

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 6, 2019

11:30 a.m.

Architectural Review Committee Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Black, Hyland, Pearlman

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

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Rebecca Salgado, Shannon Ferguson, 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

None

B. REGULAR

2. [2015-009783PTA](#) (R. SALGADO: (415) 575-9101)
220 BATTERY STREET – located at the southeast corner of Battery Street and Halleck Street, Assessor’s Block 0237, Lot 013 (District 3). **Review and Comment** before the Architectural Review Committee for the construction of a four-story rooftop addition at the existing two-story subject property. The subject property is located within the Article 11 Front-California Conservation District, a C-3-0 (Downtown-Office) Zoning District and 300-S Height and Bulk Limit.

Preliminary Recommendation: Review and Comment

SPEAKERS: = Rebecca Salgado – Staff report
 + Speaker – Project presentation
 + Speaker – Project presentation
 ACTION: Reviewed and Commented

ARC COMMENTS

1. **Composition and Massing.** The existing building fills the entire lot, with no setbacks. The proposed addition extends to the lot edges at the street-facing facades, aligning with the pattern of development found throughout the district. The district contains buildings with heights ranging from one to 11 stories, and is characterized as having a varied streetwall height. The addition will extend the height of the existing property from two stories to six stories, for a total height of 76’-8”. Although the building will become significantly taller, it will still be shorter than the adjacent buildings in the district, including 260 California Street (11 stories) and 244-256 California Street (7 stories). The buildings in the district have a prevailing pattern of two- and three-part vertical compositions. The proposed project treats the existing building as the base of the composition, with the multistory addition becoming the second part of a two-part vertical composition.
 - At the March 6, 2019, meeting, the Architectural Review Committee concurred with Staff’s assessment that the composition and massing of the proposed project will generally be compatible with that of the subject building and the surrounding district. However, in order to more strongly relate the new addition to the characteristics of the district, Staff recommended that a more prominent termination detail be added at the roofline of the addition. The Architectural Review Committee further noted that the cornice element could have a contemporary language.
2. **Scale.** The proposed addition has window bays aligning with the window bays found at the existing building, and the windows in each bay have a tripartite arrangement that also aligns with the rhythm and proportion of the existing windows found at the Battery Street facade. Spandrel glass panels in the new addition’s window bays reference the decorative metal spandrel panels located at the existing building’s bays between the first and second floors. The

new windows employ both vertical and horizontal mullions to allow the scale of glazing areas to be compatible with the glazing areas of neighboring buildings in the district.

- At the March 6, 2019, meeting, the Architectural Review Committee concurred with Staff's assessment that the proposed work appears to be compatible with the overall scale of the subject building and the surrounding district.

3. **Materials and Colors.** The existing two-story building is clad with light-colored travertine panels that likely date from the building's redesign in the mid-20th century. The addition is proposed to be clad with scored stucco with a texture and finish that references terra cotta cladding. This aligns with the preferred surface materials for the district. The proposal does not have a final finish selection, but the indicated potential finishes range from a dark orange to a lighter gray color. The new fenestration is proposed to have either a dark bronze or black finish.

- At the March 6, 2019, meeting, the Architectural Review Committee concurred with Staff's assessment that the proposed stucco cladding was not compatible with the materials and colors of the subject building and the surrounding district. Members of the committee recommended a few different options for cladding at the building that would still be affordable, including a terra-cotta rain-screen system or a brick veneer such as Brick-It. Members of the committee also recommended reviewing the details of a previously approved, as-yet-unbuilt project at 88 Broadway (Planning Department Project No. 2016- 007850COA) as well as another newer building at 788 Minna Street for possible inspiration.

In order to more strongly relate the new addition to the light-colored travertine cladding of the existing building, Staff recommended that a lighter finish found in the district be proposed for the addition's cladding. The Architectural Review Committee recommended that the finish of the cladding on the addition be closer to the finish of the historic brick at the neighboring building at 260 California Street, rather than trying to more closely match the finish of the travertine found at the existing building at 220 Battery Street.

4. **Detailing and Ornamentation.** The existing building at the subject property has travertine cladding with multilite aluminum windows/storefronts accented by paneled metal spandrels between the first and second floors. The proposed materials of the new addition include scored stucco cladding, aluminum multilite windows, and spandrel glass panels with a ceramic frit to reference the paneled metal spandrels found at the existing building. The interstitial space between the existing building's roof and the new rooftop addition is proposed to be clad with a decorative metal fascia.

- At the March 6, 2019, meeting, the Architectural Review Committee concurred with Staff's assessment that the detailing and ornamentation of the proposed project will generally be compatible with that of the subject building and the surrounding district. However, in order to more closely relate the new addition's detailing to the detailing found throughout the district, Staff recommended that the glass spandrel panels be changed to decorative metal panels or be otherwise detailed in a way that is more compatible with the district. One potential alternative proposed by the Architectural Review Committee would be to use a set-in brick at the spandrels to still preserve the vertical emphasis of the proposed design.
 - At the March 6, 2019, meeting, the Architectural Review Committee concurred with Staff's assessment that the proposed window recesses do not appear strong enough to be compatible with the subject property and the surrounding district. Staff recommended that the new cladding material return on the window openings. The Architectural Review Committee also recommended that windows have a "punched opening" appearance overall.
 - At the March 6, 2019, meeting, the Architectural Review Committee concurred with Staff's recommendation that the detailing of the interstitial space be further developed to make this element a more integrated part of the overall design. The Architectural Review Committee recommended considering a protruding string course at the interstitial space that referred to the string course of the neighboring building at 260 California Street.
3. [2018-009197COA](#) (S. FERGUSON: (415) 575-9074)
 1470-1474 MCALLISTER STREET – north side between Scott and Pierce Streets. Assessor's Block 0776, Lot 045 (District 5). **Review and Comment** before the Architectural Review Committee for work proposed to abate Planning Enforcement Case No. 2017-015635ENF, addressing work completed without a Certificate of Appropriateness and proposed expansion of a penthouse and addition of a roof deck. Construction of the property was approved by the Historic Preservation Commission in 2012 in Case No. 2012.0874A, Motion No. 0182 and construction was completed in 2016. The property is located in the Article 10 Alamo Square Landmark District and is within a RM-1 (Residential, Mixed, Low-Density) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District.
Preliminary Recommendation: Review and Comment
- SPEAKERS: = Shannon Ferguson – Staff report
 + Andrew Junius – Project presentation
- ACTION: Review and Comment

ARC COMMENTS

1. **Front façade bay windows:** As approved by HPC the square projecting bays were to have windows that wrapped around the building corner. As built, the

square projecting bays have large windows at the front and windows at the side. Project sponsors have indicated that necessary structural elements at the building corner did not allow for the windows to wrap around the side of the bay as originally approved by HPC.

- The Architectural Review Committee concurred with staff's assessment at the March 6, 2019 meeting that the elements, articulation, and proportions of the square bays are in keeping with the traditional bays and character of historic building forms found in the Victorian and Edwardian buildings in Alamo Square. The bays are still predominately composed of glazing, which is consistent with the composition of the projecting bays found in the surrounding historic buildings.
2. **Rear Balconies:** Angled balconies with wood railings were approved by HPC. As built, the rear elevation is composed of rectangular balconies with large areas of glazing and glass railings. The rear elevation is slightly visible due to the adjacent surface parking lot.
 - The Architectural Review Committee concurred with staff's assessment at the March 6, 2019 meeting that the rectangular profile of the balconies and use of glass railings compatible despite its slight visibility.
 3. **Roof Cornice:** The building currently does not have a cornice, which is incompatible with the intense ornamentation found in the district.
 - The Architectural Review Committee concurred with staff's assessment that the profile of the cornice should be strengthened and to look to the neighboring building for guidance for common characteristics, such as height, projection, and profile and recommends that a section detail of the cornice element be submitted for final design review.
 4. **Window Trim:** The building currently employs no ornamentation, which is incompatible with the highly ornamented wood facades of the district.
 - The Architectural Review Committee concurred with staff's assessment and recommended the profile of the window trim millwork be strengthened and to look to the neighboring building for guidance.
 5. **Front Entry:** With its absence of columns, transom and sidelights, the current entry is incompatible with the district. Entries in the district are typically intensely ornamented, principally with wood.

- The Architectural Review Committee concurred with staff's assessment and recommended columns be installed as proposed. The Architectural Review Committee concurred with staff's assessment and recommended the installation of additional simple flat painted wood ornament in the area surrounding the paired glazed doors within the recessed entry to better relate to the character of the district. The Architectural Review Committee concurred with staff's assessment and recommended concrete steps. These changes would make the main entry more reflective, in terms of ornamentation and materials, of the historic entries found in the district.
6. **Utility Meter Screening:** Meters were required to be placed in the front yard set back by PG&E and are visible from the public right of way.
- The Architectural Review Committee concurred with staff's assessment and recommended metal screening be provided to minimize the visibility of the utility meters.
7. **Roof Penthouse:** Although not as tall, the penthouse as built is larger in overall size and in a different configuration than originally approved by HPC. Due to its orientation, configuration and angle of roof, now oriented east-west, the penthouse appears to have a heavier bulk and massing, and consequently adds a degree of visual clutter to the roof. Without sightline studies, it is unclear from elevation drawings if the constructed penthouse is visible from the street, however it shows prominently on plans. It is visible at the east elevation when viewed from across the adjacent surface parking lot.
- The Architectural Review Committee concurred with staff's assessment that while minimally visible above the side elevation facing the parking lot, the penthouse is substantially setback, is subordinate to the main volume of the building, and does not detract from the primary façade in manner that is compatible with district.
8. **Proposed Roof deck:** The proposed new roof deck railing is composed of glass with metal cap and is setback from front and side elevations to reduce visibility. It is unclear if the roof deck will be visible at the east elevation when viewed from across the adjacent parking lot.
- The Architectural Review Committee concurred with staff's assessment and recommended the roof deck and guardrails be set back from all edges of building to ensure no sight lines from street or neighboring properties. The project sponsor will provide additional information, such as sightline studies, regarding potential visibility of the proposed roof deck guardrail.

9. **Proposed Gate:** The proposed gate appears to be metal and approximately 6' tall.
 - The Architectural Review Committee concurred with staff's assessment and recommended the finish, materials and dimensions of the gate be called out on plans to better analyze its compatibility with the district.

ADJOURNMENT – 12:14 PM
ADOPTED APRIL 17, 2019