SAN FRANCISCO ASTIR OVER EMPORIUM'S UNCERTAIN FUTURE

In the heat of the holiday shopping season, when Federated Department Stores indicated they may locate a Bloomingdale's at the site of the historic Emporium, the mayor's office, according to Gerald Adams' account in the Examiner (December 4, 1996), seemed prepared to give away the store, literally, to make it happen. It would "move heaven and earth," even though Federated might seek to demolish all but the Market Street elevation.

Several days later, Matier & Ross (Chronicle, December 9, 1996) reported a more considered response (someone probably remembered we have a Downtown Plan that protects historical resources), that the City would do anything "within the law." Matier & Ross also noted, "San Francisco's always-active preservationists are going to fight Bloomie's every step of the way." No doubt, but they would much rather work with them and with the City to achieve a plan for the building's reuse that both respects its historic character and achieves Federated's programmatic needs.

Shortly after it acquired the Emporium through its purchase of Broadway Stores, Inc., in October 1995, Federated Department Stores, of Cincinnati, announced it would close the chain's flagship store on Market Street. The doors closed in February, just three months short of the store's centenary.

Downtown watchers assumed that Federated would open a Bloomingdale's at that location, but the retailer was noncommittal. Then, in April of last year, the Chronicle reported a proposal to install Bloomingdale's on the first three floors and convert the remainder of the 680,000 square foot space to a "boutique hôtel." There has been no further word on this idea from Federated. Meanwhile, we at Heritage began to hear of the existence of plans and a model that showed new construction on the site with retention only of the historic Beaux-Arts façade.

The lack of activity along the

—continued on page 9
ARCHITECTURAL FRAGMENTS

- Heritage was among the co-sponsors for a special showing of the exhibition, *The Splendors of Imperial China*, at the Asian Art Museum on December 8. The evening’s proceeds benefited the Chinatown Neighborhood Preservation Initiative, which must raise $250,000 in order to receive $800,000 in matching funds. The initiative is part of a pilot project of the Pew Charitable Trusts, which selected Chinatown and eight other working-class neighborhoods across the nation to support formation of community development programs. The three-year program will address earthquake safety, housing, the environment, the economy and youth leadership in Chinatown. Partners in the initiative include the Chinatown Resource Center, the Chinese Community Housing Corporation and the San Francisco Foundation. For information on how you can support this worthwhile effort, call Normie Pineda at (415) 984-1472.

- In March, the University of California Press will publish *The Forum of Trajan in Rome*, by James E. Packer. The 3-volume work is the first comprehensive study of its subject and includes a history of the site, an examination of all previous scholarship on the subject and a modern reconstruction of the second-century monument in architectural renderings. The work is available in a fine limited edition of 1000 sets at a pre-publication price of $550, until February 28 ($650 thereafter). To order call (800) 777-4726.

- Stanford University has selected Carey & Co., Inc. as preservation architects for the rehabilitation of the 1898 School of Humanities and Sciences building on the university’s Main Quad. The firm will work with Stanford’s team of architects and construction managers on the rehabilitation, seismic strengthening and systems upgrade of the historic masonry structure, designed by Shepley, Rutan & Coolidge.

- On April 9, the first *San Francisco Forum* presents *Architecture of the Imagination*. Seven renowned architects will speak about architecture that moves from the real into the realm of fantasy. Aaron Betsky, SFMOMA curator of architecture and design, will moderate two panel discussions, at Herbst Theater, in which Elizabeth Diller, Peter Eisenman, Frank Gehry, Zaha Hadid, Craig Hodgetts, Rem Koolhaas and Robert Stern present their work. Call (415) 357-4027.

- Two architectural lecture series are in progress. The Center for Critical Architecture is presenting 7 programs of young North American architects discussing their work, at the California College of Arts & Crafts/San Francisco. Call (415) 703-9568 for details. The UC College of Environmental Design offers its spring series at Wurster Hall on the Berkeley campus, through May 7. Call (510) 642-0831.
DEMOlITION OF MODERNIST BUILDING

1550 Sutter Street
(Gardner Dailey, 1948)

On December 15th, the Red Cross Chapter of San Francisco vacated their headquarters building at 1550 Sutter Street and moved to smaller leased quarters elsewhere in the city. The building, designed in 1948 by Gardner Dailey and Walter Steilberg, has been sold. The new owner will demolish it and build a retirement complex in its place.

The Red Cross Building is one of the most significant Modernist buildings in San Francisco; it was one of the first International Style office buildings erected in the city and is considered one of Dailey’s best works. It received national attention at the time of its construction and was included in the 1952 New York Museum of Modern Art show, Built in USA, as one of the best modern buildings constructed in the country between 1944 and 1952. Despite these distinguished credentials, no one contested the demolition permit.

Dailey is best known for his residential work and, along with contemporaries like William Wurster, was responsible for the distinctive regional modernism produced in the Bay Area during the 1930s, ’40s and ’50s. Because he had only a handful of non-residential commissions during this significant period, the Red Cross Building is all the more important.

The newly formed Northern California Chapter of DOCOMOMO (Documentation and Conservation of Buildings of the Modern Movement) was able to schedule a tour of the building before the Red Cross vacated it. At the December meeting of the Landmarks Board two DOCOMOMO members spoke about the contribution that modern buildings make to the city’s architectural heritage and decried the demolition of the Red Cross Building. They presented a petition to the board signed by local architects and preservationists urging them to recognize and begin landmarking significant modern structures in San Francisco.

—contributed by Chandler McCoy

NORTH END POLICE STATION

The former North End Police Station (1912) at 2475 Greenwich Street (See July/August 1995 and March/April 1996 Newsletter) is the subject of a proposal that is pending at the Landmarks Board. The owner, who purchased the surplus city property in October, is seeking approval to convert it to an artist’s studio and live/work unit for his own use.

The project involves the two landmark buildings on the site. A third building, a storage shed added in the 1950s or 1960s, would be demolished and replaced with a smaller structure. The historic garage at the back of the lot will remain a garage, after undergoing seismic reinforcement, reroofing and various repairs. Plans also call for the addition of skylights, which will not be visible from the ground. The clay roof tiles will remain. Restoration work, based on the original plans, will include reconstructing the missing rooftop cupola and repairing the
principal entry doors, which were modified sometime in the past, and returning them to their original condition.

The police station itself will also receive a seismic upgrade that requires only some minor modifications that will not be visible from the street, including the removal of several skylights. To meet ventilation requirements for the painting studio, which will be located in the main assembly room, some windows will be changed from stationary to operable.

Removal of the sign above the main entrance for the Youth Services Bureau, the most recent tenant, will reveal the original sign for the North End Police Station. Other restoration work will renew the large wrought iron lamps that flank the entry.

The proposed project promises a sensitive treatment for this City Landmark that retains its historic character and ensures an extended life for the building. The architect is David Gast.

UPDATING ISSUES

Heritage was in discussion with its owner to arrive at a design solution that would retain at least some of the severely fire-damaged 1880s residential building. The Planning Commission, on the recommendation of the Landmarks Board, had denied a demolition permit. It was a struggle, but in the end, the developer retained the undamaged front portion of the historic house, to a depth of about eight feet, raised it to add a garage and replaced the rear portion of the building with new construction. The accompanying recent photograph (at left) shows the completed project.

People who regularly ride into the city from the East Bay have witnessed the transformation of an icon. The

Last year brought closure on some preservation cases first addressed in "Preservation Notes" during 1995. When 2247 Turk Street appeared in these pages (July/August 1995),

Heritage was in discussion with its owner to arrive at a design solution that would retain at least some of the severely fire-damaged 1880s residential building. The Planning Commission, on the recommendation of the Landmarks Board, had denied a demolition permit. It was a struggle, but in the end, the developer retained the undamaged front portion of the historic house, to a depth of about eight feet, raised it to add a garage and replaced the rear portion of the building with new construction. The accompanying recent photograph (at left) shows the completed project.

People who regularly ride into the city from the East Bay have witnessed the transformation of an icon. The

Notice of Annual Meeting

Heritage will hold its annual meeting for members
Saturday, June 7, 1997

The meeting features a lecture, lunch and the annual business meeting, including election of officers and new board members. Members may, by petition of at least 2 percent of the total membership, nominate candidates for the Board of Directors. Petitions must be received by March 7, 1997.

Candidates nominated by petition shall be voted on by the members present at the annual meeting.

Union Oil tower (See September/October 1995 Newsletter), at First and Harrison, remained shrouded for months while the public waited for

the new look. Bank of America had purchased the property and engaged STUDIOS to impress its own corporate identity on the tower. The white, orange and blue colors of Union 76 have given way to the bank's red, white and blue "BA" logo (photo above). The digital clock remains, as promised.

HOK completed an interior remodel and seismic upgrade of the adjoining office building, which the bank now occupies.

LANDMARKS BOARD

Several changes at the Landmarks Board greeted the new year. With the reassignment of Vincent Marsh to long-range preservation planning, Mark Paez, a planner previously assigned part-time to landmarks, assumes the position of secretary to the board. Denise LaPointe succeeded Michael Crowe in the office of president of the board at the first meeting of 1997. At the same time, a new member took his place on the board; architect Jeremy Kotas fills the vacancy left by the resignation of Sheila Starr last year.
SCHOOL DISTRICT SEeks DEMOLITION OF LANDMARK 170 FELL STREET

A portion of the historic High School of Commerce campus, a designated City Landmark and contributory to the Civic Center Historic District, faces demolition, if the San Francisco Unified School District has its way. A new building would replace it as part of a project to convert the entire school complex on the block between Van Ness, Fell, Franklin and Hayes into the School of the Arts.

The endangered building is at the northeast corner of Fell and Franklin streets. It is a three-story-over-basement (partially below grade) steel frame and tan brick structure with spare Classical Revival ornamentation expressed in terra cotta. Floor slabs are concrete; partition walls are clay tile.

Newton J. Tharp designed the building during his brief tenure as City Architect following the 1906 disaster. He died the year before its completion in 1910, and the City honored his work by naming the school after him. It sat on the north side of Grove Street, between Polk and Larkin, until plans for the new Civic Center forced its relocation to the present site, in 1913, in what the Examiner called "an exceedingly delicate feat of engineering." The move took 7 months. As late as 1924, the manufacturer of the brick used in the building touted the performance of its product in what it called "an engineering triumph." The building underwent minor modifications in the course of placement on its new site.

Between 1923 and 1926, John Reid, Jr., designed the additions (not proposed for demolition) that resulted in the campus that exists today. Only the athletic field, across Hayes Street, is gone, replaced first by a parking lot and now by Davies Symphony Hall. In 1952, the Board of Education closed Commerce and converted it to school district administrative offices. The '20s buildings continue in that use.

The October 1989 earthquake threw the future of 170 Fell Street into doubt. The school district vacated the building, which suffered extensive although not severe damage to exterior brick and terra cotta and to interior hollow clay tile partitions. Erection of wooden barricades protected the public from the danger of falling masonry. The following spring, the Bureau of Building Inspection declared 170 Fell a "secured building," that is, one that presents no imminent public hazard but which may not be occupied.

Soon thereafter, the school district received a draft report, prepared under contract, that provided a structural analysis and proposals for the preservation and rehabilitation of the historic brick building. Although the analysis found that the building's capacity to resist lateral forces was compromised (but not its vertical load-bearing capacity), none of the existing conditions would preclude preservation and rehabilitation of 170 Fell. "In fact," the study concluded, "we have confirmed the building can be returned to service." On its recommendation, the chimney and about half the parapet were removed to reduce potentially hazardous conditions.

In July 1990 the school district received Landmarks Board approval of certain seismic related exterior work on the building that seemed to indicate a commitment to preserve it. However, the work was never undertaken, and by the end of the year, 170 Fell appeared to be headed for demolition. Landmarks Board staff informed the district, in January of 1991, that demolition would require a Certificate of Appropriateness, because it is located within the landmark site. In April, the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) threw up another obstacle to demolition by offering the opinion, in direct contra...—continued on page 8
MAYOR BROWN swore in a new director of city planning in November. Although the Planning Commission conducted a nationwide search for candidates, the mayor personally selected Gerald Green to be his new head planner from within the department, where Green has worked for 12 years. During January, the new director graciously sat for an interview with Heritage so that we could introduce him to our readers. What follows is a condensed and edited version of the interview.

The most critical planning issue facing San Francisco, Green believes, is the need to restructure the Planning Department to make it more relevant to changing economic conditions. He contends that the planning process is too complex. It needs to be more practical and more closely linked with planning for economic development in the city.

Where does preservation fit into this? It is important, especially in San Francisco, according to Green, which tourists come from around the world to see because of its historic architecture. "I wouldn't give preservation priority over affordable housing needs or economic development," he said, but it is not incompatible with either of these objectives.

We need a preservation element in the planning code, and we need a strong one, in Green's view. He commented on the criticism he has taken for reassigning Vincent Marsh but says he believes Vincent is the best qualified to work on broad issues like the preservation element. Once it is adopted, we can bring Articles 10 and 11 into conformity with it. We would certainly not dismantle either of these preservation articles but rather bring them up to date.

Would this include amending Article 10 to give commission status to the Landmarks Board (now merely advisory to the Planning Commission)? Green is frank to admit he has not given this serious thought but does not feel disposed to seek that change at this point. He fears this change might seem to the public as adding another bureaucratic layer. We would have to amend the planning code to bring this about, and such a change should come from a higher level, not from the planning director alone.

Green recalled his appearance before the Landmarks Board shortly after his appointment. He guaranteed its members there will be more emphasis on preservation. He recognizes that, next to cities having comparable historic resources, preservation in San Francisco is woefully understaffed. We need to increase the number of planning staff assigned to preservation. That has to be addressed in the budget process, and "I hope to do it early on, while I am still enjoying my honeymoon in this position," Green stated.

The planning department also must update its surveys, in Green's judgment. The 1976 survey is not easy to use, he says. The department relies heavily on its findings to apply "Proposition M" policies with regard to preservation of historic buildings and neighborhood character. However, according to Green, developers are challenging the department's use of the survey because of its gaps and inconsistencies. Better surveys would make it easier to resolve conflicts over whether a building is significant or not and could speed up the review process which the State Historic Preservation Office requires for approval of affordable housing projects that the City would like to accelerate.

When asked if he would seek funding for survey activity, he replied that this is another budget issue. The department does not have the staff to do surveys at this time, and it is not clear where the money would come from to support the activity. He suggested that perhaps the planning department could seek grants jointly with Heritage to fund surveys.

Does the planning director have a comment on Federated's plans for the Emporium? He replied, "I'm not clued in enough at this time. I would like to see them get in there and want to know more about what they think are the problems with the building. I haven't seen all the facts. We need to look at their programmatic plans. They say the building is inefficient; we want to hear more about it. What does this mean? We want to work with them."

In a concluding remark, Mr. Green offered the following: "Preservation is definitely an important ingredient in my vision. The only real message to your audience is that we will give preservation the resources it needs, but we will also place it within the larger picture. Preservation is one factor in the equation; we will take a balanced approach."
Notre Dame des Victoires (564 Bush Street), known as “The French Church,” is close to completing construction that will extend its useful life well into the 21st century. Most of the $2.1 million project entailed a seismic retrofit, but the casual observer is likely to notice only some refurbishing and cosmetic repairs, so sensitively has the task been accomplished.

The church undertook the work in response to the mandate of the City’s unreinforced masonry building ordinance. The original construction is a combination of brick and reinforced concrete with a steel frame. The adjoining rectory, included in the project, is brick.

These buildings replaced structures on the site, purchased from the Baptist Church by the French Catholic community in 1856, that were destroyed in the 1906 earthquake and fire. The first stage of rebuilding was construction of the church hall (the basement level), in 1907. It housed services and served as a social hall whose rental income supported the building fund.

Construction on the upper church began in 1912, and its dedication took place three years later. The architect was Louis Brouchoud. E.A. Garin designed the rectory (built probably the same time as the church hall).

Joe Baldelli, project manager with URS Greiner, Inc., a San Francisco engineering firm, said that the church structure showed some weakness in the transverse (i.e. east-west) direction. The principal elements of the seismic solution were the addition of shotcrete shear walls at the north and south ends, the installation of a horizontal steel truss (integrated with the existing steel frame) to tie the two shear walls together and the addition of plywood subroofing to the two-story nave and the one-story side aisles to act as a diaphragm that increases resistance to lateral forces.

The north shear wall, at the altar end of the church, was added directly to the existing wall and is out of sight. At the south end, a new shear wall frames the entrance and stands just behind the first column in the two ranks of columns separating the nave from the aisles. It extends into the brick rectory, which shares a common wall with the church on the west side. When they prepared to connect the shear wall to two existing reinforced concrete columns in the basement, workers discovered there were no rebars connecting them to their footings. They drilled the columns to insert rebars, encased them in six-inch concrete jackets, rebuilt the footings and tied them into the shear wall.

Installation of the south shear wall required elimination of two confessional, one on either side of the entrance to the church. The space behind the new wall in the southeast corner became the housing for an elevator, to provide access for the disabled, while on the southwest corner a “reconciliation room” was constructed, adorned with the stained glass window relocated because of the installation of the elevator. The carved wood fasciae of the original confessional have been “appliquéd” to the surface of the shear wall.

The addition of tube steel provides reinforcement to the twin towers that face Bush Street, which, with the church’s façade, are now anchored to the shear wall. Two buttresses, one on each side of the structure, complete the seismic system by tying the roof of the nave together with the roof of the aisles at the church’s north end.

The seismic project provided the opportunity to do other work, including repointing some of the brick, repairing terra cotta ornament on the church’s exterior and installation of new roofing, copper flashing, gutters and down spouts. New exterior illumination will highlight the church’s Romanesque Revival architecture.

The project reversed some interior alterations done over time that compromised the integrity of the —continued on page 8
Church
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The nave of Notre Dame des Victoires during repainting and refinishing.

170 Fell
continued from page 5

diction to the findings of a consultant hired by school authorities, that 170 Fell is National Register eligible. Because the school district was hoping to qualify for federal funds, through the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), demolition would require Section 106 Review, under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, to explore alternatives and mitigating measures.

Undaunted, the school district applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition. In a hearing in November of 1991, the Landmarks Board found the application incomplete and took no action. They noted the need to seek formal determination of National Register eligibility and requested refinement of comparative cost figures for demolition and new construction versus rehabilitation.

Once again, school officials heard that the proposal would have to undergo Section 106 Review.

There followed a long period of inactivity—or at least silence. The Unified School District has not been forthcoming during any of this process, but we began to hear that it would preserve and rehabilitate 170 Fell Street. In fact, SHPO had already reviewed plans for such a project and found no adverse effect on the historic property. Then, in 1994, voters approved a bond measure providing funds for the School of the Arts at the Commerce High School campus.

Rehabilitation of 170 Fell still seemed a possibility, until a change of administration at the school district. Under a new superintendent of schools, the Board of Education voted to approve demolition, and—burned once before by the process—sought exemption from local planning review as "an independent state agency." This last ploy, however, sent the school district right into the arms of SHPO, which, in December 1995, informed the school district that it must comply with all state laws and regulations which govern the actions of state agencies regarding historical resources. In short, the Unified School District is subject to environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act and must submit to SHPO any project that affects historical properties.

Furthermore, SHPO cited the Governor's Executive Order W-26-92: that "all state agencies shall recognize and, to the extent prudent and feasible within existing budget and personnel resources, preserve and maintain the significant heritage resources of the State."

Consequently, although it has not abandoned its plan to demolish 170 Fell, claiming it cannot achieve its programmatic needs in the existing building, the school district has given in to the process. An environmental impact report is in preparation, and Section 106 Review is continuing at this time to consider alternatives to demolition. FEMA is prepared to offer about $9 million for the rehabilitation of 170 Fell or $3 million for demolition and new construction, but only if rehabilitation is not feasible. Design of a new building would also be subject to review for compatibility with the landmark High School of Commerce.

If the school district achieves its objective, it will have the distinction of carrying out the first demolition of a designated landmark in San Francisco.

MAYOR BOOSTS
PRESERVATION

Mayor Willie Brown attended a reception at the Roos House in November that celebrated the 25th anniversary of the National Trust's Western Regional Office. Reflecting on a recent visit to Paris, he spoke of the importance of maintaining continuity with the past and of preserving San Francisco's architectural heritage. The mayor expressed pride at his part in the renovation of City Hall. "First we had to decide what was best for the building and then find the money to do it." He observed that preservation has not had the emphasis it should; "It is very important to the city's future."
Emporium
continued from page 1
Emporium's 275-foot Market Street frontage for nearly a year has left everyone understandably uneasy about the future of the site. A new factor in the equation—and cause for additional concern—is Macy's decision to relocate its home furnishings department to the main floor of the Emporium (now open), until completion of new construction and rehabilitation of its Union Square store. That will not occur before 1998 or even 2000.

It is good to have at least part of the building back in business, but when will there be a decision about its future? We share the mayor's reported interest in "a quick and beneficial reuse of the Emporium." The way to achieve that is to deal openly with all interested parties, now, including the preservation community.

Federated should begin by engaging a qualified firm to prepare a historic resources report that will identify the significant areas of the building that should be preserved. Secondly, an engineer experienced with older structures should undertake a structural analysis to determine whether in fact the building is unsafe, as the owner asserts, and propose preservation solutions for any structural deficiencies.

Local newspapers reported that Federated will seek some kind of financial contribution from the City to convert the site. It is unlikely there will be much support among the voters to subsidize one of the world's largest and most profitable retailers to demolish a historic building. On the other hand, there are a number of means, already in place, to facilitate adaptive reuse of historic properties, notably the recently completed rehabilitation of the historic PG&E and Matson Buildings on Market Street. The adaptive reuse project for the historic Don Lee Showroom at 1000 Van Ness, now under way, will also seek rehabilitation tax credits.

The retail conglomerate could donate a preservation easement on the Emporium building and receive a one-time federal income tax deduction. Heritage holds many such easements in the largest program of its kind in the Western United States, and the owners of the Don Lee Building will explore an agreement with us.

Last spring, the mayor signed an ordinance to implement the Mills Act in San Francisco, first passed by the California Legislature in 1976. This allows the City to enter into a contract with the owner of a historic property who agrees to preserve and rehabilitate it, in return for a property tax reduction.

Finally, the State Historical Building Code provides equivalent life safety standards for the repair and alteration of historic buildings. Modern building codes often make rehabilitation of older structures difficult and costly. The SHBC allows conservation of significant historic fabric while ensuring the health and safety of the building's occupants. The many examples of its use in San Francisco include the PG&E project.

Heritage is eager to explore the most feasible adaptive reuse of the Emporium property. What happens there will have a substantial impact on the entire Mid-Market Street zone, which is to become a redevelopment area.

Preservation does not mean that no changes in a historic building are possible, but façadism is not a preservation solution. A process exists to review development proposals for significant structures, and the process works when all interested parties are drawn into it. The recent Macy's Union Square proposal—also a Federated project—is a case in point. Heritage, the Landmarks Board and Planning Department staff consulted with the developer and its architect to arrive at a design that all could accept.

Whatever else happens, the City—and Heritage—should be prepared to defend the letter and the spirit of the Downtown Plan.
In July 1992 the Board of Supervisors passed legislation requiring that unreinforced masonry buildings (UMBs) be retrofitted within certain time lines. The voters approved a $350 million general obligation bond in November 1992 to create a loan fund to finance the retrofit projects. Unfortunately, more than four years later, there are still more than 1,450 buildings that have not been strengthened.

Retrofitting UMBs as quickly as possible is important for many reasons. First, a major earthquake could strike San Francisco at any time. The Northridge earthquake confirmed our worst fears that unstrengthened UMBs are extremely vulnerable to structural failure. Second, San Francisco's retrofit law requires that UMBs either be retrofitted or demolished. The best way to ensure that architecturally and historically significant UMBs are not lost to earthquakes or demolition is to retrofit them as soon as possible.

The City has been making loans to UMB owners since February 1995. The loan program was designed to be more flexible than commercial bank loans. Owners can borrow funds to finance their retrofit costs plus an additional 25 percent to cover disabled access and other life-safety improvements. The interest rate is 8.5 percent for "market-rate" loans and 2.5 percent for buildings that contain affordable housing. All loans are fixed rate with 20-year terms and may be assumed. All property types, including apartment, residential and tourist hotel, church, office, retail and mixed use properties are eligible for the loan program.

In addition to offering attractive interest rates, the City loans will subordinate to other financing. It is not uncommon for the City to take a second or even third lien position behind existing financing. The City also permits overall loan-to-value ratios of up to 95 percent. This means that a borrower who could never qualify for traditional financing may still be able to obtain a City loan.

The City loan program provides other helpful services in addition to financial assistance. Loan program staff will track borrowers' permits through the Department of Building Inspection and the Department of City Planning. City staff can help owners plan their tenant accommodations so that the retrofit project goes smoothly for everyone involved.

For public safety, preservation of historic buildings and retention of small business and affordable housing, it makes sense to retrofit UMBs as soon as possible. City staff are available for free consultations with owners, potential buyers or bankers to discuss how the loan program can help preserve these buildings for future use and appreciation.

For details contact Seismic Safety Loan Program, 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 720, San Francisco, CA 94102 415-554-9891

City loan program financed Altamont Hotel retrofit for affordable housing.

130 BUSH STREET
AN ILLUSTRATED STORY
ABOUT FOUR BUILDINGS
AND A MONUMENT
IN
SAN FRANCISCO
by
L.G. Segedin

This story is a slice of architectural history, from the dedication of the Mechanics Monument to the completion of the Crown Zellerbach Building at One Bush Street. 
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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. For information call (415) 441-3011.

—NOTICE—
This issue of the newsletter was mailed February 10, 1997.
If you receive delivery later than three weeks after that date, notify your carrier.
CONTINUING HERITAGE EVENTS

Sundays 11 am to 4:15  
Wednesdays 12 noon to 3:15  
Haas-Lilienthal House Tours $5  
Sundays 12:30 pm  
Pacific Heights Walking Tour $5  
First Saturday every month 10 am  
Yerba Buena Tour $5  
678 Mission St.  
All regular Heritage tours are free to Heritage members and their guests.

Group Tours by Arrangement  
Call (415) 441-3000.

For information about all current Heritage events, call (415) 441-3004.

FEBRUARY

February 15 - April 27
Exhibition: Masterpieces from the Pierpont Morgan Library  
Legion of Honor. Call (415) 863-3330

February 15 - April 27
Exhibition: Art of the Americas: Pride of Place. De Young Museum  
Call (415) 863-2330

February 22, 3:00 pm  
California Preservation Foundation Design Awards. PG&E Building  
Call (510) 763-0972

February 27, 7:30 pm  
2801 Leavenworth. (415) 750-9986

March 15  
Planning & Conservation League Environmental Legislative Symposium. Berkeley. Call (916) 444-8726

APRIL

April 5, 2:00 pm  
SF History Association Lecture: Joaquín Tejada Sánchez, Building the Dream. Yerba Buena Center for the Arts  
2525 Mission St. (415) 357-4027

April 9, 9:00 am - 5:30 pm  
Call (415) 357-4027

April 26  
Heritage Soirée  
Sheraton Palace Hotel  
Invitations will be mailed to members

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

BAY AREA TOURS

Allied Arts Guild, Menlo Park  
Tours Call (415) 322-2405

Camron-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) 615-5555

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) 299-8878 or 324-3121

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

Strybing Arboretum Golden Gate Park  
Tours Call (415) 661-1316 ext. 312

JOIN SAN FRANCISCO HERITAGE!

Please enter my membership in the following category:

$40 Individual  
$60 Family  
$100 Supporting  
$250 Contributing  
$500 Sustaining  
$30 Seniors/Students

Name

Address

City, state, zipcode

Phone

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

Contributions are tax deductible.