

# **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, June 19, 2019**

**11:30 a.m.**

## **Architectural Review Committee Meeting**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Black, Hyland, Pearlman

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

**STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:** Justin Greving, Ali Kirby, Jonathan Vimr, Jeff Joslin, 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. [2012.1384ENV](#) (J. GREVING: (415) 575-9169)  
645 HARRISON STREET – south side of Harrison Street, between Vassar Place and 3rd Street, Assessor's Block 3763, Lot 105 (District 6) – Request for **Review and Comment** by the Architectural Review Committee of the Historic Preservation Commission for proposed exterior alterations and addition to the 4-story International style industrial building that was designed by master architect Herman C. Baumann for A. Carlisle & Co, a prominent San Francisco-based lithography business. The property is located in the CMUO (Central Soma-Mixed Use Office) Zoning District, the 130-CS-200CS Height and Bulk Districts and was added to the Landmark Designation Work Program on August 17, 2016 as a potential Article 10 (or Category III Article 11) Landmark.  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Review and Comment*

SPEAKERS: = Justin Greving – Staff presentation  
+ Denise Hannah – Project presentation  
+ Leo Chow – Design presentation

ACTION: Reviewed and Commented

**ARC COMMENTS**

In general, commissioners on the ARC were in support of the size and scale of the addition as it relates to the historic resource. Commissioners provided more detailed comments on the finish of the addition and its side setbacks.

**1. Massing and location of the vertical addition**

- Overall, commissioners were supportive of the size and scale of the vertical addition as it relates to the historic resource. Commissioners found the addition's setback was sufficient to make it look like a separate building.
- Commissioner Hyland supported the larger goal of the locating the addition closer to the freeway. Commissioner Black stated that the deep setback was critical, and that the addition was successful in reading as a separate building behind the historic resource. Commissioner Pearlman reiterated his agreement with the general size and scale of the addition and thought it was in conformance with the relevant standards 2, 9, and 10.
- Commissioner Hyland questioned if the east and west setbacks of the addition were far enough setback so that the massing of the addition reads as a separate structure from these elevations. Hyland thought the treatment at these side elevations where the addition meets the building could be improved. Commissioner Black wanted to know if there was a vantage point on the street at which the hyphen was visible (aside from the highway). Commissioner Black stated that the hyphen was an important aspect of the west elevation. Commissioner Pearlman did not think that increased side setbacks would improve the project design.

**2. Materials and fenestration of the addition**

- In general, commissioners were supportive of the materials and fenestration of the addition because they were sufficiently differentiated from the original structure to

read as a separate building. Commissioners encouraged the project sponsor to explore emphasizing the architectural elements of the addition that do relate to the existing building.

- Commissioner Pearlman stated his only real issue with the project was regarding the skin of the addition. He saw the new fenestration pattern of the addition reading as a coursing, like a running bond pattern, or a fabric; whereas on the existing building the fenestration pattern provides a strong horizontal break, almost black and white stripes. He wondered if there was a way to relate the two more closely.
- On a similar note, Commissioner Pearlman saw the vertical tower of the original building being a very strong contrasting element, but the vertical element in the addition is much more subtle of a gesture, like one overlapping hierarchy among many. He wondered how it would look to pull the vertical portion up to make some sort of penthouse similar to how it functions in the original building. Commissioner Pearlman thought the vertical element added visual interest and the elevation would be boring without it.
- Commissioner Hyland thought the weaving pattern of the addition which has a dense undulating mix of windows and projecting solid surfaces also contrasted with the simple planar massing of the two proposed adjacent towers.
- Commissioner Black wondered if there was a way to articulate the fact that because of the proposed plaza between 645 Harrison and the tower to the west, there will be more space between the buildings and the west elevation of 645 Harrison will be more prominent. Commissioner Black stated that she at first had reservations about the treatment of the addition but now understands it is theoretically a different building so the treatment is okay. Commissioner Black did not feel the vertical articulation was necessary but was curious to know if the architect had explored locating it off center to the right rather than to the left.

### 3. Treatment of existing building

- Commissioners did feel the fenestration pattern of the west elevation could be differentiated from the existing pattern on the north, east, and south elevation to show that all windows along this elevation are new openings and not simply replacement windows.
- Commissioner Hyland wondered if the proposed openings along the west elevation could be treated in a manner such that they do not appear to always have been there, possibly by leaving the first bay solid. Commissioner Pearlman agreed that the west elevation could be differentiated so it doesn't appear to be a series of windows that have simply been replaced.
- Commissioner Hyland thought the treatment of the Perry Street (south) elevation was fine and thought it was better to keep the existing openings along the east elevation as they are.

3. [2019-000539PRJ](#) (A. KIRBY: (415) 575-9133)  
1000 MARKET STREET – northwestern corner of Market and 6th Streets, Assessor's Block 0350, Lot 001 (District 4) – Request for **Review and Comment** by the Architectural Review Committee of the Historic Preservation Commission for proposed exterior alterations including the partial removal of the existing cornice return on Golden Gate Avenue, which

extends beyond the subject property line, to accommodate a previously approved new 193-unit, mixed-use building at 1028 Market Street. The property is located in the C-3-G (Downtown-General) Zoning District, and 120-X Height and Bulk Districts, and is a Category 1- Significant Building individually listed under Article 11 of the Planning Code.

*Preliminary Recommendation: Review and Comment.*

SPEAKERS: = Alexandria Kirby – Staff presentation  
 + Adam Tetenbaum – Project presentation  
 + Jesse Koats – Design presentation  
 + Speaker – Design presentation  
 + Lisa Yergovich – Design presentation  
 ACTION: Reviewed and Commented

### ARC COMMENTS

1. **Secretary of the Interior's Standards.** Department staff found that Option 1 satisfied all relevant Standards as it would repair and retain the full cornice return while also allowing retention of much of the interior space and housing supply originally approved for the adjacent new structure. Staff found that neither Option 2A nor 2B, which were reviewed by a qualified preservation consultant for the project sponsor, fully complied with Standards 2, 5, and 9.

- The Architectural Review Committee concurred with staff's assessment at the June 19, 2019 meeting, with Commissioner Pearlman noting that maintaining and reinforcing the return of 1000 Market Street improved compatibility with the Market Street Theater and Loft Historic District, while also best preserving the character of the building itself. Commissioner Black agreed, stating that Option 1 was preferable to either of the alternatives.

2. **Cornice Repair.** Department staff additionally recommended that the cornice be fully evaluated for structural stability as the documented sections appear to be meaningfully damaged as a result of corrosion.

- The Architectural Review Committee concurred with staff's assessment at the June 19, 2019 meeting.

4. [2018-00767PTA](#) (J. VIMR: (415) 575-9109)  
865 MARKET STREET – southeastern corner of Market and 5th Streets, Assessor's Block 3705, Lot 042 (District 6) – Request for **Review and Comment** by the Architectural Review Committee of the Historic Preservation Commission for proposed exterior alterations including the removal of certain portions of the exterior at primary entries and their replacement with glass curtain wall systems; constructing a metal screen wall that would clad over levels two through five of each elevation; and 'squaring-off' of the currently oblique edges of levels six through eight. The property is located in the C-3-R (Downtown-Retail) Zoning District, the 120-X and 160-S Height and Bulk Districts, and is a Category V- Unrated Building within the Article 11 Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter Conservation District.  
*Preliminary Recommendation: Review and Comment*

SPEAKERS: = Jon Vimr – Staff presentation  
+ Speaker – Project presentation  
ACTION: Reviewed and Commented

### ARC COMMENTS

1. **Composition and Massing.** The project would maintain the building's full lot coverage, with the proposed stainless-steel belt course and cornice alluding to the traditional tripartite façade composition typical of the district.
  - Staff recommended that a more strongly expressed cornice be implemented to better emphasize the cap of the proposed screen wall (this could be achieved through size, profile, or both). The ARC concurred with staff's assessment, adding that the design's belt course and building corner should be similarly exaggerated. Commissioner Hyland referred to the much greater size and presence of the cornice found atop the Westfield Centre's existing postmodern façade as an example.
2. **Scale.** The proposal attempts to reflect the heavily articulated but consistent nature of facades within the district through the use of numerous individual fins for the screen wall system as well as vertical pilasters to divide the façade into vertically oriented bays. There would be no change to the height of the building.
  - The ARC found the project to be incompatible and inappropriate with the character-defining features of the district, indicating that as proposed the façades would appear overly flat and uniform, resulting in massive, horizontally oriented wall surfaces. The ARC noted that the facades should be broken up via consistent use of fenestration, punched windows, detailing, and/or textural variation to provide a sense of depth and establish rhythms and proportions consistent with those found throughout the district. The proposal failed to reflect these characteristics in both the design of the screen wall and that of the glass curtain walls. Commissioner Black noted that backlighting the screen wall at night as well as shifting of the fins may provide some variation of the façade, although likely to an insufficient extent.
3. **Materials and Colors.** As proposed, the revised exterior would consist of a glass curtain wall above the primary entries on each façade, as well as a metal screen wall system composed of light colored, powder-coated fins and unpainted pilasters, cornice, and belt course with a satin finish.
  - Staff indicated that where utilized, metal cladding within the district typically has a painted or well brushed finish, with little to no glossiness or reflectivity. Staff also noted the use of terra cotta fins for the project at 300 Grant Avenue as a potential alternative. The ARC did not object to the use of metal as the project's primary cladding material but noted that substitute materials may be necessary in order to address the Committee's concerns related to the scale, composition, and detailing

of the facades. Commissioner Pearlman noted that utilization of terra cotta fins for 300 Grant Avenue represented a successful approach, at least for that project.

4. **Detailing and Ornamentation.** The screen wall system would be slightly setback from the new pilasters and belt course/cornice, while the fins that would compose much of the system may provide some sense of depth through light and shadow.
  - Staff recommended further study to assess whether the screen wall would create an appropriate sense of visual depth. The ARC stated that detailing and ornamentation were essentially absent in the proposed design, with similar concerns expressed as those regarding the scale of the design (see Response No. 2). The ARC stated that revised facades should relate to the district by picking up on elements from surrounding buildings while developing them for new purposes.
5. **Signage.** While Department staff did not request comments from the ARC pertaining to signage, the case report indicated that tenant branding and signage will continue be reviewed at the staff level for its conformance with the Department's sign guidelines and conformance with transparency requirements.

ADJOURNMENT – 12:56 PM  
ADOPTED AUGUST 21, 2019