

SAN FRANCISCO HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

CORRECTED - Meeting Minutes

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

Wednesday, March 15, 2017

11:30 a.m.

Architectural Review Committee Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Hyland, Hasz, Pearlman

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY COMMISSIONER HYLAND AT 11:32 AM

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Jeff Joslin – Director of Current Planning, Marcelle Boudreaux, Shelley Caltagirone, Tim Frye – Historic Preservation Officer, Jonas 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. [2016-007850COA](#) (M. BOUDREAUX: (415) 575-9140)
88 BROADWAY – block bounded by Broadway, Vallejo, Davis and Front Streets; Lots 007 and 008 in Assessor's Block 0140 (District 3) – **Review and Comment** before the Architectural Review Committee on the proposal for new construction of two buildings ranging from four to six stories, with an open midblock passage between Broadway and Vallejo Streets, within the Northeast Waterfront Landmark District. One building, with frontages on Vallejo, Front and Broadway Streets, is proposed for Family Affordable Housing (130 dwelling units; 145,923 gross square feet), and the other, fronting Davis Street, is proposed for Senior Affordable Housing (54 dwelling units; 44,024 gross square feet). The project site is within a C-2 (Community Business) Zoning District, the Waterfront

Special Use District No. 2, and 65-X Height and Bulk Districts. The project sponsor is seeking Conditional Use Authorization for a Planned Unit Development.

Preliminary Recommendation: Review and Comment

SPEAKER: = Marcelle Boudreaux – Staff report
+ Speaker – Project presentation
+ Speaker – Design presentation
= Stan Hayes – Design and massing
+ Carol Harlett – Support
+ Bill Hannan – Support
+ Lee Robins – Design
= Jim Haas – Historical facts
+ Bruno Karter – Support

ACTION: Reviewed and Commented

~~Overall, the ARC felt that neither the full preservation alternative nor the partial preservation alternative were adequate for incorporation in the Draft EIR.~~

~~The ARC felt that the proposed alternatives were understating the estimated number of dwelling units that could be incorporated on the site. Additionally, the ARC felt that through more articulated design, the alternatives could increase the dwelling unit count to be closer to the proposed Project's total unit count, and could come into better conformance with Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, specifically Standard No. 9. The ARC recommended that the Sponsor to explore how the existing church could still be used by a congregation, which may entail potentially reducing the sanctuary space.~~

~~In addition, the ARC felt the proposed Project, which removed the raised entry stair and porch and incorporated only the exterior façade for the first 16 feet of the existing church building, was facadism.~~

~~The ARC recommended that the Sponsor and the Department to explore modifications to the alternatives, as follows:~~

~~Full Preservation Alternative~~

- ~~• In deference to interior character defining features, incorporate a small vertical addition with a substantial setback from public rights of way;~~
- ~~• Increase height of replacement structure at 474 O'Farrell to the maximum permitted in the height district; and~~
- ~~• Investigate utilization of the State Density Bonus, which would allow increased height and additional units at other areas of the site, with the goal to preserve the church building (individual resource).~~

~~Partial Preservation Alternative~~

- ~~• Increase height of addition at church building to the maximum permitted in the height district;~~

- ~~Reduce the size and/or relocate the interior courtyard with the goal to add more dwelling units in the area previously un-occupied by the interior courtyard space; and~~
- ~~Investigate utilization of the State Density Bonus, which would allow increased height and additional units at other areas of the site, with the goal to conserve the church building (individual resource).~~

~~The ARC members were overall supportive of the Project, of the enhanced pedestrian experience, and of the overall lightness of the design. Commissioners Pearlman and Hyland felt the Front Street elevation was incredibly successful. Commissioner Pearlman felt success of the Davis Street "brick" building stemmed from the visual structural columns that come to the ground rather than the "floating" facade on the Front Street elevation. Commissioner Hasz noted a concern about maintenance of the ground floor active uses through smaller commercial retail spaces or alternative uses, if the commercial retail at Broadway and Front is not leased as one large space.~~

~~**Recommendation 1:** In collaboration with the project team and community input, explore the option of the frame and infill building without the notch at the sixth floor of the Vallejo and Broadway Street elevations, as shown on Sheets A.13, or explore some variation to achieve conformance with the character of the District.~~

~~*In general, the ARC felt that the existing notch, setback from the midblock crossing at Broadway and Vallejo Streets, was not as successful in breaking down the massing as other moves. The ARC recommended studying two modifications at the frame and infill buildings. Commissioner Pearlman recommended a setback of five feet at the entire top floor from Broadway (and presumably Vallejo) Street was suggested. Commissioners Hyland and Hasz recommended re-orienting the notch to the Broadway and Vallejo Street elevations instead of at the mid block crossing.*~~

~~**Recommendation 2:** Study a modified fenestration pattern for the frame and infill building elevations on Front, Broadway and Vallejo Streets. At minimum, Staff recommends two approaches for ARC direction to sponsor for study and possible incorporation into the frame and infill fenestration pattern, within technical confines for building performance. One option is to shift the orientation to horizontal and increase consistency of glazing. Another option is to maintain the existing orientation while increasing the glazing from one panel to two, within the three panel system created for the project.~~

~~*The ARC discussed that the fenestration pattern at the frame and infill buildings should incorporate more regularity. Commissioner Hyland felt this regularity could be achieved within the 35% threshold for Title 24 purposes. Commissioner Pearlman felt there was too much verticality as the window system spanned a two-floor unit, and recommended more horizontal design definition. The ARC did not recommend additional glazing.*~~

Recommendation 3: To ensure the long-term integrity of the District, Department staff recommends selecting another contemporary masonry material or selecting several brick tone colors that can be varied randomly for the brick building Cembrit panel rainscreens. Alternately, ensuring that the manufacturer provides a lifetime guarantee against fading, and replacement, would assist in ensuring that the single-color materials selection would assist in maintaining the long-term integrity of the District.

Commissioners Hyland and Pearlman noted a concern about the monolithic and monochromatic appearance of the single-color panel. Commissioner Hyland noted an additional concern of longevity and UV discoloration with use of dark-colored cement panel boards. Commissioner Pearlman suggested reviewing the coursing pattern of the panels. The ARC directed Staff to review additional information on guarantees against fading and to review images of projects of like materials and color with long lifespan.

Recommendation 4: Explore an alternative design to the projecting bay window-like architectural feature and incorporate this into the frame and infill building, with the goal of maintaining the integrity of the District. The alternative design should strengthen the definition of the floors and piers, taking note of horizontal and vertical planes (pilasters, beltcourses, sills, etc) characteristic of the District's "newer buildings" pursuant to Section 7 of Appendix D, Article 10, those elements relationship to one another, and to the expression of the construction method. There are numerous examples provided by Sponsor in the submittal, as well as Staff's attachment to this Memo titled "Representative examples of contributors to the NE Waterfront Landmark District".

The ARC felt that the random placement of the projecting bay window-like architectural features diminished their power, and recommended establishing a regular pattern of placement of these features on the frame and infill building. Commissioner Pearlman suggested having the projecting elements at the corners or ends to be a reference to the heavily articulated quoins on many of the district buildings.

Recommendation 5: Strengthen the articulation at the parapet of the brick building to reference the built-up brick corbelling characteristic in the District.

The ARC recommended enhancing the cornice feature by making the material which defines the cornice thicker or by increasing the projection beyond the face of the wall. The ARC referenced the Teatro Zinzanni project and the steel channel cornice.

LETTER: 0074

2. [2014-001204CWP](#) (S. CALTAGIRONE: (415) 558-6625)
PUBLIC ART INSTALLATION AT MCALLISTER BRT STATION – **Review and Comment** of a conceptual plan for a public art installation at the proposed McAllister BRT station. Presentation by San Francisco Arts Commission staff, Justine Topfer. The Van Ness BRT

Project includes a public art component that is proposed for installation at the McAllister BRT Station. The Arts Commission's Public Art Program staff is currently working with artist Jorge Pardo on the conceptual design for the installation. The installation site is located with the Civic Center Landmark District, and the work would require approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness. Staff will present the conceptual design to the Architectural Review Committee for review and comment.

Preliminary Recommendation: Review and Comment

SPEAKER: = Shelley Caltagirone – Staff report
+ Speaker – Art installation
- Jim Haas – Inappropriate public art component

ACTION: Reviewed and Commented

1. **Location.** The Commissioners agreed that the proposed location is not appropriate for the art installation. Other locations along Van Ness Ave were suggested, included between Hayes and Grove, at the Market Street intersection as is called out in the EIS M-AE-6, or near the children's playground.
2. **Design.** The Commissioners had varying comments regarding the design, summarized below:
 - a. A playful, contrasting art piece could be a good fit in the district, but in another location.
 - b. The artist does not appear to understand the challenges or content of the district. The art piece looks like a series of crack pipes or like a bunch of people with waving arms.
 - c. The art piece should be in conversation with the district. There is no context to this piece. It could be anywhere. There is no reflection of the Beaux Arts planning or the Neo-Baroque architecture.
 - d. The art piece detracts and distracts from the district buildings.

LETTER: 0075

ADJOURNMENT – 12:53 PM

PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED MAY 3, 2017