The Planning Department (“Department”) and the Project Sponsor (“Sponsor”) are requesting review and comment before the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) regarding the proposed Preservation Alternatives for the project at 447 Battery Street (“the project”).

On March 18, 2015, the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) adopted Resolution No. 0746 to clarify expectations for the evaluation of significant impacts to historic resources and the preparation of preservation alternatives in Environmental Impact Reports. Although the resolution does not specify ARC review of proposed preservation alternatives, the HPC, in their discussions during preparation of the resolution, expressed a desire to provide feedback earlier in the environmental review process – prior to publication of the Draft EIR – particularly for large projects. After passing of the resolution, preservation alternatives were presented to the ARC for their feedback but were not reviewed by the full HPC until after publication of the Draft EIR. More recently, the HPC expressed interest in having all members of the HPC review and provide design feedback on the alternatives. Alternatives are now brought to the full HPC for their consideration prior to publication of the Draft EIR. The Department and Project Sponsor seeks the HPC’s input in design of the preservation alternatives to address the anticipated significant impact to the historical resource at 447 Battery Street.

The Planning Department is in the process of preparing an Initial Study and Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to evaluate the related physical environmental effects of the proposed project. The proposed Preservation Alternatives are being brought to the HPC for comment prior to inclusion in the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR is expected to be released to public review in spring 2020. A hearing to receive the HPC’s comments on the Draft EIR would occur during the Draft EIR public comment period.

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION
447 Battery Street, known as the Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company Building, is located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Battery and Merchant Streets, within San Francisco’s Financial District neighborhood, the Downtown-Office Zoning District, and a 200-S Height and Bulk District. Sitting on a rectangular lot measuring 74 feet along Battery Street and 97 feet along Merchant Street, the subject
building is three stories and 48 feet tall, with exterior load-bearing walls of exposed brick masonry construction and a heavy timber internal structural framework. The subject building fills all of its rectangular lot except for a notch at the northwest corner that creates a narrow light court at the rear.

Along its primary Battery Street elevation, the subject building contains two large storefront openings and a recessed building entry at the ground story. These openings currently contain modern metal and glass storefront and door systems and are covered at the lintel-level with fabric-clad box awnings. Dimensional letter signage advertising the storefront tenant has been installed in the spandrel area between the ground and second stories. At both the second and third stories on the primary facade, the subject building features seven identical window openings, with projecting brick sills and segmental arch lintels. Each opening contains a pair of metal casement windows under a single fixed sash. Above the third story, the subject building is capped with a brick cornice consisting, from bottom to top, of a projecting bandcourse, a flat frieze, several courses of corbeling, and projecting coping.

The secondary Merchant Street façade is similar to the primary façade, with the following differences: the secondary façade contains eight bays of windows compared to the primary façade’s seven; all bays are evenly spaced except for the two westernmost bays, which are closer together; at the ground story, six of the secondary façade’s eight bays feature short segmental arch openings containing metal casements under fixed lights; the westernmost two bays at the ground story feature a bricked-in door opening and an altered door opening into which a wooden entry door has been installed; a small rectangular metal door has been installed to the west of the westernmost bay; in the second- and third-story window openings, the metal windows have multi-light configurations that differ from the primary façade’s simple casement-under-fixed-sash design.

The subject building’s brick west elevation looks onto a narrow light court and is not visible from the public way. Behind the raised parapets, the subject building has a flat roof.

Site History
Designed by architect Frank S. Van Trees in a simple store-and-warehouse style typical of late nineteenth and early twentieth century industrial and commercial buildings, 447 Battery Street was constructed in 1907 on a lot that the 1906 earthquake and fires had cleared of earlier buildings. Historic photos taken approximately ten years after initial construction show the subject building’s street-facing facades clad in a light-colored coating—likely painted stucco—and featuring painted wall signage, with awnings installed over the street-level storefronts. Later photos show traditional wood-frame storefront infill in the ground-story openings and one-over-one windows in the upper-story openings. Between 1957 and 1968, the stucco cladding was removed and the windows and storefronts were replaced. In 1967 the building was converted into offices. Subsequent exterior alterations include parapet reinforcement (1986, 1997), the installation of the existing tenant signage (1998), and the undated installation of the existing storefront, building entry, and awnings on Battery Street.

CEQA HISTORICAL RESOURCES EVALUATION
The subject property is considered a known historic resource, having been evaluated in the 1968 Junior League survey and included in the Here Today book, which was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in
1970 as “the official City-wide survey and inventory of historically and architecturally significant structures.” The Planning Department confirmed these findings in the Historic Resource Evaluation Response, Part 1 (HRER Part 1), dated December 18, 2017, that was prepared by the Planning Department in conjunction with the current project. The HRER Part 1 determined that the subject building is eligible for individual listing in California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) under Criterion 1, for its associations with post-1906 reconstruction and the historically significant San Francisco coffee industry, and under Criterion 3, as a notable example of the early 20th century store-and-warehouse building type. The period of significance is 1907-1967, which corresponds to the period when the building was occupied by the Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company, the original tenants. The building is not located in a known historic district.

INTEGRITY
The Department finds that the subject property retains sufficient integrity to convey its significance as a notable example of a brick store-and-warehouse type building associated with post-1906 reconstruction and the San Francisco coffee industry.

CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES
The following is a list of character-defining features of the subject property:

- Three-story height and roughly rectangular footprint;
- Exterior walls constructed of brick masonry;
- Openings for storefronts and a building entry on Battery Street;
- Regular, evenly spaced rhythm of window openings on the first (Merchant Street only), second and third stories; the westernmost two bays on Merchant Street are slightly closer together;
- Slightly projecting brick sill and a segmental arch head at window openings;
- Brick cornice consisting, from bottom to top, of a projecting bandcourse, a flat frieze, several courses of corbeling, and projecting coping.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The project proposes to demolish the existing building and construct a new 18-story hotel building. The new building will rise out of the retained street facades of the existing building. The new, 143,449-gsf building will contain 198 hotel rooms, two restaurants occupying 7,486-gsf, 24 vehicle parking spaces, 8 class-1 bicycle parking spaces, and 19 class-2 bicycle parking spaces. The proposed project would include approximately 2,720-GSF of publicly accessible private open space (POPOS) along Merchant Street. The two retained street facades will be altered with new openings, windows, and awnings. Above the retained facades, the new building will feature a two-story vertical hyphen that is set back four feet. Above the hyphen, the new building will be coplanar with the historic facades, will be clad in stone and glass, and will feature a stepped roof. For more details on the proposed project, see p. 6-10 of the attached Page & Turnbull report.

---

1 The Planning Department did not concur with the conclusion of a Historic Resource Evaluation, Part 1, voluntarily submitted by the project sponsor, which found that the subject building is not eligible for individual listing in the California Register.
PROJECT IMPACTS
Planning staff has determined that the project does not meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation 2, 9, and 10, and would result in a material impairment to the historic resource. The project would negate the property’s status as a building through the demolition of sections of the façade and the entire roof and internal structure. Furthermore, the new 18-story building that would rise out of the retained street facades of the existing building would be incompatible in size and scale and would overwhelm the remnants of the historic building. Therefore, the project would cause a significant adverse impact to the identified historic resource.

PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVES - PROJECT
As the proposed project is anticipated to result in a significant impact on a historic resource due to demolition and new construction, the EIR will consider alternatives to the project. Alternatives considered under CEQA do not need to meet all project objectives; however, they should reduce identified project impacts while still meeting most of the basic objectives of the project. The project objectives are included in the attached Preservation Alternatives Report prepared by Page & Turnbull.

Department staff and the project team have identified the following preservation alternatives: No Project Alternative, Full Preservation Alternative, and Partial Preservation Alternative. The Full and Partial Preservation Alternative are depicted in the attached plans and massing studies.

No Project Alternative
Under the No Project Alternative, no modifications to the existing historic resource would be completed. No additional residential, retail, and/or commercial units or buildings would be added. The historic character-defining features of the warehouse building at 447 Battery Street would be retained; no modifications, repairs, or restoration activities would be conducted. The building would remain three stories. The historic resource would retain its approximately 45-foot height and approximately 7,178 square feet of office space, including the ground floor and two upper floors. The No Project Alternative would not meet the basic project objectives.

Full Preservation Alternative
The Full Preservation Alternative would retain all facades and portions of the internal structure and would feature a two-story rooftop addition and mechanical penthouse. Existing ground-story openings on Battery Street would be enlarged to create new entries and larger windows covered by flat glass awnings. New, historically appropriate windows would be installed in the other historic window openings. The two-story addition would be set back 15 feet from the two street facades. The Full Preservation Alternatives would feature 42 hotel rooms for a total of 27,261 gsf, 2,630 gsf of restaurant space, and five total stories for a building height of 74 feet.
The Full Preservation Alternative would retain all of the character-defining features of the historic resource at 447 Battery Street.²

The Full Preservation Alternative partially meets the basic objectives of the project but would only create 42 hotel rooms versus the proposed project’s 198 hotel rooms.

**Partial Preservation Alternative**

The Partial Preservation Alternative would demolish the existing building and construct a new 8-story hotel building. The new building would rise out of the retained street facades of the existing building. No internal structure would be retained. Excavation would be required in order to construct three basement levels containing parking, back-of-house spaces, and guest amenities. The two retained street facades will be altered with new openings, windows, and awnings. Above the retained facades, the new building will feature one-story “hyphen” area that is set back ten feet. Above the hyphen, the new building will be coplanar with the historic facades, will be clad in stone and glass, and will feature a flat roof with a setback mechanical penthouse. The Partial Preservation Alternatives would feature 78 hotel rooms for a total of 53,589 gsf, 5,599 gsf of restaurant space, 0 parking spaces, and eight total stories for a building height of 110.5 feet.

The Partial Preservation Alternative would retain or partially retain all of the building’s character-defining features. It would alter the perceived massing of the building, remove sections of the façade at the ground story, and demolish its non-visible facades and entire internal structure.³

The Full Preservation Alternative partially meets the basic objectives of the project but would only create 78 hotel rooms versus the proposed project’s 198 hotel rooms.

**REQUESTED ACTION**

The Department seeks comments on the adequacy of the proposed Preservation Alternatives for inclusion in the Draft EIR.

**ATTACHMENTS**

- 447 Battery Street Preservation Alternatives Memorandum and Graphics Package, prepared by Page & Turnbull, (dated September 23, 2019)
- Historic Resource Evaluation Response, Part 2, prepared by the San Francisco Planning Department, (dated September 20, 2019)
- Historic Resource Evaluation Response, Part 1, prepared by the San Francisco Planning Department, (dated December 18, 2017)
- Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report, prepared by the San Francisco Planning Department, (dated August 7, 2019)

---

² For a more detailed description of the Full Preservation Alternative, see p. 11 of the Page & Turnbull Preservation Alternatives Report.

³ For a more detailed description of the Partial Preservation Alternative, see pp. 12-14 of the Page & Turnbull Preservation Alternatives Report.
MEMORANDUM

DATE September 23, 2019

TO Jorgen Cleemann

OF San Francisco Planning Department

FROM Christina Dikas, Project Manager/Senior Architectural Historian; Ruth Todd, Principal

CC Rachel Schuett, San Francisco Planning Department; Jodie Knight, Rueben, Junius & Rose LLP; Erin Efner, ICF; Eric Lundquist, Heller Manus

REGARDING: 447 Battery – Preservation Alternatives Memorandum (Draft)

INTRODUCTION

This Preservation Alternatives Memorandum has been prepared at the request of the San Francisco Planning Department for the proposed project at 447 Battery Street (Assessor’s Block 0206, Lot 002) in the Financial District (Figure 1 and Figure 2). The rectangular, 7,178-square-foot project site is located on the west side of Battery Street, between Washington Street on the north and Merchant Street alleyway on the south, and across from One Maritime Plaza. 447 Battery Street currently accommodates offices, but was originally constructed by architect Frank S. Van Trees in 1907, following the 1906 earthquake and fires, and was occupied by a small Bay Area coffee and tea wholesale supplier and roastery from 1907 through 1966.

The subject building, known as the Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company Building, was evaluated in the 1968 Junior League survey and included in the Here Today book, which was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 1970 as “the official City-wide survey and inventory of historically and architecturally significant structures.” The subject building was evaluated again in several subsequent surveys, including the 1976 Architectural Quality Survey, for which it was given a rating of "1" for "contextual importance," and the 1978 Architectural Heritage Survey, for which it was given a rating of "B" for "Major Importance." Based on the findings of the previous surveys, in particular the adopted 1968 Junior League survey, the subject building is considered a "Category A" property (Known Historical Resource) for the purposes of the Planning Department’s California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review procedures.

San Francisco Planning Department staff prepared an updated evaluation of the property using criteria for the California Register of Historical Resources in a Historic Resource Evaluation Report (HRER), dated December 18, 2017. The building at 447 Battery Street was found to be individually

1 Assessor’s Report, San Francisco Planning Department’s Online Property Information Map.
eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) under Criterion 1 (Events) and Criterion 3 (Architecture) with a period of significance of 1907-1967, confirming its status as a historic resource for the purposes of review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).²

The proposed project involves the demolition of the building at 447 Battery Street to construct one 18-story hotel with ground-floor retail that would reach approximately 200 feet tall.³ The preservation alternatives described in this memorandum include a No Project Alternative, a Full Preservation Alternative, and one Partial Preservation Alternative.

---

Figure 2: Aerial image of the project site at 447 Battery Street, delineated by orange outline. Source: Google Earth, 2019. Edited by Page & Turnbull.

Methodology
This memorandum was produced based on guidance provided by “Historic Preservation Commission Resolution No. 0746” and consultation with Preservation Staff at the Planning Department to provide the Historic Preservation Commission with information to confirm, further develop, and/or analyze the preservation alternatives described herein. The first few sections of this memorandum summarize the property’s significance, character-defining features, and proposed project description. The memorandum then describes a No Project Alternative, Full Preservation Alternative, and Partial Preservation Alternative to review impacts on identified character-defining features of 447 Battery Street.

Under Case No 2014.1036ENV, Page & Turnbull primarily referred to the “Historic Resource Evaluation Response” authored by the Planning Department (December 18, 2017). Page & Turnbull also consulted the “Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report” (NOP), prepared by the Planning Department (August 7, 2019).

The description of the proposed project is derived from the NOP. The No Project Alternative, Full Preservation Alternative, and Partial Preservation Alternative were developed in consultation with Preservation Staff at the Planning Department. The preservation alternatives descriptions are based on the graphics package produced by Heller Manus (see Appendix).
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE

Evaluation Summary
According to the San Francisco Planning Department’s HRER (December 18, 2017),

Staff finds that the subject building is individually eligible for inclusion on the California Register under Criterion 1 due to its associations with reconstruction following the 1906 earthquake and fires, and with the development of the San Francisco coffee industry.

Regarding the association with post-1906 reconstruction, the subject building’s specific association with this citywide historical phenomenon relates to its status as one of the most prominent of a small number of buildings from this era that survive in a part of the Financial District that underwent massive change in the second half of the 20th century. […]

Regarding the subject building’s association with the development of the San Francisco coffee industry, the building’s specific association with this historical phenomenon relates to its status as the only known building with the original use of coffee roasting and warehousing to remain in the historic center of this highly significant local industry. […]

447 Battery Street has been found individually eligible for listing in the CRHR under Criterion 3 as a notable example of the brick store-and-warehouse type that was common during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, but that has become increasingly rare in this part of San Francisco. […] The subject building was constructed in 1907 to the designs of architect Frank S. Van Trees. Although Van Trees was a prominent Bay Area architect responsible for several notable buildings […], the subject building actually appears to conform to the more vernacular style of warehouse architecture described above. Referring to it as “[a] handsome post-fire brick warehouse building,” architectural historian Michael Corbett described the subject building as “indistinguishable from much earlier buildings of the same type.” The design of the subject building may therefore be seen as a continuation and a notably late example of an architectural tradition that extends far back into the nineteenth century. […] Within the subject building’s immediate context, dominated as it is by mid- to late-twentieth century redevelopment, there is nothing similar.4

Character-Defining Features
For a property to be eligible for national or state designation under criteria related to type, period, or method of construction, the essential physical features (or character-defining features) that enable the property to convey its historic identity must be evident. These distinctive character-defining features are the physical traits that commonly recur in property types and/or architectural styles. To be eligible, a property must clearly contain enough of those characteristics to be considered a true

representative of a particular type, period, or method of construction, and these features must also retain a sufficient degree of integrity. Characteristics can be expressed in terms of form, proportion, structure, plan, style, or materials.

The HRER prepared by the San Francisco Planning Department identified the character-defining features for the building at 447 Battery Street:

- Three-story height and roughly rectangular footprint;
- Exterior walls constructed of brick masonry;
- Openings for storefronts and a building entry on Battery Street;
- Regular, evenly spaced rhythm of window openings on the first (Merchant Street only), second and third stories; the westernmost two bays on Merchant Street are slightly closer together;
- Slightly projecting brick sill and a segmental arch head at window openings;
- Brick cornice consisting, from bottom to top, of a projecting bandcourse, a flat frieze, several courses of corbeling, and projecting coping.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND DESCRIPTION

447 Partners, LLC (the “Project Sponsor”) is undertaking the proposed project at 447 Battery Street. As discussed in the HRER, the Planning Department found that the proposed would “have a significant impact on the historic resource, which would be demolished. Demolition would remove all character-defining features of the individually eligible building and would materially impair its ability to convey its historic significance.”

Project Sponsor’s Objectives

The Project Sponsor seeks to achieve the following objectives by undertaking the proposed project:

- Add a well-designed building to an underutilized parcel in an area with a demonstrated demand for hotel rooms;
- Construct a 4-star hotel with enough rooms to make hotel use feasible for an operator, which generally requires approximately 200 or more hotel rooms, as well as meeting space and ballroom;
- Provide a basement for vehicle parking and mechanical equipment, as well as the bike parking and employee showers and lockers required by the Planning Code;
- Conduct structural and seismic upgrades to the existing building to allow construction of a multi-story addition above;

▪ Construct a well-designed building that balances the architectural elements of the existing façade and an addition;
▪ Provide employment during construction and operation, and benefit the City economically;
▪ Improve Merchant Street by providing a POPOs and a partially shared street that includes trees, seating, bicycle parking, and special paving, thereby bringing more pedestrian life to the neighborhood;
▪ Improve Battery Street by adding street trees and bicycle parking and adding street life from hotel and restaurant patrons;
▪ Provide active restaurant uses to the Site, including a full-service restaurant, café/bar,, and rooftop bar/lounge.

The following table presents a summary of square footage and unit counts for the Project compared to the preservation alternatives, which are described in later sections of this report.

Table 1. Preservation Alternatives Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>NO PROJECT</th>
<th>FULL PRESERVATION</th>
<th>PARTIAL PRESERVATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLOOR COUNT</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROSS</td>
<td>143,449 gsf</td>
<td>7,178 gsf</td>
<td>31,419 gsf</td>
<td>81,540 gsf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE/RETAIL</td>
<td>0 sf</td>
<td>7,178 sf</td>
<td>0 sf</td>
<td>0 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESTAURANT</td>
<td>7,486 sf</td>
<td>0 sf</td>
<td>2,630 sf</td>
<td>5,599 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOTEL</td>
<td>114,662 sf</td>
<td>0 sf</td>
<td>27,261 sf</td>
<td>53,589 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOTEL ROOM COUNT</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICAL PARKING SPACES</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Project Description

The “Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report” (NOP) provides the following summary description of the proposed project at 447 Battery Street (refer to the Appendix for graphics of the proposed project):

Table 2: Proposed Project Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Component</th>
<th>Area (gross square feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (hotel, lobbies, conference,</td>
<td>122,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restaurant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Parking(^a)</td>
<td>13,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL(^b)</td>
<td>143,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicly-accessible Open Space</td>
<td>2,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Open Space</td>
<td>2,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Open Space</td>
<td>3,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Component</strong></td>
<td><strong>Amount</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hotel Rooms (total)</strong></td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking Spaces</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto(^c)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle (class 1)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle (class 2)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height of Building</td>
<td>200 feet (up to 220 feet inclusive of elevator/stair penthouse, parapet, and various rooftop elements)(^d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Stories</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^a\): Includes garage circulation space in the basement levels.

\(^b\): Includes mechanical uses not listed in this table.

\(^c\): Includes two Americans with Disabilities Act–compliant accessible spaces.

\(^d\): Consistent with the Planning Code Height and Bulk designations for the project site, the building height is 200 feet, with up to 20 feet for allowed for rooftop appurtenances.

The proposed project would involve retaining the existing building façade, as seen by the public. The interior would be reconfigured to comply with the current building code and accommodate an additional 143,449 gross square feet of space at the project site. Ultimately, the proposed project would consist of an 18-story, 200-foot-tall hotel. The hotel would have 198 rooms on 16 floors, with a lobby and restaurant on the ground floor and mezzanine and another restaurant on the 18th floor.

The proposed project would have frontages on Battery and Merchant streets, as shown in Figure 2. Landscaping would be provided on Battery and Merchant streets, while loading would be provided on Merchant Street.
The proposed project would be a total of 143,449 square feet of development, including 122,148 square feet of commercial uses (hotel, lobbies, conference, and restaurant), 13,680 square feet of vehicle parking uses, and 404 square feet of bicycle parking uses. The proposed project would provide 2,720 square feet of POPOs along Merchant Street, 2,203 square feet of required commercial open space, and 3,934 square feet of terrace space. In addition, 24 vehicle parking spaces, eight class 1 bicycle parking spaces, and 19 class 2 bicycle parking spaces would be provided.

The ground floor would include the hotel lobby, a restaurant/bar, a loading dock/car elevator, and a fire command center (see Figure 3). Pedestrian access would be from Battery and Merchant streets. The mezzanine level would include a restaurant, a kitchen, and dining areas; the eastern portion of the mezzanine level would be open to the ground floor. For security, the building would include a camera system and valets for the entry.

The four basement levels would include one level for ancillary hotel uses, one level for mechanical uses, and two levels for loading or parking (see Figures 4 through 7). Basement Level 1 would include a conference center, gym, and spa areas for use by hotel guests. Basement Level 2 would include mechanical uses, such as electric generators, a fuel pump room, building storage, and maintenance areas as well as a room for bicycle parking, showers, and lockers. Basement Level 3 would be used for loading and accessed from the loading dock/car elevator at Merchant Street, discussed in more detail in the “Parking, Loading, and Bicycle Facilities” section, which follows. Basement Level 4, the parking level, would provide 22 valet parking spaces (in stackers), and two valet Americans with Disabilities Act–(ADA–) compliant accessible spaces, also accessed from the loading dock/car elevator at Merchant Street. The total depth of the basement would be approximately 50 feet.

Floors 2 through 17 of the building would contain 198 hotel rooms. Floors 2 through 8 would each contain 13 hotel rooms, Floors 9 through 14 would each contain 14 hotel rooms, Floor 15 would contain 11 hotel rooms, Floor 16 would contain eight hotel rooms, and Floor 17 would contain four hotel rooms (see Figures 8 and 9). The hotel rooms would vary in size from 300 square feet to 628 square feet, offering a mix of 157 regular rooms and 31 suites. Floor 18 would include a restaurant and bar. Floors 15 through 18 would each include a private terrace, facing either Battery Street or Washington Street or facing west toward Sansome Street.

The proposed structure would be approximately 200 feet in height to the roof, with a mechanical penthouse extending up to 20 feet above the roof height, for a total height of 220 feet (see Figure 10).

The building would be designed in a contemporary architectural style, employing glass and limestone as the primary building materials. For the primary façades on Merchant and Battery streets, the proposed design would feature large glass
storefronts that would be articulated by a glass overhang. The existing brick façade would be retained for the ground floor and mezzanine, with a glass façade used for Floors 3 through 18.

The proposed project would comply with the City and County of San Francisco’s (City’s) Green Building Code and meet Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design Gold requirements. Conceptual renderings were prepared by the project architect to illustrate how the proposed project would appear from different vantage points (see Figures 11 and 12). The vantage point in Figure 11 is from the southeast, across Battery Street, at the western edge of Maritime Plaza. The vantage point in Figure 12, is from the east, across Battery Street, also at the western edge of Maritime Plaza but from the height of the tower (approximately 150 feet).

**Open Space.** The proposed project would include approximately 2,720 square feet of POPOs along Merchant Street. Street furniture, such as tables and benches, would be placed along the Merchant Street sidewalk in front of the proposed building, along with stone paving and new street trees from Battery Street to Sansome Street. The proposed 2,720 square feet of privately owned public open space would exceed the planning code open space requirement for proposed hotel and restaurant uses (2,203 square feet). In addition, approximately 3,934 square feet of terrace space would be provided on floors 15 through 18 for hotel and restaurant guests.

**Parking, Loading, and Bicycle Facilities.** The existing building contains no off-street parking spaces. The proposed project would create one new curb cut and add an approximately 10-foot-wide garage door along Merchant Street for the loading dock/car elevator, which would provide access to the loading and parking levels. As shown in Figure 4, the proposed project would add 24 valet parking spaces in Basement Level 4; 22 of the spaces would be in stackers, and two would be individually accessible ADA-compliant spaces. Car-share parking spaces would not be provided. Vehicle parking spaces would be available to hotel guests and restaurant patrons. Access to the parking spaces would be from the loading dock/car elevator on Merchant Street. The loading dock/car elevator would be sized for both trucks and vehicles. A truck or service van would back up into the loading dock/car elevator and be transported down to Basement Level 3. Once in Basement Level 3, the truck or service van would back up to the loading dock. After unloading, the truck or service van would depart through the loading dock/car elevator and exit at Merchant Street. For vehicles, a valet driver would take the vehicle from patrons on Merchant Street, then enter the loading dock/car elevator and be transported down to Basement Level 4. The valet driver would put the vehicle in an open parking spot until the vehicle is needed again, at which point the valet would take the vehicle up the loading dock/car elevator and back to Merchant Street to deliver it to the driver.
Eight class 1 bicycle parking spaces would be provided on Basement Level 2 in code-complaint, lift-assisted double-deck bicycle racks, as shown in Figure 6. The bicycle racks would have a manually operated system that would stack the bicycles on two tiers, with lift-assist top trays that would slide down to within inches of the ground, requiring minimal lifting of the bicycle to the tray. As shown in Figure 3, access to the bicycle spaces would be from the ground-level foyer on Merchant Street, located between the stairs and the loading dock/car elevator, or from the hotel reception area on Merchant or Battery streets where patrons would take an elevator to Basement Level 2.

Nineteen class 2 bicycle parking spaces would be provided in bike racks. One bicycle rack would be on Battery Street, and one bicycle rack would be on Merchant Street, as shown in Figure 3. These bicycle parking spaces would be available to hotel guests, restaurant patrons, and building employees. Access to the bicycle spaces would be from the lobby entry on Merchant Street or Battery Street.

**Landscaping.** No trees would be removed as part of the proposed project because none currently exist at the project site. As part of the proposed project, three new street trees would be planted on Battery Street, and eight new street trees would be planted on Merchant Street, as shown in Figure 3. The proposed tree types are London plane for Battery Street and Fastigiata ginkgo for Merchant Street. The sidewalks adjacent to the proposed building along Merchant and Battery streets would be replaced with decorative paving and curbs.

**Foundation and Excavation.** The proposed project’s deep foundation is anticipated to require the use of auger pressure-grouted displacement piles, drilled shafts, auger cast piles, fundex piles, or torque-down piles. The proposed project would include excavation to a maximum depth of approximately 55 feet to accommodate the four subterranean levels and the building’s foundation; approximately 15,000 cubic yards of material would be excavated.

**PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT**

San Francisco Planning Department, Project Sponsor, Heller Manus, ICF, and Page & Turnbull staff participated in an in-person meeting on August 6, 2019 to discuss the development of the preservation alternatives for the proposed project at 447 Battery Street. The participants aimed to develop a Full Preservation Alternative that reduced impacts to the historic building by proposing to rehabilitate the resource to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. The participants determined that one Full Preservation Alternative should be developed that retains some or all of the interior structure, likely with a lower rooftop addition. The team also aimed to develop a Partial Preservation Alternative that would retain in part the character-defining features of the identified historic resource. The participants determined that the Partial Preservation Alternative should retain the facades like the proposed project, but with a lower addition equal to the height of adjacent buildings and with deeper setbacks from the historic facades.
Following the meeting, Heller Manus developed drawings for the preservation alternatives, which were reviewed by Planning Department staff, the Project Sponsor, ICF, and Page & Turnbull prior to preparation of this memorandum. All new construction proposed in the preservation alternatives has been designed to the greatest extent that is technically feasible to be comparable in square footage to the proposed project; the preservation alternatives illustrated are based on the proposed project program, building types, and their limitations. The alternatives shown are limited in height and square footage based on the Building Code. The Full Preservation Alternative includes a two-story addition and the Partial Preservation Alternative includes a five-story addition. The preservation alternatives are described in detail in the following sections.

Site Limitations
The existing building does not include a basement. It was determined that, due to the age, size, masonry construction, and heavy timber frame of the existing building that it would not be possible to retain and preserve the building and excavate beneath it. In addition, the existing building structure would not bear the load of more than two additional stories because the added weight would require the entire structure to be retrofitted to current seismic codes.

Considered but Rejected Preservation Alternatives
In preparing the preservation alternatives, one full preservation alternative concept, which included more than two stories above the existing building, was considered and discarded. It was determined that the existing structure would not support more stories than the two-story addition presented in the Full Preservation Alternative discussed in a following section. In addition, life safety codes would require all wood structure to be removed from a building with occupiable floors more than 75 feet in height. Taller or shorter partial preservation alternatives were considered and ultimately discarded in favor of an alternative that matched the adjacent building’s height. Alternatives with three to seven story additions are captured within the range of preservation alternatives presented.

NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE
Description
Under the No Project Alternative, no modifications to the existing historic resource would be completed. No additional commercial or hotel units would be added. The historic character-defining features of the building at 447 Battery Street would be retained; no modifications, repairs, or restoration activities would be conducted. The historic resource would retain its approximately 45-foot height and approximately 7,178 square feet of office and retail space on the first through third floors.

FULL PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE
Description
The Full Preservation Alternative would retain all of the character-defining features of the historic resource at 447 Battery Street. A portion of the interior structure would be retained, and spatial relationships with the site and environment would be somewhat altered.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character-Defining Feature</th>
<th>Retained</th>
<th>Partially Retained</th>
<th>Not Retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three-story height and roughly rectangular footprint</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior walls constructed of brick masonry</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openings for store fronts and a building entry on Battery Street</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular, evenly spaced rhythm of window openings on the first story (Merchant Street only), second, and third stories; the westernmost two bays on Merchant Street are slightly closer together</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly projecting brick sill and a segmental arch head at window openings</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick cornice consisting, from bottom to top, of a projecting band course, a flat frieze, several courses of corbeling, and projecting coping</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Full Preservation Alternative would feature a two-story addition and mechanical penthouse above the existing three-story building for a total of 31,419 square feet. This would include 2,630 square feet for a ground-floor restaurant and kitchen, and 28,789 square feet for hotel use, including guest and service lobbies at the ground floor and four floors containing 42 hotel rooms above. There would be a center stair as well as a stair and elevator core in the northwest corner. The hotel units would be accessed via U-shaped corridors on the upper floors.

The Full Preservation Alternative would not require excavation. It would retain the historic building, including all four exterior facades. Existing rectangular ground floor openings on the primary (east) façade would be maintained but extended to the ground to create two entries and a center full-height window system. The glazed entries would be protected by flat glass awnings. All other segmental-arched window openings on the primary (east) and south facades would be retained and restored with new four-lite glazing.

A portion of the internal wood structure (floors, ceilings, and posts) would be retained in the Full Preservation Alternative. Approximately the front (eastern) 20 feet and southern 30 feet of interior wood structure would be retained, but interior materials would need to be removed for the northwest circulation core. There would also need to be a number of interior interventions in order to support the rooftop addition, including the insertion of new columns.

The two-story addition (fourth and fifth floors) would be set back 15 feet from both the east and south facades of the historic building, providing a 2,048 square-foot balcony. A three-sided lightwell would angle inward at the north façade. The addition would be designed in a contemporary architectural style with extensive glazing. The mechanical penthouse would be situated in the northwest corner, further set back from the roofline of the fifth floor.
Table 3. Full Preservation Alternative Program Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Building GSF</th>
<th>Restaurant</th>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>FAR Exclusions</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>Commercial FAR Occupied</th>
<th>Hotel Rooms</th>
<th>Floor Heights</th>
<th>Cum. Heights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>4,772</td>
<td>4,772</td>
<td>4,772</td>
<td>4,772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>4,772</td>
<td>4,772</td>
<td>4,772</td>
<td>4,772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>8,620</td>
<td>8,620</td>
<td>8,620</td>
<td>8,620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>8,620</td>
<td>8,620</td>
<td>8,620</td>
<td>8,620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>5,707</td>
<td>2,636</td>
<td>4,077</td>
<td>5,352</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>31,418</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,030</strong></td>
<td><strong>27,261</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,856</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,523</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,533</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARTIAL PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE**

**Description**

The Partial Preservation Alternative would retain a majority of the character-defining features of the historic resource at 447 Battery Street, which are mostly located on the east and south street facades. However, the north and west façade and the interior structure would not be retained, and the historic resource’s spatial relationships with its site and environment would be altered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character-Defining Feature</th>
<th>Retained</th>
<th>Partially Retained</th>
<th>Not Retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three-story height and roughly rectangular footprint</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior walls constructed of brick masonry</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openings for storefronts and a building entry on Battery Street</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular, evenly spaced rhythm of window openings on the first story (Merchant Street only), second, and third stories; the westernmost two bays on Merchant Street are slightly closer together</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly projecting brick sill and a segmental arch head at window openings</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick cornice consisting, from bottom to top, of a projecting bandcourse, a flat frieze, several courses of corbeling, and projecting coping</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Partial Preservation Alternative would feature four basement stories, three stories within the facades of the existing building, five additional stories, and a mechanical penthouse, totaling 81,540 square feet. This would include 5,599 square feet for restaurant space on two floors and 77,691 square feet for hotel use. Uses per floor, from bottom to top, include: hotel/valet and accessible parking (24 spaces) at Basement 4; fire pump room, loading dock, and car elevator at Basement 3; mechanical, electric, storage, maintenance, and bike parking at Basement 2; meeting rooms and fitness room in Basement 1; guest and service foyers, hotel lobby and reception, bar/restaurant,
back of house, and off-street car elevator at the ground floor; hotel units at the second and third floors; a restaurant and kitchen at the fourth floor; and another four floors of hotel rooms above. There would be a center stair as well as a stair and elevator core in the northwest corner. The Partial Preservation Alternative would contain a total of 78 hotel units, which would be accessed via U-shaped corridors on the upper floors. The Partial Preservation Alternative would require excavation in order to construct the four basement levels, and none of the internal structure would be retained.

The Partial Preservation Alternative would retain the primary (east) and south street-facing facades. Existing rectangular ground floor openings on the primary (east) façade would be maintained but extended to the ground to create two entries and a center full-height window system. The glazed entries would be protected by flat glass awnings. Five of six extant segmental-arched window openings at the ground floor of the south façade, facing Merchant Street, would be replaced with a glazed roll-up garage door, a single glazed door within an existing segmental arch, and two rectangular glazed storefront entry systems with flat awnings. The segmental arch window openings at the second and third stories of the primary (east) and south facades would be retained and restored with new four-lite glazing.

The fourth floor of the addition would be set back 10 feet from both the east and south facades of the historic building, providing a 1,359 square-foot balcony. The upper three floors would have the same floor area as the first three floors. A three-sided lightwell would angle inward at the north façade of the addition. The addition would be designed in a contemporary architectural style with extensive glazing. The mechanical penthouse would be situated in the northwest corner, set back from the roofline of the eighth floor.

Table 4. Partial Preservation Alternative Program Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Building Gross Floor Area</th>
<th>Restaurant</th>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>FAR Exclusions</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>Commercial/Par Occupied</th>
<th>Hotel Floors</th>
<th>Floor Heights</th>
<th>Cumulative Heights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>6,920</td>
<td>5,820</td>
<td>6,820</td>
<td>6,820</td>
<td>6,422</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>6,920</td>
<td>5,820</td>
<td>6,820</td>
<td>6,820</td>
<td>6,422</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>6,920</td>
<td>6,020</td>
<td>6,020</td>
<td>6,020</td>
<td>6,422</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>6,920</td>
<td>5,025</td>
<td>6,820</td>
<td>6,820</td>
<td>6,422</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>6,920</td>
<td>5,025</td>
<td>6,020</td>
<td>6,820</td>
<td>6,422</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>6,920</td>
<td>6,020</td>
<td>6,020</td>
<td>6,020</td>
<td>6,422</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.16</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>6,920</td>
<td>8,020</td>
<td>6,820</td>
<td>6,820</td>
<td>6,422</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.66</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>6,920</td>
<td>8,020</td>
<td>8,020</td>
<td>8,020</td>
<td>6,423</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lobby/Restaurant</td>
<td>6,920</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>5,302</td>
<td>5,345</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>6,920</td>
<td>0.558</td>
<td>0.558</td>
<td>6,558</td>
<td>6,537</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-18.02</td>
<td>-16.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>6,920</td>
<td>8,940</td>
<td>8,940</td>
<td>8,940</td>
<td>8,940</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-11.30</td>
<td>-27.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Loading/ Parking</td>
<td>6,920</td>
<td>8,940</td>
<td>8,940</td>
<td>8,940</td>
<td>8,940</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-11.30</td>
<td>-38.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>6,920</td>
<td>5,940</td>
<td>5,940</td>
<td>5,940</td>
<td>5,940</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-11.30</td>
<td>-49.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**: 81,540 | 5,590 | 53,580 | 0 | 20,674 | 53,826 | 50,623 | 78

**FAR**: 7.5
CONCLUSION

The building at 447 Battery Street was constructed in 1907. 447 Battery Street was included in the Junior League’s *Here Today*, and is therefore considered a "Category A" property (Known Historical Resource). It was evaluated by Planning Department Preservation staff in a Historic Resource Evaluation Report (HRER) completed in December 2017, wherein the property was found to be individually eligible for listing in the California Register. For these reasons, it is considered a historic resource for the purposes of CEQA review. The proposed project at 447 Battery Street will demolish the existing building and will therefore cause a material impairment to the historic resource. This memorandum was produced based on guidance provided by “Historic Preservation Commission Resolution No. 0746” and consultation with Preservation Staff at the Planning Department to provide the Historic Preservation Commission with information to confirm, further develop, and/or analyze the preservation alternatives described herein.

The Full Preservation Alternative would retain all of the character-defining features of the historic resource at 447 Battery Street. A portion of the interior structure would be retained, and spatial relationships with the site and environment would be somewhat altered due to the two-story addition.

The Partial Preservation Alternative would retain a majority of the character-defining features of the historic resource, which are located on the east and south street facades. However, the north and west façade and the interior structure would not be retained, and the historic resource’s spatial relationships with its site and environment would be altered due to the five-story addition.
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APPENDIX B: PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVES GRAPHICS PACKAGE BY HELLER MANUS (JUNE 5, 2019)
## PROGRAM SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Building GSF</th>
<th>Restaurant</th>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>FAR Exclusions</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>Commercial FAR Occupied</th>
<th>Hotel Rooms</th>
<th>Floor Heights</th>
<th>Cum. Heights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lobbies/Restaurant</td>
<td>6,707</td>
<td>2,630</td>
<td>4,077</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,362</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>6,820</td>
<td>6,820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,820</td>
<td>6,422</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.66</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>6,820</td>
<td>6,820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,820</td>
<td>6,422</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.66</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>4,773</td>
<td>4,773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,773</td>
<td>4,373</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>4,773</td>
<td>4,773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,773</td>
<td>4,373</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical Pent.</td>
<td>1,528</td>
<td>1,528</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>31,419</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,630</strong></td>
<td><strong>27,261</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,890</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,529</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,933</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FAR** 3.4
NOTE: REFER TO LANDSCAPE DRAWINGS FOR SITE ALL SITE INFORMATION NOT SHOWN, INCLUDING MATERIALS, LIGHTING, TREE PLACEMENT, ETCETERA.
# PROGRAM SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Building GSF</th>
<th>Restaurant</th>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>FAR Exclusions</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>Commercial/FAR Occupied</th>
<th>Hotel Rooms</th>
<th>Floor Heights</th>
<th>Cum. Heights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical Flats</td>
<td>1,524</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>6,630</td>
<td>6,620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,620</td>
<td>6,620</td>
<td>6,422</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>6,630</td>
<td>6,620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,620</td>
<td>6,620</td>
<td>6,422</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>6,630</td>
<td>6,620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,620</td>
<td>6,620</td>
<td>6,422</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>6,630</td>
<td>6,620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,620</td>
<td>6,620</td>
<td>6,422</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>97.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>4,904</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.18</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>6,630</td>
<td>6,620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,620</td>
<td>6,620</td>
<td>6,422</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>6,630</td>
<td>6,620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,620</td>
<td>6,620</td>
<td>6,422</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lobby/Restaurant</td>
<td>6,701</td>
<td>6,133</td>
<td>5,362</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Concourse</td>
<td>6,536</td>
<td>6,536</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>6,231</td>
<td>6,231</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Mezzanine</td>
<td>6,048</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,048</td>
<td>6,048</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Loading/Parking</td>
<td>6,046</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,046</td>
<td>6,046</td>
<td></td>
<td>-11.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>6,048</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,048</td>
<td>6,048</td>
<td></td>
<td>-11.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>81,594</strong></td>
<td>5,599</td>
<td>53,589</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53,626</td>
<td>50,623</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PART II: PROJECT EVALUATION

Proposed Project: ☑ Demolition ☐ Alteration

Per Drawings Dated: _______________ 3/1/2019 _________________

Part 1 Summary
In the Historic Resource Evaluation Response, Part 1 (dated December 18, 2017), Planning staff determined that the existing three-story, brick-clad building at 447 Battery Street is eligible for individual listing in California Register of Historical Resources under Criterion 1, for its associations with post-1906 reconstruction and the historically significant San Francisco coffee industry, and under Criterion 3, as a notable example of the early 20th century store-and-warehouse building type. The period of significance is 1907-1967.

Project Description
The project proposes to demolish the existing building and construct a new 18-story hotel building. The new building will be clad in stone, glass, and metal and will rise out of the retained street facades of the existing building.

Project Evaluation
If the property has been determined to be a historical resource in Part I, please check whether the proposed project would materially impair the resource and identify any modifications to the proposed project that may reduce or avoid impacts.

Subject Property/Historic Resource:
☐ The project will not cause a significant adverse impact to the historic resource as proposed.
The project will cause a significant adverse impact to the historic resource as proposed.

California Register-eligible Historic District or Context:

☐ The project will not cause a significant adverse impact to a California Register-eligible historic district or context as proposed.

☐ The project will cause a significant adverse impact to a California Register-eligible historic district or context as proposed.

Under CEQA, a project that conforms to all of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation (the Standards) benefits from the presumption that it will not result in an impact to historic architectural resources (CEQA Guidelines 15064.5(b)(3)). If a project fails to meet the Standards, then it must be analyzed further to determine if the project will “materially impair” the significance of a historic resource. Material impairment occurs when a project “[d]emolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources” (CEQA Guidelines 15064.5(b)(2)(B)).

Staff finds that the proposed project does not meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and would result in a significant adverse impact to historic resources.

The project does not meet the following Standards:

Standard 2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features that characterize a property shall be avoided.

The project proposes to remove large sections of the facade at the ground story of the south facade in order to allow for the installation of two storefronts, an exit door, and a loading bay. On the ground story of the east façade, the sill would be removed from the central display window. The building’s roof and entire internal structure—including all walls, vertical supports, and floor plates—would be removed in order to allow for excavation and new construction. Although the interior does not contribute to the building’s historic significance, the complete removal of the interior, along with the roof, effectively negates the property’s status as a building, which is integral to its historic significance. Because the proposed project would remove 100 percent of the internal structure and floor plates, Preservation staff has determined that the amount of removal of interior elements is sufficiently large to meet a standard definition of demolition. Finally, because the existing building’s 3-story height has been identified as a character-defining feature, the proposal to construct a new 18-story building will damage the historic character that is tied to the building’s existing massing and scale. In sum, the proposal to undertake substantial façade removal, demolition, and a drastic change in massing and scale does not meet Standard 2.

Standard 9. New additions, exterior alterations or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
The project proposes to construct an 18-story tower that will rise out of the existing building’s retained facades. This construction necessitates the demolition of the subject building’s entire internal structure (see Standard 2 above). When completed, the new construction will read as a 15-story addition to an existing building. Although the new construction will be differentiated from the old through the use of modern cladding materials, window configurations, and a two-story setback “hyphen” over the existing building; and although the new construction will gesture toward the historic building through the use of masonry materials and a design that abstractly references brick construction; overall, the size, scale and proportion, and massing of the new construction is too large to be considered compatible under Standard 9. According to the Preservation Brief 14, a publication of the National Park Service that provides guidance on designing compatible and appropriate exterior additions to historic buildings, a “new addition should be smaller than the historic building—it should be subordinate in both size and design to the historic building.”1 Referring specifically to rooftop additions, Preservation Brief 14 states, “Generally, a rooftop addition should not be more than one story in height.”2 Because it is not subordinate in size to the historic building, and because it far exceeds the one-story standard for rooftop additions, the new construction proposed in this project does not meet Standard 9.

Standard 10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

If the new construction were removed in the future, the only remnants of the historic building would be the retained facades. Because no interior elements would remain and sections of the south façade would have been removed, the essential form and integrity of the property would be impaired.

In sum, the proposed project would not meet Standards 2, 9, and 10. Additionally, it is staff’s determination that the project would result in a material impairment to the historic resource. Because the project would essentially negate the property’s status as a building through the demolition of sections of the façade, the entire roof, and internal structure, and because the new construction would be incompatible in size and scale and would overwhelm the remnants of the historic building, Preservation staff has determined that the proposed project would result in a material impairment to the individually-eligible historic resource at 447 Battery Street.

Impacts to Offsite Historic Resources
The subject property’s setting is characterized by a diversity of building types and styles constructed at various points throughout the twentieth century. Due to the highly compromised integrity of the subject property’s historic setting, the project is not expected to have an impact on offsite historic resources.

2 Ibid.
EIR and Mitigation Measures

Because the project will result in a significant and unavoidable impact to a historic resource, CEQA requires the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) in order to disclose impacts, evaluate alternatives, and describe required mitigation measures. Mitigation measures related to impacts to historic architectural resources for this project will likely include the following:

- Documentation: Documentation typically includes Historic American Building Survey (HABS)-level architectural photography, measured drawings, and a historical narrative, as well as video recording and the preparation of a print-on-demand softcover booklet containing the relevant historical documentation in an easily accessible format.

- Interpretation: The sponsor will be required to develop an interpretive program for the purpose of communicating the subject building’s historic significance to the general public. Examples of interpretive materials include publicly accessible building signage, multimedia displays, and interactive websites.

The final mitigation measures will be included in the Environmental Impact Report. Planning staff notes that while these and other mitigation measures may reduce the impact of the proposed project, they will not reduce it to a less than significant level. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation.
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Figure 1. 447 Battery Street. Screenshot of 2017 Google Street View.
PART I: HISTORIC RESOURCE EVALUATION

Buildings and Property Description

447 Battery Street, known as the Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company Building, is located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Battery and Merchant Streets, within San Francisco's Financial District neighborhood, the Downtown-Office Zoning District, and a 200-S Height and Bulk District. Sitting on a rectangular lot measuring 74 feet along Battery Street and 97 feet along Merchant Street, the subject building is three stories and 48 feet tall, with exterior load-bearing walls of exposed brick masonry construction and a heavy timber internal structural framework. The subject building fills all of its rectangular lot except for a notch at the northwest corner that creates a narrow light court at the rear.

Along its primary Battery Street elevation, the subject building contains two large storefront openings and a recessed building entry at the ground story. These openings currently contain modern metal and glass storefront and door systems and are covered at the lintel-level with fabric-clad box awnings. Dimensional letter signage advertising the storefront tenant has been installed in the spandrel area between the ground and second stories. At both the second and third stories on the primary facade, the subject building features seven identical window openings, with projecting brick sills and segmental arch lintels. Each opening contains a pair of metal casement windows under a single fixed sash. Above the third story, the subject building is capped with a brick cornice consisting, from bottom to top, of a projecting bandcourse, a flat frieze, several courses of corbeling, and projecting coping.

The secondary Merchant Street façade is similar to the primary façade, with the following differences: the secondary façade contains eight bays of windows compared to the primary façade's seven; all bays are evenly spaced except for the two westernmost bays, which are closer together; at the ground story, six of the secondary façade's eight bays feature short segmental arch openings containing metal casements under fixed lights; the westernmost two bays at the ground story feature a bricked-in door opening and an altered door opening into which a wooden entry door has been installed; a small rectangular metal
door has been installed to the west of the westernmost bay; in the second- and third-story window openings, the metal windows have multi-light configurations that differ from the primary façade’s simple casement-under-fixed-sash design.

The subject building’s brick west elevation looks onto a narrow light court and is not visible from the public way. Behind the raised parapets, the subject building has a flat roof.

Construction and Alteration History
Designed by architect Frank S. Van Trees in a simple store-and-warehouse style typical of late nineteenth and early twentieth century industrial and commercial buildings, 447 Battery Street was constructed in 1907 on a lot that the 1906 earthquake and fires had cleared of earlier buildings. Historic photos taken approximately ten years after initial construction show the subject building’s street-facing façades clad in a light-colored coating—likely painted stucco—and featuring painted wall signage, with awnings installed over the street-level storefronts. Later photos show traditional wood-frame storefront infill in the ground-story openings and one-over-one windows in the upper-story openings.

The subject building’s permit history contains very few instances of significant exterior alterations. However, an analysis of historic photos and narrative descriptions from historic surveys (see “Pre-Existing Historic Survey/Rating,” below) indicate that between 1957 and 1968 the stucco cladding was removed (possibly through sandblasting) and the windows and storefronts were replaced. These and other unrecorded alterations (e.g., the doorway alterations at the westernmost end of the Merchant Street façade) may be linked to the building’s 1967 conversion from warehouse to office space. Subsequent exterior alterations include parapet reinforcement (1986, 1997), the installation of the existing tenant signage (1998), and the undated installation of the existing storefront, building entry, and awnings on Battery Street. The current building owner states that, in addition to the ca. 1967 campaign, the building was sandblasted again in the 1990s, but that the treatment was determined to be harmful to the building and was halted after having completed the entire Battery Street façade and the easternmost ten feet of the Merchant Street façade. The extent of this more recent treatment is said to correspond to the repointing with a light-colored mortar that has occurred on the Battery Street façade and part of the Merchant Street façade.

Pre-Existing Historic Rating / Survey
The subject building, known as the Jones-Thierbach Coffee Company Building, was evaluated in the 1968 Junior League survey and included in the Here Today book, which was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 1970 as “the official City-wide survey and inventory of historically and architecturally significant structures.” The subject building was evaluated again in several subsequent surveys, including the 1976 Architectural Quality Survey, for which it was given a rating of “1” for “contextual importance”; and the 1978 Architectural Heritage Survey, for which it was given a rating of “B,” for “Major Importance.” Under Article 11 of the San Francisco Planning Code, the subject building is listed as a “Category V - Unrated” building, meaning that it has not been assigned a rating for the purposes of that code section. Based on the findings of the previous surveys, in particular the adopted 1968 Junior League survey, the subject building is considered a “Category A” property (Known Historical Resource) for the purposes of the Planning Department’s California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review procedures.
Neighborhood Context and Description

447 Battery Street is located at the northwest corner of Battery Street and Merchant Street. (Merchant Street, which does not conform to the North of Market area’s predominant 50-vara grid, is more of a mid-block alley.) The subject block is built on landfill that sits beyond the natural shoreline of San Francisco, in the middle of the historical Yerba Buena Cove. Currently considered part of the Financial District, until the mid-twentieth century this area hosted a wide range of stores, warehouses, and other mercantile establishments associated with the nearby produce market and working waterfront. Starting in 1959, much of this historic marketplace neighborhood was razed in connection with the Golden Gateway Redevelopment Project, a massive urban renewal scheme that was completed over the course of the subsequent decades. The results of this project are visible today as the collection of apartment towers, townhouses, office buildings, hotels, parks, plazas, parking garages, and shopping areas that occupy the blocks to the immediate east of the subject property.

The blocks on the west side of Battery Street, including the subject block, have been absorbed into the Financial District, and include many buildings constructed in the late twentieth century, although there is nothing on the massive urban scale of the Golden Gateway Project to the east. The Transamerica Pyramid, San Francisco’s tallest building from the time of its construction in 1972 until 2017, stands less than two blocks west of the subject building. The subject block and the block to the south across Merchant Street include several buildings constructed in the aftermath of the 1906 earthquake and fires (447 Battery Street, 1907; 439 Washington Street, 1907; 425 Washington Street, 1907 (altered); 432 Clay Street, 1912), a 1920s office building (500 Sansome Street, 1929), a modernist fire station (530 Sansome Street, date unknown), and a contemporary hotel building (425 Battery, early 2000s). Nearby historic buildings include the 1911 U.S. Customs House (555 Battery Street), the 1944 U.S. Appraisers Building (630 Sansome Street), and 545 Sansome Street, built in 1930. The identified historic district that is closest to the subject building is the Article 10 Jackson Square Historic District, known for its nineteenth century commercial buildings. Other nearby historic districts include the Article 11 Commercial-Leidesdorff and Front-California Conservation Districts, which contain commercial buildings from the early twentieth century.

CEQA Historical Resource(s) Evaluation

Step A: Significance

Under CEQA section 21084.1, a property qualifies as a historic resource if it is “listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources.” The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources or not included in a local register of historical resources, shall not preclude a lead agency from determining whether the resource may qualify as a historical resource under CEQA.
Historic Resource Evaluation Response  
Dec 18, 2017  
447 Battery Street  

Property is individually eligible for inclusion in a California Register under one or more of the following Criteria:

- Criterion 1 - Event:  [X] Yes  [ ] No
- Criterion 2 - Persons:  [ ] Yes  [X] No
- Criterion 3 - Architecture:  [X] Yes  [ ] No
- Criterion 4 - Info. Potential:  [ ] Yes  [X] No

Period of Significance: 1907-1967

Property is eligible for inclusion in a California Register Historic District/Context under one or more of the following Criteria:

- Criterion 1 - Event:  [ ] Yes  [X] No
- Criterion 2 - Persons:  [ ] Yes  [X] No
- Criterion 3 - Architecture:  [X] Yes  [ ] No
- Criterion 4 - Info. Potential:  [X] Yes  [ ] No

Preservation staff finds that the subject building is individually eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) under Criteria 1 and 3, but that it does not contribute to an eligible historic district. The subject building’s period of significance extends from the time of its original construction in 1907 until 1967, when it ceased to be used for the manufacture and warehousing of coffee. These findings are based on information found in the Planning Department and in the Historic Resource Evaluation provided by the consultant, Page & Turnbull. Preservation staff does not concur with the consultant’s conclusion that the subject building is not a historic resource.

Criterion 1: Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.

To be eligible under the event Criterion, the building cannot merely be associated with historic events or trends but must have a specific association to be considered significant. Staff finds that the subject building is individually eligible for inclusion on the California Register under Criterion 1 due to its associations with reconstruction following the 1906 earthquake and fires, and with the development of the San Francisco coffee industry.

Regarding the association with post-1906 reconstruction, the subject building’s specific association with this citywide historical phenomenon relates to its status as one of the most prominent of a small number of buildings from this era that survive in a part of the Financial District that underwent massive change in the second half of the 20th century. Historical photographs and maps confirm that the area surrounding the subject property was devastated in the 1906 earthquake and fires. In the subsequent frenzy of activity, developers reconstructed these blocks with generally low-scale buildings devoted to the manufacture, warehousing, and sale of commercial goods. Sanborn maps from 1913-1915 show most of the area surrounding the subject property rebuilt, with only a few isolated vacant lots. Nearby businesses trafficked in a wide range of products, including barrels, brooms, candy, cigars, flour, liquor, milk, paint, paper, printed material, paste, spices, and syrup. Also present were the numerous open stalls and marketplaces dedicated to the sale of produce, for which the larger district was known.

Maps dating to 1950 show few changes to the largely commercial and industrial character of the area to the east of Battery Street, where produce sales remained prominent. West of Battery Street, more offices and banks had spread north from the Financial District core around California Street. The larger North of Market district also hosted a number of small- to medium-scale coffee roasteries at this time: in addition
to the subject building, roasteries were present at 901 Battery Street (the roastery, warehouse, and offices for the popular Manning’s cafeteria chain; extant) and 306 Sacramento Street (demolished).

However, within ten years of the publication of the 1950 map, the blocks to the west of Battery Street were razed in connection with the Golden Gateway Redevelopment Project (see “Neighborhood Context and Description,” above). Historical concept drawings indicate that at least one version of the project included a “panhandle” that extended between Washington and Clay Streets up to Montgomery Street, connecting the redevelopment area to the present site of the Transamerica Pyramid. Had this concept been realized, the subject building would have been demolished. In addition to the Golden Gateway project, other changes taking place in this district in the mid- to late-twentieth century included the slow decline of the nearby working waterfront and the construction of the Embarcadero Freeway. Taken together, these changes erased much of the physical fabric linking this area to its industrial and blue-collar past, and effectively integrated it into the expanding Financial District.

Within this context, the subject building stands as one of the last surviving connections to this earlier history. The City of San Francisco has identified a number of buildings in the North of Market area as historically significant for their associations with pre-World War II history. Specifically, the Commercial-Leidesdorff and Front-California Conservation Districts have been recognized under Article 11 of the Planning Code for their “concentration of early 20th Century architecture” (Commercial-Leidesdorff) and retention of their “post-fire appearance, [with] most of the architecturally significant buildings constructed in the short period from 1907 through 1918” (Front-California). The Jackson Square Historic District, designated under Article 10 of the Planning Code, represents a generally earlier phase of development. Although the subject building is physically separated from these districts by swaths of more modern historic fabric that prevent it from contributing to their historic character, it nonetheless conveys many of the same historical associations. Furthermore, the subject building’s location in an area that saw so much mid- to late-twentieth century redevelopment makes it one of the very last vestiges within its immediate context of the neighborhood’s earlier history, and thereby elevates these associations to a level of specificity such that a finding of individual eligibility for the CRHR can be supported.

Regarding the subject building’s association with the development of the San Francisco coffee industry, the building’s specific association with this historical phenomenon relates to its status as the only known building with the original use of coffee roasting and warehousing to remain in the historic center of this highly significant local industry. In the wake of the Gold Rush, a number of different importers and manufacturers of coffee established themselves in San Francisco. Some of these businesses—e.g., Folger’s, Hills Brothers, MJB—eventually grew into large firms with a significant presence in regional and national markets. By the second half of the twentieth century, such firms employed armies of laborers and office workers in large, modern facilities that were centrally located in or near San Francisco’s downtown. According to the 1996 National Register of Historic Places nomination form for the Folger Coffee Company Building (101 Howard Street, extant), as early as 1882 San Francisco was the largest importer and processor [of coffee] on the West Coast, and with the advent of World War I and the opening of the Panama Canal, became the
third largest in the United States after New York and New Orleans; by the late 1940s, coffee was San Francisco’s fourth largest industry.¹

In addition to the larger companies listed above, San Francisco also hosted dozens of small and medium-sized roasters—such as that which operated out of the subject building—that contributed to the industry’s prominence.

The subject building is located in an area that was the center of the San Francisco coffee industry for the entire nineteenth century and the early years of the twentieth century. San Francisco’s first major coffee producer was William Bovee, who set up his first roastery near the intersection of Broadway and Stockton Street upon his arrival in 1850. By 1860 Bovee had relocated to 123 Front Street (and had taken on James Folger as a junior partner). The City Directory at this time lists three other “Coffee Factories.” One, like Bovee’s firm, was located in the North of Market area; the remaining two were located just south of Market. By the early 1870s, however, the industry had concentrated in the North of Market area: Of the seventeen coffee “importers” and “factories” listed in the 1873 directory, ten are located in the North of Market area, four are located in the South of Market (SoMa) area, and the locations of four are unknown.² This trend accelerated through the 1880s: of the 33 firms listed in the 1880 directory, all but seven were located north of Market. And although many coffee businesses had established themselves in SoMa by 1905, more than half were still located north of Market. The proportion of coffee-related businesses in the North of Market area steadily declined in the years following the 1906 earthquake and fires, although as late as 1920 the area still contained twelve separate firms. By 1955, however, on the eve of the implementation of the Golden Gate Redevelopment project, the industry was concentrated almost entirely in SoMa.³

The City of San Francisco has identified two other buildings associated with the coffee industry as historically significant: the Hills Brothers Coffee Plant at 2 Harrison Street (1924-26; an Article 10 landmark), and the J.A. Folger & Company Building at 101 Howard Street (1904-06; an Article 11 Significant Building). Both buildings are quite large and are located in SoMa. The subject building, on the other hand, is comparatively small and is located to the north of Market, in an area that served as the center of the coffee manufacturing business through the nineteenth century and into the early twentieth century. Although the industry had begun to shift slowly into SoMa around the time of the subject

¹ National Register of Historic Places, The Folger Coffee Company Building, San Francisco, California, National Register #96000679, Section 8, Page 6.

² Starting in the late nineteenth century, directories distinguish between coffee “importers” and coffee “factories” or “mills.” Later directories further divide the industry into “wholesalers,” “roasters,” “brokers,” etc. Although in some cases the addresses for the “importers” or “brokers” clearly refer to offices that were separate from the industrial operations, at other times the organization is less obvious. The 1920 directory, for instance, lists the business in the subject building as an “importer,” even though it is known to have housed other functions such as warehousing and roasting. Therefore, unless a listing clearly refers to a non-industrial office use, it was counted as the location of a coffee-related business.

³ Directories consulted to determine the historical distribution of coffee businesses include: A.W. Morgan & Co.’s San Francisco City Directory, 1852; Langley’s San Francisco Directory, 1860; Langley’s San Francisco Directory, 1873; Langley’s San Francisco Directory, 1880; Crocker-Langley San Francisco Directory, 1905; Crocker-Langley San Francisco Directory, 1908; Crocker-Langley San Francisco City Directory, 1920; Polk’s San Francisco City Directory, 1955-56.
building's construction in 1907, the North of Market area remained important to the coffee industry for decades to come. The subject building appears to be the only remaining building in this area with the original use of roasting and warehousing coffee. Furthermore, the subject building’s smaller size—relative to the large industrial complexes that are preserved in SoMa—helps to convey the fact that this highly significant local industry comprised many smaller concerns in addition to the massive corporations with recognizable names.

As noted above, the subject building shares some characteristics with buildings in nearby historic districts that have been found significant for their associations with post-1906 reconstruction, but does not appear capable of contributing to these districts’ historical significance due to intervening swaths of more recent development that create a physical barrier between the subject building and the districts. The block on which the subject building is located (which, for the purposes of this analysis, classifies Merchant Street as a mid-block alley and therefore takes in the area bounded by Battery, Clay, Sansome, and Washington Streets) does contain a number of other buildings that date to the post-1906 period of reconstruction. However, this block does not appear to contain a sufficiently high concentration of historical buildings to qualify as a district that can be found significant for its association with historic events. Therefore the subject building does not appear to contribute to a historic district eligible for listing in the CRHR under Criterion 1.

Criterion 2: Property is associated with the lives of persons important in our local, regional or national past.

Records indicate that the lot at 447 Battery Street was owned by Henry E. Bothin at the time of the subject building’s construction. Ownership was transferred almost immediately to Thierbach & Co., the coffee roasting and wholesale company helmed by Charles Thierbach. Thierbach & Co. owned the building until 1912, at which point they partnered with M.P. Jones to form the Jones-Thierbach coffee company, which owned and occupied the building until 1966. The Ron Kaufman Company acquired the subject building in 1967 and, renovating it for office use, held the property until 1986. Subsequently the building changed hands among a number of different companies and ownership entities, none of whom owned it for more than eight years. The current owner, Montgomery Realty Group, acquired the subject building in 2007. Occupied exclusively by the Thierbach & Co./Jones-Thierbach coffee company for the first sixty years of its existence, the subject building was occupied by a number of different businesses and retailers following its conversion to office use in 1967/68.

None of the owners or occupants of the subject building has been identified as historically important such that a finding of significance underCriterion 2 could be supported. Although Henry Bothin was a prominent Bay Area industrialist, real estate developer, and philanthropist, he does not appear ever to have been associated with the subject property outside of his capacity as temporary owner during the construction phase. As the owners of a medium-size coffee company, Charles Thierbach and his heirs do not appear sufficiently distinguished within their field to justify a finding of significance under Criterion 2. Later owners and occupants also do not appear important in our local, regional, or national past.

Therefore, 447 Battery Street is not eligible for listing in the CRHR under Criterion 2.

Criterion 3: Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values.
447 Battery Street has been found individually eligible for listing in the CRHR under Criterion 3 as a notable example of the brick store-and-warehouse type that was common during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, but that has become increasingly rare in this part of San Francisco.

As San Francisco emerged as the United States' principal West Coast port in the years following the Gold Rush, the number of buildings devoted to the production, refinement, and warehousing of bulk trade goods proliferated along the waterfront and in developing industrial areas. Originally constructed of wood, post-1870 warehouse buildings had load-bearing masonry walls and heavy timber internal structural frameworks. These features were intended both to prevent (or at least slow) the spread of fires and also to carry heavy loads. As the limited amount of property became more expensive, the economic imperative to house more floor area on smaller plots of land became stronger, and warehouse buildings accordingly grew taller, occasionally appearing with as many as seven stories. Other character-defining features of this type include storefronts or loading bays at the ground story, upper floors with a regular rhythm of window openings, and restrained ornamentation that emphasizes the buildings' utilitarian function.

The subject building was constructed in 1907 to the designs of architect Frank S. Van Trees. Although Van Trees was a prominent Bay Area architect responsible for several notable buildings (e.g., the Koshland residence at 3800 Washington Street; the National Register-listed Hearst Free Library in Anaconda, MT; numerous residences and other buildings throughout San Francisco and the Bay Area), the subject building actually appears to conform to the more vernacular style of warehouse architecture described above. Referring to it as "[a] handsome post-fire brick warehouse building," architectural historian Michael Corbett described the subject building as "indistinguishable from much earlier buildings of the same type." The design of the subject building may therefore be seen as a continuation and a notably late example of an architectural tradition that extends far back into the nineteenth century. In the haste to rebuild after the 1906 earthquake and fires, the Classically trained Van Trees may have resorted to replicating a simple design with a proven track record of adequately performing its intended industrial purpose. Regarding the rarity of this type, Planning staff notes that although the broader North of Market area does contain a number of brick loft and warehouse style buildings built in the aftermath of the earthquake and fires, most of these buildings (e.g., 405, 407, and 705 Sansome St., 568 Sacramento St.) were designed in more exuberant architectural styles that feature a profusion of ornamental features. Relatively few buildings can match the subject building's minimalist aesthetic and simple, repetitive pattern of fenestration. (The Legallet Building at 601 Battery Street is one other example of such a building, although even here the detailing is less restrained.) Within the subject building's immediate context, dominated as it is by mid- to late-twentieth century redevelopment, there is nothing similar.

Therefore the subject building has been determined individually eligible for listing in the CRHR as an outstanding example of a late nineteenth/early twentieth century store-and-warehouse building. Although architect Frank S. Van Trees could be considered a master architect, the subject building does

---

4 By definition, vernacular buildings do not have named architects.

not represent his broader body of work; for this reason the subject building has not been found significant under Criterion 3 as the work of a master architect.

As noted above, the subject building does not appear to contribute to any previously identified historic districts, nor does it appear to be located in an area that coheres visually or thematically into a heretofore unidentified historic district. Therefore the subject building does not contribute to a historic district eligible for listing in the CRHR under Criterion 3.

Criterion 4: Property yields, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.
The subject property does not appear eligible for listing in the CRHR under Criterion 4 as it applies to buildings and structures. This significance Criterion typically applies to rare construction types when involving the built environment. The subject property is not an example of a rare construction type. The archeological significance of the site, as opposed to the building, is not addressed in this document.

Step B: Integrity
To be a resource for the purposes of CEQA, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the California Register of Historical Resources criteria, but it also must have integrity. Integrity is defined as “the authenticity of a property’s historic identity, evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the property’s period of significance.” Historic integrity enables a property to illustrate significant aspects of its past. All seven qualities do not need to be present as long the overall sense of past time and place is evident.

The subject property has retained or lacks integrity from the period of significance noted in Step A:

| Location: | ☒ Retains | ☐ Lacks |
| Association: | ☒ Retains | ☐ Lacks |
| Design: | ☒ Retains | ☐ Lacks |
| Workmanship: | ☒ Retains | ☐ Lacks |
| Setting: | ☐ Retains | ☒ Lacks |
| Feeling: | ☒ Retains | ☐ Lacks |
| Materials: | ☐ Retains | ☒ Lacks |

447 Battery Street retains integrity. The subject building lacks the quality of “setting” due to the redevelopment of the surrounding neighborhood; and it partially lacks the quality of “materials” due to the removal of the stucco, the windows, and the storefronts. Regarding “materials,” Planning staff notes that all of the removed elements are features that are often repaired and replaced over the course of a building’s lifespan. Stucco in particular may be regarded as an almost sacrificial material, such as paint, that is expected to steadily wear away as it is exposed to the elements, requiring reapplication. Windows have a similarly limited lifespan. Overall the subject building retains sufficient integrity to convey its significance as a historic resource individually eligible for the CRHR under Criteria 1 and 3.

Step C: Character Defining Features
If the subject property has been determined to have significance and retains integrity, please list the character-defining features of the building(s) and/or property. A property must retain the essential physical features that enable it to convey its historic identity in order to avoid significant adverse impacts to the resource. These essential features are those that define both why a property is significant and when it was significant, and without which a property can no longer be identified as being associated with its significance.

The character-defining features of the subject property include the following:
- Three-story height and roughly rectangular footprint;
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- Exterior walls constructed of brick masonry;
- Openings for storefronts and a building entry on Battery Street;
- Regular, evenly spaced rhythm of window openings on the first (Merchant Street only), second and third stories; the westernmost two bays on Merchant Street are slightly closer together;
- Slightly projecting brick sill and a segmental arch head at window openings;
- Brick cornice consisting, from bottom to top, of a projecting bandcourse, a flat frieze, several courses of corbeling, and projecting coping.

CEQA Historic Resource Determination

☒ Historical Resource Present
☒ Individually-eligible Resource
☐ Contributor to an eligible Historic District
☐ Non-contributor to an eligible Historic District

☐ No Historical Resource Present
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PART II: PROJECT EVALUATION

Proposed Project ☒ Demolition ☐ Alteration

Per Drawings Dated: 2/26/2016

Project Description
The proposal is to demolish the existing building and construct a new 18-story hotel and residential building. The proposed new building will have approximately 144 hotel rooms, 9 residential units, hotel and residential lobbies, ground-floor retail, a loading dock, and below-grade parking.

Project Evaluation
If the property has been determined to be a historical resource in Part I, please check whether the proposed project would materially impair the resource and identify any modifications to the proposed project that may reduce or avoid impacts.

Subject Property/Historic Resource:
☐ The project will not cause a significant adverse impact to the historic resource as proposed.
☒ The project will cause a significant adverse impact to the historic resource as proposed.
California Register-eligible Historic District or Context:

☐ The project will not cause a significant adverse impact to a California Register-eligible historic district or context as proposed.

☐ The project will cause a significant adverse impact to a California Register-eligible historic district or context as proposed.

Demolition
The proposed project at 447 Battery Street will have a significant impact on the historic resource, which would be demolished. Demolition would remove all character-defining features of the individually eligible building and would materially impair its ability to convey its historic significance.

New Construction
Due to the highly compromised integrity of the subject property’s historical setting, the project is not expected to have an impact on offsite historic resources.
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Signature: ____________________________ Date: 12/29/17
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Figure 1. 447 Battery Street. Screenshot of 2017 Google Street View.
INTRODUCTION

The project sponsor, 447 Partners, LLC, proposes to redevelop a 7,178-square-foot (0.16-acre) rectangular property at the northwest corner of Battery and Merchant streets, within San Francisco’s Financial District neighborhood, with a large hotel and ground-floor retail. The project site is currently occupied by an approximately 144,000-square-foot, three-story building with five commercial tenants. The building’s office and retail uses include a furniture rental store and wine bar. The 447 Battery Street Project (proposed project) would involve demolishing the existing building while retaining the existing building façade, as seen by the public; replacing the internal structure to bring it up to building and structural codes; and building an addition to create a new 18-story, 200-foot-tall hotel with a ground-floor lobby and restaurant (see Table 1). The hotel would have a total of 198 hotel rooms on 16 floors, with another restaurant on the 18th floor. Four below-grade basement levels would contain conference rooms, mechanical equipment, a loading area, and vehicle and bicycle parking. A new privately owned, publicly accessible open space (POPOS) would be provided along Merchant Street, in addition to private terraces for hotel guests and restaurant patrons. The proposed project would also include improvements to Merchant Street, as discussed below.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This section provides a description of the project location and site characteristics, the existing conditions, and the proposed project characteristics.
Table 1 Proposed Project Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Component</th>
<th>Area (gross square feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (hotel, lobbies, conference, restaurant)</td>
<td>122,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Parking(^a)</td>
<td>13,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL(^b)</td>
<td>143,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicly-accessible Open Space</td>
<td>2,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Open Space</td>
<td>2,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Open Space</td>
<td>3,934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Component</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Rooms (total)</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto(^c)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle (class 1)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle (class 2)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height of Building</td>
<td>200 feet (up to 220 feet inclusive of elevator/stair penthouse, parapet, and various rooftop elements)(^d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Stories</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^a\) Includes garage circulation space in the basement levels.
\(^b\) Includes mechanical uses not listed in this table.
\(^c\) Includes two Americans with Disabilities Act–compliant accessible spaces.
\(^d\) Consistent with the Planning Code Height and Bulk designations for the project site, the building height is 200 feet, with up to 20 feet for allowed for rooftop appurtenances.

**Project Location**

The approximately 7,178-square-foot (0.16-acre) project site (Assessor’s Block 0206, Lot 002) is at the northwest corner of Battery and Merchant streets, on a block bounded by Washington Street to the north, Battery Street to the east, Clay Street to the south, and Sansome Street to the west (see Figure 1). Merchant Street, an east–west street that divides the block in two, forms the southern boundary of the project site.

Streets surrounding the project site include one or two lanes and are not considered major arterials. Battery, Washington, and Sansome streets are all two lane-roadways; Merchant Street is a one-lane road. The nearest major thoroughfares are Columbus Avenue to the west, Market Street to the south, and The Embarcadero to the west. However, both Battery Street and Sansome Street support important functions related to circulation by serving as major routes for regional traffic into and out of the Financial District.
(particularly commuters residing in the East Bay and North Bay) as well as local traffic from residents living in neighborhoods northwest of downtown. Regional roadways that serve the project site are I-80, I-280, and U.S. 101, all three of which have on- and off-ramps within 0.5 mile of the project site.

The project site is connected to the transit network by numerous San Francisco Municipal Railway (Muni) stations. Muni bus routes 1, 10, 12, 30X, 41, and 82X all operate within a couple blocks of the project site. In addition, subsurface Muni lines have entrances along Market Street, the closest of which are the Embarcadero (0.3 mile south) and Montgomery (0.4 mile south) stations; these are served by the J, K, T, L, M, and N Muni Metro light-rail lines. Bay Area Rapid Transit, which provides regional public transit service, is also at the Embarcadero and Montgomery stations on Market Street. Regional public transit service is also provided by the Alameda–Contra Costa Transit District; the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway & Transportation District; the San Mateo County Transit District; and Caltrain.

**Existing Conditions**

The project site is generally flat, with an elevation of approximately 1 to 2 feet, San Francisco City Datum. The site is rectangular in shape, with approximately 74 feet of frontage on Battery Street and approximately 97 feet of frontage on Merchant Street.

The project site is currently developed with an approximately 144,000-square-foot, three-story, 45-foot-tall building that occupies the entire lot. The building was constructed in 1907 and is considered to be an historic resource. The building was originally occupied by a small Bay Area coffee producer, the Jones-Thierbach Company (1912 to 1966). After the company vacated, the property was converted to an office and retail building in 1967. The building’s current office and retail uses include a furniture rental store and wine bar on the ground floor. The second and third floor tenants are technology companies.

Two buildings adjoin the project site: a seven-story office building to the north with ground-floor retail space (401–423 Washington Street) and a three-story building to the west with a ground-floor restaurant (424 Merchant Street). Adjacent to the project site, across Merchant Street, is an 11-story hotel with ground-floor commercial uses (424 Clay Street and 425 Battery Street). To the east, across Battery Street, is an adjacent two-story parking garage and Maritime Plaza. West of the project site, at Sansome and Merchant streets, is San Francisco Fire Department Station 13.

---

1. San Francisco City Datum establishes the city’s zero point for surveying purposes at approximately 11.3 feet above the current 1988 North American Vertical Datum. Because tides are measured from mean lower low water (about 3.1 feet below mean sea level), an elevation of 0 feet San Francisco City Datum is approximately 8.2 feet above mean sea level.
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Project Location

The area surrounding the project site is a densely built area with land uses primarily consisting of neighborhood-serving retail uses on the ground level, with commercial space above. Parking, residential, hotel, office, and institutional facilities are also present in the area. The nearest residential buildings include the 21-story mixed-use building at 550 Battery Street (the Gateway apartments and townhomes) and a 23-story mixed-use residential building northeast of the project site. The nearest hotels are the Club Quarters Hotel at 424 Clay Street and Le Méridien at 333 Battery Street, immediately south of the project site, and the Hilton at 750 Kearny Street, two blocks west of the project site. Although the project site is adjacent to three- and seven-story buildings, the area includes high-rise buildings as well, such as the Transamerica Pyramid, the second tallest building in San Francisco, and the 21-story mixed-use building at 550 Battery Street.

Vegetation in the immediate vicinity of the project site is generally limited to street trees. Nearby public parks and open spaces include Maritime Plaza, Transamerica Redwood Park, Sydney G. Walton Square, Sue Bierman Park, Empire Park, Portsmouth Square Plaza, St. Mary’s Square, Market/Battery Plaza, and One Bush Plaza.

The proposed project is within San Francisco’s Financial District neighborhood and the Downtown Area Plan area, as identified in the San Francisco General Plan. The project site is also within a C-3-O (Downtown Office) zoning district and a 200-S height and bulk district. This height district allows for a building height of 200 feet. Regarding this bulk district, the bulk controls for the lower tower are a maximum length of 160 feet, a maximum floor size of 20,000 square feet, and a maximum diagonal dimension of 190 feet. The bulk controls for the upper tower are a maximum length of 130 feet, a maximum average floor size of 12,000 square feet, a maximum floor size for any floor of 17,000 square feet, and a maximum average diagonal measure of 160 feet.

The project site is not within a historic district. The Washington-Broadway Special Use District and the Jackson Square Special Use District are directly north of the project site. Waterfront Special Use District 3 is three blocks north of the project site. In addition, the project site is one block southeast of the Jackson Square Historic District, two blocks northeast of the Commercial-Leidesdorff Conservation District, and two blocks north of the Front-California Conservation District.

**Proposed Project Characteristics**

The proposed project would involve retaining the existing building façade, as seen by the public. The interior would be reconfigured to comply with the current building code and accommodate an additional 143,449 gross square feet of space at the project site. Ultimately, the proposed project would consist of an 18-story, 200-foot-tall hotel. The hotel would have 198 rooms on 16 floors, with a lobby and restaurant on the ground floor and mezzanine and another restaurant on the 18th floor.

The proposed project would have frontages on Battery and Merchant streets, as shown in Figure 2. Landscaping would be provided on Battery and Merchant streets, while loading would be provided on Merchant Street.
Figure 2
Proposed Site Plan

The proposed project would be a total of 143,499 square feet of development, including 122,148 square feet of commercial uses (hotel, lobbies, conference, and restaurant), 13,680 square feet of vehicle parking uses, and 404 square feet of bicycle parking uses. The proposed project would provide 2,720 square feet of POPOs along Merchant Street, 2,203 square feet of required commercial open space, and 3,934 square feet of terrace space. In addition, 24 vehicle parking spaces, eight class 1 bicycle parking spaces, and 19 class 2 bicycle parking spaces would be provided.

The ground floor would include the hotel lobby, a restaurant/bar, a loading dock/car elevator, and a fire command center (see Figure 3). Pedestrian access would be from Battery and Merchant streets. The mezzanine level would include a restaurant, a kitchen, and dining areas; the eastern portion of the mezzanine level would be open to the ground floor. For security, the building would include a camera system and valets for the entry.

The four basement levels would include one level for ancillary hotel uses, one level for mechanical uses, and two levels for loading or parking (see Figures 4 through 7). Basement Level 1 would include a conference center, gym, and spa areas for use by hotel guests. Basement Level 2 would include mechanical uses, such as electric generators, a fuel pump room, building storage, and maintenance areas as well as a room for bicycle parking, showers, and lockers. Basement Level 3 would be used for loading and accessed from the loading dock/car elevator at Merchant Street, discussed in more detail in the “Parking, Loading, and Bicycle Facilities” section, below. Basement Level 4, the parking level, would provide 22 valet parking spaces (in stackers), and two valet Americans with Disabilities Act– (ADA-) compliant accessible spaces, also accessed from the loading dock/car elevator at Merchant Street. The total depth of the basement would be approximately 50 feet.

Floors 2 through 17 of the building would contain 198 hotel rooms. Floors 2 through 8 would each contain 13 hotel rooms, Floors 9 through 14 would each contain 14 hotel rooms, Floor 15 would contain 11 hotel rooms, Floor 16 would contain eight hotel rooms, and Floor 17 would contain four hotel rooms (see Figures 8 and 9). The hotel rooms would vary in size from 300 square feet to 628 square feet, offering a mix of 157 regular rooms and 31 suites. Floor 18 would include a restaurant and bar. Floors 15 through 18 would each include a private terrace, facing either Battery Street or Washington Street or facing west toward Sansome Street.

The proposed structure would be approximately 200 feet in height to the roof, with a mechanical penthouse extending up to 20 feet above the roof height, for a total height of 220 feet (see Figure 10). The building would be designed in a contemporary architectural style, employing glass and limestone as the primary building materials. For the primary façades on Merchant and Battery streets, the proposed design would feature large glass storefronts that would be articulated by a glass overhang. The existing brick façade would be retained for the ground floor and mezzanine, with a glass façade used for Floors 3 through 18.
Figure 3
Proposed Ground Floor Plan

Proposed Basement Level 4 Plan

Proposed Basement Level 2 Plan

Figure 7
Proposed Basement Level 1 Plan
Figure 8
Proposed Level 2 Hotel Plan
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Figure 9
Proposed Level 17 Hotel Plan

Figure 10
Proposed Cross Section (Facing North)

The proposed project would comply with the City and County of San Francisco’s (City’s) Green Building Code and meet Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design Gold requirements. Conceptual renderings were prepared by the project architect to illustrate how the proposed project would appear from different vantage points (see Figures 11 and 12). The vantage point in Figure 11 is from the southeast, across Battery Street, at the western edge of Maritime Plaza. The vantage point in Figure 12, is from the east, across Battery Street, also at the western edge of Maritime Plaza but from the height of the tower (approximately 150 feet).

**Open Space.** The proposed project would include approximately 2,720 square feet of POPOs along Merchant Street. Street furniture, such as tables and benches, would be placed along the Merchant Street sidewalk in front of the proposed building, along with stone paving and new street trees from Battery Street to Sansome Street. The proposed 2,720 square feet of privately owned public open space would exceed the planning code open space requirement for proposed hotel and restaurant uses (2,203 square feet). In addition, approximately 3,934 square feet of terrace space would be provided on floors 15 through 18 for hotel and restaurant guests.

**Parking, Loading, and Bicycle Facilities.** The existing building contains no off-street parking spaces. The proposed project would create one new curb cut and add an approximately 10-foot-wide garage door along Merchant Street for the loading dock/car elevator, which would provide access to the loading and parking levels. As shown in Figure 4, the proposed project would add 24 valet parking spaces in Basement Level 4; 22 of the spaces would be in stackers, and two would be individually accessible ADA-compliant spaces. Car-share parking spaces would not be provided. Vehicle parking spaces would be available to hotel guests and restaurant patrons. Access to the parking spaces would be from the loading dock/car elevator on Merchant Street. The loading dock/car elevator would be sized for both trucks and vehicles. A truck or service van would back up into the loading dock/car elevator and be transported down to Basement Level 3. Once in Basement Level 3, the truck or service van would back up to the loading dock. After unloading, the truck or service van would depart through the loading dock/car elevator and exit at Merchant Street. For vehicles, a valet driver would take the vehicle from patrons on Merchant Street, then enter the loading dock/car elevator and be transported down to Basement Level 4. The valet driver would put the vehicle in an open parking spot until the vehicle is needed again, at which point the valet would take the vehicle up the loading dock/car elevator and back to Merchant Street to deliver it to the driver.

Eight class 1 bicycle parking spaces would be provided on Basement Level 2 in code-complaint, lift-assisted double-deck bicycle racks, as shown in Figure 6. The bicycle racks would have a manually operated system that would stack the bicycles on two tiers, with lift-assist top trays that would slide down to within inches of the ground, requiring minimal lifting of the bicycle to the tray. As shown in Figure 3, access to the bicycle spaces would be from the ground-level foyer on Merchant Street, located between the stairs and the loading dock/car elevator, or from the hotel reception area on Merchant or Battery streets where patrons would take an elevator to Basement Level 2.

Nineteen class 2 bicycle parking spaces would be provided in bike racks. One bicycle rack would be on Battery Street, and one bicycle rack would be on Merchant Street, as shown in Figure 3. These bicycle parking spaces would be available to hotel guests, restaurant patrons, and building employees. Access to the bicycle spaces would be from the lobby entry on Merchant Street or Battery Street.

Figure 12
Visual Simulation from East
Notice of Preparation of an EIR
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Landscaping. No trees would be removed as part of the proposed project because none currently exist at the project site. As part of the proposed project, three new street trees would be planted on Battery Street, and eight new street trees would be planted on Merchant Street, as shown in Figure 3. The proposed tree types are London plane for Battery Street and Fastigiata ginkgo for Merchant Street. The sidewalks adjacent to the proposed building along Merchant and Battery streets would be replaced with decorative paving and curbs.

Foundation and Excavation. The proposed project’s deep foundation is anticipated to require the use of auger pressure-grouted displacement piles, drilled shafts, auger cast piles, fundex piles, or torque-down piles. The proposed project would include excavation to a maximum depth of approximately 55 feet to accommodate the four subterranean levels and the building’s foundation; approximately 15,000 cubic yards of material would be excavated.

Construction Schedule. Demolition and construction are estimated to take approximately 28 months, with six overlapping phases, including demolition (1 month), site preparation (2 months), grading/excavation (6 months), building construction (16 months), paving (2 months), and architectural coating work (1 month). Construction is expected to commence in December 2020.

REQUIRED APPROVALS
The proposed project would require approvals from several authorities, including those listed below.

Actions by the Planning Commission
- Approval of conditional use authorization from the Planning Commission under Planning Code section 303 to permit hotel uses.
- Approval of Downtown Project Authorization from the Planning Commission, per Planning Code section 309 for projects within a C-3 zoning district greater than 50,000 square feet in area or 75 feet in height and for granting exceptions to the requirements of certain sections of the planning code.

Actions by Other City Departments
- San Francisco Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection – Approval of the site permit.
- Department of Building Inspection – Approval of demolition, grading, and building permits for demolition of the existing building and construction of the new building and night noise permit for nighttime construction.
- Department of Public Health – Approval of compliance with Maher Ordinance.
- San Francisco Public Works – Approval of a street space permit from the Bureau of Street Use and Mapping if sidewalks are used for construction staging and pedestrian walkways are constructed in the curb lanes.
- San Francisco Public Works – Approval of construction within the public right-of-way (e.g., bulb-outs, sidewalk extensions) to ensure consistency with the Better Streets Plan.
- San Francisco Public Works – Approval of a permit to plant street trees adjacent to the project site.
- San Francisco Public Works – Approval of maintenance agreement for Merchant Street improvements, subject to major encroachment permit.
- San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency – Approval of the placement of bicycle racks on the sidewalk, and other sidewalk improvements, by the Sustainable Streets Division.
- San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency – Approval of a special traffic permit from the Sustainable Streets Division if sidewalks are used for construction staging and pedestrian walkways are constructed in the curb lanes.
- San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency – Approval of construction within the public right-of-way (e.g., bulb-outs, sidewalk extensions) to ensure consistency with the Better Streets Plan.
- San Francisco Public Utilities Commission – Approval of any changes to sewer laterals (connections to the City sewer).
- San Francisco Public Utilities Commission – Approval of an erosion and sediment control plan, in accordance with article 4.1 of the San Francisco Public Works Code.
- San Francisco Public Utilities Commission – Approval of post-construction stormwater design guidelines, including a stormwater control plan that complies with the City’s 2016 Stormwater Management Requirements and Design Guidelines.
- San Francisco Board of Supervisors – Approval of major encroachment permit by board resolution for Merchant Street improvements.
- San Francisco Recreation and Parks – Approval of a joint resolution by the Planning Commission and San Francisco Recreation and Parks to raise the absolute cumulative shadow limit on Maritime Plaza.
- San Francisco Entertainment Commission – Determine if a hearing is required and possible noise attenuation conditions.

SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

The proposed project could result in potentially significant environmental impacts. This section describes how the San Francisco Planning Department (department) will prepare an initial study and environmental impact report (EIR) to evaluate the potential physical environmental impacts of the proposed project. An initial study will assess both project-specific and cumulative impacts for all topics required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). As required by CEQA, an EIR will further examine those issues identified in the initial study to have potentially significant impact, identify mitigation measures, and analyze whether the proposed mitigation measures would reduce potentially significant
environmental impacts to a less-than-significant level. The initial study will be published as an appendix to the EIR.

It is anticipated that the EIR will address cultural resources, specifically historic resources. Environmental impacts related to land use and land use planning, population and housing, cultural resources (specifically archaeological resources and human remains), tribal cultural resources, transportation and circulation, noise, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, wind, shadow, utilities and service systems, recreation, public services, biological resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, hazards and hazardous materials, mineral resources, energy, agriculture and forest resources, and wildfire are anticipated to be analyzed in the initial study, unless significant impacts are identified that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, in which case, analysis of any such impacts will be included in the EIR. The environmental issues to be addressed in the initial study or EIR are described briefly below. For all topics, the analysis will consider the impacts of the proposed project individually as well as cumulative impacts resulting from other reasonably foreseeable projects.

Since the proposed project meets the requirements of a transit-oriented infill development project under Senate Bill 743, aesthetics and parking will not be considered in determining if the proposed project has the potential to result in potentially significant environmental impacts. Visual renderings may be included within the initial study and EIR project descriptions.

**Land Use and Land Use Planning**

The land use and land use planning initial study section will describe existing land uses on the project site and in the project vicinity and analyze whether the proposed project would physically divide an established community or result in a significant physical environmental impact due to a conflict with land use plans adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

**Population and Housing**

The population and housing initial study analysis will analyze the potential for the proposed project to result in impacts related to direct or indirect population growth, employment and housing provision and balance, and residential displacement.

**Cultural Resources**

The cultural resources initial study analysis will address archeological resources and human remains. The building on the project site is considered a historic resource for the purpose of CEQA review. The proposed project would include demolition of the existing building with retention of portions of the façade. The EIR will describe the historic resources on the project site, summarize applicable portions of the Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) report\(^4\) and Historic Resource Evaluation Response (HRER),\(^5\) and identify the potential impacts on historic resources.

**Tribal Cultural Resources**

The tribal cultural resources initial study analysis will address the potential for the proposed project to affect tribal cultural resources.

---


\(^5\) San Francisco Planning Department, 447 Battery Street Historic Resource Evaluation Response, December 17, 2017.
Transportation and Circulation
The proposed project would generate new vehicle trips, generating additional vehicle miles traveled (VMT) to and from the project site. The proposed project would also generate new transit, pedestrian, and bicycle trips, and loading demand. A transportation impact study will be prepared in support of the transportation and circulation initial study analysis which will discuss trip generation, freight and passenger loading operations, site circulation, VMT impacts, transit service and capacity, code compliance, loading, hazards due to a project design feature, including to pedestrians and bicyclists, construction impacts, and emergency access.

Noise
The noise initial study analysis will evaluate noise impacts related to construction and operation of the proposed project, including the effect of construction noise on adjacent sensitive noise receptors.

Air Quality
The air quality initial study analysis will discuss construction and operational emissions of criteria pollutants and toxic air contaminants, as appropriate, as well as compliance with the City’s Construction Dust Control Ordinance.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions
The greenhouse gas emissions initial study analysis will refer to the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) checklist and disclose the anticipated consistency finding with the City’s GHG Reduction Strategy.

Wind
At 200 feet in height, the proposed project could change wind conditions near the project site in a way that could affect public areas. A wind study will be prepared for the proposed project to evaluate the existing wind conditions near the project site and the extent to which the proposed project would affect ground-level wind. The initial study will summarize the results of the wind analysis, including a summary of ground-level wind impacts, and determine if mitigation measures for wind impacts are required.

Shadow
The preliminary shadow fan prepared by the department indicates that the proposed project could cast new shadows on properties under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission, including Maritime Plaza. The initial study section will summarize the results of a shadow analysis, and will evaluate the extent to which shadows cast by the proposed project could adversely affect the use and enjoyment of publicly-accessible open spaces.

Recreation
The recreation section of the initial study will analyze whether the proposed project would physically degrade existing parks and recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of parks and recreational facilities that could have a physical effect on the environment.

Utilities and Service Systems
This initial study analysis of utilities and service systems will examine the proposed project’s effect on water supply, wastewater treatment, solid waste disposal, and energy generation and transmission. It will describe existing utility providers, system capacity, and improvement plans; evaluate the net change in the
demand for water, wastewater, solid waste, and energy, relative to existing and planned capacity for the utilities; consider stormwater generation associated with the proposed project and how the City’s Stormwater Management Ordinance will apply; and discuss whether implications of the proposed project trigger the expansion or construction of new infrastructure or facilities. In addition, the analysis will evaluate the proposed project’s consistency with the Recycled (or Reclaimed) Water Use Ordinance.

**Public Services**
The public services initial study analysis will analyze whether existing public service providers (e.g. police and fire protections, schools, etc.) would be adversely affected by the proposed project so as to require new or physically altered public facilities, the construction of which could result in physical environmental effects.

**Biological Resources**
The biological resources initial study analysis will discuss the existing biological resources or habitats that could be effected by the proposed project, such as trees or the movement of any native resident or migratory bird species, and the potential for the proposed project to result in a substantial adverse effect on these biological resources or habitats.

**Geology and Soils**
The geology and soils initial study section will summarize the findings of the geotechnical investigation and will evaluate the susceptibility of the project site to seismic activity, liquefaction, landslides, erosion, soil stability, and risks to life or property. The analysis will also include whether or not the proposed project would substantially change the topography or any unique geologic or physical features of the site, or directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

**Hydrology and Water Quality**
The hydrology and water quality initial study analysis will evaluate the proposed project’s potential to violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or result in adverse effects to groundwater supplies. The analysis will also consider any effects to drainage patterns resulting from the proposed project and evaluation the potential to result in runoff that could affect stormwater drainage systems.

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials**
The hazards and hazardous materials initial study analysis will evaluate the potential for the proposed project to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment related to hazards and hazardous materials through location on a hazardous materials site, the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, the emission or release of hazardous soils or groundwater, or interference with an emergency response plan.

**Mineral Resources**
The mineral resources initial study analysis will analyze potential impacts of the proposed project related to existing mineral resources.
Energy Resources
The energy resources initial study analysis will analyze potential impacts of the proposed project related to existing energy resources.

Agricultural/Forest Resources
The agriculture and forest resources initial study analysis will analyze potential impacts of the proposed project related to existing agricultural and forest resources.

Wildfire
The wildfire initial study analysis will analyze potential impacts of the proposed project related to potential impacts from wildfires.

FINDING
This project may have a significant effect on the environment and an EIR is required. This determination is based upon the criteria of the State CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15064 (Determining Significant Effect), and 15065 (Mandatory Findings of Significance). The purpose of the EIR is to provide information about potential physical environmental impacts of the proposed project, to identify possible ways to minimize the potentially significant impacts, and to describe and analyze possible alternatives to the proposed project. Preparation of an EIR notice of preparation, initial study, or EIR does not indicate a decision by the City to approve or disapprove a proposed project. However, prior to making any such decision, the decision makers must review and consider the information contained in the EIR.

ALTERNATIVES
Alternatives to be evaluated in the EIR for the proposed project will include, but not be limited to, a No Project Alternative, which will assume no change to the existing conditions on the project site, one or more alternatives that preserve all or most of the historic resources on the project site, and additional alternatives to address other significant effects of the proposed project that are identified in the EIR. The alternatives considered and the analysis thereof is based upon the criteria of the State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6 (Consideration and Discussion of Alternatives to the Proposed Project).

PUBLIC SCOPING PROCESS
Written comments will be accepted until 5:00 p.m. on Friday, September 6th, 2019. Written comments should be sent to Rachel Schuett, San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103, rachel.schuett@sfgov.org.

If you work for a responsible State agency, we need to know the views of your agency regarding the scope and content of the environmental information that is germane to your agency’s statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. Your agency may need to use the EIR when considering a permit or other approval for this project. Please include the name of a contact person in your agency.

Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the commission or the department. All written or oral communications, including
submitted personal contact information, may be made available to the public for inspection and copying upon request and may appear on the department’s website or in other public documents.

August 7, 2019
Date

Lisa Gibson
Environmental Review Officer