

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Landmark Designation Case Report

Hearing Date: May 20, 2015 Case No.: 2015-004168DES Project Address: 350 University Street RH-1 (Residential - House, One Family) Zoning: Block/Lot: 5992/001 Property Owner: AgeSong Genesis LLC 551 Page Street San Francisco, CA 94117 Staff Contact: Shannon Ferguson - (415) 575-9074 shannon.ferguson@sfgov.org Reviewed By: Tim Frye - (415) 575-6822 tim.frye@sfgov.org

1650 Mission St. Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103-2479

Reception: 415.558.6378

Fax: 415.558.6409

Planning Information: 415.558.6377

PROPERTY DESCRIPTIONS & SURROUNDING LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT

350 University Street, historically known as University Mound Old Ladies' Home, is located on the west side of University Street between Burrows and Bacon streets in San Francisco's Portola area. Irregularly shaped in plan, the building has a two-and-half story main building flanked by two-story L-shaped wings and a two-story plus basement service wing perpendicular to the rear of the main building. Designed in the Colonial Revival architectural style by master architects Martin J. Rist and Alfred I. Coffey, the convalescent/nursing home was constructed of reinforced concrete and brick in 1931-1932.

The subject building is located in San Francisco's Portola area, a residential neighborhood characterized by two-story single family homes constructed in the 1950s through 1960s. It is located directly across from the University Mound Reservoir.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The case before the Historic Preservation Commission is the consideration of the initiation of landmark designation of 350 University Street as a San Francisco landmark under Article 10 of the Planning Code, Section 1004.1, and recommending that the Board of Supervisors approve of such designation.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW STATUS

The Planning Department has determined that actions by regulatory agencies for protection of the environment (specifically in this case, landmark designation) are exempt from environmental review, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15308 (Class Eight - Categorical).

GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

The Urban Design Element of the San Francisco General Plan contains the following relevant objectives and policies:

- OBJECTIVE 2: Conservation of Resources that provide a sense of nature, continuity with the past, and freedom from overcrowding.
 - POLICY 4: Preserve notable landmarks and areas of historic, architectural or aesthetic value, and promote the preservation of other buildings and features that provide continuity with past development.

Designating significant historic resources as local landmarks will further continuity with the past because the buildings will be preserved for the benefit of future generations. Landmark designation will require that the Planning Department and the Historic Preservation Commission review proposed work that may have an impact on character-defining features. Both entities will utilize the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* in their review to ensure that only appropriate, compatible alterations are made.

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING CODE SECTION 101.1 - GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY AND IMPLEMENTATION

Planning Code Section 101.1 – Eight Priority Policies establishes and requires review of permits for consistency with said policies. On balance, the proposed designation is consistent with the priority policies in that:

a. The proposed designation will further Priority Policy No. 7, that landmarks and historic buildings be preserved. Landmark designation of 350 University Street will help to preserve an important historical resource that is architecturally significant as an embodiment of the Colonial Revival style and as a work of two by master architects, Martin J. Rist and Alfred I. Coffey.

BACKGROUND / PREVIOUS ACTIONS

On June 18, 2014, Belles Yelda, a nearby resident, submitted a "Potential San Francisco Landmarks Evaluation Form" (Preservation Bulletin No. 19) for the University Mound Old Ladies' Home (see attached). On July 29, 2014, Mr. Yelda submitted to the Department a petition in support of preserving the building that contained 222 signatures of nearby residents (see attached). Supervisor Campos expressed support for landmark designation in a letter dated August 20, 2014 (see attached). 350 University Street, the University Mound Old Ladies' Home, was added to the Landmark Designation Work Program on October 8, 2014.

OTHER ACTIONS REQUIRED

If the Historic Preservation Commission adopts a resolution to initiate designation of the subject property as an Article 10 landmark at its May 20, 2015 hearing and directs staff to finalize the landmark designation report, a second Historic Preservation Commission hearing will be scheduled for the Commission's recommendation of approval of the designation. At the second hearing, if the Historic Preservation Commission recommends approval of the designation, its recommendation will be sent by the Department to the Board of Supervisors. The nomination would then be considered at a future Board of Supervisors hearing for formal Article 10 landmark designation.

APPLICABLE PRESERVATION STANDARDS

ARTICLE 10

Section 1004 of the Planning Code authorizes the landmark designation of an individual structure or other feature or an integrated group of structures and features on a single lot or site, having special character or special historical, architectural or aesthetic interest or value, as a landmark. Section 1004.1 also outlines that landmark designation may be initiated by the Board of Supervisors or the Historic Preservation Commission and the initiation shall include findings in support. Section 1004.2 states that once initiated, the proposed designation is referred to the Historic Preservation Commission for a report and recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to approve, disapprove or modify the proposal.

Pursuant to Section 1004.3 of the Planning Code, if the Historic Preservation Commission approves the designation, a copy of the resolution of approval is transmitted to the Board of Supervisors and without referral to the Planning Commission. The Board of Supervisors shall hold a public hearing on the designation and may approve, modify or disapprove the designation.

In the case of the initiation of a historic district, the Historic Preservation Commission shall refer its recommendation to the Planning Commission pursuant to Section 1004.2(c). The Planning Commission shall have 45 days to provide review and comment on the proposed designation and address the consistency of the proposed designation with the General Plan, Section 101.1 priority policies, the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation, and the Sustainable Communities Strategy for the Bay Area. These comments shall be sent to the Board of Supervisors in the form of a resolution.

Section 1004(b) requires that the designating ordinance approved by the Board of Supervisors shall include the location and boundaries of the landmark site, a description of the characteristics of the landmark which justify its designation, and a description of the particular features that should be preserved.

Section 1004.4 states that if the Historic Preservation Commission disapproves the proposed designation, such action shall be final, except upon the filing of a valid appeal to the Board of Supervisors within 30 days.

ARTICLE 10 LANDMARK CRITERIA

The Historic Preservation Commission on February 4, 2009, by Resolution No. 001, adopted the National Register Criteria as its methodology for recommending landmark designation of historic resources. Under the National Register Criteria, the quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, feeling, materials, workmanship, and association, and that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or properties that have yielded, or may likely yield, information important in prehistory or history.

PUBLIC / NEIGHBORHOOD INPUT

There is no known public or neighborhood opposition to designation of 350 University Street as an Article 10 landmark. The Department will provide any public correspondence received after the submittal of this report in the Historic Preservation Commission's correspondence folder.

PROPERTY OWNER INPUT

On April 13, 2015 Planning Department staff toured the property with Ami Champaneri, AgeSong Genesis Executive Director of the University Mound Old Ladies' Home, who verbally expressed support for landmark designation.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The case report and analysis under review was prepared by Department preservation staff. The Department has determined that the subject property meets the requirements for Article 10 eligibility as an individual landmark. The justification for its inclusion is outlined below under the Significance and Integrity sections of this case report.

SIGNIFICANCE

Constructed in 1931-1932, University Mound Old Ladies' Home at 350 University Street is a convalescent/nursing home that is architecturally significant as an embodiment of the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, and method of construction and represents the work of two master architects. With its front door accentuated by a broken pediment, recessed tetrastyle portico supported by tall slender columns, numerous fanlights and multi-pane windows, and symmetrically composed façade, the University Mound Old Ladies' Home illustrates the distinctive characteristics of the Colonial Revival style that was popular following the restoration of Colonial Williamsburg in the late 1920s. Architects Martin J. Rist and Alfred I. Coffey, both separately and in partnership were well known for their designs of institutional buildings, such as schools and hospitals. Rist was known on a state level for his execution of revival style architecture. In September 1932 his recent body of work was featured in *The Architect & Engineer* and included a two page spread on the University Mound Old Ladies' Home. Alfred I. Coffey was well known locally for his work designing school buildings as City architect in 1910. Their best

known work during the early 1930s is the Art Deco style Psychopathic Ward at San Francisco General Hospital (1932-1935) designed in partnership shortly before Coffey's death. Furthermore, the University Mound Old Ladies' Home is a rare property type in San Francisco as it is one of the few high style Colonial Revival institutional buildings that retains a high degree of physical integrity having undergone very few alterations since its construction.

INTEGRITY

The building retains integrity of association, as it has remained in continual use as a convalescent/nursing home since its construction. It likewise retains integrity of design, materials, workmanship and feeling. Based on a review of the building permit history and visual inspection, known exterior alterations are relatively limited in scope and remain subordinate to the building's overall design and ornamentation. Similarly, interior spaces including the living room, dining room and chapel have experienced few alterations and readily convey their association with the building's historic use. The Home's original large park like setting of 25 acres has diminished to just 2.5 acres, however, with its set back from the street, mature trees and shrubs, and as the only building on the west side of University Street, it retains the feeling of a much larger property.

Overall, the Department has determined that the building's primary character defining features, both exterior and interior, are largely unaltered since the building's construction in 1931-1932 and 350 University Street retains outstanding integrity to convey its historical significance.

CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES

Whenever a building, site, object, or landscape is under consideration for Article 10 landmark designation, the Historic Preservation Commission is required to identify character-defining features of the property. This is done to enable owners and the public to understand which elements are considered most important to preserve the historical and architectural character of the proposed landmark.

As described in the Landmark Designation Report, the following is a list of exterior and interior character defining features of the University Mound Old Ladies' Home.

The character-defining *exterior* features of the building are identified as:

- All primary exterior elevations, form, massing, structure, architectural ornament and materials identified as:
 - Form and massing, including rectangular, two and a half story, side-gabled roof with arched dormers of main building flanked by two story L-shaped, flat roofed wings
 - Symmetrically balanced façade with centered door and regular fenestration pattern with six-over-six, double-hung windows and arched fanlight windows.
 - Architectural ornament including broken pediment at the main entry, recessed tetrastyle portico supported by tall slender columns, decorative frieze and dentil molding, spandrel panels below first story windows, and balusters at the parapet of the wings
 - Materials including Flemish bond red face brick, slate roof tiles on main building and chapel and painted wood ornamentation

The character-defining *interior* features of the building identified as:

- Living room
 - Arched openings at north, south, and west walls. Multi lite wood French doors and transoms at east wall
 - Fireplace with marble surround and wood mantle
 - o Decorative plaster bas relief pilasters with urns of flowers and plaster molding
 - Board formed concrete beamed ceiling with decorative painting and two brass chandeliers
- Dining room
 - Windows with fanlights at north and south walls
 - Fireplace with marble surround and wood mantle
 - o Built-in sideboards with leaded glass top cabinet fronts
 - Plaster chair rail molding
 - o Board formed concrete beamed ceiling with decorative painting and brass chandeliers
- Chapel
 - o Arched windows and shutters at north and south walls
 - o Multi lite window with sidelights and fanlight on east wall
 - o Raised, recessed half round chancel with decorative lintel and brackets
 - o Peaked ceiling with rough sawn beams and brass carriage lamp chandeliers

INTERIOR LANDMARK DESIGNATION

Because the living room, dining room and chapel in the University Mound Old Ladies' Home are the principal interior spaces and are largely unaltered, landmark designation of these interior features is authorized under Section 1004(c) of the Planning code, which states that:

(c) The property included in any such designation shall upon designation be subject to the controls and standards set forth in this Article 10. In addition, the said property shall be subject to the following further controls and standards if imposed by the designating ordinance:

- (1) For a publicly-owned landmark, review of proposed changes to significant interior architectural features.
- (2) For a privately-owned landmark, review of proposed changes requiring a permit to significant interior architectural features in those areas of the landmark that are or historically have been accessible to members of the public. The designating ordinance must clearly describe each significant interior architectural feature subject to this restriction.

BOUNDARIES OF THE LANDMARK SITE

The proposed landmark site encompasses Assessor's Block 3992, Lot 001 – on which the subject building is located.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION

Based on the Department's analysis, 350 University Street is individually eligible for Article 10 Landmark designation as an excellent example of the Colonial Revival architectural style applied to an institutional building and as the work of master architects Martin J. Rist and Alfred I. Coffey. The Department recommends that the Historic Preservation Commission initiate designation of 350 University Street as a San Francisco landmark. If the Historic Preservation Commission takes action to initiate Article 10 designation on May 20, 2015, the Department may undertake further research on the design of hospital/convalescent homes in the 1930s as part of the final designation report.

The Historic Preservation Commission may recommend approval, disapproval, or approval with modifications of the proposed designation of 350 University Street as a San Francisco landmark under Article 10 of the Planning Code to the Board of Supervisors pursuant to Planning Code Section 1004.1. If the Historic Preservation Commission approves the designation, a copy of the motion of approval is transmitted to the Board of Supervisors, which holds a public hearing on the designation and may approve, modify or disapprove the designation (Section 1004.4). If the Historic Preservation Commission disapproves the proposed designation, such action shall be final, except upon the filing of a valid appeal to the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (Section 1004.5).

ATTACHMENTS

- A. Draft Landmark Designation Report
- B. Draft Motion initiating designation
- C. Potential San Francisco Landmarks Evaluation Form, submitted June 18, 2014; Petition of Support, submitted July 29, 2014; Supervisor Campos Letter of Support, dated August 20, 2014.



Historic Preservation Commission Resolution No. XXX

HEARING DATE MAY 20, 2015

RESOLUTION TO INITIATE 350 UNIVERSITY STREET, HISTORICALLY KNOWN AS UNIVERSITY MOUND OLD LADIES' HOME, LOT 001 IN ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 5992, AS ARTICLE 10 LANDMARK.

- 1. WHEREAS, on June 18, 2014, Mr. Belles Yelda, a nearby resident, submitted a "Potential San Francisco Landmarks Evaluation Form" (Preservation Bulletin No. 19) for 350 University Street, University Mound Old Ladies' Home, and on July 29, 2014, submitted to the Department a petition in support of preserving the building that contained 222 signatures of nearby residents; and Supervisor Campos expressed support for landmark designation in a letter dated August 20, 2014; and with the support of the Planning Department, the Historic Preservation Commission added 350 University Street, to the Landmark Designation Work Program on October 8, 2014; and
- 2. WHEREAS, Department staff Shannon Ferguson, who meets the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualification Standards, prepared the Landmark Designation Report for 350 University Street which was reviewed by Department staff Tim Frye for accuracy and conformance with the purposes and standards of Article 10; and
- **3.** WHEREAS, the Historic Preservation Commission, at its regular meeting of May 20, 2015, reviewed Department staff's analysis of 350 University Street's historical significance per Article 10 as part of the Landmark Designation Case Report dated May 20, 2015; and
- 4. WHEREAS, the Historic Preservation Commission finds that 350 University Street nomination is in the form prescribed by the HPC and contains supporting historic, architectural, and/or cultural documentation; and
- 5. WHEREAS, the Historic Preservation Commission finds that 350 University Street conveys its architectural significant as an embodiment of the distinctive characteristics of the Colonial Revival style and represents the work of master architects Martin J. Rist and Alfred I. Coffey; and
- 6. WHEREAS, the Historic Preservation Commission finds that 350 University Street appears to meet the eligibility requirements per Section 1004 of the Planning Code and warrants consideration for Article 10 landmark designation; and

1650 Mission St. Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103-2479

Reception: 415.558.6378

Fax: 415.558.6409

Planning Information: 415.558.6377

- 7. WHEREAS, the Historic Preservation Commission finds that the boundaries and the list of interior and exterior character-defining features, as identified in the draft Landmark Designation Report, should be considered for preservation under the proposed landmark designation as they relate to the building's historical significance and retain historical integrity.
- 8. WHEREAS, the proposed designation is consistent with the General Plan priority policies pursuant to Planning Code section 101.1 and furthers Priority Policy No. 7, which states that historic buildings be preserved, for reasons set forth in the May 20, 2015 Case Report; and

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Historic Preservation Commission hereby confirms the nomination and initiates 350 University Street, Assessor's Block 5992, Lot 001 as an Article 10 Landmark pursuant to Article 10 of the Planning Code.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Historic Preservation Commission at its meeting on May 20, 2015.

Jonas P. Ionin Commission Secretary

AYES:

NAYS:

ABSENT:

ADOPTED: May 20, 2014





University Mound Old Ladies' Home 350 University Street

Draft Article 10 Landmark Designation Report submitted to the Historic Preservation Commission, May 20, 2015

City and County of San Francisco Edwin M. Lee, Mayor Planning Department John Rahaim, Director Landmark No.

Cover: University Mound Old Ladies' Home , April 2015.

The Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) is a seven-member body that makes recommendations to the Board of Supervisors regarding the designation of landmark buildings and districts. The regulations governing landmarks and landmark districts are found in Article 10 of the Planning Code. The HPC is staffed by the San Francisco Planning Department.

This Draft Landmark Designation Report is subject to possible revision and amendment during the initiation and designation process. Only language contained within the Article 10 designation ordinance, adopted by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, should be regarded as final.

CONTENTS

OVERVIEW	3
BUILDING DESCRIPTION	4
Primary Façade	4
Secondary Facades – South Elevation	5
Secondary Facades – West Elevation	6
Secondary Facades - North Elevation	7
Interior	8
CONSTRUCTION HISTORY	10
Alteration History	12
Architectural Influences	14
Martin J. Rist & Alfred I. Coffey, Architects	15
PORTOLA NEIGHBORHOOD HISTORY	17
APPENDIX: OLD AGE HOMES	20
BIBLIOGRAPHY	26
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	27

University Mound Old Ladies' Home 350 University Street

Built:1931-1932Architect:Martin J. Rist and Alfred I. Coffey

OVERVIEW

Constructed in 1931-1932, University Mound Old Ladies' Home at 350 University Street is a convalescent/nursing home that is architecturally significant as an embodiment of the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, and method of construction and represents the work of two master architects. With its front door accentuated by a broken pediment, recessed tetrastyle portico supported by tall slender columns, numerous fanlights and multi-pane windows, and symmetrically composed façade, the University Mound Old Ladies' Home illustrates the distinctive characteristics of the Colonial Revival style that was popular following the restoration of Colonial Williamsburg in the late 1920s. Architects Martin J. Rist and Alfred I. Coffey, both separately and in partnership were well known for their designs of institutional buildings, such as schools and hospitals. Rist was known on a state level for his execution of revival style architecture. In September 1932 his body of work was featured in *The Architect & Engineer* and included a two page spread on the University Mound Old Ladies' Home. Alfred I. Coffey was well known locally for his work designing school buildings as City architect in 1910. Their best known work during the early 1930s is the Art Deco style Psychopathic Ward at San Francisco General Hospital (1932-1935) designed in partnership shortly before Coffey's death. Furthermore, the University Mound Old Ladies' Home is a rare property type as it is one of the few high style Colonial Revival institutional buildings in San Francisco that retains a high degree of physical integrity having undergone very few alterations since its construction.

BUILDING DESCRIPTION



Primary façade of main building, April 2015

University Mound Old Ladies' Home (the Home) is located in a residential neighborhood of single family homes constructed in the 1950s through 1960s. Located on University Street between Burrows and Bacon streets, the Home is directly across the street from University Mound Reservoir. A vacant lot is located north of the building. The building is set back from the street and the primary façade faces east towards University Street. An asphalt circular driveway accesses the primary façade of the property. A second asphalt driveway is located at the northern property line and accesses the rear of the building and exits on Bacon Street. Landscaping consists of mature shrubs, trees and hedges.

Irregularly shaped in plan, the Colonial Revival style building has a two and half story main building flanked by two story L-shaped wings and a two story plus basement service wing perpendicular to the rear of the main building. The Home is constructed of reinforced concrete with a concrete foundation, brick veneer walls with brick quoins at the corners and painted wood decorative elements. The main building has a slate clad side gable roof and the wings have flat, asphalt clad roofs. The "L" of the northern wing has a one-and a half story front gable roof clad in slate. Fenestration generally consists of multi-lite, wood sash windows.

Primary Façade

Main Building

The primary, east façade of the main building is accessed by five brick steps flanked by brick planters. The façade of the main building is seven bays wide. The four center bays have a recessed, two story portico supported by four Doric columns. Fenestration at the first story consists of five multi-lite wood French doors with transoms. The center door is surmounted by a broken pediment indicating the main entrance. The second floor has six over six, double-hung, wood sash windows. The portico is illuminated by a large hanging metal pendant light. Outer bays of the main

building are brick and have a six over six, double-hung, wood sash window at the first story covered by decorative wrought iron grille work and a fixed oval window at the second story. The façade terminates in a wide frieze band decorated with pilasters, and a dentiled wood cornice. The building is topped with a side gabled roof with three arched top dormers containing six over six, double-hung, wood sash windows. A vented elevator penthouse with louvers is located on the south side of the roof.

North Wing

The primary facade of the north wing is seven bays wide and has a symmetrically composed fenestration pattern. Each bay has a wood spandrel panel surmounted by six over six, double-hung, wood sash window on the first story. The northern most bay is obscured by a flat roof wood porch enclosed by multi lite wood windows. Six over six, double-hung, wood sash windows are in each bay of the second story. The north wing is topped by a wide wooden cornice and tall brick parapet pierced by wood balusters. The "L" on the north wing contains the chapel and primary facade features a large arched window.

South Wing

The primary facade of the south wing is six bays wide and has a similar symmetrically composed fenestration pattern. Each bay has a wood spandrel panel surmounted by six over six, double-hung, wood sash window on the first story and six over six, double-hung, wood sash window on the second story. The south wing is topped by a wide wooden cornice and tall brick parapet pierced by wood balusters. The primary façade of the southern "L" is three bays wide. The center bay has a multi-lite wood French door at the first story. A similar door is located at the second story and is surmounted by a wood pediment. Metal fire stairs exit from both doors.



Primary (east) façade of south wing, April 2015

Primary (east) façade of north wing, April 2015

Secondary Facades – South Elevation

Main Building

The south elevation of the gable end of the main building is partially visible and contains a wood door surmounted by a fanlight and flanked by six over six, double-hung, wood sash windows. The gable end has a high parapet.

North wing

The south elevation of the north wing contains the chapel is three bays wide. One bay is obscured by a flat roof wood porch enclosed by multi-lite wood windows. Remaining bays have a wood spandrel panel topped by a round fanlight window.

South Wing

The south elevation of the south wing is six bays wide and has a similar symmetrically composed fenestration pattern with a spandrel panel surmounted by six over six, double-hung, wood sash windows on first story and six over six, double-hung, wood sash windows on the second story. In the second bay from the west are wood and glass double doors with a transom sheltered by wood canopy supported by shaped brackets. A concrete ramp with metal railing leads from the doors to the sidewalk.

Service Wing

The south elevation of the service wing is six bays and has a daylight basement with five multi-lite fixed wood sash windows. The first story has three contemporary sliding doors with original sidelights and fanlights in the east bays. Window openings in the western three bays have been infilled with painted plywood. The second story has six over six double-hung, wood sash windows in western bays and three smaller six over six, double-hung, wood sash windows in eastern two bays and one six over six, double-hung, wood sash window in the remaining bay. A utilitarian cornice tops the building.





South elevation of chapel at north wing, April 2015

South elevation of south wing, April 2015



South elevation of service wing, April 2015

Secondary Facades – West Elevation

Main Building

Two bays of the main building are partially visible beyond each side of the service wing and are mirror images. Inner bays have multi-lite wood French doors with transoms at the first story and six over six double-hung, wood sash windows at the second story. The outer bays have multi-lite round fanlight windows between the first and second stories. The gable roof has a brick chimney at the center flanked by arched top dormers.

North and South Wings

The west elevations of the wings flanking the main building are also mirror images of each other. They are eight bays wide with a regularly spaced fenestration pattern with six over six double-hung, wood sash windows at the first and second stories. Center bays have a multi-lite wood door surmounted by an arched canopy and accessed by brick steps. The wings have a wide wood cornice and solid brick parapet. An addition of a one-story, glass sunroom with pent roof is located at the south wing.

Service Wing

The rear or west elevation of the service wing is three bays wide. The first story has a wood paneled door with transom surmounted by a wood canopy at the center bay. There is a contemporary vinyl window in the northern bay and a glass and wood paneled door in southern bay. The second story has six over six, double-hung, wood sash windows in the north and center bays. A metal exhaust vent is also located in the north bay. A utilitarian cornice tops the building.







West elevation of south wing, April 2015



Sunroom alteration at west elevation of south wing, April 2015

Secondary Facades - North Elevation

Main Building

The gable end of the main building is visible beyond the wing and contains a fanlight window at the center.

North Wing

The north elevation of the chapel is three bays with wood spandrel panels and round fanlight windows in each bay. The north elevation of the wing is three bays with a small multi lite fixed window and a six over six wood sash window in outer bays of the first story. The second story has a multi-lite round fanlight window in the center bay flanked by six over six wood sash windows.

South Wing

The north elevation of the south wing is three bays wide with a symmetrically composed fenestration pattern with a spandrel panel surmounted by six over six, double-hung, wood sash windows on first story and six over six, double-hung, wood sash windows on the second story.

Service Wing

The service wing is six bays wide and has a partial daylight basement with multi-lite wood sash windows. The first story has three contemporary sliding doors with original sidelights and fanlights in the east bays and six over six double-hung, wood sash windows fill the western three bays. The second story has six over six double-hung, wood sash windows in western bays and three smaller six over six double-hung, wood sash windows in eastern two bays and one six over six double-hung, wood sash window in the remaining bay.







Interior

Living Room

Significant features of the interior include the living room, dining room and chapel. The living room is located in the main building on the first floor. It is directly accessed from the front porch by five multi-lite wood French doors with transoms located on the east wall. The large rectangular room has two arched openings and one blind arch at the south wall while the north wall has three arched openings. Between the arches is a plaster picture rail and bas relief plaster pilasters topped by urns of flowers. The north wall features a centered fireplace with marble surround carved with a bas relief urn of flowers and a wood mantle supported by pilasters and frieze band reminiscent of the main building's primary facade. Arched openings are located on either side of the fireplace. The ceiling has board formed concrete beams with decorative painting. The floor is covered in contemporary ceramic tile with mosaic inlay. The living room is illuminated by two brass chandeliers that are original to the room according to historic photographs; however the glass shades are now missing.



Living room, view south, April 2015



Living room, view north, April 2015

Dining Room

The dining room is located on the first floor of the service wing. Three sets of contemporary sliding doors with original sidelights and fanlights are located on the north and south walls. At the center of the west wall are double doors enframed by a blind arch. The doors are flanked by built-in sideboards that have leaded glass top cabinet fronts. The south wall features a projecting fireplace with similar decorative surround and mantle as the living room. A plaster wainscot molding encircles the room. The ceiling has board formed concrete beams with decorative painting. The floor is covered in contemporary ceramic tile. The dining room is illuminated by two brass chandeliers that are likely original to the room.



Dining room, view east, April 2015

Dining room, view west, April 2015

Chapel

The chapel has three sets of arched multi-pane double-hung,-wood sash windows with arched operable wood shutters on the north and south walls. The east wall has a large multi-lite window with sidelights and fanlight. On the west wall is a raised, recessed half round chancel with decorative lintel and brackets that is reached by two steps with wrought iron railing. Rough sawn wood beams support the vaulted ceiling. The floor is covered in linoleum squares in a checkerboard pattern. The chapel is illuminated bay two brass carriage lamps that are likely original to the room.



Chapel, view east, April 2015



Chapel, view west, April 2015

CONSTRUCTION HISTORY

The Home owes its existence to two people, James Lick and Mary Staples. James Lick was among the wealthiest men in California upon his death in 1876, with a fortune in real estate conservatively estimated at almost \$3 million. He was left a substantial portion of his wealth to a variety of social and scientific causes. Lick's son and other distant relatives challenged the validity of the will, tying it up probate for a number of years. Despite the challenges to the will, the trust was able to carry out Lick's philanthropic bequests. In addition to the \$100,000 to found an old ladies' home in San Francisco, Lick's final bequests included \$700,000 to establish the Lick Observatory on Mount Hamilton, \$25,000 each to the Protestant Orphan Asylum in San Francisco, Ladies Protection and Relief Society, and San Jose Orphan Asylum, \$10,000 to the Mechanics Institute to purchase scientific and mechanical books, \$10,000 to the Society for the Prevention of Animals, \$150,000 to building free baths in San Francisco, \$60,000 for a bronze monument in Golden Gate Park to Francis Scott Key, author of the Star Spangled Banner, \$100,000 for bronze monuments in from of City Hall, \$51,000 to establish a School of Mechanical Arts as well as endowments to the Society of Pioneers and the Academy of Sciences and gifts to various San Francisco schools and parks.¹²

Mary Staples's husband, David J. Staples, spent several months assisting James Lick in framing his will. As someone who was described as "constant in her efforts to relieve the distress of others,"³ Mary was also the founder of Children's' Hospital, and Crocker Old Peoples' Home. According to early San Francisco historian, poet and 28th mayor of San Francisco Edward Robeson Taylor, Lick asked Mary if there were any requests she would like to make before he signed the will. Mary asked him to "set aside a goodly sum of money for a home for aged women."⁴ Lick originally proposed \$50,000, but Mary convinced him to double the amount. Lick's final will bequeathed \$100,000 to found the Lick Old Ladies' Home in San Francisco.⁵

Because of the challenges to Lick's will, the Home was not incorporated until 1884. At that time it was called Lick Old Ladies' Home in honor of Lick. The original articles of incorporation list the five trustees as A. B. Forbes, Robert McElroy, E. W. Newhall, Ira P. Rankin, and J. B. Roberts. This Board of Trustees managed the financial decisions for the Home. In May of that year, the trustees purchased 25 acres in the University Mound tract along with the former University Mound College building for \$30,000⁶. The three-story, plus basement, wood-frame Gothic Revival building was originally constructed by University Mound College, a Presbyterian boarding school for boys, in December 1875 after the first college building had burned down earlier that year.⁷ The new building had cost the college over \$50,000 to rebuild, however the third floor was unfinished due to lack of funds.⁸ An 1875 article described the building as having large day rooms on the ground floor, a chapel on the second floor, sunny bedrooms each with its own washstand, and landscaped grounds. The college ran out of money and closed, putting the building up for auction in 1879.⁹ At the time of purchase, the Lick Old Ladies Home trustees planned to spend \$5,000 for furnishings and other improvements to the building and invest the remaining \$65,000 to support the Home.¹⁰ The 25 acres surrounding the building was farmed. Residents of the Home worked in the vegetable garden and hay was grown to feed and cows, chickens and pigs that were kept to provide milk, eggs, and bacon.¹¹ Because of this, fresh vegetables, chicken and egg dishes regularly appeared on the Home's menu.

¹ "James Lick's Gifts: The New Deed of Trust Recorded." San Francisco Chronicle, November 11, 1875.

² "The Lick Estate Trust." New York Times, May 29, 1885.

³ Edward Robeson Taylor. *On the Establishment of the Boundaries of the Pueblo Lands of San Francisco.* San Francisco: Overland Monthly Publishing Co., 1896.

⁴ "Her Life work is Ended." San Francisco Call, April 29, 1895.

⁵ "James Lick's Gifts." San Francisco Call, November 11, 1875.

⁶ "Old Ladies Home." Daily Alta California, Volume 36, Number 12457, May 25, 1884.

⁷ "A College Building Burned." San Francisco Chronicle, April 6, 1875.

⁸ University Mound: The New College Thereon." San Francisco Chronicle, December 15, 1875.

⁹ Pacific Presbyterian Union." San Francisco Chronicle, November 10, 1879.

¹⁰ "Old Ladies Home." Daily Alta California, Volume 36, Number 12457, May 25, 1884.

¹¹ Roberts, Percy. University Mound Ladies Home, 1939.



Original building of the University Mound Old Ladies' Home (San Francisco Public Library, March 10, 1926)



Original building of the University Mound Old Ladies' Home (San Francisco Public Library, March 6, 1930)

The trustees appointed an advisory board of four women, called the Board of Lady Managers, who were in charge of the daily affairs of the Home, including admissions and appointing staff. A matron ran the Home on a daily basis. If the matron was married, her husband cared for the garden and livestock. Additional staff employed by the Home included a chief nurse, nurse's aids, maids, chef, kitchen helpers, a laundress, handyman and waitresses. Many of the staff members lived on site. A physician visited weekly and a reverend performed services in the Chapel every Sunday.¹²

Admission to the Home was open to women who were 65 years old, or in some special cases 63 years old, had lived in California for five years and were in good health. Women were admitted on either a life care contract or a room and board basis. The life care application process was rigorous. It required the applicant to disclose money, real estate, securities and any other property owned; age, birthplace, previous residences; illnesses and medical care received in the last ten years; and a medical examination as well as two interviews with the Board of Lady Managers. If admitted on a life care contract, there was a mandatory probationary period. Those with terminal illnesses were not accepted. Life care residents were provided with board, lodging, clothing, medical care, and funeral arrangements. Life care costs ranged from a one-time fee of \$500 to \$3,000 depending on the year the resident was admitted. If a life care resident left the home, a refund was given less a charge of \$50 a month for the time she spent in the home. The Home also accepted residents on a board and care basis if they could not afford to pay the life care fee, but still had a regular dependable source of income such as a government pension or annuity. Board and care residents did not have to undergo a physical examination and were charged \$30-50 a month. Guests were also welcome at the Home. They were charged twenty-five cents for breakfast, fifty cents for dinner, and fifty cents to stay overnight.¹³

In 1896 the trustees of the Lick Old Ladies Home filed an application to change the name of the Home to the University Mound Old Ladies' Home. The name change was prompted by the fact that the institution was in financial distress. The trustees felt the current name interfered with and prevented many charitable bequests to the Home and that a more general name would promote the interests of the Home. At the time the current income of the Home was insufficient to meet expenses. The original \$100,000 endowment had dwindled to \$60,000 and the return on this investment was only \$300 a month. Contributing to the lack of funds was the discontinuance of money received by the state. The Home had received \$100 a month from the state for each resident because it cared for more than ten elderly women and its property was worth less than \$15,000. In 1893 the Home received \$3,867.37 from the state; however the law that made this type of subsidy possible was repealed in 1895.¹⁴ According to a 1939 report the staff were underpaid and overworked, resulting in the hiring of underqualified staff and high turnover. In addition, there were never sufficient funds to properly retrofit the old school building as a home for elderly women; as late as 1929 blackboards were reportedly still hanging on the walls. Although the number of residents had dropped from 85

¹² Roberts, Percy.

¹³ Roberts, Percy

¹⁴ Roberts, Percy

to 30, the Home was unable to take in any more residents. Trustees had deliberately set admission fees low in order to provide affordable care for elderly women of modest means, but because of the low admission fee and lack of income, there were no funds to care for additional residents.¹⁵ It wasn't until 1913 that the Home began accepting new residents. An advertisement in the San Francisco Call shows that the Home was now offering board to "elderly ladies with an excellent table in a pleasant home with large grounds" for \$30 a month.¹⁶ The residents even helped to support themselves by holding an annual charity benefit where they sold handmade shawls, tablecloths and rugs at a bazaar for extra funds.¹⁷ The Home would struggle with financial issues for most of its existence.

In 1922 a merger with the San Francisco Ladies' Protection and Relief Society, another charitable institution, was proposed, likely to help the Home's financial situation. The Society had been founded in 1853 during the Gold Rush to shelter young women. It operated a home on Franklin Street at Geary Street for school age children who had lost a parent, as well as cared for indigent and elderly women. The Society had recently purchased the block bounded by Francisco, Laguna, Bay and Octavia streets. Tentative plans called for the two institutions to join their resources and build two large modern buildings, one for women and one for children with playgrounds and other associated facilities.¹⁸ Ultimately, however, the two institutions chose to remain independent.

Alteration History

A report notes that an application for a license to operate the home was submitted to the state licensing board on October 22, 1925. However the board took no action because the wood frame building was considered unsafe, particularly in case of fire. Prior to 1931, the Home sold the western half of the original 25 acres to Convent of the Good Shepard.¹⁹ This land sale was likely to fund demolition of the wood frame building and construction of the present fireproof building on the remaining 13 acres. A building permit was filed July 15, 1931 to construct the three story, reinforced concrete brick building. Interestingly, the permit notes there were several deficiencies in the proposed plans to prevent fire and egress in case of a fire. A secondary egress stair from attic to ground floor, incinerator and dumbwaiter enclosed in a fireproof box and hose reels were urgently recommended. It is unclear whether these modifications were made to the plans. The building was originally constructed without an elevator. An elevator shaft was constructed in the southeast corner of the main building off of the living room and an elevator penthouse was added to the roof. A one-story glass sunroom with shed roof was added to the main building west elevation. Sliding glass doors and single lite sidelights replaced original multi-lite wood French doors and multi-light sidelights in the dining room at an unknown date. In the early 1950s the Home sold the southwest corner fronting Bacon and Princeton streets, likely to a developer. In the early 1960s the Home sold the northwest corner fronting Princeton and Burrows streets, leaving the property with 2.2 acres today. The building was included in the 1990 Unreinforced Masonry Building Survey. In 2014 the Home was sold to AgeSong Genesis LLC, an assisted living provider. They laid the contemporary tile floors in the living room and dining room in 2014-2015. AgeSong is also remodeling communal bathrooms on the first and second floors of the north and south wings and plans to remodel several bedrooms for residents.

¹⁵ "Tis But a Memory Now." San Francisco Call, June 13, 1896.

¹⁶ San Francisco Call, Volume 114, Number 137, October 22, 1913.

¹⁷ "The Happy Old Ladies." San Francisco Call, June 7, 1896.

¹⁸ "Charity Bodies to Unite to Build Two Big Homes." San Francisco Chronicle, March 23, 1922.

¹⁹ Percy Roberts.



Sanborn Fire Insurance Map updated to 1914 showing the footprint of the original building. (San Francisco Public Library)



University Mound Old Ladies' Home shortly after construction (San Francisco Public Library, June 16, 1932)



Sanborn Fire Insurance Map updated to 1950 showing the footprint of the current building. (San Francisco Public Library)



University Mound Old Ladies' Home shortly after construction (San Francisco Public Library, June 16, 1932)



Living room of University Mound Old Ladies' Home shortly after construction (San Francisco Public Library, June 16, 1932

Architectural Influences

The University Mound Old Ladies' Home is rendered in the Colonial Revival style. Colonial Revival was a stylistic trend that stared in the 1880s on the east coast. It was the first architectural movement to celebrate America's origins by referencing colonial-era building and design traditions. Interest in the style began after the 1876 Centennial when the nation was caught up in a wave of patriotism. With its clean lines and minimal use of applied decoration, it was a reaction to what was perceived to be the excessive qualities of the Queen Anne style of the Gilded Age. The style took off after nationally prominent firm McKim, Mead & White made a widely publicized tour of New England to study original Georgian and Adam buildings first hand. By 1886 the firm had designed large summer homes that incorporated Georgian, Federal and even First Period proportions and detailing, the Appleton House (1883-1884) in Lennox, Massachusetts and the Taylor House (1885-1886) in Newport, Rhode Island. Like the rest of the nation, the early examples of the style in San Francisco were rarely historically correct copies, but inspired by 18th century precedent, with borrowed colonial details applied to Victorian houses. These houses were much larger than their prototypes and were only reminiscent of the earlier Colonial style.

During the 1920s, Colonial Revival began to be often mixed and matched elements from Georgian and Federal styles. 18th century Georgian was typically used for larger commercial and public buildings while smaller buildings used a more broad range of early 18th century up through the federal style after 1800.²⁰ Despite the remoteness of California from New England, the Colonial Revival became popular in San Francisco and the rest of California between 1895 and 1910, partly due to the New England origins of many of the state's leading families and recently arrived architects from New England, New York, and Chicago, including Willis Polk and others. Although the style first took hold in the City's wealthier neighborhoods such as Pacific Heights, the style was not confined to homes for the rich. Much of the destroyed residential fabric of San Francisco replaced after 1906 was rebuilt in the simple, elegant and flexible vocabulary of the Colonial Revival.

The restoration of colonial Williamsburg in the late 1920s reenergized the popularity of the style. The progress of the restoration of Williamsburg in the late 1920s and early 1930s was closely followed in national newspapers, professional architectural journals and in home magazines for the upper and middle-class. Measured drawings and photographs of American colonial architecture were published in architectural journals, magazines such as *Good Housekeeping, Ladies' Home Journal and Town and Country* and a number of picture books and historical studies.²¹. These colonial inserts were used directly as source material for architects during the design process. As a result architects began to produce more correct interpretations of historical models. While homes designed during this time period were more authentic interpretation of Colonial, public buildings, churches and educational buildings continued to reflect the 18th century American Georgian style constructed in the 1920s.

The clean lines and minimal use of applied decoration of the Colonial Revival style had the added bonus of being inexpensive to construct and the building materials were readily available. As the Home was continually struggling financially, the Colonial Revival style likely fit their budget.

Colonial Revival style is characterized by a brick and white-painted wood trim symmetrical façade often three or five bays in width with the entrance located in the center bay. Prominent classical elements, such as an accentuated front door with decorative pediment, fanlights and multi-paned double-hung, sash windows, dormers and classically detailed cornices are also distinctive features. Small round windows on the primary façade and gable ends were widely used in the 1930s, 40s and early 50s.²²

²⁰ Gebhard, David. "The American Colonial Revival in the 1930s." *Winterthur Portfolio*, Vol 22, no 2/3 (Summer-Autumn, 1987): 109-148.

²¹ Gebhard, David.

²² McAlester, Virginia and Lee. A Field Guide to American Houses. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1997: 332.

Martin J. Rist (1888-1956) & Alfred I. Coffey (1866-1931), Architects

Master architects Marin J. Rist and Alfred I. Coffey partnered on the design of the University Mound Old Ladies' Home. Martin J. Rist and Alfred I. Coffey, both separately and in partnership were well known for their designs of institutional buildings, such as schools and hospitals. Rist was known on a state level for his execution of revival style architecture. In September 1932 his recent body of work was featured in *The Architect & Engineer* and included a two page spread on the University Mound Old Ladies' Home. Alfred I. Coffey was well known locally for his work designing school buildings as City architect in 1910.



Taraval Police Station designed by Martin J. Rist and Alfred I. Coffey and completed ca. 1930. (San Francisco Public Library, n.d.)

Gualt School in Santa Cruz designed by Martin J. Rist and Alfred I. Coffey and completed 1931. (Google Street View)

Martin Rist was born to German parents in Columbus, Ohio in 1888. His family arrived in San Francisco in 1906, and Rist soon found employment as a draftsman working for the architect William Curlett. He continued to work for Curlett until 1914, and then as a designer for Charles Gottschalk and Carl Werner. One year after being granted a certificate to practice architecture in California by the State Board of Architecture in 1922²³, Rist opened his own practice, and a year later joined Charles Gottschalk in partnership with offices in the Phelan Building. In August 1928 The Architect and Engineer observed that Gottschalk and Rist had "one of the busiest offices in San Francisco."²⁴ Among their projects at that time was the construction of estates in Hillsborough and San Mateo, as well as an apartment building on Filbert Street in San Francisco. Several of these buildings were subsequently photographed for the September 1932 edition of The Architect and Engineer, which said of Rist:

... We find him detailing everything, moldings, window frames, cupboards, leaving nothing to the mills' withering concept of economy. Buildings are designed on all sides—nothing is left to chance even on kitchen entrances. We do not find expanses of repeated ornament, but necessary things are deftly done, with a full blooded sense of well-being.²⁵

As with many architects during the building boom in the 1930s, Rist's work favored Period Revival influences, including Mediterranean Revival, Colonial Revival and Tudor Revival style designs. During this period Rist also completed designs in association with architect Alfred I. Coffey, including the McKinley School in Redwood City, California, Taraval Police Station (ca. 1930) and the Gault School in Santa Cruz (1931), as well as Rist's own house—a Storybook style residence at 136 Yerba Buena Avenue (1928). Their best known work during the early 1930s is the Art Deco style Psychopathic Ward at San Francisco General Hospital (1932-1935).

²³ "Granted Certificates to Practice." The Architect and Engineer, Vol. 71, No.1 (October 1922); 106.

²⁴ "With the Architects," The Architect and Engineer, Vol. 94, No. 2 (August, 1928), 105.

²⁵ Julian C. Mesic, "Architectural Practice and the Work of Martin J. Rist," *The Architect and Engineer*, Vol. 110, No. 3 (September, 1932): 24-25.

During the latter 1930s, Rist's work increasingly showed Arte Moderne influences. These included an exuberant commercial building at 470 Columbus Avenue (1936), as well as three stripped-down Streamline apartment buildings located at 1963 to 1981 Clay Street. Other Public Works Administration projects involving Rist included the Coffin-Reddington Building at 301 Folsom Street (1936-1937); and Abraham Lincoln High School in association with Timothy Pflueger, Frederick Meyer and W. P. Peugh (1938-1940).²⁶ Rist also collaborated with architects Albert Schroepfer, Charles F. Strothoff, and Smith O'Brien on the Sunshine School at (1937) and Buena Vista Elementary School (replaced by a new building in 1968).

Following World War II, Rist completed several large institutional projects in San Francisco, all of them concentrated in the city's western neighborhoods. These included the West Portal Lutheran Church (1947), Mercy High School (1952), and St. Cecilia Catholic Church (1954-1956). Of interest, both the West Portal Lutheran Church and St. Cecilia's were designed in the Spanish Colonial Revival style, while Mercy High School is more Modernist in orientation. During this period Rist maintained an office in the Sunset District in the Henry Doelger building at 320 Judah Street. Rist died in 1956 and is buried at St. Mary's Cemetery in Oakland.



1961-1936 Clay Street designed by Martin J. Rist and completed 1936. (Google Street View)



470 Columbus Avenue designed by Martin J. Rist and completed in 1936. (Google Street View)

Alfred I. Coffey was born in San Francisco in 1866. He was a graduate of Saint Mary's College in Moraga, California. Coffey married Gladys Coulter in Santa Clara in 1915. In 1917 he lived at 1390 Washington Street. Later he lived in Redwood City and maintained his own practice in San Francisco. He is most well-known for his school and hospital designs. In 1910 he was selected as city architect for San Francisco for his special experience in designing school buildings which was opportune because the city was then in the process of designing a large number of school buildings.²⁷ He was the fifth person to be named to the office in the past four years.²⁸ His school building designs include McKinley School and Sequoia High School, Redwood City (1904, additions 1928-1929), Mission Revival style Gault School in Santa Cruz (1931) in partnership with Rist. His hospital designs include the Neo-Classical Southern Pacific Railroad Company Hospital (1906-1908), a Gothic Revival building for St. Joseph's Hospital (1889) and an addition to St. Francis Hospital (1911)²⁹ all in San Francisco and St. Agnes Hospital, Fresno (1929).³⁰ Besides school and hospital buildings, he designed a domed, Renaissance Revival style, two-story building for the Bank of San Mateo County in 1906³¹ and in 1913 he designed the Roxie Theater on 16th Street as two storefronts each with a

²⁶ Therese Poletti. Art Deco San Francisco: The Architecture of Timothy Pflueger. (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2008), 225.

²⁷ "Alfred I. Coffey." San Francisco Call, Volume 109, Number 83, February 21, 1911.

²⁸ "City Architect No. 5." Architect and Engineer, Volume 19, Issue 2.

²⁹ Domestic Engineering and the Journal of Mechanical Contracting, Volume 87, 1919.

³⁰ Architect and Engineer, Volume 97-98 Apr.-Sept. 1929, page 15.

³¹ Regnery, Dorothy F. An Enduring Heritage: Historic Buildings of the San Francisco Peninsula.

curved parapet and is one of the last "storefront" movie theaters.³² Coffey partnered with architect Carl Werner in 1919 to design city hall for South San Francisco³³ and again in 1921 to prepare plans for additions to the Sequoia Union High School in Redwood City.³⁴ Coffey, working with Rist designed two additions of the San Francisco General Hospital, the Cancer Unit and the Psychopathic Building, before his death from a stroke on November 10, 1931.³⁵



Southern Pacific Railway Hospital designed by Alfred I. Coffey and completed 1906-1908. (San Francisco Public Library, August 19, 1964)

Psychopathic Ward at San Francisco General Hospital designed by Alfred I. Coffey and completed ca. 1932-35.³⁶ (San Francisco Public Library, February 23, 1950)

PORTOLA NEIGHBORHOOD HISTORY

The Home is located in what was originally part of the Rincon de las Salinas y Potrero Viejo rancho. H.S. Brown, Esq. acquired the land at an unknown date. Brown first had the area surveyed in 1862 and the survey was recorded May 1, 1863. The University Mound Survey map from that time shows that the area bounded by Oxford, San Bruno Avenue, Olmstead and Silver Avenue was laid out in linear blocks with eight lots per block. Most streets were named after universities and colleges on the east coast: Oxford, Harvard, Yale, Amherst, Princeton, Dartmouth, Holyoke, and Bowdoin streets. A four block by two block area between University and Cambridge streets and mid-block between Wayland and Henry (now Felton Street) streets was dedicated to "University College Grounds."³⁷ In 1867 a survey for the University Homestead Association expanded the neighborhood west to Harvard Street. The 1867 map shows owner's names on some lots, however the majority of lots remained unsold. The Homestead Association was first extended in 1868. In 1870 the University Extension Homestead Association filed a map to extend the tract west to by up to four blocks; however it appears that the extension never took place, as today this area has a different street grid than University Mound and is known as the Excelsior. Although the 1870 map shows that more lots had been sold, newspapers reported cattle still roamed freely in the neighborhood, even attacking and killing a resident of the Home in 1895.³⁸ In 1872 plans were made to construct a railroad to University Mound terminating in Bay View at a cost of \$40,000.³⁹ In 1904 the area received electric arc lights on the corner of Dwight, Woolsey, Wayland, Holyoke

³⁴ Western Architect and Engineer, Volumes 66-67, 1921.

³² Dinkelspiel, Susan Cerny abnd Beth A. Armstrong. *An Architectural Guidebook to San Francisco and the Bay Area*. Utah: Gibbs Smith, 2007.

³³ Architect and Engineer, Volumes 57-58, 1919.

³⁵ Architect and Engineer Volume 107-108, October 1931- March 1932. November 1931: 76.

³⁶ "Builders' Contracts." San Francisco Call. November 11, 1903.

³⁷ The San Francisco Block Book. *Vol. II, Homesteads: University Mound Homestead Ass'n.* San Francisco: Hicks-Judd Co., 1907: 21.

³⁸ "Alleged Measure to Prevent Extension of the Pound Limits." San Francisco Call, December 9, 1895

³⁹ "University Mound Railroad." Daily Alta California, Volume 24, Number 8034, March 25,1872

and Crane streets because so many new homes had been constructed in the district.⁴⁰ Despite these improvements, growth of the Portola district was still slow, until after the 1906 fire and earthquake.



University Mound Survey, recorded 1863. (San University Mound area shown fully built out in Sanborn Fire Francisco Public Library) Insurance Map updated to 1983. (San Francisco Public Library)

In 1913 the neighborhood surrounding the Home was purchased by the Brown Estate, which began advertising that all 300 lots all had a view of the ocean and boasted that the neighborhood was perfect for salaried men who wanted to keep in touch with their downtown offices, as it was located just off Mission Street on Silver Avenue and only 20 minutes from Third and Market streets with 5 different street cars lines only two minutes away.⁴¹ The Brown Estate said that no expense had been spared in improving the tract – streets had curbs and electric street lights and water and sewer service was available.⁴² Apparently the roads were still unpaved and there were no sidewalks in some areas, because a 1939 report describes the difficulty residents of the Home had in navigating the unpaved road from the Home to Silver Avenue.⁴³ As further incentive, the lots had low opening prices of \$400 and homes could be built for new owners on easy terms with payments of only \$10 a month, claiming that was amount was within what was usually paid as rent money.⁴⁴ Despite this advertising, the neighborhood was not fully built out until the 1960s.

With its eastern slope and southern exposure, the Portola neighborhood was a good site for farming. In the 1920s, it became home to at least 19 nurseries, many owned by Italian-Americans families. They grew the majority of flowers sold in San Francisco for decades.⁴⁵ A 1938 aerial photograph shows that there were numerous greenhouses north of the Home. A 1939 report notes that a resident of the Home had asked one of the nurseries for 10 cents worth of flowers and they filled her arms with a huge bunch of pink roses.⁴⁶ During World War II many of the families stopped growing flowers and instead grew vegetables or raised chickens to feed and support themselves. In the late 1930s some of the nurseries were closed when landowners lost their property to the city for the creation of McLaren Park and the University Mound Reservoir system.⁴⁷ Today, the lone block of greenhouses remains along Hamilton Street, east of the reservoir.

^{40 &}quot;Residents Want Light." San Francisco Call, Volume 97, Number 15, 15 December 1904

⁴¹ "University Mound is Selling Fast." San Francisco Call, August 2, 1913.

 ⁴² "Good Improvements in New Subdivision." San Francisco Call, May 24, 1913.
⁴³ Roberts, Percy.

⁴⁴ "University Mound is Being Appreciated." San Francisco Call, July 19, 1913.

⁴⁵ Garibaldi, Rayna. San Francisco's Portola. Arcadia: Mount Pleasant, S.C., 2007.

⁴⁶ Roberts, Percy.

⁴⁷ Garibaldi, Rayna



Aerial view of the University Mound area. University Mound Old Ladies' Home outlined in red. Convent of the Good Shepard buildings can be seen to the west and greenhouses to the north (David Rumsey, 1938)

Immediately east of the Home is the University Mound Reservoir. The north basin of the reservoir, directly across the street from the Home, was brought into service in 1885. At that time the area around the reservoir was a windswept, little known section of the city that was sparsely populated with street car service a mile away.⁴⁸ The south basin of the reservoir was constructed in 1937.

Like other San Francisco neighborhoods, the Portola was home to waves of new people and cultures in the 20th century. The first settlers were Jewish and Portola was sometimes called "Little Jerusalem" because of its two temples, Kosher delis on unpaved San Bruno Road, and a settlement house run by the Council of Jewish Women. The Portola is one of the few neighborhoods in the United States that has a Maltese presence. Immigrants from the island of Malta in the Mediterranean came to San Francisco in the 1920s and formed a small ethnic community around San Bruno Avenue. The 2010 census found that roughly three-quarters of the neighbors are of Asian or Hispanic descent.

⁴⁸ Spring Valley Water Company, San Francisco Water, Vol. 1, No. 1, January 1922.

APPENDIX: OLD AGE HOMES

Retirement as it currently exists today is a relatively new phenomenon brought about by changing social and economic conditions and social reform legislation. When farming dominated the economy, the ageing farmer was likely to be employed as long as his health held out. His ability to perform some type of farm work provided status and security. As factories began to replace farms in economic importance, the ageing in cities had few modern vocational skills to work in them. These diminished job opportunities meant that the elderly were forced into poverty, living in almshouse or other institutions with other needy persons, orphans and the insane. The late 19th century welfare worker and charity experts saw a direct relationship between old age and poverty and advocated for separate institutionalization of elderly paupers from these other needy persons. These separate institutions would become a "home" that provided cheap, efficient care and attended to inmates who were not only destitute but likely to be infirm as well. However, while late 19th century social workers endorsed the idea of sending lower-class elderly to a publically run institution, many questioned the propriety of sending the middle class to the same place. Thus many private old-age homes were founded around this time period. By the end of the century, most of the residents in an old-age home were white, middle-class women who had paid to enter. The University Mound Old Ladies' Home seems to have been modeled after the first old age home for ladies in Philadelphia, the Indigent Widows' and Single Women's Society (Society) opened in 1817. The Society declined to accept any applicant who had been raised in poverty. Instead they only accepted respectable women who came from refined walks of life and were used to certain comforts. The Society wanted the women to see the institution as their home and the other inmates as their family. Women were provided private rooms and meals were taken at a general table meant to ensure a feeling of family unity. Each applicant was required to give proof of her character and provide recommendations. Once admitted, they were given a one-year probationary period and expected to donate their labor, sewing, knitting and quilting to help raise money for the institution.49

Also at this time, hospital design was beginning to shift from housing patients in large wards with numerous beds to smaller wards with fewer beds or even private rooms.

By the beginning of the 20th century, there were scores of old-age homes in every large American city. ⁵⁰ In 1932, when the Home was completed, the San Francisco city directory listed 25 "Homes and Asylums" including seven orphanages and five asylums specifically for women or girls. Of those, only four, including the University Mound Old Ladies Home are extant and in operation as convalescent/nursing homes. Designed in period revival styles, all four reflect the architectural influences of the period. They include the Hebrew Home for the Aged and Disabled (Jewish Home San Francisco) located at 302 Silver Avenue designed by Samuel Lightner Hyman in the Georgian Revival style and completed in 1923 with two wings added in 1945 and 1959, extensively altered and today derives its significance from the 1969 Brutalist Goodman Building designed by Howard Friedman and 1970 courtyard and fountain designed by Lawrence Halprin; the San Francisco Ladies' Protection and Relief Society (The Heritage) located at 3400 Laguna Street, designed by Julia Morgan in the Tudor Revival style in 1924; and the Christian Science Benevolent Association on the Pacific Coast (Arden Wood), located at 445 Wawona Street, designed by Henry Gutterson in the Chateauesque style and completed in 1930. Based on this review, the University Mound Old Ladies Home, can be considered a rare property type. It is one of the few high style Colonial Revival institutional buildings in San Francisco.

⁴⁹ Haber, Carole, *Beyond Sixty-Five: The Dilemma of Old Age in America's Past*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

⁵⁰ Haber, Carole.





Christian Science Benevolent Association on the Pacific Coast (Arden Wood), located at 445 Wawona Street, designed by Henry Gutterson in the Chateauesque style 1930 (www.ardenwood.org)

San Francisco Ladies' Protection and Relief Society (The Heritage) located at 3400 Laguna Street, designed by Julia Morgan in the Tudor Revival style in 1924 (Google Street View).



Jewish Home of San Francisco located at 302 Silver Avenue designed by Samuel Lightner Hyman in the Georgian Revival style and completed in 1923 with two wings added in 1945 and 1959, n.d. (www.jhsf.org)

Jewish Home of San Francisco Goodman Building designed by Howard Friedman in the Brutalist style and completed in 1969 (www.jhsf.org).

ARTICLE 10 LANDMARK DESIGNA TION

This section of the report is an analysis and summary of the applicable criteria for designation, integrity, period of significance, significance statement, character-defining features, and additional Article 10 requirements.

Criteria for Designation

Check all criteria applicable to the significance of the property that are documented in the report. The criteria checked is (are) the basic justification for *why* the resource is important.

- _____ Association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- _____Association with the lives of persons significant in our past.
- <u>X</u> Embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.
- ____ Has yielded or may be likely to yield information important in history or prehistory.

Statement of Significance

Characteristics of the Landmark that justify its designation:

Constructed in 1931-1932, University Mound Old Ladies' Home at 350 University Street is a convalescent/nursing home that is architecturally significant as an embodiment of the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, and method of construction and represents the work of master architects Martin J. Rist and Alfred I. Coffey. With its front door accentuated by a broken pediment, recessed tetrastyle portico supported by tall slender columns, numerous fanlights and multi-pane windows, and symmetrically composed façade, the University Mound Old Ladies' Home illustrates the distinctive characteristics of the Colonial Revival style that was popular following the restoration or Colonial Williamsburg in the late 1920s. Rist and Coffey, both separately and in partnership were well known for their designs of institutional buildings, such as schools and hospitals. Their best known work during the early 1930s is the Art Deco style Psychopathic Ward at San Francisco General Hospital (1932-1935). Furthermore, the University Mound Old Ladies' Home is one of the only extant Colonial Revival style convalescent/nursing homes in San Francisco that retains a high degree of physical integrity having undergone few alterations since its construction.

Periods of Significance

The period of significance is 1931 to 2014 representing the construction date of the present building until the end of ownership by the University Mound Old Ladies' Home.

Integrity

The seven aspects of integrity are location, design, materials, workmanship, setting, feeling, and association in relation to the period of significance established above. Cumulatively, the building at 350 University Street retains high degree of integrity to convey its architectural significance. The building retains integrity of association, as it has remained in continual use as a convalescent/nursing home since its construction. It likewise retains integrity of design, materials, workmanship and feeling. Based on a review of the building permit history and visual inspection, known exterior alterations are relatively limited in scope and remain subordinate to the building's overall design and ornamentation. Similarly, interior spaces including the living room, dining room and chapel have experienced few alterations and readily convey their association with the building's historic use. The Home's original large park like setting of 25 acres has diminished to just 2.5 acres, however, with its set back from the street, mature trees and shrubs, and as the only building on the west side of University Street, it retains the feeling of a much larger property.

Overall, the Department has determined that the building's primary character defining features, both exterior and interior, are largely unaltered since the building's construction in 1931-1932 and 350 University Street retains a high degree of integrity to convey its historical significance.

ARTICLE 10 REQUIREMENTS SECTION 1004 (b)

Boundaries of the Landmark Site

Encompassing all of and limited to Lot 1 in Assessor's Block 5992 on the west side of University Street between Burrows and Bacon Streets.

Character-Defining Features

Whenever a building, site, object, or landscape is under consideration for Article 10 Landmark designation, the Historic Preservation Commission is required to identify character-defining features of the property. This is done to enable owners and the public to understand which elements are considered most important to preserve the historical and architectural character of the proposed landmark.

- All primary exterior elevations, form, massing, structure, architectural ornament and materials identified as:
 - Form and massing, including rectangular, two and a half story, side-gabled roof with arched dormers of main building flanked by two story L-shaped, flat roofed wings
 - Symmetrically balanced façade with centered door and regular fenestration pattern with six-oversix, double-hung windows and arched fanlight windows.
 - Architectural ornamentation including broken pediment at the main entry, recessed tetrastyle portico supported by tall slender columns, decorative frieze and dentil molding, spandrel panels below first story windows, and balusters at the parapet of the wings
 - Materials including Flemish bond red face brick, slate roof tiles on main building and chapel and painted wood ornamentation

The character-defining *interior* features of the building are identified as:

- Living room
 - Arched openings at north, south, and west walls. Multi lite wood French doors and transoms at east wall
 - Fireplace with marble surround and wood mantle
 - o Decorative plaster pilasters with urns of flowers and plaster molding
 - o Board formed concrete beamed ceiling with decorative painting and two brass chandeliers
- Dining room
 - Windows with fanlights at north and south walls
 - o Fireplace with marble surround and wood mantle
 - o Built-in sideboards with leaded glass top cabinet fronts
 - Plaster wainscot molding
 - o Board formed concrete beamed ceiling with decorative painting and brass chandeliers
- Chapel
 - o Arched windows and shutters at north and south walls
 - o Multi lite window with sidelights and fanlight on east wall
 - o Raised, recessed half round chancel with decorative lintel and brackets
 - o Peaked ceiling with rough sawn beams and brass carriage lamp chandeliers



First floor plan of University Mound Old Ladies' Home with living room, dining room and chapel shaded to show character defining interior spaces (First floor plan, The Architect and Engineer, September 1932).

PROPERTY INFORMATION

Historic Name: University Mound Old Ladies' Home

Popular Name: n/a

Address: 350 University Street

Block and Lot: 5992/001

Owner: AgeSong Genesis LLC

Original Use: Retirement home

Current Use: Convalescent/nursing home

Zoning: RH-1 Residential-House, One Family

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS + REPORTS

- Cerny, Susan Dinkelspiel and Beth A. Armstrong. An Architectural Guidebook to San Francisco and the Bay Area. Utah: Gibbs Smith, 2007.
- Haber, Carole. Beyond Sixty-Five: The Dilemma of Old Age in America's Past. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Garibaldi, Rayna. San Francisco's Portola. Mount Pleasant, S.C.: Arcadia, 2007.

- McAlester, Virginia and Lee. A Field Guide to American Houses. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1997, p.332.
- Poletti, Therese. Art Deco San Francisco: The Architecture of Timothy Pflueger. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2008.
- Regnery, Dorothy F. An Enduring Heritage: Historic Buildings of the San Francisco Peninsula. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1976.
- Roberts, Percy. University Mound Ladies Home, 1939.
- Taylor, Edward Robeson. On the Establishment of the Boundaries of the Pueblo Lands of San Francisco. San Francisco: Overland Monthly Publishing Co., 1896.
- The San Francisco Block Book. Vol. II, Homesteads: University Mound Homestead Ass'n. San Francisco: Hicks-Judd Co., 1907.

NEWSPAPERS + PERIODICALS

- Gebhard, David. "The American Colonial Revival in the 1930s." Winterthur Portfolio, Vol 22, no 2/3 (Summer-Autumn, 1987), 109-148.
- Julian C. Mesic, "Architectural Practice and the Work of Martin J. Rist," The Architect and Engineer, Vol. 110, No. 3 (September, 1932), 24-25.

PUBLIC RECORDS

Sanborn Maps

San Francisco city directories

City of San Francisco Department of Building & Inspection, building permits

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

San Francisco City and County

Edwin M. Lee, Mayor David Campos, District 9 Supervisor

Historic Preservation Commissioners

President: Andrew Wolfram Vice-President: Aaron Jon Hyland Commissioners: Karl Hasz Ellen Johnck Richard S.E. Johns Diane Matsuda Jonathan Pearlman

Planning Department

John Rahaim, Director Tim Frye, Preservation Coordinator

Project Staff

Shannon Ferguson, research, writing, and photography

Additional Support

Tim Frye
SAN FRANCISCO PRESERVATION BULLETIN NO. 19

POTENTIAL SAN FRANCISCO LANDMARKS EVALUATION FORM

The Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board (Landmarks Board) seeks suggestions from the general public on buildings, structures, sites, districts or objects potentially eligible for designation as future San Francisco historic landmarks.

San Francisco contains many older buildings that contribute to the overall architectural, aesthetic and urban design qualities of the city, in varying degrees. Some buildings are important solely based on their individual design attributes while others derive their worth from the history of their owners, occupants and uses. Some buildings may be significant more for their contextual association with surrounding properties. Buildings proposed for landmark designation may include both those of individual importance and those that taken as a whole are considered to be contributory elements to a neighborhood or district.

The Landmarks Board set in 1999 and reaffirmed in 2000 the following priorities for the selection of potential landmark designations:

- To directly address and engage the cultural and social history of San Francisco; and
- To go to neighborhoods that have not been represented and underrepresented in the program to date; and
- To involve communities of people (ethnic communities, communities of interest, cultural communities): and
- Public spaces / common grounds; and
- Architecturally significant buildings.

In order to assist the Landmarks Board in its evaluation, the following information should be provided on each potential landmark. Please provide as much information as possible as an incomplete application may affect consideration of landmark designation. Note: *Generally, properties eligible for local landmark designation are at least 50 years old. Properties less than 50 years of age must be exceptionally important to be considered eligible for listing.*

Potential San Francisco Historic Landmark Questionnaire

Resource Name: University Mound Ladies Home

Historic Name (if known): Uneversity Mound

N:\SHARE\TECH SPEC\PresBulletins\CurrentPresBulletins\PresBulletin19FUTURELAND.doc

Address of Resource: 350 University Stree	et
Block and Lot of Resource:	
Primary Contact: Sandra Rivas	(Phone #) (415)239-6696-Ext. 15
Resource Date of Construction:	
Date(s) of Alterations/Additions to Resource:	1930 Present Building

Significance of Proposed Landmark

1. Is the resource associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history (local, state or national)? If so, how?

The University Mound Ladies Home, has been a Historic Home for seniors in San Franci

San Francisco's Portola District.Is a 74 bed nonprofit community provided

assisting living, Palliative care, and Hospice care for both women and men

of modest means. All resident receive three meals daily laundry and housekeeping ser

services and assistance with medications and daily activities. 2. Is the resource associated with the lives of persons significant in our past (local, state or national)? If so, how?

In year 1884 with 100,000 begest from James Lick also the the bnefactor

of Lick observatory.

3. Does the resource embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction? If so, how?

Present Building was constructed, design by San Francisco architect Martin J. Rist,

it features a Georgian Revival exterior and an interior that evokes the

Spanish Colonial style, especially in the common areas such the front parlor

chapel and dinning room, the home's Grand georgian Revival facade front,

a circular driveway with a portico featuring four tall white columns framing an outdoor porch. A dentillated cornice and understated frieze accentuate the roofi roofline above the second story, while three dormers peek from the hipped roof of the third floor. Address of Resource: 350 University Street

Block and Lot of Resource:

Primary Contact: Sandra Rivas (Phone #) (415)239-6696-Ext. 15

Resource Date of Construction: 1884

Date(s) of Alterations/Additions to Resource:_____1930 Hesent Building

Significance of Proposed Landmark

1. Is the resource associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history (local, state or national)? If so, how?

The University Mound Ladies Home, has been a Historic Home for seniors in San Fr

San Francisco's Portola District.Is a 74 bed nonprofit community provided

assisting living, Palliative care, and Hospice care for both women and men

of modest means. All resident receive three meals daily laundry and housekeeping

services and assistance with medications and daily activities. 2. Is the resource associated with the lives of persons significant in our past (local, state or national)? If so, how?

In year 1884 with 100,000 begest from James Lick also the the bnefactor

of Lick observatory.

3. Does the resource embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction? If so, how?

Present Building was constructed, design by San Francisco architect Martin J. Rist,

it features a Georgian Revival exterior and an interior that evokes the

Spanish Colomial style, especially in the common areas such the front parlor

chapel and dinning room, the home's Grand georgian Revival facadeffront,

a circular driveway with a portico featuring four tall white columns framing an outdoor porch. A dentillated cornice and understated frieze accentuate the roofi roofline above the second story, while three dormers peek from the hipped roof of the third floor.

University Mound Ladies Home: An Architectural Perspective

The University Mound Ladies Home, a historic home for seniors in San Francisco's Portola District, was founded in 1884 with a \$100,000 bequest from James Lick, also the benefactor of the Lick Observatory. Today it is a 74-bed nonprofit community providing assisted living, palliative care, and hospice care for both women and men of modest means. All residents receive three meals daily, laundry and housekeeping services, and assistance with medications and daily activities.

The original home was a large, three-story wooden building on 25 acres of land at the present location. In the early 1930s some of the land was sold and the present building was constructed. Designed by San Francisco architect Martin J. Rist, it features a Georgian Revival exterior and an interior that evokes the Spanish Colonial style, especially in the common areas such as the front parlor, chapel, and dining room.

The home's grand Georgian Revival façade fronts a circular driveway, with a portico featuring four tall white columns framing an outdoor porch. A dentillated cornice and an understated frieze accentuate the roofline above the second story, while three dormers peek out from the hipped roof of the third floor.

The large front parlor offers a Spanish Colonial feeling, with an intricately stenciled wood-beam ceiling, grand archways, and rustic chandeliers. A wood-burning fireplace is framed by small white columns in a modest echo of the striking exterior.

The interdenominational chapel continues the Spanish Colonial theme, with a dramatic peaked ceiling featuring prominent exposed wood beams and hanging lanterns. A majestic Palladian window at the rear of the chapel reveals the trees outside, while smaller windows along the side walls are graced with intriguing curved interior shutters.

The dining room features a stenciled wood-beam ceiling similar to that in the front parlor, as well as a row of floor-to-ceiling Palladian windows that look out on the home's trees and gardens and flood the room with light on sunny days. The many expansive windows in the home's common areas are particularly welcome in a home for the elderly; the windows help residents retain a sense of the outdoors, whether or not they feel hardy enough to venture outside.

The sunroom adjoining the dining room, created in the 1960s, is the home's only significant addition since its construction in 1932.

The home's Spanish Colonial elements are echoed in other buildings designed by Martin J. Rist, including St. Cecilia Catholic Church in San Francisco (at 17th and Vicente) and St. Bernard's Church in Tracy, California.

The Ladies Home today is experiencing an exciting renaissance. In 2009 it began an innovative partnership in which SFSU students and faculty are contributing their expertise to improve the lives of residents and the operations of the home. Other recent improvements have included the hospice and palliative care wing, a remodeled library, and donated artwork placed throughout the building to brighten the lives of residents.

-written by Sherri Schultz, former UMLH board member, and Kaleene Kenning

Living residence for women AND men 501(c) 3 non- profit, 74 room Assisted University Mound Ladies Home is a over the age of 60.

and compassionate care, UMLH offers means for 130 years in a culturally and the activities of daily living. UMLH is refuge for people who need help with Known for its high level of excellent environmentally diverse community. unique serving people of modest

Francisco. UMLH is an affordable assisted "This is one of the best kept secrets in San living facility with excellent care and is a

5 Star Yelp Reviewer 6.19.2013

less stressful for the people living at UMLH." non-profit. The staff is unionized so they earn a living wage, which reduces turnover and is

of our community, or for an assessment of For more information, to schedule a tour your loved one, please contact the **Executive Director:**

(415) 239-6696

or e-mail info@ladieshome.org



UNIVERSITY MOUND LADIES HOME SINCE 1884



People of Modest Means Assisted Living for

San Francisco, CA 94134 350 University Street

www.ladieshome.org

RCFE License # 380500678

3/2014

University Mound Ladics Flome

IMILH

MEN MEN 1

SERVICES INCLUDE

- Spacious, comfortable rooms, private or shared, furnished or unfurnished.
- Three nutritious meals a day, plus
 - two snacks. Medication management.
- Personal care with dressing, bathing, & personal appearance.
 - Incontinence care.
- Caregivers who speak English, Spanish, and Tagalog.
 Personal laundry/linen service.
 - 24-hour emergency response
- system.
- Full-time Activities Director & extensive activities program. Secure, quiet environment



AMENITIES

 Built in the 1930s, this historic, stately building is located near the beautiful McLaren Park.



- Elegant front reception with fireplace, comfortable seating, and a grand piano.
 - Spacious, cheerful dining room with floor-to-ceiling window's.
- Bright sunroom for small gatherings of residents who play cards & other activities.
- Non-denominational chapel, with wood-beam ceiling for peaceful Sunday services.
- Private backyard and garden features benches, raised planters, accessible walking paths, and is safely gated and fenced. Public transportation by Muni

(Lines #29, #44, & #52) & BART.

OPTIONAL SERVICES*

- In-room private telephones.
 - In-room satellite television
 - Weekly beautician visits
- Monthly podiatrist visits
- Special services for nonambulatory residents

*Extra cost



UMLH is licensed to accommodate nonambulatory residents, those using walkers, or who have difficulty following instructions during an emergency without assistance due to memory impairment.

THIS PETITION IS TO PRESERVE THE UNIVERSITY MOUND LADIES HOME BUILDING.

LOCATED 350 UNIVERSITY STREET SAN FRANCISCO CA, 94134

Amenities built in the 1930s; this historic, stately building is located near the beautiful McLaren Park. It is a historic home for seniors in San Francisco's Portola District, was founded in 1884 with a \$100,000 bequest from James Lick, also the benefactor of the lik Observatory. Today it is a74-bed non-profit community providing assisted living, palliative care, and hospice care for both women and men of modest means. This building was designed by San Francisco architect Martin J. Rist, it features a Georgian Revival exterior and an interior that evokes the Spanish Colonial style especially in the common areas such as the front parlor, chapel, and dining room. This is one of the best-kept secrets in San Francisco. University Mound Ladies Home is affordable assisted living facility. To preserve this building please sign.

Petition Organizer

Name. Be		Last Yelda	Address.426 Cambridg	ge Street	Phone # 239-1433
Signature	Belles y	lda			8 9 8 8
Name. Signature	wayne	Last ways	Address P.O.BOX	475 673	Phone # 83/ 683/
Name. Signature	by 1 Cai	Last	Address		Phone # 218-2904
-	Beverly Cai	he	080 Silver		1 Holle # 210 2109
Name. Signature	Borgh	Last ello Nora .	Address 356- Holyoke		415 Phone # 468-3196
Name	Q	Last	Address	-	
Signature	MARY	SAMMUT	210 Hamilton	l	Phone # 467-1686
Name	Mooría	Last Ochuca	Address Fallow	et: 4	12134 Phone #4690933
Name. Signature	Vigine 1	Last the +1	Address DL3 BancingT an	1	Phone # 254 - 947 C - 415
Name. Signature	Onto	Last Kensinger	Address 325 Holyoke		Phone #) \$4\5-4513
Name. Signature	Willia	Last	Address		Phone # <i>415-239-6456</i>
Name.		Last	Address		Phone #
\mathbf{O}	•	4	1101 04000-0		415
MILI	PI	relova	426 CAMBRIDG	EST	613-5147

Phone # Address Name. Last Name. REBECCA Phone #(415)722-2744 S Last REYES Address 945 HOLMOKEST. Signature SF. Ch 94134 SEGUNDO Last RETES Phone #415/467_8613 Address G45 HOLYOKE Name. Signature moto Rey S.F., CA 94134 NO Phone # 65 0annini Address 189 5 Mayfin Last -Name. Carla 156-3169 Signature AL Address Phone # Last Name. Signature /[Hontono Address Phone # Last Name. 143 Uniterst 239-9289 Signature Phone # Address 4 Name. Last 5 Signature Name. Lupe Last Address Phone # \$ Signature **Phone #** Address Last Name. Signature 210 Handles 758-2125 Phone # Last Address Name. 649 Girard st Mubayed 124.8048 Signature Phone # 4/S Last MMMAS Address 310 Cialg Ct Name. 041-5998 Signature / Last DOW Name. Thou III Address Ugo Salver Ave Phone # A15_894_797 Signature Sara Last Address Phone # Name. 350 hovergity (UMLH) 415 239 -6696 Signature Jane Smith Phone #(925) Address 130 Byron C Last NOWNes Name. Laura Pleasant Hill, CA 94523 872-3343 Signature Parela O milles Phone # Address Last Name. Ro 805347302 SF (4 94/34 Signature Address 723 29th Avenue Name. Nich M. Gallejor Last Phone # (405) Sun Francisco (a. 94/21 Signature 387-1379 Phone # 239-6696 Address Last Name. N SA. Josehi' 350 errett Phone # 237.66% Last Address 350 DAMARA 350 dereversity Phone # 239-4696 Last Address Mann man 21

repenched Last Name. Address Phone # 350 Universety Signature Last white how Address 35D University St Name Phone # whit Signature 6025868407 JEAN Name. SRUCE Address **Phone #** 11 11 11 Signature Name. Chris Last Christensen/Address Phone # 11 11 n Signature Christena Name. Last Address Phone # n 11 11 Signature þ Name. Last Address 11 Phone # 11 Deile Signature anne M. Address 1976 ZIST AV Phone # Name. Guadahupe Last 415 5. F. CA 34116 678-9257 Signature 🖇 Name. Address Last 374-Phone # Signature 3473-20th St. SF. Almendones 415-6756 Name. Addres Last Phone # Signature Name. Te CAM bildg Phone # (4 15) Address 438 586-8230 SF. (A 94134 Signature Name. Last Address Phone # Signature Chama 5 NI Calord St 14 X15-337-2650 Address Name. Phone # 453372650 Signature 501 ON ford St Address Name. Phone # Last orman Signature / TORTER 435 UXFORD ST. 415-586-0830 Name. Last Address Phone # PORTER Signature /-NGELA 415-586-0830 435 OXFORD ST. Name. Last Address Phone # Signature Last Yey Name. Tina Address Phone # Signature 535 difford St 415 35 - 0631 2 (415) Phone # Name Last Address FURD Signature Name. Address Last **Phone #**

Cesident la FakifiTy

(

3

Address S83 OXFORD ST Phone # 337.934 Name. BROCK Last WILLIAMSON Signature m Address 597 OYCORA ST SAN FRANCISIO Phone # 415 3333187 Last GEORGEP Name. BASLEY Signature Address 682 Cambridge Last Ng Phone # 415 Name. 333-549K Signature SE Address 032 (ambrida Last PHZ Phone # 4 Name. Signature 628 Cambridge Phone # 415 860 Name. Last Address Lewis CA 94134 Signature SF 5993 Last DeBruin 31 Name. Denise Address Phone # 337: Nian 1450 Wayland Signature VigiL 415. Name. Mark Talcani Last Palcanis Address 1433 Wayland **Phone #** Signature marke Pali 378-9448 Name Francis Last meding Address 1433 Wayland **Phone #** 702-1055 Signature Last ORTEN Name. Address 469 Yale St Phone # Signature 584-6567 don Last MAFFEI Address 968 YALE ST Name. ALAN **Phone**# Signature 469-7331 Address 526 Cumbridge Phone # 587-586 Name. Last Lay Signature U Address 1820 Liwkin St PUN Phone # 376 1876 Ellen Last Name. Signature Last Emanuel Address 438 (ambn by St Phone # 415 Name. Peppia Signature Alemance SECA PHISY 939-7670 Last HARPER Name. VALERI Address Phone # 640 SWCENT ST SFCA 415-333-8145 Signature 1/alun NEila Last Waters Name. Address 73 Monsfield St Phone # Signature And Waters SF. C.1 94112 6503023836 Name. DANIEL HARPER Address 640 Sweeny St Phone $\# 4/\overline{5}$ Signature (5.F. (A 94)34 333-8145 Name. Miko Stinct Last Floorin to pul, Address 226 Goodfing of Phone # 468-2726 Signature HALLS Name. Last Address Phone # 2 4

Signature Ka 953 Daight St. 415-572-9515 un Dern Last Name. Address Phone # Signature Name. Last Address Phone # Last Tecrell Address 953 Dwghb-St Phone #5/0.303.67317 Name. Signature Address 690 Universityst Phone # 337-7367 Last Chiluin Name. Helena Signature Helenr Last San clovgot Name. Michael **Address** 693 University Phone #337-736 Signature . Su down Name. Last Address **Phone #** Signature Dree Address ghy Dw want St Phone # Name. Jornes Last xel mes () Signature ran Seex Francis EU CA 94134 334-4279 Name. Last Address 692 Coppy Phone # 415-812-21 Signature Phone # 415-\$ 81.74 Name. Address Last Signature Brothig A. Celis Dwight st 967 LU is PAR Last Name. Address **Phone #** 51 415 233:53.6 Signature Name Cristian Canada Last Can ada Address **Phone #** 830 Dwight st Signature Cristian 415-595-4921 Name. JI Whills Address 547 DW: At StPhone #445 Last / A94124 Signature 3330124 HTDWight Last LUCG Name Joniel Address X Phone # ST. SF.9434 415330124 Signature onil ucas Name. EStelly Address Phone # Last JOHNSID 1335 Friggeale Aue 415 375-2976 Signature phaso Address 187 Princeton & Phone # (415) 585-255 Last Name. Jeni Signature 5. F. CA94134 Name. Last Address Phone #

(5

Signature 508 Larlin #20% Last))lun Address Name. Signature Name. Address Phone # Signature 447-0653 1350 Name. Address Last Phone # Signature (4CS) 933-9466 omtool2 546 29th. Name. Address Last Phone # 41.5-Signature 186 Merced Que. 081-65)an Name. Address 2452 19 and NO Phone # **MLast** 11 Signature (626) 318-1580 San Francisco, CA RIVNO anca Last Name. Address **Phone #** Signature Address 398 HAIGHT ST APT3 P Name. Last Phone # Signature San Froncisco 94/02 (413)690015. Name. Angelitas ere - Last Address Phone # Signature (4) 2451 BRYANT St. SF. 415-282-7535 Address 1542-47+6 AUE. Phone # 415/407 AH Last deas THO Name. S.F. CA .94122 Signature HAST 1020 Address / 321 - 17# Ave Name. Mary Hans Last HAnson Phone # 4/5 SF 94124 Signature 681-1412 Name. Kos 1917 Oakdale Hue Phone # 510.754 4951 Last Address Signature Name. Rover Guerks Last GUES Address 815 Alvarado St A SF CA 94114 Phone # 45 -203 · 6/0 / Signature // 3685 17 st #16 Phone # 415-MitchellLast Are Name. Address Sm Francisco CA 94114 828 8341 Signature an notity Name. Address Last **Phone #**(415) Signatury 224-Anhesi, ST SF & 54134 452-8047 Name. Last Address **Phone #** Signature Name. Last Address **Phone #**

6

THIS PETITION IS TO PRESERVE THE UNIVERSITY MOUND LADIES HOME BUILDING.

LOCATED 350 UNIVERSITY STREET SAN FRANCISCO CA, 94134

Amenities built in the 1930s; this historic, stately building is located near the beautiful McLaren Park. It is a historic home for seniors in San Francisco's Portola District, was founded in 1884 with a \$100,000 bequest from James Lick, also the benefactor of the lik Observatory. Today it is a74-bed non-profit community providing assisted living, palliative care, and hospice care for both women and men of modest means. This building was designed by San Francisco architect Martin J. Rist, it features a Georgian Revival exterior and an interior that evokes the Spanish Colonial style especially in the common areas such as the front parlor, chapel, and dining room. This is one of the best-kept secrets in San Francisco. University Mound Ladies Home is affordable assisted living facility. To preserve this building please sign.

Petition Organizer

. . . .

Name .	Belles	Last Yelda	Address.426 Cambridge Street	Phone # 239-1433
Signatu	ire Briv	nell, Ramour	236 Hugo St. SF 9	4122
Name. Signati	5	Last	Address	Phone #
Name. Signatu	ire Tora	Last	579 23rd AVE SF 9 Address SIF 833 Dartmorth St 94	
Name. Signatu	re Chin tun	Last	Address SF SANTA MARINA ST. 94110	
Name	ure Eileen (Last	Address OC Cort land	Phone #970 334
Name Signati	ureFram Henry	basserg.	Address SE 94110	415 Phone # 648-289
Name. Signatu		Last VASQUEZ, Rasatien	Address 4186ate ST SF	Phone # = Cor 94110
Name. Signatu	ire Anthom	Last Blann	Address 3800 Folson St.	Phone # #15-827-85
Name. Signatu	re Carol	Last Siddle	Address 738 Andover St. SF	Phone #
Name.	ca V I V	Last	Address	Phone #

THIS PETITION IS TO PRESERVE THE UNIVERSITY MOUND LADIES HOME BUILDING.

LOCATED 350 UNIVERSITY STREET SAN FRANCISCO CA, 94134

Amenities built in the 1930s; this historic, stately building is located near the beautiful McLaren Park. It is a historic home for seniors in San Francisco's Portola District, was founded in 1884 with a \$100,000 bequest from James Lick, also the benefactor of the lik Observatory. Today it is a74-bed non-profit community providing assisted living, palliative care, and hospice care for both women and men of modest means. This building was designed by San Francisco architect Martin J. Rist, it features a Georgian Revival exterior and an interior that evokes the Spanish Colonial style especially in the common areas such as the front parlor, chapel, and dining room. This is one of the best-kept secrets in San Francisco. University Mound Ladies Home is affordable assisted living facility. To preserve this building please sign.

Petition Organizer

Name. Belles	Last	Yelda	Address.426 Cambridge Street	Phone # 239-1433
Signature RiA	1.0	Roselli	346 Bingt	
Name. JoHN Signature	Last	JoHNS	346 Promato Address WIVERSITY ST.	Phone # 944
Name. CHRISTINA	ELast	JOHNS	Address UNIVERSITY ST	239-5944
Signature Chilston	or E	John	436 @ UniversiTI	Phone #
Name. Signature Guiliana		Pinochi'	Address 1121 Bacon St	239-7664 Phone#
Name Signature Alberto	Last	Penochi	Address 1121 Bacon	239-7664 Phone #
Name Signature Suspan	Last	Pucci	Address (80 Princeron	239-5914 Phone #
Name. Signature GIAMPIER	Last	Pucci	Address 480 MINCEUN ST.S.F	Phone #
Name. Signature KOHNH	Last	Bozzetto	Address	Phone # 239-7098
Name. Signature // n/ber 10	Last	Bozzello	Address	Phone # 239-7098
Name.	Last		Address	Phone #

01

S.F. 9484 Phone # Name. Last Address Signature 400 University ST., E= 586-8379 Liu Last Name. Address Phone # Signature Mar 400 University Wen St 94134 586-8379 Last Address Name. Phone # Signature Sung Quan Wen 400 University ST. 656 586-8319 Address 23/ PRINCETON ST Last Stellini Name Affhur . Phone # Signature 415. 586.2918 Name. Ricky Address Phone # Last Chen 1127 Burrows st Signature 415-812-2987 YELDA Name. LIND Last Address Phone # Signature 426 Cam 415-239-1433 Name. Last Phone # Address Signature eichner 818 585-6918 4/02 Princeton Address /140 RAC Name. Phone # Last 033L ours Signature ^o Name. Last Address Phone # AUdlas Signature Name. Last Address Phone # AVALOS Signature 445 PRINCETON 587-9533 DNINA Name. Last Address Phone # 400 Rhyra 4 Signature mura 415 hog 02+ Name GEMIGNAN'Last Address Phone # Signature 1232 BACONST 415-239-698 Address Name. Phone # 'sall' Signature Handle 234 Ottawa ave sh-595 193 Name. Address Last Phone # 415 - 2846 4 94/34 Signature 1115 BURROWS On) Name. + Distin Novo Last NOVO Address Phone # 400 266 University Signature 23966 Name. Last Address **Phone #**

THIS PETITION IS TO PRESERVE THE UNIVERSITY MOUND LADIES HOME **BUILDING.**

LOCATED 350 UNIVERSITY STREET SAN FRANCISCO CA, 94134

11

Amenities built in the 1930s; this historic, stately building is located near the beautiful McLaren Park. It is a historic home for seniors in San Francisco's Portola District, was founded in 1884 with a \$100,000 bequest from James Lick, also the benefactor of the lik Observatory. Today it is a74-bed non-profit community providing assisted living, palliative care, and hospice care for both women and men of modest means. This building was designed by San Francisco architect Martin J. Rist, it features a Georgian Revival exterior and an interior that evokes the Spanish Colonial style especially in the common areas such as the front parlor, chapel, and dining room. This is one of the best-kept secrets in San Francisco. University Mound Ladies Home is affordable assisted living facility. To preserve this building please sign.

Petition Organizer

Ð

Name. Belles	Last Yelda	Address 426 Cambridge Street	Phone # 239-1433
Signature			
Name. William Signature William	Last Borghello Borghello	Address 57 Princeton St.	Phone # 239-6656
Name. Thomas Signature Shemes	Last Castro Caster	Address 468 Priveton SP	684-7398 Phone#
Name. Joseph Signature	Last Maffei	Address 1134 Wayland	Phone # 494-5293
Name Chris Signature Chris	Last Siebert Grown	Address 468 Privation St	914-521-7760 Phone #
Name Signature Reter R Su	Jast PETERR Spectert	Address 468 Reviceron ST	Phone # 415 239 6790
Name. Erik Signature Rif f. er	Last Persad	Address	Phone #
Name. CARMEN Signature Darmen	Last ACIOS Rgina	1224 Mayland Address 474 PRINCETON St	Phone # ⁴⁶ -
Name. Ed Signature El Ban	Last BARSI	Address 1150 Wayland ST	Phone # 415 239-6829
Name. Sorothy Barsi	Last Bassi	Address /150 Wayland St	Phone #415 \$39-6822
			(90) 10

Address 1122 WAYLAND ST Phone # 572-2423 TONY Name. Last HERNONDER Signature Address #//22 WAYLAND ST Phone # 239 6249 Name. KELLY Last MORENO Name. Last Address Phone # Morend Signature Address 445 Princeton Name. Victorio-HValos Phone # 687-9532 Last Signature Last Fyles Roberts Name. Address 414 Princeton ST Phone # 286-1049 Signature Robert tyles Address 469 Princetonhone # 333-029 Last Peneyra Name. Signature Olimpia Last Variallo Address 486 Princeton Phone # 333-595 Name. Victoria Signature Victoria 48 Vassallo Address 469 PRINCETON Sphone # 333-0294 CIPRIAND Last PENLYRA Name. Signature MAKGARFTLast Name. Address 12 Scotia Ave Phone # 467-0426 Signature nargaret Last Name. Address Phone # Signature SUMPLET 1331 Feton st 415-337-1214 MISSOT Address 3 Name. Phone # 415 334 52 Last Signature // V M Address Name. Last Phone # 415 334 Signature and Last CORPUZ Name. GR Address Phone # Signature 1401 FELTOM ST. S.F. CA. 415-587669 Phone # 239-9125 Dast 3 Address Name. W Signature 🏈 1220 Bacon an Phone # 586-7917 Name. Last Address 4,50ABBR1061 Signature Address Name. Last **Phone**#

Signature

Name. Address 94579 Phone # 1491 VIDING DR SL 510 282.5068 Freddie, Rick Signature Address Hill VINIng T Name. (PAPACIA Name. Address Last Signature Borok Address 5 Eugenia Ave Last Phone # 415 Name. 5F 94110 \$47-6308 Signature Tempel Address 230 El Camito del Mau Phone # Name. ast Signature SF 94121 Address 324 Fetton Alderote Juan Name. Last Phone # Signature 415-468-54-19 Juanfiles Address 1324 Felton St. Phone # 4/123947. Last CAV Name. Signature Name. Address Phone # Last 12/8 Felton St Signature UT5298.0119 Last Martin Name. Michau) Address Phone # Signature 7.18 Yah ST 415 585-8824 Aldereta Socorro Address 326 Felton St Name. Last Phone # 469-3495 Signature Lono IMAN Address 236 VALEST. Phone # 233-8065 Last Name. Signature Address 211 VALL St. Name. Turn Kiln Last Phone # LP50-303-3147 Signature umbe SAN FRANCISCO -41 Last Kun Address 292 Amherst St Name. Rub Phone # 415-728-8892 SF, CA, 94134 Signature 2 Address Anth and gy134 Name. Last, Phone # 415-971-0385 Signature 194 6 upusting Address Name. Last Phone # KNINCLATON JF Signature 415-775.8719 big-bic Name. ' Last Address **Phone #** 12

Address 300 07 DW & Ft Phone # 415 6 52051 Name. ALicie Salas Last Salas Signature alimini Last LAFERRERA Name. SANDRA Address Z26 PRINCETON St Phone # SF CA. 94134 Signature 415-5850142 formera Name. Address Last Phone # ALQUI 1133 DURPANS ST Signature RATE 408-505-94.99 RANK Name.~ Last Address Phone # 45 333 5066 1139 Burrows Signature TI. A Name. Last (Address Phone # Macchia 1139 Burrows Signature 415 333-5036 Last BRUCA FRONTH Address 1134 BURDAUSS Phone #415) 349-8178 Name. (10 VANHI Signature envan K 0 Last BRUAFRONTH Address 1134 BURROWS STPhone #45)349-8178 VANDA Name. Signature - Belling Vanla Address 1164 BUTTOWS St Phone # (415) Name. Last\ 305-8376 S.F. CA 94134 Signature LARA Name. DAUID Last Address Phone # 415 Signature David 1146 BURROWS ST. Lan 469-9351 a Ann Last VARA Address 1146 Burraus St. Name. Phone # Signature 415-469-9351 blim KANA Last (veto- VAMNUCCUAddress 1147 BUTTOWT St Phone #4/15-231-584 Name. Adman Signature Address 1147 Burrows St Phone #415-239 annucch Name. Steven Last Signature 5944 Address 1/74 BURKOWSPhone #415-239 Last Name. Signature Address 117 + Burgows & Phone #239 Name. Signature 5325 Veretz Address 1178 Burrows Phone # 2-39-B Name. Last 6018 Signature Address 1178 Bugerous Phone #239-YERC2 Last Name. Signatury 6015 SCERRI Address N75BURROW Phone # 334486 Last Name. Signature 7 (1) 94/34 Address 1175 Burrows Phone # 334-4826 Name. Scern Last 8 9 94B4

ALINA L. BELTRAMI Name. Address Phone # Signature alina L. Beltrame 1190 BURROWS ST 239-4040 Name. Sam Hontales Last Hortales Address **Phone #** Signature & Huth 584-0661 1/25 Burrows St. Last Hontalas Name. Rit Address Phone # 1175 Burrows St. Signature 5840661 Name. Sother Hontal Last Houtales Address / 18 Burrows St. Phone # Signature 239-738 Name. JOSE O. SALAZAR Last Address Phone # Signature Jose O. Jala Bar 1199 BURREWS ST 715,8009 Last SALAT. AR Name MARIA Address Phone # Signature maria Saloras 1199 BURROWS. 715.8109 TAI K Last WU Phone # Name. Address Signature 281 Amperst St 415-585-2429 LPP Name. even Last Address Phone # Amherst St. Signature 265 415-585-0804 JOO tomen Chenny Name. Last Lee Address Phone # 265 Amherst St 415-535-0804 Signature Address & 66 am herst St Phone # 415-337-03. Name. FORMIN KingsLast Signature Formin, Nerm Address 206 AnHERST ST Phone # 415-239-0 LBERT Name. Signature Address 1530 BURROWS Phone # 334-1677 Last Name. Signature Name. Last Address **Phone #** Signature Name. Last Address **Phone #** Signature Name. Last Address Phone # Signature Name. Last Address Phone #

THIS PETITION IS TO PRESERVE THE UNIVERSITY MOUND LADIES HOME BUILDING.

LOCATED 350 UNIVERSITY STREET SAN FRANCISCO CA, 94134

Amenities built in the 1930s; this historic, stately building is located near the beautiful McLaren Park. It is a historic home for seniors in San Francisco's Portola District, was founded in 1884 with a \$100,000 bequest from James Lick, also the benefactor of the lik Observatory. Today it is a74-bed non-profit community providing assisted living, palliative care, and hospice care for both women and men of modest means. This building was designed by San Francisco architect Martin J. Rist, it features a Georgian Revival exterior and an interior that evokes the Spanish Colonial style especially in the common areas such as the front parlor, chapel, and dining room. This is one of the best-kept secrets in San Francisco. University Mound Ladies Home is affordable assisted lining facility. To preserve this building please sign.

Petition Organizer

Name . Belles	Last Yelda	Phone #415-239-1433 Address.426 Cambridge Street SF. CA 94134
Name. FRANCES	Last CAIRNS	Address 1467 Silver Are 415468 Address 1467 Silver Are Phone # 8636
Name. GRACE	Last Ferniandez	Address 1467 S: (ver Ave #15-468-8636
Name. Wanda	Last Crady	Address 130 Hamilton 415-468-223
Name. alina	Last Beltrami	Address /190 Burrows Sh. 239-
Name. Juli	Last Conched	Address 447- Succe Se 9. 765-057
Name. Qrie	Last Byus dearch	
Name. Mary	Last Such by los	Address 2717 Boula Repunt 592-6966
Name. Frederic	Last Muttorie	Address 508 Margar 12 cu 94122
Name. Jarah	Last Manucch	
Name. SIL	Last (MTO	Address 223 PRIMOTON 94/34
Name. Bachara	Last Gotelle.	Address 125 Sonja RJ. 94080
Name. Tory	Last SAMMUT	Address 210 HAMICTONST. 96134
Name. Jue	Last Gatt	Address 32/ Pernet 239-5216
Name. Albert	Last Sindora	Address, 693 University street SF. CA. 94134
Name. Barbara	Last Our	Address 693 UNIVERSITY Street 54. CA. 94/34 Coll (45) 722-6270 4. 337-7367 Address 953 Dwig HT 57. 945-6500
Name.	Last	Address
Name.	Last	Address
Name.	Last	Address

Last allela Name. Therear Address 1019 Woolvey St. Name. Last Address inelli 215 Firard St. Cadelago 268 Somercet Name. Last Address 51 Name. Last (Address 451 PRINEETON 8F Last (Address Name. Diode K51 PHINEFTONI ST Aincelon Name. Mora Last Address 450 Name. Last Address 366 Hanad St ymal Address Name. Last 366 Harard St Name. Last Address the ff. 3 Woolsey 1 Last m St.S Address Burreyes Name. 529 asang Woolsey Florence Last SP Name. alyon Address 317 Name. Address Last 1-7. 88 Destmarth Name. Last Address 1.7 798 Taples Last Address Name. elen 1210 Name. Last Address lito esmor Name. Last Address Name. Last Address

N	lame. Jolt	Last CATALPU	Address 58 COLBYST
N	ame. Ada	Last DePAOLI	Address 314 FELTONI ST
N	lame. Louis	Last TOSTI	Address 1211 SILVER AUE
N	ame. Grace	Last Gagliardo	Address 3444 San Bruno AVL, SF
N	Iame. Theres a, S.	Last Spitey	Address J3 & goettingen St. S.F.
	ame. Helen	Last Zahra	Address 400 Gaettingen St. S.F.
N	ame. Carmen	Last Gring	Address 534 Holyoke St. Sr.
N	lame. John	Last Grina	Address 534 Holypke St. SF.
N	ame. Ruby	Last Kwong	Address 242 Amherst St.
N	lame.	Last	Address
N	lame.	Last	Address
N	lame.	Last	Address
N	lame.	Last	Address
N	lame.	Last	Address
N	lame.	Last	Address
N	lame.	Last	Address
N	lame.	Last	Address
N	lame.	Last	Address
N	lame.	Last	Address
N	łame.	Last	Address
N	lame.	Last	Address
N	Tame.	Last	Address
N	lame.	Last	Address
N	lame.	Last	Address
N	lame.	Last	Address
N	Name.	Last	Address
N	ame.	Last	Address

1. A. A.



Name. Siro	Last Colombare	Address 385 Guard St.
Name. adrian	Last Colombora	Address 385 Quart St.
Name. Desing	Last Pouros	
Name. Joan	Last assarts	Address 337 Princeton SA SF
Name Bob	Last Gamba	
Name Ray Catelly	•	Address 518 Yale ST SF- Address 220 Somerat 28
Name. Marido	Last DALLECTON	
Name. Julie	Last Valledon	Address 1600 Silliman St
Name. Nora	Last Borghello	Address 356 Halyake St
Name.	Last	Address

1 1 A 1 1 A

Name. Andrew Signature Adu V. M	Last Hontalas	Address 195 Bullows Street San Francisco, CA 941	
Name. PEGGY ROBINET Signature	FLast uelle	Address 174 Scotin AVE SIF.	
Name. ABIGALL Signature Wigael	Last JOHNSTON	Address 1342 FLORIDAST. SE, CA 94110	Phone # 415 - 826-0870
Name. BETTY Paresta Signature Betty Parsha	Last PARSHALL	Address 386 WILDE AVE. 58 94134	Phone # 415 - 467 - 7423
Name. JOAN Signature	Last FANNING	Address 69 ALDERST SECA94134	Phone # 415
Name. Barbara Signature	Last Lane	Address 601 Mississipp SF, (A94/07	and the second se
Name. Ken Signature	Last Vuong	Address 1179 Burrowst Stich 94134	Phone # 915 867-5494
Name. Miriam Signature Zostorns	Last Zaranis	Address 249 Amberst St.	Phone # 415 552 5007
Name. Signature	Last	Address	Phone #
Name. Signature	Last	Address	Phone #
Name. Signature	Last	Address	Phone #
Name. Signature	Last	Address	Phone #
Name. Signature	Last	Address	Phone #
Name. Signature	Last	Address	Phone #
Name. Signature	Last	Address	Phone #
Name.	Last	Address	Phone #

Member, Board of Supervisors District 9



City and County of San Francisco

August 20, 2014

DAVID CAMPOS

The Historic Preservation Commission San Francisco Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

Landmark Status for the University Mound Ladies Home, 350 University Street, San Francisco Re:

Dear Commissioners:

I am writing to express my strong support for efforts lead by the community to designate the University Mound Ladies Home at 350 University Street as a San Francisco Landmark.

In 1884, the University Mound Ladies Home was established through an endowment established by James Lick to provide care for women of modest means. Lick, one of San Francisco's early benefactors, recognized the importance of providing care to our most vulnearable elders. This vision was continued by the Newhall family, whose members served on the University Mound Ladies Home Board for several generations.

In recent years, San Francisco has rallied to save this beloved institution. I have spent significant time with the residents, their families and those providing care at the facility. During this time, I have been charmed by the facility - and have become committed to its legacy.

Although, a transition has been made to AgeSong for ownership and operations of the facility, I am continuing my advocacy to ensure that the legacy of University Mound Ladies Home as an institution for persons of 'modest means' will continue for future generations.

I believe efforts to pursue the building's eligibility for Landmark status will aid efforts to preserve not only the physical building, but also the legacy it embodies. Accordingly, I urge the Historic Preservation Commission to support the University Mound Ladies Home in obtaining a landmark status.

Thank you for your consideration of this important institution.

Sincerely.

David Campos

Parcel Map



SUBJECT PROPERTY



Zoning Map





Aerial Photo



SUBJECT PROPERTY



Sanborn Map*



*The Sanborn Maps in San Francisco have not been updated since 1998, and this map may not accurately reflect existing conditions.



Site Photo

