

SAN FRANCISCO HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION



Draft – Meeting Minutes

Commission Chambers, Room 400
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Wednesday, June 15, 2016

11:30 a.m.

Architectural Review Committee Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Pearlman, Hasz, Hyland

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY COMMISSIONER PEARLMAN AT 11:30 AM

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Rich Sucre, Tim Frye - Preservation Officer, and Jonas P. Ionin – Commission Secretary

SPEAKER KEY:

- + indicates a speaker in support of an item;
- indicates a speaker in opposition to an item; and
- = indicates a neutral speaker or a speaker who did not indicate support or opposition.

1. [2014.1434COAENX](#) (R. SUCRE: (415) 575-9108)
950 TENNESSEE STREET – located on the west side of Tennessee Street between 20th and 22nd Streets, Assessor's Block 4107, Lot 001B (District 10) - **Request for Review and Comment** by the Architectural Review Committee regarding the proposal to demolish the existing two-story, non-contributing industrial building, and construct a new four-story-with-basement, residential building (approximately 98,662 sq ft) with 108 dwelling units and 94 off-street parking spaces. Currently, the project is undergoing environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The project site is located within the Dogpatch Landmark District, which is designated in Appendix L of Article 10 of the San Francisco Planning Code, and is also located in the UMU (Urban Mixed-Use) Zoning District and a 40-X Height and Bulk District.

Preliminary Recommendation: Review and Comment

SPEAKERS: = Rich Sucre – Staff presentation
+ (M) Speaker – Design presentation
+ Steve Vettel – Alley discussion

ACTION: Reviewed and Commented

Compatibility of New Construction with Dogpatch Landmark District

The ARC finds that the new construction is largely compatible with the Dogpatch Landmark District with the incorporation of the modifications, as detailed below.

Recommendations on Overall Form & Continuity, Scale & Proportion

The ARC finds the proposed form, massing and proportion, as proposed to be consistent and compatible with the surrounding landmark district. The overall project is organized with two distinct massings and two defined architectural styles, which harken to the district's dominant residential and industrial characteristics. Against the northern edge of the mid-block alley, one of the masses is more "industrial" in character with a sawtooth roof, an upper-story setback along the street edge (on both Minnesota and Tennessee Streets), pre-weathered matte metal panels, and a powder-coated aluminum window system. The other mass is more residential or "rowhouse" in character, and is organized into 25-ft modules defined by a strong vertical fin with off-white and charcoal composite panels.

The ARC disagreed with Department staff recommendation, and does not recommend an additional massing step-down along Tennessee Street. The ARC found the massing, as proposed, to be compatible with the surrounding district.

The ARC does request additional diagrams and documentation to illustrate the relationship between the Project and the surrounding landmark district. Specifically, the diagrams should illustrate the district's relationship to the "rowhouse" portion and the "industrial" portion of the Project.

Recommendations on Fenestration

The ARC concurs with the staff recommendation regarding the fenestration on the "industrial" portion of the Project, since the fenestration successfully draws from the district's typical industrial pattern, albeit at a much larger-scale. The project's fenestration is characterized by a powder-coated aluminum window system. Within the "industrial" portion of the project, the fenestration is designed in a large-scale industrial sash pattern.

The ARC finds the width and scale of the proposed bay windows within the "rowhouse" portion of the Project is over-scaled and is not compatible with the district's dominant bay window typology. Within the "rowhouse" portion of the project, the fenestration is large in scale with few mullions. The ARC did not express a preference for either Option 1 or Option 2, as presented by the Project Sponsor. However, the ARC recognized that the

proposed fenestration needs to express more verticality to better relate to the typical window typology found within the surrounding district.

Recommendations for Materials

The ARC finds the proposed lighter colored (off-white composite) panels on the “rowhouse” portion of the Project to be compatible with the lighter-colored, wood siding found in the surrounding district. The project proposes a material palette consisting of a pre-weather matte metal panel for the “industrial” portion and off-white and charcoal composite panels for the “rowhouse” portion.

Recommendations for Details

The ARC finds the detailing evident on the “industrial” portion of the Project to be compatible with the district’s character-defining features. Currently, on the “industrial” portion, the project features a sawtooth roof and a series of projecting fins on the fourth floor, as well as a glass handrail at the roofline of the setback. On the “rowhouse” portion, the projecting vertical fins assist in defining a roofline.

The ARC did not express a strong preference for or against the proposed glass handrails; however, the ARC did recommend study of an alternative handrail material, which may be more compatible with the surrounding landmark district given the past determinations by the HPC.

The ARC acknowledged a conflict with the proposed vertical fins (on the upper story of the “industrial” portion of the Project) relative to their compatibility with the surrounding landmark district. The ARC agreed that additional texture should be accommodated on the upper story, and recognizes that the proposed fins could be refined to better fit within the surrounding district. The ARC recognized the need for refinement of the fin detail. The ARC recommends study of a range of options, including: removal of the fins; reducing the depth of the fins; bring the frame element on the lower-stories up to the upper story; allowing for an expression of the sawtooth roof; and, exploration of a trellis feature for greater compatibility.

The ARC acknowledged the proposed saw-tooth roof as a strong characteristic that relates to the surrounding landmark district.

AYES: Pearlman, Hyland, Hasz
LETTER: 0062

2. [2012.1410AX](#) (R. SUCRE: (415) 575-9108)
77-85 FEDERAL STREET – located on the east side of Federal Street at 2nd Street, Assessor’s Block 3774, Lot 044 (District 6) - **Request for Review and Comment** by the Architectural Review Committee regarding the proposal to demolish the existing two-story, non-contributing industrial building, and construct a new five-story-with-basement, commercial building (approximately 72,070 sq ft) with 22,266 square feet of retail space (fitness center/gym) and 49,832 square feet of office use. Currently, the project is undergoing environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The project site is located within the South End Landmark District, which is designated in Appendix I of Article 10 of the San Francisco Planning Code, and is also located in the MUO (Mixed Use Office) Zoning District and a 65-X Height and Bulk District.

Preliminary Recommendation: Review and Comment

SPEAKERS: = Rich Sucre – Staff presentation
+ (M) Speaker – Design presentation

ACTION: Reviewed and Commented

Compatibility of New Construction with South End Landmark District

The ARC finds that the new construction is largely compatible with the South End Landmark District with the incorporation of the modifications as detailed below.

Recommendations on Overall Form & Continuity, Scale & Proportion

The ARC concurs with the staff determination that the proposed form, scale and proportion are consistent and compatible with the surrounding landmark district. The proposed project is five stories tall, large in bulk with minimal setbacks, and provides for an appropriate massing and scale relative to the adjacent context and larger landmark district. Along De Boom Street, the project is three-story tall along the street frontage with a setback incorporated for the upper two floors. This massing allows for a strong relationship to the two adjacent buildings, which are two stories in scale. Along Federal Street, the project is two stories tall along the street frontage with a setback incorporated at the third floor and fourth/fifth floor levels. This massing is driven by Planning Code requirements. The ARC finds that a taller building at the street frontage would be appropriate given the district's context and massing; however, Planning Code requirements only allow for the two-story massing at the street face along Federal Street. This massing along Federal Street allows for an appropriate relationship to the neighboring three-story building.

The ARC concurs with the staff recommendation regarding the material expression on the side (secondary) facades. Given the visibility of this façade, the Project should incorporate the primary façade materials along the entire length of the visible side facades. Currently, the brick façade and metal siding terminate partway along the side elevations, and the side elevations express a simpler material palette (stucco or exposed concrete). To allow for a reading of building in the round, as occurs within other buildings in the landmark district, the ARC recommends continuing the primary façade material along the entire length of the visible side facades.

Concurrence on Fenestration

The ARC concurs with the staff recommendation and finds the proposed fenestration to be compatible with the surrounding landmark district. On the three lower floors, the project incorporates an appropriate proportion of deeply recessed industrial sash windows in a regular pattern on both street facades. On the upper floors, the project incorporates a butt-glazed window system with no visible frames or sashes.

If the project uses a brick material palette, the ARC recommended a refinement to the proposed fenestration to incorporate a projecting header, sill or frame to better define the exterior fenestration.

Recommendations for Materials, Color & Texture

The ARC concurs with the staff recommendation, and does not find the proposed metal panels to be compatible with the surrounding landmark district. Currently, the Project includes patterned metal panel across the entire length of the façade on the fourth and fifth floors. Although contemporary, the metal siding is too flat with no texture or visual depth. The Project Sponsor will need to select an alternate exterior material.

The ARC finds the proposed buff-colored brick to be compatible with the surrounding landmark district. Although red brick is a dominant material in the landmark district, the immediate area does not possess many examples of red brick. The project proposes a material palette consisting of a smooth-face, beige brick (first through third floors). The beige brick would be laid in a common bond pattern and would feature soldier course accents at the roofline. The ARC recommended that any proposed exterior brick should have a strong texture and color variation.

The ARC is open to an alternate exterior material palette. The Project Sponsor expressed a desire to eliminate the brick material on the exterior and redesign the façade in concrete or cement plaster. If one of these new materials is used on the exterior, the Project Sponsor should pay special attention to the texture and color of the concrete and/or cement plaster.

Recommendations for Details

The ARC concurs with the staff recommendation and does not find the proposed corten steel base along De Boom Street to be compatible with the district's characteristics. This material seems incongruous with the surrounding district. The Project Sponsor should consider an articulated brick base or colored concrete, which are common features found among the district's contributors. The Project Sponsor will need to select an alternate exterior material for this element.

The ARC concurs with the staff recommendation regarding the addition of a secondary roofline/cap along Federal Street. Given the prevalence of the district's roofline termination, the ARC finds that additional articulation is warranted in this location, since a roofline termination is commonly found along the street facade. The Project Sponsor will need to redesign this façade to add a roofline element or cap.

The ARC has no issues with the current configuration of the entryway along De Boom Street. To improve the entryway, the ARC recommends continued dialogue with Department staff to refine the handrails and landscaping.

AYES: Pearlman, Hyland, Hasz
LETTER: 0063

ADJOURNMENT – 12:40 PM