CHURCH LANDMARK BAN PENDING

In June, Speaker Willie Brown reactivated Assembly Bill 133. The measure would make permanent a one-year exemption from local landmark designation for non-commercial property owned by religious organizations due to expire on December 31. It would not affect buildings already designated.

The Senate Local Government Committee heard the bill on June 29. Heritage joined a number of individuals and organizations urging defeat of the proposal, including California Preservation Foundation, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the Preservation League of California, and the League of California Cities. Also speaking against AB 133 were Margaret Kisliuk the lobbyist for the City of San Francisco and Cherilyn Widell, recently appointed State Historic Preservation Officer. The committee passed the measure on to the Senate floor by an 8-to-2 vote. Senator McCorquedale of Modesto joined San Francisco's Quentin Kopp in opposition.

It would appear that on July 5, AB 133 failed to pass the Senate by a single vote. It is due for a third reading, but the Senate recessed for the month of July without taking it up. We can expect its reappearance in August.

Opposition to AB 133 rests on two —continued on page 9

MEMBERS INVITED TO A BIRTHDAY PARTY

Be sure to set aside September 11. On that date, Heritage members and friends will have a unique opportunity to tour one of Pacific Heights' finest grand houses.

The occasion is the celebration of the one-hundredth anniversary of 2000 Pacific Avenue. The owners will host a tour of the fully furnished interior, led by Heritage docents. Although it suffered neglect, the house remained largely intact over time, and the present owners in the years of their stewardship have beautifully refurbished and enhanced its original details, including the fine golden oak paneling.

Heritage accepted the donation of a preservation easement on 2000 Pacific from the current owners in 1980. One of 55 easements which Heritage holds, it ensures preservation of the "historical, open space and scenic values of the Property in perpetuity." The agreement, which runs with the title to the property, binds owners to make no change, addition or alteration to —continued on page 9
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ARCHITECTURAL FRAGMENTS

■ The Old Mission Dolores Restoration Project has raised just over $1.7 million of the $1,807,000 cost of recently completed repairs and seismic retrofit on the historic landmark. Additional funding will be necessary for conservation of the art works at the Mission and to restore an original doorway sealed up for 116 years that workers uncovered in the course of the recent work. This “new” entrance will provide improved handicapped access to the historic interior. Send contributions to Old Mission Dolores Restoration Project, 3321 Sixteenth Street, San Francisco, CA 94114, or call (415) 621-8203 to learn about giving programs.

■ San Francisco Historical Society will sponsor a tour of several house interiors in Presidio Heights and Presidio Terrace on Saturday, September 17, between the hours of 10 am and 5 pm. The homes are within easy walking distance of each other, and participants will find a gift boutique and food service at the last stop. For information contact Linda Toschi (415) 731-2187 or 616-8330.

■ The San Francisco Chapter of the AIA and the Museum of Modern Art have announced details of their 16th Annual Lecture Series. Titled Urban Landscapes, this year’s program begins September 19 with James Ingo Freed, continues with William Morrish and Catherine Brown (9/26), Rob Wellington Quigley (10/17), Adele Naude Santos (10/24), Laurie Olin (11/14), and concludes with a panel discussion (11/21). For program details call (415) 362-7397 or 357-4000; for ticket information, call (415) 978-2787.

■ The 48th annual meeting of the National Trust for Historic Preservation will convene in Boston, October 26-30. This year’s theme is “The Economics of Livable Communities: The Role of Historic Preservation.” For program and registration information call 1-800-944-NTHP.

■ Heritage member and San Francisco preservation advocate Jean Kortum received this year’s Jack Morrison Lifetime Achievement Award from San Francisco Tomorrow. The urban environmental organization honored Kortum, one of its founding members, for her years of service on the Landmarks Board and her commitment to other urban causes, including the city’s “freeway revolt.”
Conclusion of the Williams Building issue appears at hand. The Redevelopment Commission has approved expenditure of $1.5 million of its FEMA grant to stabilize the 8-story office building at the southeast corner of Third and Mission.

Awaiting resolution is the issue of where to apply the 12-inch layer of shotcrete, a blown-on concrete that will strengthen the structure. Agency staff recommended application on the inside of the building. Heritage objected that this would destroy interior features of the structure and urged the Agency to apply it to an unadorned exterior wall. The Agency’s contractor has stated exterior application would be cheaper, and the staff is willing to accede, but only if it does not trigger further 106 review by the Advisory Council. It is not yet clear how this will turn out.

The Redevelopment Agency decided to apply the balance of the funds to other projects, allowed under the FEMA grant. The Commission voted to put $2.3 million toward the cost of a seismic upgrade of the Jessie Street Substation for use by the Jewish Museum San Francisco. While Heritage had sought the Agency’s commitment to expend the full FEMA grant on a complete seismic retrofit rather than an interim stabilization of the Williams Building, it agreed to endorse this proposal for the substation. This historic industrial structure, which now looks across an open expanse from Jessie Street to the new Yerba Buena Gardens, has stood vacant for the better part of 20 years.

Excited by the prospect of locating at the substation, Joyce Linker, president of the museum board, said, “We believe its combination of historic grandeur and dynamic space will be a perfect fit with our mission and programs.” She stated that she looks forward to working with Heritage as the museum develops plans “to bring this magnificent building back to life for the benefit of the whole community for generations to come.” Heritage, which began the fight to save the Jessie Street Substation in 1974, also eagerly anticipates a cooperative relationship with the Jewish Museum.

Willis Polk designed the Jessie Street Substation (1905) as a remodel of an 1881 structure that burned two months before the 1906 earthquake and again following that disaster. It was rebuilt in 1907 and enlarged two years later. It is a city landmark and listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

Heritage is working with the Agency to develop a program, which the Redevelopment Commission supports in concept, to make the balance of the FEMA grant, about $2.52 million, available to other buildings in need of seismic upgrade. One option may be to assist owners of UMB places of assembly who have difficulty raising money for seismic work mandated by the City.

**WATERFRONT PLAN**

On June 6, planning staff of the Port of San Francisco issued a Draft Waterfront Land Use Plan. The Port Commission will have reviewed and taken public comment on the plan at its July 26 meeting.

Assuming area plans of the Department of City Planning as a standard, Heritage finds inadequate treatment of historical and architectural resources in the Port’s document. There are numerous references to preserving “historic character and architectural value” in specific portions of the waterfront but without analysis of what constitutes such “character” and “value.”

This shortcoming is particularly disappointing because the San Francisco Department of City Planning has already done much of the work on cultural resources in preparing plans for the north and northeast waterfronts. Port planners could have incorporated those findings, along with information the State Office of Historic Preservation reviewed in its determination of National Register eligibility of pier bulkheads during the 1970s. Caltrans also covered waterfront areas in its I-280 transfer study.

Occasionally the plan identifies specific structures for preservation, “if
feasible," but with little indication why their preservation is important. Apart from the obvious case of the Ferry Building area, only the Union Iron Works receives more than passing notice as a candidate for retention, and that does little to establish the enormous significance of this site.

Upon inquiry, Heritage learned from Port staff that the environmental impact report would contain a comprehensive preservation component. However, that will not be in final form before the end of 1995, and there is no provision for incorporating the findings of the EIR into the final waterfront plan.

By press time, Heritage will have conveyed its comments to the Port Commission.

SMOKESTACK REVISITED

When the item on the removal of the smokestack at 166-178 Townsend appeared in our last issue, one of the building's owners contacted Heritage to correct the implication that he did not have the proper permit to carry out the demolition. He stated that the permit application clearly indicated the intention to remove the smokestack to the roof line and that he was taking this course to comply with a city mandate to do corrective work.

The drawing submitted with the permit that Alice Carey saw subsequent to her visit to the site referred to the removal of the "chimney," a word that conveyed to her a very different idea from "smokestack." The permit, as she recalls, showed a floor plan but no elevation or section drawing or any data that would indicate the subject of the demolition was a 130-foot structure. The owner also stated that drawings specifying the extent of demolition were available at the job site. Carey says, however, that no one offered her the opportunity to see them.

It does now appear, as the owner pointed out to Heritage, that the City's Building Department issued the permit prematurely. It should have referred the application to the Landmarks Board, because the building is in the South End Historic District.

We also reported, incorrectly, that Carey had called the owner's office to inquire about the permit. In fact, she called the contractor's office, whose number she received from personnel at the job site.

There is no evidence that the owners were acting in bad faith, and that inference should not be drawn from Heritage's account. In fact, since all of this has come to a head, the owners have accepted Heritage's request to consider an alternative to demolition. Alice Carey reports that the neighborhood is raising some money to help defray the cost of a second structural engineer's analysis of the smokestack.

FIRES STRIKE LANDMARKS

In recent weeks, two City Landmarks fell victim to destructive fires.

On June 24, a four-alarm fire caused extensive damage to the third floor and attic of the historic McMullen House, at 827 Guerrero. Built in 1881 for John and Lena McMullen as a small two-story Victorian residence, it grew with their fortunes to its present form. The original architect or builder is unknown, but in 1890, Samuel Newsom enlarged and remodeled the house, adding the tower and in general remaking it in the image of the Queen Anne style favored at that time.

The house remained a single-family residence until the late 1950s, when it became a boarding house. Kathy and Leroy Looper bought it in 1978 and operated a board and care facility for mentally disabled adults. With technical assistance from Heritage and funding from a variety of public and private sources, the Loopers undertook a rehabilitation of the property, which they completed in 1984 (See Fall 1983 and Fall 1984 Newsletter).

The Loopers still own the house, although they recently leased it to Westside Community Health. Soon after the disaster, the Loopers began the process to bring back the 113-year old house.

In the early morning hours of July 7, a multi-alarm blaze struck the Oriental Warehouse, at First and Brannan. Constructed in 1867-8, the massive brick structure is all that remains of the Pacific Mail Steamship facility that was the hub of San Francisco's extensive Pacific trade (See Summer 1990 Newsletter). Until the early 20th century, it served also as the west's chief port of entry for Asian immigrants.

Firewalls that run east and west divide the structure into three bays. The fire virtually destroyed the north bay. The east wall remains standing, and the ground floor appears to have survived.

Vacant for many years and the victim of an earlier fire, the Oriental Warehouse is in the Redevelopment Agency's Rincon Point-South Beach project area. The owner, Reliance Development of Los Angeles, was to begin conversion of the historic building to live-work units later this year.

At press time, investigators had not yet determined the cause of the fire.
Do you own a building with “problem” windows? Consider your options carefully. Do not rush to replace existing windows because they seem “beyond repair,” or a contractor says it is your only course. That choice may prove expensive and can result in compromising your building’s design integrity.

Learn to look at windows. Take a walk through your neighborhood and notice the windows. Even if you take a familiar route, the variety of designs will probably surprise you.

The two most common types of window in San Francisco are the double-hung window and the casement window, but the design variations within those types are numerous. Historically, the casement window, hinged from one side and opening outward (sometimes inward), is the older type, dating to the Middle Ages. The double-hung window appeared at the beginning of the 18th century and won a wide acceptance that has survived through all the changes of architectural taste into the 20th century. Its simplicity and ease of operation, as well as its adaptability to stylistic variation, account for its popularity.

Window types less common in San Francisco than double-hung are those that push out from horizontal pivot points at or toward the top of the frame, tip inward from pivot points at the bottom or open on a vertical pivot. Fixed or stationary windows include transom lights and decorative windows, such as stained glass.

Technical History of Windows

Early double-hung sash were divided-light or multi-pane in character. This use of many small panes of glass was driven by the state of technology but became an expression of style or taste. By the time of the Civil War, manufacture of larger panes of glass of good quality and strength made possible the one-over-one window that is common in San Francisco residences of the Victorian and Edwardian eras. Most of San Francisco’s surviving development is post-Civil War. In most cases where multiple light windows appear, therefore, it is a conscious stylistic decision, as in the case of an architect employing a historic revival design—Tudor, Mission or Mediterranean.

Much of the aesthetic impact of a window comes from the surround or detail that outlines or frames the opening. The window units themselves make a far subtler but no less significant contribution to the overall design of a façade. Function—providing light and ventilation—only partially dictates fenestration (the arrangement and placement of windows in a building). Architectural style and design—and sometimes the state of technology—are strong determinants of a window’s character.

In tracing the technical history of windows in America, Susan Swiatosz notes that design handbooks of the 1830s and ’40s gave detailed window specifications for house builders. By the middle of the 19th century, with the spread of mail order suppliers of building materials, “Mass produced, standardized components became affordable and widely available to the average builder.” At first, the catalogs of these suppliers provided windows
to accommodate certain regional differences, but with increasing competition in ever-widening markets under the impact of rapid urbanization in America, standardization of size and types became general across the nation.

With the diversification of styles in the late Victorian period, catalogs displayed variations of double-hung sash. The most popular was a multi-light ornamented upper sash over a single pane lower sash typical of the Queen Anne style (See top left photo). Curved glass appeared late in the 19th century and with it bowed bays (See middle left photo).

Architectural supply catalogs offered metal windows as early as 1860, but they did not enjoy wide use until the turn of the century, and then primarily in industrial and institutional construction. At that time, new technology made it possible to mass produce rolled steel windows at a cost competitive with wood windows. Stricter fire codes, the response to devastating urban fires, encouraged their use in industrial, commercial and office buildings. Steel sash helped make possible large window areas that admitted more light and better ventilation, contributing to a healthier and more attractive workplace.

Architects began to use steel casement windows in highrise residential design prior to World War I. Their durability and fire-resistant properties added to their popularity. Also their thin profiles suited the machined, streamlined appearance of the Moderne and International Styles (See bottom left photo). After the Second World War, cheaper aluminum won preference over steel, although the latter continue to be produced.

No Window is Maintenance Free

Windows, more than almost any other element of a building’s façade, suffer from lack of proper maintenance. Some property owners, looking for a cheap and quick solution—and preferably one that will be “permanent” and maintenance free—turn to stock aluminum windows. Wood windows may be in need of repair or repainting. They may rattle and admit drafts. They may stick or operate with difficulty. Each of these problems is solvable without resorting to the extreme of tearing them out and replacing them with aluminum or other material.

No window is maintenance-free. Any window requires a certain amount of care over time to keep it in good working order. Wood is the most adaptable of all available window materials. It is almost infinitely capable of renewal and repair, and when you want to change your color scheme, all it takes is a bit of surface preparation and a new coat of paint. A good experienced worker can do routine maintenance of a typical wooden, Victorian-era double-hung window in a couple of hours.

What is the Right Thing?

If the condition of windows is such that replacement is the only alternative, the simple answer to the question, “What is the appropriate window replacement for my building?” is replacement in kind, with respect to type, style and materials. Consistency of type and style is clearly important in order to retain the building’s architectural integrity. Material is also important, however. While you can install a vinyl or vinyl-clad window of the correct type and style, the texture of the surface will not be like wood. What is more, you will have to live with the color, since vinyl, although now available in a variety of colors, will not take paint well, if you decide you want a change. Finer details, like the profile of sash and muntins (framing members that hold panes in the sash), may not be available in stock vinyl windows, and the cost of customizing these in vinyl may be prohibitive. All of these are points you should consider, not
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There are four distinct categories of work that can be done to a window unit depending on its condition.

1. **Routine Maintenance.** Windows that are structurally sound can usually be restored to working order and an acceptable level of energy efficiency with only minor repairs. Common, inexpensive projects include replacement of broken sash cords or glass, scraping and painting, installing new glazing compound, and replacement of broken sash locks.

2. **Structural Repair.** A lack of routine maintenance over the years can lead to serious deterioration and decay of the window unit. The presence of decay in a window unit does not mean it should be replaced. Modern wood epoxy restoration techniques can economically rejuvenate even severely damaged and decayed window units.

3. **Replacement of Sash Only.** The original moveable sash may be missing or damaged beyond repair, but the frame with its pulleys, counterweights, and exterior moldings may be intact. In this instance, new, wood replacement sash can be installed in the existing frames at a cost that is usually less than total replacement of the entire unit.

4. **Replacement of the Entire Unit.** As a last resort, when damage to the original window unit is too severe to permit consideration of any other alternative, new window units made to exact dimensions of the old one and preferably made of wood to duplicate the look and material of the old units should be installed.


Even in a well-cared for building (top right), the wrong window type (upper floor) creates a disharmony. In the example above, the replacement window on the left interrupts the curving lines of the bay.

—— Where to get more information


Sharon C. Park, AIA. *Preservation Briefs: 13, The Repair and Thermal Upgrading of Historic Steel Windows.* National Park Service


Birthday Party
continued from page 1
the exterior of the building without Heritage’s consent.

In 1985, Heritage approved the owners’ request to add a garage and to enlarge the cock’s living quarters in the basement to provide an apartment. Heritage staff monitored the design process to ensure that these additions, which would accommodate modern needs, were compatible with the house’s historic architectural character and would have minimal visual impact. The results speak well enough for the success of that effort.

When Gray Brechin, who was architectural historian at Heritage at the time, prepared an evaluation of this candidate for an easement, he described 2000 Pacific Avenue as a “very fine Queen Anne. . . distinguished by two corner towers, two exceptionally fine art glass windows, the original wrought iron fence around the entire streetfront, and a large and prominent lot with much of the original planting.” He attributed the design to Henry Burns.

The original owners were Emma J. and Charles B. York, who was secretary of G.M. Josselyn, ship chandlers in the city, and resident in Oakland at the time of the house’s construction, in 1894. Three owners followed in the years after the Yorks sold in 1911, and the current owners, after 20 years, are looking soon to pass this extraordinary piece of San Francisco’s heritage on to new proprietors.

The house will be open between the hours of 2 and 5 pm on September 11, only. Refreshments will create the festive atmosphere of a birthday party. Heritage members will get ticket information in the mail. Others should call (415) 441-3000 for details. ■

Landmark Ban
continued from page 1
principles. First, it singles out a particular category of property owner for privileged treatment. In granting this privilege to religious properties, the measure runs contrary to recent court decisions that bar the government from favoring religion. Furthermore, the courts have consistently found that designating churches as landmarks does not infringe the free exercise of religion, as the proponents of the measure argue.

Secondly, AB 133 preempts the traditional right of cities and counties to govern local land-use matters. Fearing a flood of nominations in the wake of its announcement of church closures, the Catholic Archdiocese of San Francisco sought AB 133. However, San Francisco’s landmarks ordinance already provides adequate checks and balances against its arbitrary use. It provides for three full public hearings on any nomination—one each before the Landmarks Board, the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. Designation requires a resolution of the Board of Supervisors and the mayor’s signature.

Although members of some parishes scheduled for closing have explored landmark designation as a means to keep the churches open, that has not been the issue for preservation advocates. The sole question for us is whether any of these church buildings, on the merits of their historical or architectural significance, are worthy of preservation as landmarks. If a structure is important enough to make it through the checks and balances of the landmark review process, it deserves as much protection as possible.

There is no question that the City’s mandated upgrade of unreinforced masonry buildings presents a serious financial challenge to the Catholic Church and other religious communities in San Francisco. Relief should be sought locally and not by sweeping state legislation. Heritage has long urged the City of San Francisco to refine the seismic ordinance, extending the time limit for religious groups to comply, and to explore sources of financial assistance for them.

This issue of the newsletter will be in the mail before AB 133 comes up for its third reading. If it passes, the governor will need to hear from preservation advocates urging him to veto the bill. Watch the newspapers or call Heritage for an update. ■

UPDATE ON THE OLD MINT

Because its future remains unsettled, the Old Mint (See March/April Newsletter) made this year’s National Trust list of America’s 11 Most Endangered Historic Places.

Meanwhile, authorization to expend $18 million for seismic and life-safety work on the building has cleared its first hurdle in the U.S. Senate. If it passes the full Senate and the House, it will go into the appropriations bill for fiscal 1996.

Senator Feinstein has introduced legislation to issue a commemorative coin for the building’s 125th anniversary. Proceeds of its sale would go to the nonprofit Old Mint Corporation.

The building is awaiting transfer from the Treasury Department to the General Services Administration, which may then lease it to the Old Mint Corporation to operate as a museum. Until all these parts come together, a group called Friends of the Mint is raising money to fund planning for the reuse of the building so that any necessary interior alterations can proceed at the same time as the structural overhaul.

Heritage is acting as fiscal agent to receive donations for Friends of the Mint. Send your contribution to Friends of the Mint, c/o San Francisco Heritage, 2007 Franklin Street, San Francisco, CA 94109. ■

— Heritage thanks Abbey Carpet, T.C. McMochen, president, for generously donating carpet for the basement bathroom of the Haas-Lilienthal House, recently freshness up with a coat of paint.

— Reminder: Deadline for entering Heritage’s Awards Program is September 16. Call (415) 441-3000 for an application.
As Good As New
Paul J. Jakubovich
The Department of City Development, Milwaukee, 1993

An attractive and useful book arrived recently at the Heritage office, unsolicited. As Good As New is a publication of Milwaukee's Department of City Development, prepared by preservation consultant Paul J. Jakubovich. While the book addresses the Milwaukee homeowner, much of it could apply to San Francisco.

The book proposes both to head off unsympathetic exterior alterations of older houses and to provide a guide to reversing earlier inappropriate alterations. Its readable, easy-to-follow text presents a clear, level-headed and detailed explication of common rehab problems and their solutions. Well produced with excellent and appropriate illustrations, its 250 pages are spiral-bound to lie flat when open. A glossary of terms and a reading list add to the book's utility.

A photo album surveys the historic styles of Milwaukee residences. It reflects roughly the same period of development as San Francisco but reveals some notable differences.

Detached houses on large lots with free-standing garages seem to predominate in Milwaukee.

To order As Good As New, send a check for $15.95, which also covers postage and handling, payable to the City of Milwaukee, to Linda Wallner, Milwaukee Historic Preservation Commission, Department of City Development, P.O. Box 324, Milwaukee, WI 53201.

The Fantastic Fair

The California Midwinter International Exposition is San Francisco's forgotten fair, at least until this year's centennial observance generated several exhibits, as well as The Fantastic Fair, by Arthur Chandler and Marvin Nathan. It was the first of the city's three expositions—and the first world's fair west of Chicago—but the one that has endured least in memory, even though its legacy includes the Japanese Tea Garden, the Music Concourse (but not the Music Pavilion) and the foundation of what became the de Young Museum.

Most of today's San Franciscans will be surprised at the scale of the fair of 1894. It opened January 27, with over 180 structures. Inspired by the Chicago Exposition of 1893, which was seven years in the planning, Michael de Young, publisher of the Chronicle, was the driving force that put together the Midwinter Fair in seven months.

De Young hoped the fair would generate business to help pull the city out of the economic slump the whole nation was experiencing. The idea of a winter fair was to publicize California's mild climate, inducing visitors to settle here and to locate their enterprises in the city. The fair closed July 4, before visitors could learn the awful truth about our summer fog.

This little book—it is under 100 pages—provides concise descriptions of the fair, its preparation and its attractions, illustrated with engravings and several interesting photographs by I.W. Taber. There is also a series of "colored art views" that H.S. Crocker of San Francisco originally published. Readers will find this book a worthwhile introduction to its subject.

If you have occasion to patronize any of our advertisers, thank them for supporting the Heritage Newsletter.
The historic Haas-Lilienthal House, a property of The Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage, is available for rental for private or corporate events. The House can accommodate up to 150 guests. Please call 415-3011 for more information.
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NOTICE
This issue of the newsletter was mailed August 1, 1994. If you receive delivery later than three weeks after that date, notify your carrier.
CALENDAR

CONTINUING HERITAGE EVENTS

Sundays 11 am to 4:15
Haas-Lilienthal House Tours $5
Free to Heritage members & guests

Wednesdays 12 noon to 3:15
Haas-Lilienthal House Tours $5
Free to Heritage members & guests

Sundays 12:30 pm
Pacific Heights Walking Tour $5
Free to Heritage members & guests

Group Tours
Group tours of the Haas-Lilienthal House and of Pacific Heights,
Chinatown and the Presidio are available. For information or to book a
group tour, call (415) 441-3000.

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

AUGUST

August 25 - 27
"Preserving Historic/Cultural Landscapes in the West." National Park
Service workshop in San Francisco.
Call Ann Huston (415) 744-3988

August 26 - 28
Festival of the Sea 1994, Hyde St. Pier
Call (415) 929-0202

Through August 28
Oakland Heritage Walking Tours
Every Saturday & Sunday
Call: (510) 763-9218 for schedule

SEPTEMBER

September 10 and 11
Alameda Victorian Preservation
Society House Tour and Craft Fair
Call (510) 523-2877

September 15 - 18
California Historical Society and the
California Council for the Promotion
of History Annual Conference
San Diego. Call (415) 567-1848

September 16, 5 pm
Deadline for entries in Heritage's
Awards for Excellence in Architectural
Conservation. Call (415) 441-3000

Through September 16
Exhibit: "Cable Car Houses"
Cable Car Museum (415) 474-1887

September 17, 10 am - 5 pm
S.F. Historical Society House Tour
Call (415) 731-2187 or 616-8330

OCTOBER

October 20 - 23
Heritage Los Angeles Tour
Call (415) 441-3000

October 26 - 30
Annual Meeting of the National Trust
for Historic Preservation, Boston
Call 1-800-944-NTHP

October 16, 1 - 5 pm
Victorian Alliance House Tour in Cole
Valley. $15 in advance/$20 at the door
7 outstanding buildings, door prizes
and refreshments. Call (415) 821-3866

NOVEMBER

November 18
Heritage Awards Luncheon
Call (415) 441-3000
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BAY AREA TOURS

Cameron-Stanford House, Oakland
Tours Call (510) 836-1976

City Guides Walks of San Francisco
For schedule call (415) 557-4266

Falkirk Victorian Estate, San Rafael
Tours Call (415) 485-3328

Dunsmuir House & Gardens, Oakland
Tours Call (510) 562-9344

Lathrop House, Redwood City
Tours Call (415) 365-5564

Luther Burbank Home & Gardens
Santa Rosa Call (707) 524-5445

McConaghy House, Hayward
Tours Call (510) 276-3010

Octagon House San Francisco
Tours Call (415) 441-7512

Palo Alto-Stanford Heritage
Tours Call (415) 321-8667 or 324-3121

Pardee Home Museum, Oakland
Tours Call (510) 444-2187

Villa Montalvo, Saratoga
Tours Call (408) 741-3421

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

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

Name ________________________________________________
Address ______________________________________________
City, state, zip________________________________________
Phone _______________________________________________

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

Contributions are tax deductible.