

SAN FRANCISCO HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION



Meeting Minutes

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

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

11:30 a.m.

Architectural Review Committee Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Hyland, Pearlman, Johnck

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY COMMISSIONER PEARLMAN AT 11:48 AM

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Allison Vanderslice, Justin Greving, Alexandra Kirby, Maia Small, Tim Frye –
Preservation Officer 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.

A. COMMITTEE MATTERS

1. Committee Comments & Questions

President Pearlman:

I would just like to welcome Ellen Johnck to the Committee.

Commissioner Johnck:

Alright.

Commissioner Hyland:

We have done that already but –

Commissioner Johnck:
That's okay I'll take two.

President Pearlman:
Oh is this your second meeting? I missed the last one.

Commissioner Johnck:
Yes this is my second meeting. That's alright.

President Pearlman:
Alright thank you I think I'm okay with that.

B. REGULAR CALENDAR

2. [2017-011878ENV](#) (A. VANDERSLICE: (415) 575-9075)
POTRERO POWER STATION MIXED-USE PROJECT (1201 ILLINOIS STREET) – irregularly shaped industrial site that is bordered by 22nd Street to the north, the San Francisco Bay to the east, 23rd Street to the south, and Illinois Street to the west, Assessor's Blocks/Lots 4232/006, 4232/001, 4175/002, 4175/017, and 4175/018, (District 10). - **Review and Comment** before the Architectural Review Committee on the proposed preservation alternatives in the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the project. The project site is located in San Francisco's Central Waterfront neighborhood, south of the recently approved, but not yet constructed, Pier 70 Mixed-Use Project. The project proposes to demolish the California Register of Historical Resources individually-eligible resources and contributors to the California Register of Historical Resources-eligible Third Street Industrial Historic District. Station A, Meter House, and Compressor House are determined to be both individually eligible for the California Register and District contributors. The Gate House and Unit 3 are District contributors. The Proposed Project is located on an approximately 29.0-acre site along San Francisco's Central Waterfront, encompassing the site of the former Potrero Power Plant that closed in 2011. The proposed project would redevelop the site for a proposed multi-phased, mixed-use development, and activate a new waterfront open space. The proposed project would provide for development of residential, commercial (including office, research and development [R&D]/life science, retail, hotel, and production, distribution, and repair [PDR]), parking, community facilities, and open space land uses. Overall, the proposed project would construct up to approximately 5.3 million gross square feet of new uses. The project is within a PDR-1-G (Production, Distribution & Repair -1- General) and M-2 (Heavy Industrial) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District.

Preliminary Recommendation: Review and Comment

SPEAKERS: = Allison Vanderslice – Staff presentation
 + Kristen Hall – Project presentation
 + Christina Dykas – Preservation alternatives
 + Maia Small – Height and zoning

ACTION: Reviewed and Commented

ARC COMMENTS
Adequacy of the Alternatives Summary

- The ARC concluded that the heights and uses proposed for the new construction on the site in the Full Preservation Alternative should be reevaluated for their ability to accommodate additional housing.
- The ARC determined that the partial preservation alternatives explored were adequate; however, additional information on how the retained facades of Station A, the Meter House and the Compressor House would be incorporated into the project in Partial Preservation Alternative 4 was requested.
- Commissioners were appreciative of the work that was done to develop the five preservation alternatives. Commissioner Pearlman greatly appreciated the work done to evaluate the other alternatives that were considered but rejected. Commissioner Johnck was glad that the preservation alternatives were brought to ARC review early on in the environmental review process.

Full Preservation Alternative

- All commissioners stated that Full Preservation Alternative should be revised to include more residential units. Commissioner Hyland suggested that one way to achieve additional units was to further increase heights of new construction on the site and Commissioner Pearlman suggested upzoning other parcels on the site to achieve more residential development.
- Commissioner Hyland wondered if the Full Preservation Alternative could accommodate 3,000 housing units and whether development of this many units could help fund rehabilitation of the retained historic structures.
- Commissioner Hyland recommended that the Gate House on Block 11 be detached more from the new construction because the new building overshadows it.

Partial Preservation Alternatives

- Commissioner Johnck stated that Partial Preservation Alternative 4 (façade retention) does not at this point provide sufficient information on how the facades are treated and how the additions to the buildings will be added to make a judgement regarding impacts to the historic resources. Commissioner Hyland and Commissioner Johnck questioned the ability of Partial Preservation Alternative 4 to reduce project impacts. Commissioner Pearlman acknowledged that this alternative would not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, but if it was sensitively designed then this alternative could convey the history of the power plant.
- In response to Partial Preservation Alternative 3 (Rehabilitation of the Meter House and Compressor House), Commissioner Pearlman raised concerns about removing Station A, as it is the most visible building at

the project site, and the building that he believes most strongly conveys the history of the power plant. Commissioner Pearlman felt that retention of the Meter House and Compressor House would not be enough to convey their history without Station A.

- Commissioner Pearlman was not certain that the partial retention of some of the buildings, as proposed in the Partial Preservation Alternatives, would result in less than significant with mitigation (LSM) determination for the Third Street Industrial District as currently outlined in the Preservation Alternatives impact analysis.

Project Comments

- Commissioner Hyland stated that he was disappointed that there does not seem to be an attempt to retain the historic buildings in the proposed project. Given the size of the project site, Commissioner Hyland felt that more of the site's historic resources should be incorporated into the project.
- Commissioner Johnck said that, from the perspective of recent approvals at Pier 70, elsewhere in the Central Waterfront, and at Mission Bay, the proposed demolition of historical resources at the Potrero Plant site is not acceptable.

3. [2015-014028ENV](#) (J. GREVING: (415) 575-9169)
3333 CALIFORNIA STREET – Located on a 10.25 acre site bounded to the north and south by California Street and Euclid Avenue and to the east and west by Presidio/Masonic avenues and Laurel Street, Assessor's Block 1032, Lot 003 (District 1). **Review and Comment** before the Architectural Review Committee on the proposed preservation alternatives in advance of publication of the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the proposed project. The project proposes to: demolish the existing surface parking lots and Service Building and partially demolish and adaptively reuse the existing Main Building for residential use and the construction of 13 new mixed-use buildings with heights ranging from three to six-stories. The project would provide a total of 558 dwelling units, 49,999 square feet of office space, 54,117 square feet of retail space, 14,690 square feet for child care, and 895 off-street parking spaces. A project variant with no proposed office space is also under consideration that would provide a total of 744 dwelling units, 48,593 square feet of retail space, 14,650 square feet for child care, and 971 off-street parking spaces. The building at 3333 California Street is considered to be an historic resource for purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The project site is located within a RM-1 (Residential – mixed, low density) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk Limit.
Preliminary Recommendation: Review and Comment

SPEAKERS: = Justin Greving – Staff presentation
 + Don Bryke – Project presentation
 + Maggie Smith – Preservation alternatives
 ACTION: Reviewed and Commented

ARC COMMENTS

1. Adequacy of the Preservation Alternatives

- Commissioner Johnck emphasized the importance of the landscape as a natural feature on the site and as an integral component of the design, not just as a pretty park but also as a component of healthy living. Johnck said the alternatives looked okay, but emphasized the importance of looking at the designed landscape as an important character-defining feature of the resource. She requested more explanation of how the Full Preservation and Partial Preservation Alternatives addressed retention of the landscape features.
- Commissioner Pearlman agreed with Commissioner Johnck that the alternatives analysis lacked sufficient detail in how the character-defining landscape features would be affected by the different alternatives. Pearlman emphasized the importance of Eckbo, Royston, and Williams, and especially Garrett Eckbo as an important Modern Landscape Architect. Commissioner Pearlman mentioned the unique resource type that 3333 California presents as a suburban campus located within a dense urban setting and emphasized the importance of how the site was viewed and experienced from surrounding public viewpoints, i.e. the streets surrounding the site. The best views of the landscape and building were considered to be from Masonic and Bush streets, while these features were not discernible from California Street viewpoints. Commissioner Pearlman noted that Full and Partial Preservation Alternative 2 appeared to retain more of these important suburban landscape elements. He explained that any development along Euclid and Masonic would affect the relationship of the building to the landscape.
- Commissioner Hyland thought that Partial Preservation Alternative 2 went too far in removing character-defining features and wondered if the Full Preservation Alternative could increase density by allowing for additional height in the buildings along California Street. Commissioner Hyland noted the project incorporated a square footage of office space that was significantly smaller than any office space allotted in the alternatives and recommended converting some of this office space to housing in the alternatives to get the number of residential units closer to those in the proposed project. Commissioner Pearlman also mentioned that the alternatives could reduce the square footage of office space so as to bring the number of units of housing closer to those in the proposed project.
- The Commissioners agreed that the alternatives were adequate but the analysis could be improved by demonstrating and exploring in more detail how the landscape architecture of the resource would be affected by each different alternative. The Commissioners also encouraged the project sponsor to look into reducing the square footage of office space in the alternatives so as to allow for more

housing on the site. The Commissioners thought the alternatives could incorporate additional housing on the site by increasing the height of the buildings along California Street.

2. Project Comments

- Commissioner Hyland mentioned there are few Mid-Century Modern gems in San Francisco and urged the project sponsor to look into incorporating more preservation of the historic resource within the proposed project.
- Commissioner Pearlman stated that the proposed base project did not adequately address the character-defining landscape features.
- Commissioners Pearlman and Hyland wondered if it would be possible in the base project to create a walkway underneath the building instead of cutting it in half entirely as they felt this would be more sensitive to the historic resource.

4. [2015-005890DES](#) (A. KIRBY: (415) 575-9133)
554 FILLMORE STREET – east side of Fillmore Street between Fell and Oak streets, Assessor's Blocks/Lots 0828/022 (District 5) – **Review and Comment** before the Architectural Review Committee on proposed plans for reuse of the former Sacred Heart Church Building. The Church Building is part of the Sacred Heart Parish Complex which includes the former rectory, church, school and convent buildings and is currently proposed for Article 10 individual landmark designation. 554 Fillmore Street is located in a RM-1 Residential-Mixed, Low Density Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District.
Preliminary Recommendation: Review and Comment

SPEAKERS: = Ali Kirby – Staff presentation
 + Charles Blossie – Project presentation
 + Robert Lum Pritchard – Project and protection plan
 = Mark Riser - Interest

ACTION: Reviewed and Commented

ARC COMMENTS

1. **Fenestration.** The project proposes to insert vertical lightwells within the interior volume of the church that would provide light and air to the proposed new units. These would be illuminated via inserting skylights at the roof, clear glazing in the existing stained glass window openings and adding vertical slot windows immediately above that would cut into the brick entablature of the church at the north and south side facades to meet Building Code. Additionally, the rose windows at the transepts would be replaced with clear glazing.
 - **Slot Windows.** Staff determined that the proposed new slot windows on the north and south facades were not compliant with the *Standards* and recommended exploring alternatives.

The Commissioners concurred with the Department that the proposed slot windows on the north Fell Street elevation were not appropriate. Commissioner Pearlman was not opposed to the

new windows on the south elevation; however, Commissioner Hyland concurred with staff, stating that they did not seem to be an appropriate alteration to the exterior at either facade.

Commissioner Pearlman commented that possible reorientation of the interior programming may remove the need for non-compatible new slot window openings that would meet Building Code.

- **Stained glass.** The Department recommended retention of the stained glass windows in place, particularly on the north façade due to its high degree of visibility. If removal is necessary for light and air, staff recommended installation of a patterned glass to reference the original treatment.

Commissioner Pearlman concurred with the Department that the stained glass windows, if removed, should be replaced with clear glazing with tracery to reference the existing stained glass. He additionally agreed that retaining the original stained glass for interpretation on site was a desirable approach.

2. **Roof.** The proposed fifth floor (existing attic space) would feature a single four-bedroom unit spanning the area of the attic. Six new balconies would be carved into the roof and the campanile and side access space would both be used as additional open space for the unit. As proposed, the project would remove approximately 20% of the existing roof structure for terraces and skylights.

The Department recommended reducing the number of proposed roof terraces, as the upper unit does not require additional Useable Open Space per Section 135 of the Planning Code. The intent of this recommendation was to reduce the overall removal of original fabric at the roof while maintaining adequate access to light and air for the unit.

The Commissioners expressed that, because the roofline is minimally visible from the public right of way, the proposed new inset roof decks were not problematic.

3. **Interior programming.** As proposed, the narthex would be converted to a lobby for the residential and group housing units and the west portion of the nave below the choir loft would be retained, and limited public access would be provided. The nave would be divided into four levels with three new floor plates extending from the eastern most wall of the choir loft to the rear of the sanctuary; floor diaphragms would act as seismic stabilizers. A central light court would run through the center to provide visual access to the central mural on the ceiling of the nave. The first floor, located at the original floor level of the nave, would include an egress stair and elevator immediately at the interior entry, and a main entry door would access

four group housing units and two residential units to the rear with common space between. The second floor would include a similar plan layout although the elevator and egress stair would connect directly to the choir loft. The third and fourth floors would include ten group housing units each, with a common area to the rear (east) extending into the sanctuary space. Lastly, the fourth floor would feature an additional eight group housing units with common area at the rear (east). Neither the third nor fourth floors would extend over the choir loft, although no visual access would be provided via the units or circulation. New walls would interrupt the coved ceiling and murals at numerous points.

Staff recommended that new floors, if proposed, should be inserted in a smaller portion of the interior in order for the character-defining features, including the historic volume and decorative details to be retained, and that the new floor plates relate more sensitively to the existing character-defining features of the interior.

- Commissioner Hyland expressed that the proposed programming of 45 net new units may be too dense for the context of the project and recommended exploring fewer floorplates to better celebrate the volume of the interiors and provide more visual access to the choir loft and chancel. He noted that this may also eliminate the need for the proposed fenestration.
4. **Campanile.** The project proposes to rehabilitate and stabilize the campanile of the church by inserting shear walls and laterally supporting the structure with ties and new shear walls at the south façade in the baptistery.

The Department supported the proposed restoration and stabilization of the campanile via shear walls and bracing as the proposal appears to be the least invasive and most sensitive treatment of the structure.

The Commissioners concurred that this was the best option for stabilizing and retaining the structure.

ADJOURNMENT – 1:15 PM

ADOPTED MAY 16, 2018