Education, Architectural Services, Property Conservation and Organizational Excellence.

The Board and staff acknowledge that preservation advocacy is the primary reason the organization exists. Therefore, the first goal of the plan is: "Heritage is committed to identifying and raising public awareness on preservation issues in the city and is prepared to take an active role in supporting preservation in public forums."

Education is a constructive way for Heritage to win the preservation war before any battles are fought because it promotes understanding of the value of preserving significant architecture.

Architectural Services is a very tangible part of Heritage’s preservation programs. By providing technical assistance to projects which would not be undertaken by private architects, Heritage has a direct impact on preserving significant buildings. In addition, Heritage plans to increase technical assistance by offering more workshops.

Direct ownership is also a sure way to guarantee preservation. However, the Board concluded that the financial responsibility and the management attention required to operate additional properties would greatly limit the advocacy and education efforts Heritage could support at this time. For the next several years, therefore, Heritage will promote its façade easement program as an effective mechanism for supporting preservation of significant buildings without assuming ownership.

The plan does include a strong commitment to preservation and improvements to the Haas-Lilienthal house. Over the next year, Heritage will develop a comprehensive program to raise capital to fund improvements of the house to assure its viability as an important architectural resource for San Francisco.

The fifth goal of the plan deals with the organization itself. Heritage’s objective is to be the leading preservation force in San Francisco. To accomplish this objective, Heritage needs a broad membership base, financial stability and a strong public presence. The staff, Board, members and volunteers all contribute to achieving this goal.

The goals and programs identified through the long-range plan will serve as the basis for annual planning, budgeting and staffing decisions. The process of long-range planning will be an ongoing effort to ensure that the resources of Heritage are directed in the most effective way possible to achieve the mission of preserving San Francisco’s architectural heritage.
PRESERVATION NOTES
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This complex of structures which
together occupy the full block bounded
by Fell, Hayes, Baker and Lyon Streets
are significant not only for their
individual designs, but also as a unified
architectural group. Built between
1908 and 1911, institutional complexes
such as this are increasingly rare,
particularly when all structures have
undergone so little damaging modifica-
tion of their original design.

Early response to the proposal by the
Landmarks Preservation Advisory
Board and Heritage alerted the project
sponsor to the architectural significance
of the structures and to opposition to a
demolition scheme. The Landmarks
Board initiated designation of the
structures as a local landmark.

As the City was considering a grant of
federal funds to the project, Heritage
also advised that Section 106 of the
National Historic Preservation Act
would apply and as a result, the sponsor
has studied the feasibility of a new
design scheme which retains and reuses
the existing structures. Although not as
many housing units can be created, the
developer has indicated that a rehabili-
tation approach is possible and is under
serious consideration. Heritage is
continuing to follow this project closely
and looks forward to assisting the
proposal gain approvals necessary for
its political and financial success.

Metropolitan Life Building/
Cogswell College Building
This prominent visual landmark at 600
Stockton will undergo adaptive rehabili-
tation for reuse as a prestigious hotel
under plans being developed by
Waverly Associates of Palo Alto.

Restoration of deteriorated exterior terra
otta, replacement of the front stairs
with a porte cochère sensitively de-
signed to blend with the original
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and construction of a second structure are the key features of the project involving the exterior of the building. The interior of the structure will undergo substantial renovation. In recent meetings with the sponsor, Heritage called for retention of the proposed penthouse, the portico over the main entrance, reuse of the original front door, and appropriate glazing. Heritage anticipate that the redesigned project will seek official City approval.

The building's façade is designed in the classical style which characterizes the buildings of San Francisco's financial institutions built before the fire. The building has expanded greatly through four additions to original completion in 1909. A rating was established for the building by Heritage's survey. It was listed as an official City landmark in 1987.

Like Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, the procedure does not guarantee the retention of all buildings. If agreement can be reached, specific conditions will accompany any public funding granted to the project.

Significantly, MOH has adopted a review policy for projects using City monies from the City. At the stages of consideration of proposed projects seeking financial support from the City's own housing monies, the Office will request advice from the City Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board, and from San Francisco Heritage as to whether any structures proposed for demolition or exterior alteration are of architectural significance.

Public comment will be solicited for 30 days. If the sponsor states that the high cost of rehabilitation prevents retention of the structures, professionally prepared cost estimates must be made public for review and comment. MOH will work with the project sponsor, the Landmarks Board and Heritage to redesign the project to avoid the loss of significant structures. If agreement can be reached, specific conditions will accompany any public funding granted to the project.

Like Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, the procedure does not guarantee the retention of all buildings. If the parties fail to agree, MOH can still proceed to grant funding to the project. In that event, conservation advocates would focus their efforts on the planning and political approval processes. The requirement for early consideration of historic preservation issues in housing project funding decisions will vastly strengthen opportunities to prevent future losses of buildings like the Colombo.
Civic Architecture: San Francisco's Public Schools

When San Franciscans are asked to name the finest examples of civic architecture in the City, they turn to Civic Center, home to City Hall, the Hall of Justice, and decorative elements of civic pride.

Ten years of neglect and mismanagement have cast the San Francisco Unified School District's legacy of fine architecture in jeopardy. An eleven percent increase in enrollments since 1980 has placed strain on the aging infrastructure. The district is in jeopardy.

The building program of the 1920s grew out of academic changes, as well as demographic ones. According to the 1908 Municipal Reports, San Francisco was already experimenting with instruction in "domestic science" for girls and "manual training" for boys in seventh and eighth grades. The conviction grew among educators that schools should recognize children's differences—their varied abilities, interests, aptitudes and vocational preferences—and begin to accommodate them earlier than the first year of high school. As a consequence, a gradual transition took place from the "8-4" to the "6-3-3" school plan.

The creation of junior high schools began in 1913 with the reclassification of three grammar schools—Crocker, Hamilton, and Horace Mann—as "intermediate schools." In 1922, the Board of Education officially designated them as junior high schools. Conversion of grammar school facilities could not satisfactorily accommodate the junior high curriculum, and by the end of the decade, Horace Mann received a new plant, Presidio and Roosevelt replaced the inadequate facilities of Hamilton and Crocker, and San Francisco constructed or approved plans for four more junior highs: Everett, Portola, Francisco, and Apts.

Other educational changes affected school construction during this decade. Traditionally, specialized high schools—Polytechnic, Commercial, Girls, Lowell (academic)—enrolled students city-wide. During the 1920s, the city began to changeover to a system of district high schools (except Lowell), each offering a comprehensive curriculum, both academic and voca-
The Board of Education established new high schools in the northeast—Galileo and Mission— and provided new or expanded facilities for Mission, Commercial, and historic High Schools.

Concern for physical education years following World War I led school design, as well. Local leaders in San Francisco tended expanded school sites to nodate larger recreational areas, and playing fields. A committee considering the proposed expenditure of construction funds in 1924 thought this would be difficult in a city where land was so costly. Yet the numerous campuses of many of the schools built since then attest to the commitment. A pictorial feature in the San Francisco Chronicle of October 21, 1923, showed the courtyard at Everett High, “in which the Board of Education takes especial pride” and was noted, “where pupils get fresh air, ion, and sunshine.”

The 1920s were the Golden Age of school construction in San Francisco, then John Reid, Jr. was its King Midas. He designed half the schools built in the City that decade. This San Francisco architect was encouraged by John Howard while a student at Ecole des Beaux Arts in Paris. He received his diploma from Ecole in 1909 and began his career in San Francisco. From 1919 to 1927 he served as City Architect.

School designs were influenced most by Mission Revival and Colonial Revival styles. The noteworthy example is Mission School, with its red tile roof and Baroque tower capped in glazed ornate Baroque detailing also graces the portal and upper story of the school on 18th Street at Dolores.

Everett Middle School (Church & St.), Reid incorporated the Moorish motif of Spanish tradition. Massive bronzes define the portal of the main entrance, and a wall of glazed tile in full geometric patterns and floral motifs appears from the street like Persian carpets hanging in a row. Polychrome rafter complete the design of this alluring and inviting entrance.

Just as his designs for Everett and Mission offered gestures in recognition of their neighborhood’s historic context (both sites are within two blocks of Mission Dolores), Reid attached Chinese elements to the basic Spanish Revival building for the then exclusively Chinese Commodore Stockton School Annex (950 Washington). Reid sometimes drew on his Beaux Arts background, as in his design of Pacific Heights School (now Newcomer High, Jackson & Webster).

Reid served as City Architect for eight years. Although the position was not salaried, he received 6 percent of construction costs for each city building he designed. But as Mayor Rolph’s brother-in-law, Reid was an easy target for the mayor’s political opponents, and he was embroiled in controversy during much of his tenure. In 1927 he resigned.

Although John Reid, Jr. dominated the scene in the twenties, others were associated with school design in this era, and their names read like an honor roll of San Francisco architects: Bakewell and Brown (Sanchez School), Weeks and Day (Hawthorne, altered in 1973), and the Reid Brothers (Winfield Scott). John Reid’s erstwhile mentor, John Galen Howard designed the Beaux Arts Leonard R. Flynn (formerly Le Conte) School, and George Applegarth, architect of the Legion of Honor and the Spreckels Mansion invoked the Beaux Arts spirit at the Edison School. Crim & Resing executed fine Romanesque Revival detailing at Presidio Middle School.

But of all the schools designed in the twenties, Roosevelt Middle School (Arguello & Geary), by Miller & Pflueger, was the most innovative and remains the City’s most distinctive school building. “Designed by San Francisco’s master of Art Deco,” historian Gray Brechin has written, “it’s a swank composition of patterned bronze, brick, and terra cotta recalling the work of Dutch and German expressionists.”
Francisco became nation-town for the quality of school buildings. They are source of pride to the neighborhoods they graced. The architect William B. Murphy observed, 'In an environment, beautiful, has been the ynote and the school sincere expression of the beauty that should school children.'

In fact, in the 1930s, San Francisco did continue to provide school buildings of some architectural distinction, including George Washington High School, and Marina Junior High. Marina was built under a 1933 Public Works Administration bond issue, as were Glen Park, Lawton, and Visitation Valley. PWA grants in 1938 financed construction of the Horace Mann gymnasium and cafeteria, the gymnasium at Washington, and the Marina and Portola auditoriums. Classic examples of '30s styling include the Moderne James Lick Middle School by Crim & Resing and a Deco gem, Francis Scott Key, hidden away in the outer Sunset.

The committee looking into planned construction in 1924 had prophesied that "the buildings that are erected at this time will in all probability be serving the City of San Francisco in the year 2000...." In 1988, the majority of the fifty schools which were erected in the twenties were still in use, many upgraded during the 1970s to meet State-mandated seismic safety standards.

In some cases, as at Alvarado Elementary School, seismic alteration involved removal of all ornamental detail—and Alvarado was rich in ornamental detail. In other instances, notably at Mission High, great care was taken to preserve and secure the decorative elements. Miller and Pflueger's Alamo School was stripped to the frame and reconstructed. Several other school buildings were wholly or partially demolished and replaced because they were found to be beyond seismic upgrading.

At Commodore Sloat Elementary, sensitive new construction designed by Marquis & Associates respects the original auditorium by John Reid, Jr., which was retained and with which the new building has been integrated. Consequently, the school continues to be a graceful presence overlooking the important intersection of Ocean and Junipero Serra.

The pre-World War I Garfield Elementary School was entirely demolished for seismic safety reasons and replaced in 1980 with a new school by the firm of Esherick, Homsey, Dodge and Davis. Sited on the west slope of Telegraph Hill just below Coit Tower, the school fits snugly on the site. Stepping down the hillside, sensitive to the scale of the neighborhood, Garfield's design makes clear reference to historic San Francisco school design—a couple of bays, small-paned windows, and the rusticated entry arch.

Please see SCHOOLS, page 8
point, the question whether any older San Francisco schools will it to the year 2000 depends on successful completion of restoration that will begin with the $90 million bond funds. A “Blue Ribbon Committee, the Citizens Advisory Committee for Proposition A, has been used to monitor expenditure of the bond funds and to advise on additional maintenance. At the request of the Committee includes a consulting architect to ensure that work taken will be consistent with plans of architectural conservation.

Before the end of the century, changing demographics and changing educational needs can be expected to raise an even more critical preservation issue: what to do with redundant school buildings? In adaptive reuse of surplus property, San Francisco has not followed the example of cities like Boston and Seattle. That certain school buildings prove of no further use as schools does not mean they have no value at all to the community. Awareness of the quality of school architecture in the city has yielded a consensus in favor of adaptive reuse.

Schools reflect a community’s attitude towards its educational system. The overwhelming majority given the school bonds in June signals a growing commitment to the quality of the system. The primary beneficiaries of refurbishing the school buildings will be the students. Ultimately, all San Franciscans can renew their pride in the legacy of fine school architecture in this city as symbolic of the quality of the educational system itself.

Heritage welcomes the following new members:

Darius Aida
John Baessler
Norma Bianucci
Patrick Cannon
Richard Catalano
Bill Colvin
Kate Dishin
Theresa Felmery
Olivia Fisher
Ashton Fleetham
M/M Roy Goodwin
Erica Harkins
Lola Hallman
Howard Hetzler
Lorraine Imbody
Trish Kirchoff
Lee Lawrence
Oza Lee
Susan Levine
Rebecca Long
Carter Lowrie
Stephen & Thalia Lubin
Jo Ann Mandel
Constance McGeorge
M/M Paul Meyer
Richard Moran
Peter Necius
Carolyn Perkins
Barbara Pivicka
James Roberts
John Sampson
James Schlesinger
M/M Andy Segal
Meg Stiens
Nancy Soltar
Arles Tooker
Touche Ross
Fred Wagner
Juliet Wong
Paul Zager
Marty Zwick

Denise Auerbach
Gretchen Bender
Joan Buckley
Denise Caro
Anne Clarke
Christy Dillon
Events Etc.
Leo Fernandez
M/M Herman Fish
Candace Foote
Dorene Gould
Helin Organization
Lauren Hetick
Claude Imbault
Tricia Kain
Kathryn Langstaff
Louise Lee
Stephanie Lee
Antoinette Lewis
Peggy Lovegreen
Daniel Maisani
Amiette McCormick
Elizabeth McGovern
Allison Miller
Rita Moran
Patricia O'Rourke
Richard Pike
M/M Henry Pren
Barry Robin
M/Ted Savelnick
Margaret Schlitzer
M/M Kevin Shannon
Mrs. K.W. Savig
Maria Tannen
Jane Totten
Pierre van Houten
Caroll Weiss
Robert Yeargin
M/M Lee Zeigler

A "welcome" reception will be held at the Haus-Lilienthal House on Monday, August 29th, from 5:30 to 7:30 pm, where new members will have a chance to meet Heritage Board and staff. Watch for your invitation in the mail.
New Landmarks Ordinance Nears Completion

Work is nearly complete on the draft of a new landmarks ordinance for San Francisco.

Since early 1987, representatives of the Landmarks Board, the Planning Department and key preservation organizations have held regular working sessions to reach agreement on long overdue changes to the city’s twenty-year-old landmarks law. The 1967 ordinance created the Landmarks Board as an advisory body, appointed by the Mayor, to recommend important individual buildings and historic districts for designation by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. Under the ordinance, buildings designated can be protected from demolition for up to one year. Since 1967, approximately 190 structures have been individually designated and seven historic districts have been adopted.

However, its advisory status and lack of sufficient staff have kept the Board from realizing its full potential. The absence of stronger protections has left designated buildings vulnerable. Major changes are now being proposed which will increase opportunities for the designation of valuable architectural features of the city and strengthen protections for them once identified.

Key provisions of the new, proposed ordinance would:

- codify strong conservation standards to be used in approving changes to protected buildings
- allow approval of requests for demolitions of protected buildings only if the structure retains no market value
- specify that necessary staff support is to be provided to the Landmarks Board
- codify authority of the Landmarks Board to review development applications for conformity with Proposition M as it affects significant structures
- allow the Landmarks Board to protect important interior spaces
- identify specific areas of knowledge or expertise sought in Landmarks Board members
- eliminate the requirement for Planning Commission approval of the Landmarks Board’s recommendations
- reduce opportunities for condemnation of designated buildings without consultation with the Landmarks Board
- suspend development permits which would damage buildings proposed for protections while the designation is under consideration

Changes to the existing landmarks ordinance must be adopted by the Board of Supervisors which is expected to consider them before the end of the year. To enact these provisions will require a strong demonstration of support. If you can help, please return the coupon below to HERITAGE, 2007 Franklin Street, San Francisco, CA 94109.

YES I want to help enact a new, stronger Landmarks Ordinance. I can:

[ ] make a phone call;
[ ] write a letter;
[ ] attend a hearing

[ ] Please call me to discuss other ways in which I could help.

Name

Address

Phone

Offered for Sale - Pacific Heights Home

This grand and elegant Colonial Revival home built in 1895 by the Reid Brothers is amidst an exceptional cluster of five stately, detached Victorians. Restored with careful attention to fine details, it includes five bedrooms (with private master suite), three and one-half baths, family room, sitting rooms, five fireplaces, five car parking and lovely walkout south garden.

FOR INFORMATION CALL

DORENE C. GOULD
Broker Associate
(415) 929-1500

1919 Sacramento Street

Providing the ultimate in responsive, personalized service and competitive financing to the Bay Area’s luxury home market...

Please call James H. Herbert II, Gordon R. Taubenheim, or Katherine August for a personal consultation.

FIRST REPUBLIC BANCORP INC.

221 Pine Street, San Francisco, CA 94104 (415) 392-1400
Executive Director's Comment

Colombo Building Revisited

As members and friends of Heritage you may have shared my surprise at the controversy over our most recent action on the Colombo Building.

The critical, if inaccurate, commentary on our actions, and charges by a few well-meaning but uninformed individuals has been a sobering experience.

In the 1970s Heritage repeatedly failed to prevent the loss of major downtown landmarks when our efforts began too late and after the proposed replacement for those landmark buildings had already been planned. Partly as a result, Heritage re-examined its strategy and came to the conclusion that if architectural conservation was to be successful, it had to be built into the decision-making process at a much earlier stage. Heritage then redirected its efforts into a downtown survey which would enable us to identify significant buildings in advance. The survey findings themselves became the basis of a community educational process to gain widespread agreement on the importance of saving specific buildings.

Since that time our experiences have continued to confirm the belief that the most far reaching impacts are to be achieved through the adoption of policies and plans which ensure that considerations for architectural and historical significance are integral to planning and development decisions. In recent years we have therefore concentrated our efforts on such projects as major improvements to the City's Landmark's Ordinance, the adoption of a Preservation Ordinance of the General Plan, an historic district in Chinatown, the implementation of procedures which take advantage of Proposition M's language regarding significant buildings and plans for new survey work in the neighborhoods.

At the same time we have not neglected individual buildings proposed for demolition, which are not protected by any existing policy, plan or procedure. As you know, Heritage reviews every building proposed for demolition in San Francisco. But by the point that application is made for demolition, the new project has already been planned, the project sponsor is inflexible, and the predisposition of local government is to grant the request. Heritage fights an uphill battle, and one in which the involvement of neighborhood organizations and individuals are essential.

Despite the lack of support from any other organized community interest, Heritage continued to oppose the demolition of the Colombo Building. However, in the process, we had to give very serious consideration whether to continue to prevent the construction of 150 units of low-income housing supported by every other community organization on record on the issue and which Mayor Agnos indicated was his highest priority housing project. His office further made clear that those units could not be built without demolition of the Colombo. In addition, we were forced to acknowledge the political reality that the matter would be decided by a Board of Permit Appeals appointed by Mayor Agnos in June.

Given the organization's commitment to planning for ways to avoid continual crises over buildings where demolition is imminent, Heritage sought a fundamental change in City procedure which would address the cause of the Colombo crisis rather than merely its effect. This procedure is described elsewhere in this issue.

It is important to be aware of the background in order to assess the validity of Heritage's actions in the Colombo case. As in any matter of interest to our members and friends, I welcome your comments and suggestions, critical as well as supportive. Thanks to those who have already shared with me your thoughts.

Mark Ryser
Alhambra Theater Restoration

For years, twin minarets, subtly illuminated, beckoned residents of Cow Hollow, Polk Gulch, and Russian Hill to a temple of Moorish delights at Polk near Union. The movie-goer at the Alhambra Theater entered an exotic environment of colorful tile, horseshoe arches, arabesques, and geometric designs, transported to a fantasy world even before the screen flickered to life with the images of Hollywood idols set in fantastic realms. The Alhambra was aptly named for the citadel-palace of Granada, an expression of the last flowering of Spanish Islam, completed in the 14th century. Early this year, the theater closed for renovations, and now has reopened with its interior restored to its 1920s splendor.

The Alhambra was built in 1926 for Nasser Brothers Theaters. The architect, Timothy Pflueger, had designed their first movie house, The Castro, in 1922. When the Chronicle of November 6, 1926 reported the opening of the Alhambra, it said it was the first theater on the Pacific Coast designed throughout in the Moorish style. Twenty distinct colors were used in carrying out the decorations outlined by artist Arthur F. Mathews, known for murals in the State Capitol and in the Mechanics’ Institute.

One of the theater’s most striking features resulted from the solution of a design problem. The narrowness of the lot made it impossible to place the organ next to the proscenium, as customary. Instead, Pflueger set the organ above the ceiling and designed a pierced dome, looking like an elaborately crocheted lace cap, to allow the sound to enter the auditorium. The organ, a small Wurlitzer, was removed in the late ’40s.

Little alteration of the Alhambra’s interior occurred over the years. When the sound era came in, the main floor was closed off from the lobby. A CinemaScope screen, installed in the mid-50’s, covered but did not damage the elaborate proscenium. Even when owners divided the theater in two, the ornamentation remained remarkably intact. A wall of gray cinder blocks cut the auditorium in half and a false ceiling concealed the dome.

Blumenfeld and Pacific, which has operated the Alhambra under lease from the Nasser family since 1974, closed the theater for several months this year in order to return it to single-screen operation. Dusty Dillon of Whatever Works undertook plaster patching of the interior, and Rainbow Painting & Decorating cleaned and restored the paint. Electrical work entailed replacing two thousand burned out bulbs and restoring neon fixtures. A computerized system will do the work it once took five men to perform in recreating the multi-colored lighting effects of the original Moorish ambiance. Installation of a new organ is under discussion.

The Alhambra is the first theater in the Bay Area, once divided, to be restored to a single auditorium. Just when it seemed the multiplexed shoebox-size movie house and the home VCR had won the day, the restoration of this theater’s exotic interior proves that seeing a movie can still be a total experience, part of which is the theater itself.

Serve historic buildings and their artifacts have tended to suffer general deterioration or be to careless disregard. Attention has been paid to natural disasters, such as floods, and tornadoes.

As this concern, a conference at the National Academy Washington, D.C. on 130, 1982. The recently published, Protecting Historic and Museum Collections from Disasters, is a compilation delivered at this conference, including engineers, museum curators, conservators, and others involved in the protection of the cultural heritage.

This book is divided into the following sections:

- Destruction of the Cultural Heritage by Earthquakes and Other Natural Disasters.
- Policy Issues. Along with the introductory essay, there is a paper on the principal elements of a good disaster-preparedness policy.
- Assessment of Hazards and Vulnerability.
- Preventive Measures to Mitigate Losses. Five essays cover a wide variety of topics, including how to reduce earthquake damage to museum collections and general disaster-preparedness planning for museums.
- Emergency and Rescue Measures for Structures and Artifacts. In this section, case histories of specific disasters are analyzed for lessons that apply to disaster preparedness.
- Public and Private Response Measures. Four articles cover the relief efforts and services of various organizations.

Basically, this book provides an excellent starting point either for the professional, or the general reader, who is interested in learning more about protecting historic structures and museum collections from natural disasters.

The book is particularly valuable as a reference. Each essay is accompanied by a bibliography provided by the author, and there is a general bibliography at the end of each major section. There are two useful appendices, as well. One provides a county-by-county rating of the degree of threat posed by various natural hazards; the other is a general bibliography on natural disasters that includes listings that relate to historic preservation. The only limitation is that the references do not go beyond the 1982 date of the original conference.

Sharon Symington


A Living Legacy, by Mark Wilson, is an updated and corrected remake of East Bay Heritage, out of print since 1982. Thirty-seven self-guided tours, each accompanied by a clear, well-marked map, survey the architecture of East Bay cities, towns, districts and neighborhoods from Vallejo in the north to Fremont in the south.

While not of handbook size, A Living Legacy’s paperback format makes it a relatively comfortable walking-tour companion. Admirers of San Francisco’s architecture will find much to appreciate in the East Bay and will gain increased understanding from the larger context of Bay Area traditions which this book offers.

Donald Andreini
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In a 1947 *New Yorker* article, Lewis Mumford first brought to national attention the idea of a Bay Area Tradition in architecture. That, in turn, prompted a symposium at the Museum of Modern Art in 1948 and a feature in *Architectural Record* the following year that asked the question: "Is There a Bay Region Style?" The discussion has continued ever since and is the central theme of *Bay Area Houses*.

An introduction and seven essays describe the Bay Area Tradition, identify its chief practitioners, and give a detailed chronological account of its evolution through the present. Each essay indicates the characteristics that defined the tradition at each stage of its development and describes several typical houses in detail. Excellent photographs and architectural drawings illuminate the text substantially.

A "warm and winsome woodsy architecture" appeared in the Bay Area before the turn of the century with the shingle style of Coxhead and Polk and the local variation of the Craftsman bungalow by Maybeck and Morgan. The evolution of this Bay Area Tradition has produced less a cohesive and consistent style than a "theme and variations" interacting with, adapting or playing off against prevailing national and international styles.

One essay is devoted to the work of a single architect, William Wilson Wurster. This pivotal figure helped lead the Bay Area Tradition into the era of modern house design and elevate it to a position of influence in American architecture.

A native of Stockton, Wurster seems the quintessential practitioner of the tradition. He was sensitive to the region's history and culture and the diversity of its landscape and climate. He placed these uppermost in conceiving the design of each house, to make it the natural expression of its site and to embrace the outdoors as an integral part of the home's living space. "Architecture is not a goal," Wurster wrote. "Architecture is for life and pleasure and work and for people. The picture frame and not the picture."

When *Bay Area Houses* first appeared in 1976, the concluding essay, "The End of Arcadia", foresaw an uncertain future for the Bay Area Tradition in house design. Escalating costs of land and construction greatly reduced the volume of architect-designed, individually built homes. In the decade following, conditions seemed no more promising, with double-digit interest rates and the shortage of suitable sites, in part because of "no-growth" measures in Bay Area communities. Yet this new edition of *Bay Area Houses* concludes with the essay "Arcadia Revisited", by Sally Woodbridge and argues that the tradition is "alive and well", if changing. Ingenious architects have responded to the challenge of finding a building site by designing for sites previously considered unbuildable or by replacing existing structures, often forced to compress houses into older, denser contexts. This final essay surveys fifteen recent examples of the Bay Area Tradition.

In sum, *Bay Area Houses* is an attractively produced book that offers an intelligent survey of the work of more than 60 architects spanning nearly a century of house design in this region.

Donald Andreini
ArchiTreasures Update

Heritage’s first architectural artifacts are in.

people in attendance and sold, Heritage netted $25,000, a figure over the amount budgeted for the event. Heritage also received press coverage for its new owners and new uses for the artifacts in warehouses, basements, and attics around the Bay Area.

Heritage is enormously grateful to the donors who made this possible without the support of the many donors of items to the auction and sale. Heritage had something for everyone, at any price and our thanks go to the many donors listed below.

One final news item is that Heritage was unable to sell the highlight of the auction, the City of Paris Windows. That auction sale did not meet the owner’s stipulations, however, we are still hopeful a developer, architect or designer will be found to reuse these magnificent windows from one of the City’s lost architectural treasures. Indeed, Heritage hopes that the attention given to this event and its artifacts serves as a reminder of the city’s loss of its architectural legacy over the last 25 years and provides further evidence as to the importance of preservation activities.

CORPORATE DONORS
Butterfield & Butterfield
General Atlantic Company
Hibernia Bank
Phoebus Co., Inc.
Rincon Center

DONORS OF AUCTION/SALE ITEMS
Ross Anderson
Morley Baer
Bay West Development Company
Berkeley Architectural Salvage
Stewart Bloom & Frame of Mind
Philippe Bonnafont Architectural Drawings
Body Lighting Company
Bradbury & Bradbury
Virginia Campau
Alice Carey & Mary Hardy
Corinthian Studios
Day Studios
Topher Delaney
Richard Dreihaus
Fairmont Hotel
Sanford Goldeen
Maria Goodwin
Marty Gordon

Board member Richard Reinhardt engaged in spirited bidding during the ArchiTreasures live auction.
Rediscovering Hayes Valley

The Hayes Valley frequently eludes mapmakers and native San Franciscans. Named and legally defined by an 1860 land ordinance which was supposed to settle land claims in the western outskirts of the city, the Hayes Valley today contains an interesting enclave of shops, galleries, restaurants and residential architecture in the backyard of the Civic Center.

Thomas Hayes was a maverick politician who arrived in San Francisco in 1849. He held a variety of municipal positions throughout the 1850s. Then in 1857, he left government to establish the Market Street Railroad Company. The railroad, like many urban streetcar lines of the day, served as a mechanism for real estate development and speculation. A line extended up Hayes Street from Market, and the railroad itself began actual operations in 1860 shortly after Hayes’ claim to the area which now bears his name was confirmed.

Hayes’ land tract consisted of a square plot oriented at a 45 degree angle to the established grid of streets. The tract included 160 acres. Though development languished throughout the 1860s, Hayes built himself a home there along with the Hayes Park Pavilion. The open-air concert pavilion was supposed to encourage sales and development.

Ironically, development of the Hayes Valley did not begin in earnest until after an 1872 fire destroyed Hayes’ home and the pavilion. In the later 1870s and 80s, as the city grew westward, many educational and religious institutions moved to the valley. Among them was St. Ignatius College (later USF) which occupied a large portion of the block bounded by Grove and Van Ness.

Homebuilders followed the institutional development of the Hayes Valley and left a rich legacy of wooden Victorian residences. These early builders were largely Irish. Their lives centered around the churches and schools of St. Ignatius and Sacred Heart (at Fillmore and Oak). During the 1920s the Irish began to move farther west in the City. The neighborhood witnessed an influx of Jewish settlers and institutions. The Emanu-el Sisterhood Boarding Home for Jewish Working Girls (now the Zen Center at 300 Page Street) was designed by Julia Morgan in 1923. A Young Men’s Hebrew Association at 121 Haight was organized in 1917.

Following the Great Depression, the Valley increasingly became home to Blacks and Latins. The redevelopment of the 1950s/60s saw public housing and freeways carve away blocks of the Victorian housing stock. These effects are readily evident in today’s architectural mix.

WALKS IN THE CITY

If you were unable to participate in last year’s Summer Walks, here’s your chance to tour the Richmond with Heritage! This year our walks program will include a walking tour of Hayes Valley, featuring the interior of the Julia Morgan-designed Zen Center. Our series concludes with a special neon sign-making demonstration by Josie Crawford, and a lecture by Michael Crowe about various neon-ornamented buildings South of Market. Call Heritage at 441-3000 to make reservations now!

THE RICHMOND, $10 ($15 non-mbrs)
Lecture: August 25, 7:00 pm
Walk: August 27, 1:00 pm

HAYES VALLEY, $10 ($15 non-mbrs)
September 10, 1:00 pm

NEON LECTURE & DEMO
$10 ($15 non-mbrs)
October 22, 10:30 am

Gray Brechin Lectures
Fall 1988

As part of Heritage’s Fall Lecture Program, Gray Brechin has added a new lecture to his series on “Building the City.” Titled "Suburban Utopias: The City Grows Out," this lecture explores the movement of San Franciscans to the Peninsula and the East Bay.

The lectures will be held on Thursday evenings from 7:00 to 9:00 pm in the Auditorium of UCSF’s Laurel Heights Campus (formerly Firemen’s Fund), 3333 California at Presidio Avenue. The series of seven lectures begins on October 6th and concludes on November 17th. Call Heritage at 441-3000 for information and reservations.


**CALENDAR**

**OCTOBER**

"Current Issues in San Francisco City Planning"
October 4

The San Francisco Architectural Club hosts a lecture by City Planning Director Dean Macris at The Gatehouse, Fort Mason Center at 8pm.

For information please call 441-1098.

"Building the City"
October 6 - November 17
Laurel Heights Campus of UCSF

Heritage presents Gray Brechin's popular lecture series this fall. Please see page 15 for information.

Liberty Hill House Tour
October 16

This year Victorian Alliance offers a tour of six homes in the Liberty Hill historic district. Tickets are $12 in advance and $15 at the door.

For information, please call 647-9173.

---

**JOIN HERITAGE!**

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

- $25 Individual
- $35 Family
- $50 Sustaining
- $100 Contributing
- $250 Friend
- $10 Seniors/Students

Name ________________________________

Address ________________________________

City, state, zip code ________________________________

Phone ________________________________

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

Contributions are tax deductible.

---

**Exceptional One**

5th - September 3
Merchandise Mart
55 Market Street

Cisco Chapter of the AIA
This exhibition honors women's contributions. Exhibition hours are from 10am - 5 pm.

For information, please call 552-2311.

**Liberty Hill House Tour**

October 16

This year Victorian Alliance offers a tour of six homes in the Liberty Hill historic district. Tickets are $12 in advance and $15 at the door.

For information, please call 647-9173.

---

**Adolph Sutro Walk**

September 24

The GGNRA will give a guided walk through the estate of Adolph Sutro, the ruins of the Sutro Baths and the Cliff House, illustrating Adolph Sutro's "Contributions to San Francisco."

For information, please call 556-8642.

**Neon Lecture & Demonstration**

October 22

The Heritage Walks Program concludes with this special neon sign-making demonstration by Josie Crawford, and a lecture by Michael Crowe about neon-ornamented buildings South of Market. See page 15 for information.