MODERNISM IN SAN FRANCISCO

Since the beginnings of industrialization and large-scale urbanism, advancements in technology, economics, sociology and artistic media have lead to wholly new forms of aesthetic expression. Emerging from a society marred by the devastation of the First World War, the leaders of the modern movement sought to break with the past and to form a new type of design—free of the stylistic trappings of the pre-industrial age—for what they hoped would be an entirely new way of life.

Inspired by Humanist ideals founded in the Enlightenment, including democracy, individual freedom and prosperity, modern architects sought to harness the industrial process to mass produce design for an expanding middle class. Beginning in Europe in the 1920s, modernist design was characterized by an objective approach to aesthetics and a belief that design based on reason and science would promote social betterment.

The Swiss architect Le Corbusier—perhaps the most influential figure of the early modern period—developed an architecture rationalized to suit the high industrial period of the 1920s, by using forms and materials that were in appearance, if not in actual fact, machine-made. The German architect, Walter Gropius, took the machine-made idea to its next logical step. Gropius, director of the famous experimental Bauhaus design school during its heyday between 1919 and 1928, sought to make an architecture composed as much as possible of standardized elements, rationalized to achieve maximum efficiency in planning and construction.

California, in many ways, proved to be an ideal proving ground for these new aesthetic concepts, because the local climate, both socially and environmentally, has always been remarkably forgiving. In the 1920s, European modernism encountered a California culture still evolving, and the two formed a ready synthesis. Perhaps best represented by the works of the Austrian émigré Richard Neutra and his compatriot and early partner, Rudolph Schindler, early California modernism was on the whole more hospitable than the severe Bauhaus-inspired aesthetic. Neutra and Schindler transformed the orthodox “white box” modernism to incorporate indoor-outdoor living and set up a more intimate relationship between building and nature.

Although the popular conception of modern architecture in California is largely defined by the 1920s works of
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ARCHITECTURAL FRAGMENTS

■ On Sunday, October 19, the Victorian Alliance will present its annual house tour. This year’s event takes in several interesting houses in the “Pacific Heights South,” neighborhood, including the fine Pine Street residence shown here. The houses will be open from 1:00 until 5:00 pm, and visitors will take the tour on their own with the aid of a printed guide and docents posted in selected rooms of each house to answer questions. Light refreshments will be available at one of the stops. Tickets are $15 in advance and $20 the day of the tour. For information and tickets call Arch Wilson, (415) 824-3907.

■ You can now visit Heritage on the internet. Our web site is http://www.sfheritage.org, where you will find tour information and announcements of special activities, events and programs. There is also a bookstore inventory you can use to order directly from the Heritage Bookstore in the Haas-Lilienthal House. Many thanks to Roland Jadryev, a Heritage docent who volunteered his time and expertise to design our web site and put us online. Be sure to check it out.

■ An outstanding exhibit appeared at the Main Library this spring. Neighbors & Neighborhoods: Building Affordable Housing Together combined an effective use of informative text and excellent photographs to tell the story of meeting San Francisco's need for affordable housing, explaining why the need is so great here and illustrating what communities across the city working together are able to achieve. The balanced presentation gave a fair share to rehabilitation of historic structures and to good compatible new housing design. The exhibit will travel to various sites in the city. Call the Mayor's Office of Housing for the current venue: (415) 252-3177.

■ Santa Fe, New Mexico, plays host to the 51st Annual National Preservation Conference, October 14-19. People and Places: Living in Cultural Landscapes is the theme for more than 40 educational sessions and for field sessions that will explore preservation issues posed by the cultural landscapes of the Southwest. For preliminary program information, telephone (800) 944-6847; E-mail santafe_npc@nthp.org; internet http://www.nthp.org

■ The preservation architecture firm of Carey & Co., Inc. has expanded its staff with the addition of three new professionals since the first of the year. Cassandra Mettling-Davis brings 10 years of experience in project and construction management to Carey's design staff. Charles G. Duncan, who also joins the design staff, has over 15 years professional experience as an architectural project manager and a teacher. Laura J. Culberson is a building conservator with extensive knowledge of materials conservation, building codes, and construction materials and practices for historic structures.
After a year of intensive investigation, the project team of Tennebaum-Manheim Engineers and Architectural Resources Group (ARG) has developed schematic designs for two different approaches to the Conservatory of Flowers in Golden Gate Park. One is for the replacement of the existing wood elements in aluminum; the other entails repair and replacement of wood elements, in kind.

The primary goal of the Recreation and Park Department for this project is preservation of the greenhouse’s valuable plant collection. To meet this goal, it will be necessary to provide a durable structure that can be maintained with a reasonable amount of future care.

The concern some have expressed over the long-term durability of wood led to consideration of reconstruction in aluminum. Under this scheme it would be the intention to reproduce the Conservatory’s aesthetics as faithfully as possible, duplicating the sizes and profiles of the original wood elements to the extent allowed by the present aluminum fabrication technology. This scheme would likely require a new foundation.

Under the wood repair and replacement scheme, existing redwood that is reuseable would be retained, with new wood replacing deteriorated elements. Treatment of both old and replacement redwood with a preservative will extend its durable life. To prevent recurrence of the conditions that brought the Conservatory to its present state, ARG proposes installation of a computer controlled environmental system to allow fine tuning of temperature and humidity.

The reassembled Conservatory would require strengthening the foundation and construction of an unobtrusive seismic retrofit. ARG recommends the use of tempered glass, wherever there is an issue of public safety, and reinstallation of salvage glass in all other areas.

At this time, the wood scheme appears to be the more cost-effective and to comply better with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards.

**FIRST UNITARIAN CHURCH**

Work is nearing completion to bring the First Unitarian Church, at Franklin and Geary Streets, into compliance with the City’s Unreinforced Masonry Building Ordinance. The seismic project entails updating and upgrading work done in the mid-1960s that included installation of a steel frame and construction of a five-inch concrete wall on the south side of the church.

The present work addresses deficiencies in that project by setting the steel frame in concrete footings, tying the roof trusses into the frame and constructing three new concrete shearwalls. One of these will strengthen the four-story tower in the northwest corner of the church and requires infilling one of the three double doorways into the sanctuary. Reuse of the existing doors and frame will provide access from the vestibule to the tower and choir loft.

First Unitarian is a pioneer church that traces it origin to 1850 and is best
known for its association with Thomas Starr King, who served as minister from 1860 to 1864 and was instrumental in keeping California in the Union during the Civil War.

The present church (City Landmark #40), designed by Percy & Hamilton and dedicated in 1889, is the congregation’s third permanent home. The 1906 earthquake destroyed the tower, whose reconstruction in its present form is shorter than the original by about 20 feet. In 1968, Callister, Payne & Rossie designed a major addition that contains a chapel, meeting rooms and school facilities. Construction manager for the current project is Judy Romann of Consolidated Construction Management; engineers are SOHS; East Bay Construction & Remodeling is the general contractor. The architect is Callister Gately Heckmann Associates.

**COURT RULINGS**

Two recent court decisions relate to the subject of preservation. At the end of the U.S. Supreme Court’s 1996-97 session, the justices declared the Religious Freedom Restoration Act unconstitutional. Since Congress enacted the law in 1993, several churches have invoked it to oppose local preservation ordinances and other planning regulations because they “substantially burden” the free exercise of religion.

Such was the claim of the Archbishop of San Antonio, who sued the City of Boerne, Texas, for refusing a permit to substantially alter and enlarge a historic Catholic church. The Court’s majority opinion in the six-to-three ruling stated: “When the exercise of religion has been burdened in an incidental way by a law of general application, it does not follow that the persons affected have been burdened any more than other citizens, let alone burdened because of their religious beliefs.” Richard Moe, president of the National Trust, observed that the decision reinforces the right of local communities to apply landmarks laws to both secular and religious properties.

A California Court of Appeal’s ruling has reinforced the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The League for Protection of Oakland’s Architectural and Historic Resources filed a writ of mandate to require the City of Oakland to prepare an environmental impact report on a proposed development that would demolish the historic Montgomery Ward building. Oakland, which had issued a mitigated negative declaration, responded by saying the building is not an “officially designated” historic property and therefore does not require an EIR, under CEQA.

In ruling against Oakland, the Court stated that CEQA “does not demand formal listing of a resource in a national, state or local register as a prerequisite to ‘historical’ status.” The evidence convinced the Court that the Montgomery Ward Building “must be placed within the category of resources presumed to be historical within the meaning of [CEQA].”

Noting, furthermore, that demolition cannot be considered anything but a “significant effect,” under CEQA, the Court stated that the City’s proposed mitigation measures—documentation of the resource, display of a commemorative plaque and incorporating features of the original building in the replacement structure—“do not reduce the effects of the demolition to less than a level of significance.”

The Court concluded, “An EIR is required to identify and examine the full range of feasible mitigation measures and alternatives to demolition.”

**OWNER SEEKS THEATER DEMOLITION**

On July 14, San Francisco Theater Company filed an application with the Department of Building Inspection for a permit to demolish the Coliseum Theater. The building, located at 9th and Clement, has been closed since 1989, and last year concerned residents enlisted Supervisor Barbara Kaufman to help determine what the owner’s intentions were (See March/April 1996 Newsletter).

The Reid Brothers designed the reinforced concrete steel-frame building. The Richmond Banner described the theater’s opening in 1918 as “one of the biggest events” in the district and took it as a sign of the Richmond’s growth into “the finest residential section of the city.” Heritage’s Inner Richmond survey gave the building a “B” rating, making it landmark-worthy and possibly National Register-eligible.
PLANNING FOR THE PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC WATERFRONT RESOURCES

—This is the first of two articles on waterfront planning, with particular focus on historic and architectural resources. The present article features the historic pier area north of China Basin. The next issue of the newsletter will address the Ferry Building, Fisherman's Wharf, Pier 70 and other Port resources.

In June, after a six-year public planning process, the San Francisco Port Commission adopted the Port of San Francisco Waterfront Land Use Plan, including a Waterfront Design & Access element. The document governs land uses on 7.5 miles of waterfront property from Fisherman's Wharf to India Basin that the Port of San Francisco holds in trust for all the people of the State of California.

The Port Commission has managed the waterfront since 1969, when it took over from the State Board of Harbor Commissioners, which had governed the port for more than a century. As trustee of the waterfront, the Port Commission has the mandate "to promote maritime commerce, navigation and fisheries, as well as to protect natural resources and develop recreational facilities for public use."

Maritime commerce at the port had already declined significantly by the time the City acquired control, and failure to make a timely change to containerized cargo shipping, combined with cargo industry changes, resulted in further erosion of the volume of trade. Shipbuilding and repair, following a pattern elsewhere in the country, have also declined from their historic high levels of activity, because of overseas competition and reduced military spending.

With revenue from maritime uses in decline, the Port, which must be self-sustaining economically, began to explore development of waterfront resources. A concern that hotels and other tourist-oriented developments would overwhelm the city's fabled and historic waterfront led to a voter initiative, passed in 1990, requiring the Port Commission to prepare a comprehensive waterfront land use plan before allowing non-maritime development on the piers.

The resulting recently adopted plan reserves about two-thirds of the waterfront for continuing and possibly expanding maritime activities and identifies allowable commercial uses for the remainder that will increase both day and nighttime activities including public assembly, entertainment, retail, restaurants and museums. The Design & Access element provides guidelines "for the preservation and development of public access and open space, views, and historic resources, as well as architectural criteria that will be applied to new development."

The foundation for the preservation component of the Design & Access document is a report on port historic resources prepared by Architectural Resources Group (ARG), in 1996. The ARG report described two areas of the waterfront that contain important historic resources: north of China Basin and Pier 70. The Waterfront Design & Access element addresses...
both of these areas.

The historic form and appearance of today's waterfront is the result of changes that occurred over many years. The construction of two long seawalls shaped the waterfront north of China Basin. San Francisco's first waterfront consisted of wharfs essentially extending the streets that ended at the city's edge, out to deep water. There was no continuous roadway connecting the piers to one another, so that road traffic moving from one wharf to another had to negotiate the street grid.

The State Harbor Commission, which assumed control of the port in 1863, constructed the first seawall five years later. It proved unsatisfactory, because it followed the pattern of the streets, giving a saw-tooth edge to the waterfront and creating conditions that encouraged the deposit of silt at the wharfs. In 1872, the Commission's engineer, T.J. Arnold, recommended construction of a new seawall forming a continuous curve and a roadway along the waterfront that would provide "easy, direct and speedy communication between the different positions of the city front."

Construction of the seawall according to Arnold's plan began at Fisherman's Wharf in 1878. Its extension south of the Ferry Building occurred between 1908 and 1931, by which time the waterfront accommodated 49 piers and 21 ferry slips. Arnold's proposed roadway became East Street, now The Embarcadero. The Belt Line Railway, constructed from 1889 through the 1940s connected the piers.

Of interest in light of the Port's current Land Use Plan is the fact that Daniel Burnham's famous 1905 plan for San Francisco envisioned a waterfront that invited greater public access alongside shipping activities. Burnham wrote that "there should be piers for public recreation, a yacht and boat harbor and vast bathing places."

The Harbor Commissioners showed no interest in the recreational uses of the waterfront. They did, however, undertake major beautification projects in the years following the 1906 earthquake, in anticipation of the Panama-Pacific International Exposition and under the same impulse of the "City Beautiful" movement that produced Civic Center.

Horatio Stoll, writing in Architect and Engineer, in 1910, described the prospect along East Street that greeted visitors who entered the city from the Ferry Building: "The semi-circle of temporary wooden buildings, topped with ludeous signs gives the city an air of crude provincialism and makes the stranger smile. . . . One practical result of making streets look beautiful and artistic is that they become places of enjoyment for the citizen. . . . We must, therefore, beautify other sections (not just Civic Center) and provide all the attractions that go to make up the life of a great city if we hope to keep our exposition visitors in San Francisco for weeks instead of days."

Harbor bonds financed the construction of new piers in two phases, the first between 1910 and 1920, the second in the 1930s. There are three separate but integral historic components to the piers: the pier, properly speaking,
North of the Ferry Building, the prevailing architectural style of the bulkheads and connectors is Beaux-Arts/Classical Revival; south of the Ferry Building the style is Mission or Mediterranean Revival. A third style, suggestive of Gothic Revival, appears at Pier 45 and Pier 48.

The transition to containerized shipping rendered San Francisco’s piers obsolete, and over the years, several have been lost to fire or demolition. Twelve of the remaining piers retain a high degree of structural and architectural integrity. They currently house a variety of uses, including parking, storage, offices, venues for festivals and fairs, and accommodation for cruise ships and excursion boats.

The Plan commits the Port to complete further preservation planning in cooperation with the State Historic Preservation Office, local preservation organizations, and other waterfront constituencies. It also affirms the Port’s need to balance preservation and rehabilitation of historic resources with the Plan’s other objectives, within the constraints of financial responsibility.

This September, the Planning Commission will consider proposed amendments to the City’s General Plan, Northeastern Waterfront Area Plan and Planning Code to make them consistent with the Waterfront Land Use Plan and to establish procedures for coordinated project review. Later this year, the Port will propose amendments to the plans and policies of the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission for the same purpose.

Prepared with information generously supplied by Kate Nichol, Port Planner

---

**The Design & Access Element of the Waterfront Land Use Plan calls for the following preservation measures in the pier area:**

- For rehabilitation according to the Secretary’s Standards: bulkhead buildings and connectors 1-5; bulkhead buildings and pier sheds at Piers 45 & 48 (the former was upgraded and retrofitted in 1995; the latter will be completed in 1997.)
- For retention and reuse: bulkhead buildings at 9, 15, 19, 23, 29, 31, 33, 35, 26 & 38, Ferry Arch and connector buildings 29 1/2 and 33 1/2. Develop criteria for rehabilitation and reuse identifying some or all for preservation according to Secretary’s Standards and provide interim protection until criteria adopted.
- For further evaluation: pier sheds on Piers 1, 9, 15, 19, 23, 31, 33, 26 & 38, considering historic significance, architectural features, relationship to other resources, economic development, City pattern, structural condition, financial feasibility and compatibility of reuse with maritime activities, views and public access, and with other goals of the land use plan to develop recommendations for preservation, reuse and/or replacement.
Modernism
continued from page 1
Neutra and Schindler, two Americans, Irving Gill and Bernard Maybeck, had in fact initiated an indigenous modernism a decade earlier. In the Bay Area, Bernard Maybeck, the first American to graduate from the Ecole des Beaux Arts, practiced an eclectic gothic style but also pursued remarkably progressive explorations into new building methods and materials. His most famous example is the Christian Science Church in Berkeley, built in 1910, in which he employed a panelized cement-asbestos wall system and industrial metal sash windows.

Soon afterwards, Willis Polk advanced commercial design to a point which still inspires architects today when, in 1917, he conceived the glass curtainwall for the Hallidie Building. Polk's remarkable innovation had technical, social and economic advantages. The light weight of the system reduced construction time and also allowed light deep into the interior work spaces, while maximizing the floor area by pushing the exterior wall to the lot line.

Sophisticated modern architecture in the Bay Area during the 1920s and '30s tended to consist of unique structures for intellectually indulgent clients. However, some of this work proved very influential for the next generation of local modern architects. Houses such as Richard Neutra's Kahn House, built on Telegraph Hill in 1939, helped to establish a regional iconography based on cubic forms, modulated with generous amounts of glass. Younger local architects, including William Wurster and Gardner Dailey, borrowed selectively from the European-inspired aesthetic, altering the basic forms in subtle ways to support an intimate relationship with nature and the more casual lifestyle of the Bay Area.

Doctrinaire modernism would remain unfamiliar to most Americans until European educators including Gropius and Mies van der Rohe began teaching in American schools. Mies taught a highly disciplined approach to design motivated by his desire to create “universal space,” or an infinitely flexible architecture—built simply—to accommodate the changing requirements of the rapidly evolving post-war world. Mies's emphasis on simplification and flexibility led to the development of the pre-fabricated curtainwall that was to become the standard expression of corporate urban architecture in the 1950s and '60s. The premier San Francisco example of this style is the 1959 Crown Zellerbach Building by Hetzla & Knowles and Skidmore Owings & Merrill.

Modernism took hold on a large scale in the Bay Area during the 1950s, when cultural confidence was at an all time high, and social cohesiveness combined with unprecedented economic growth fostered the popular consensus that everything could be improved upon. This optimistic mood prompted a willingness among both public institutions and private investors to accept modern design as an agent of positive change.

Early works by William Wurster and Frank Lloyd Wright proved to be useful references for many in the 1950s who sought a simple-to-build, yet environmentally responsive architecture during the booming, culturally ambitious 1950s. It was Joseph Eichler's experience living in one of Wright's prototypical suburban "usonian" designs, in Woodside, during the 1940s, that emboldened him to hire Anshen and Allen to develop a sophisticated architecture...
for his Bay Area subdivisions. Wurster's designs were less idiosyncratic than Wright's but equally influential, and his 1930s houses offered more straightforward examples for architects and developers otherwise unaware of ways to make good design inexpensive and quick to build.

Like the Eichler Homes, Mario Ciampi's public buildings in Daly City offer confirmation of modernist principles in as much as they directly complimented the local climate and artfully combined economic construction and expressive structure with characteristically Californian indoor-outdoor planning. Although less famous than the works of Dalaey, Wurster, Neutra and others, these Bay Area buildings are perhaps more valuable from a social perspective, because they brought the visionary ideals of early modernists down to a more common denominator.

While the early modernism which defines the Bay region tends to be small scale, a few large modernist buildings received national recognition. The Crown Zellerbach Building was noted for introducing a clean curtainwall slab, similar to Lever House in New York, to a pie-shaped site carefully composed to include landscaping, terraces and a freestanding pavilion. The International Building (Anshen & Allen, 1960) drew comment for its horizontal banding of white spandrels alternating with dark gray glass, topped with a broad-brimmed cap and grilled penthouse.

The high point of corporate modernism was the Bank of America headquarters (Wurster Bernardi & Emmons/SOM, 1968), whose sawtooth floorplate broke the monotony of the Miesian flat-sided slab and made each office a corner office. Above all, the building attracted attention for its granite cladding, even more precious than the bronze sheathing of Mies's Seagram Building, in New York. Despite the architects' effort to use a more organic formal vocabulary, the public objected to the extreme bulk of the tower and the aridity of its vast plaza, heralding the beginning of a strong reaction against modernism.

During the 1960s many American architects trained in this country's Bauhaus-inspired schools reached a critical impasse, where the strictly codified methodology, popularized by Gropius, overwhelmed their concerns for aesthetics. Exceptions to this rule could be found in the Bay Area where the tradition of a more modest approach to building design freed local architects to respond directly to their environment.

At Sea Ranch, for example, Moore Lyndon Turnbull & Whitaker with Lawrence Halprin shaped the buildings there to mimic the wind-swept forms of local cypress and the sloping coastal terrain. The effect was an abstractly modern composition which nonetheless was aesthetically integrated with its setting. However, the effects of a growing mistrust of modernism in America at large, and particularly among the East Coast schools, eventually affected popular taste on the west coast, and California Modernism was once again relegated to the cultural fringe.

—Heritage is grateful to Paul Adamson, of Hornberger + Worstell, architects and planners, for generously contributing this article.
HERITAGE OFFERS PRESIDIO TERRACE TOUR

San Francisco Heritage is pleased to offer a tour of five homes of Presidio Terrace, on Saturday, September 20, from Noon to 4:00 pm. Development of this exclusive residence park began in 1905, and most of the houses were completed before 1920. Presidio Terrace’s wide lots and gracious landscaped setting offered some of San Francisco’s outstanding architects the opportunity to design fine residences on a generous scale and in a variety of styles popular early in the 20th century.

The self-guided tour begins at #40 Presidio Terrace and concludes with a wine reception and book signing by Patrick McGrew, author of The Historic Homes of Presidio Terrace. The cost for Heritage members, who will receive a notice of the tour in the mail with an order form for tickets, is $20.00. For non-members, the cost of $30.00 includes a one-year Heritage membership, available by telephone charge, at (415) 441-3000.

This event is possible only with the cooperation of the owners, including Senator Dianne Feinstein, who have graciously agreed to open their homes to us, and through the sponsorship of Institutional Real Estate, Bank of America, Peggy Haas, Hyde Street Holdings, Inc., Macy’s and the McMahan Group, and a generous grant from the San Francisco Hotel Tax Fund.

ANNUAL MEETING

President John McMahan opened Heritage’s annual membership meeting on June 7, setting a positive tone on the state of the organization that reports by the executive director, David Bahlman, and the treasurer, Bruce Miller, bore out in specific details. The secretary, Steve Plath, conducted the election to confirm the slate of nine candidates for the board of directors.

Randolph Delehanty delivered the keynote address. Now resident in New Orleans, where he is curator of the Ogden Collection of Southern Art at the University of New Orleans, Dr. Delehanty is well known to San Franciscans through his many publications on local architecture. He was Heritage’s first historian and taught at San Francisco State University.

Delehanty’s subject was New Orleans, Natchez and San Francisco: Preservation in Perspective. He described Natchez, Mississippi, as a community united by a great respect for its past. While it has the greatest concentration of Antebellum architecture in the South, Natchez faces a common urban problem, a dying downtown, the victim of strip-mall developments.

Delehanty compared New Orleans and San Francisco. Both cities have strong identities, a high opinion of themselves and a love for their history, but, he said, San Francisco is a modern city that has thrived in the post-industrial economy, while New Orleans he described as an “anti-modern” city, “in chronic decline for 150 years.” Preservation takes money, Delehanty observed, and with all its historical resources, in a stagnant economy, New Orleans is watching its rich heritage fall into decay.

Yet, he reports, New Orleans is a wonderful community whose positive gift for fantasy and celebration has turned decline into a virtue.

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.

CIRCA. 1901-1959
ISBN 0-9654381-0-4
$19.95
STACKWELL BOOKS
You don’t live in a house. You live in a treasure.

And since you’ve decided to restore it, you’ll want a designer knowledgeable in more than just architectural trends – someone sensitive to your individual style, who will treat your home with the same love and respect you have for it. Please contact the Heritage Design Group at 415-922-8404 to begin the exciting process of restoring your home to a treasure you can live with forever.

SIDNEY HOOVER ARCHITECTS
Classic Residential Architecture
Architectural Designs in the Classic Styles
Heritage Preservation and Remodeling
Sites Analyzed for New Residences
Country Houses and Cottages
City and Suburban Homes
500 Montgomery Street
San Francisco, CA 94111
(415) 434-8046
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 current Heritage events, call (415) 441-3004.
Heritage programs supported in part by the City of San Francisco Grants for the Arts

AUGUST

August 28, 7:15 pm
S.F. History Association. (415) 750-9986

Through October
Oakland Tours Program, Wednesdays & Saturdays. (510) 238-3234.
Petaluma Tours, Saturdays & Sundays, 10:30 am (707) 778-4398

SEPTEMBER

September 14, Noon - 5:00 pm
Oakland Heritage House Tour
(510) 763-9218

September 20, Noon - 4:00 pm
Heritage Presidio Terrace House Tour
(See page 9)

September 9 - October 31
9th Arango International Design
Exhibition: Re(f)use: Good Everyday
Design from Reused & Recycled
Materials. CCAC/SF (415) 703-9500

September 4 - January 3, 1998
California Historical Society Exhibition
Alaska Gold: Life on the New Frontier,
1901-1906. (415) 357-1848

September 19
California Preservation Foundation
Award Winning Design Solutions
Workshop. Oakland (510) 763-0972

September 21, Noon - 4:30 pm
“A Day in the Life of an 1880s Fruit
Ranch.” John Muir National Historic
Site. (510) 228-8860

September 25
Berkeley Architectural Heritage
Lecture: “Mackintosh Tea Rooms,”
by Alan Crawford. (510) 841-2242

September 27, Noon - 5:00 pm
AIA/SF Sand Castle Classic.
Aquatic Park. (415) 362-7397

OCTOBER

October 1
Application forms available for CPF
Design Awards. (510) 763-0972

October 14 - 19
National Preservation Conference
Santa Fe, NM (See page 2)

October 19, 1:00 - 5:00 pm
Victorian Alliance House Tour
“Pacific Heights South” (See page 2)

October 25
Heritage Symposium (See page 11)

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
San 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

Pardini 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
- $100 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.